The Internal Academic Review (IAR) of the Jewish Studies Program is now complete. The Internal Academic Review Committee (IARC) has taken into consideration all of the submissions related to the IAR of the Jewish Studies Program and respectfully submits the following report. The IARC Report to Senate is intended to supplement the findings of the attached Review Team Report and to provide a mechanism for the Director of the Program and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science to jointly report on the progress in addressing the Review Team recommendations (please see the “Outcomes” section of this report).

Summary of the Internal Academic Review of the Jewish Studies Program

Jewish Studies is a young and growing program which offers high-quality courses to students who are enrolled in a minor concentration or who choose to take Jewish Studies courses as electives. The IARC notes the efforts of a faculty complement from across several disciplines that provides a program with a depth and breadth of courses that is considered “remarkable” by external and internal reviewers. External Consultants characterized the Program as having much potential and recommend that it maintain a broad scope to its overall vision and course offerings. In addition, evidence of the quality of the students and their level of engagement in the program bode well for the future.

The Program is now well placed to increase the number of concentrators as well as its capacity to offer Jewish Studies courses as electives. This is largely the result of the commitment of the Faculty of Arts and Science in allocating additional resources to expand the role of Director to a full-time faculty position and to adding one full-time administrative support position. As the Jewish Studies Program enters this next phase, the IARC encourages exploration of its participation in the University’s interdisciplinary and diversity objectives as outlined in Queen’s Strategic Plan.

Originally a grass roots program that was established with the support of the local community, the Program has begun recruiting for an experienced Director who will be tasked with taking the Program to the next level. To guide the Program’s academic development, the IARC agrees with the reviewers’ recommendation that an academic
advisory committee be established to assist the Director with long-term academic planning and to promote and protect the freedom of academic inquiry. Furthermore, the IARC suggests that the establishment of an endowed Chair in Jewish Studies in support of the academic goals of the Program, through fund-raising at the regional, national and international levels, should continue to be a priority.

With the recent influx of new resources, the Jewish Studies Program is well on its way to enhancing its profile and outreach on campus and within the local community. The IARC adds its endorsement to the Review Team Report and its recommendations:

**Outcomes of the Internal Academic Review of the Jewish Studies Program**

*Joint response submitted by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Director of the Jewish Studies Program*

**Governance of the Jewish Studies Program:**

_The Internal Academic Review Team (IART), in agreement with the External Consultants, recommends that the Jewish Studies Program should be administered by a full-time director, who is a tenured or tenure-track Faculty member with a record of scholarship in Jewish Studies and significant experience in administering undergraduate programs._

The Faculty concurs with this recommendation and is in the process of hiring a full-time Director of the Jewish Studies Program, as a result of this recommendation.

_The IART, in agreement with the External Consultants, recommends that the Director should be supported by a full-time secretary._

The Faculty will provide resources for enhanced secretarial support for the new Director (i.e., at least a 75% position).

_The IART, in agreement with the External Consultants, recommends that a governance structure be created to provide guidance and support to the Director in policy and program matters._

The Faculty will support the incoming full-time Director of the Jewish Studies Program in establishing an advisory committee for the Program. The advisory committee should consist of instructors teaching in the Program, other tenured faculty with an interest in Jewish Studies, students, and the Jewish Studies administrative assistant.
Resources and the Future of the Program:

In response to the IART, and the recommendations of the External Consultants, the Faculty believes its additional investments outlined above will position Jewish Studies more prominently within Queen’s and the community-at-large.

*Follow-up on these recommendations and issues will take place during annual budget and staffing strategy meetings between the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Vice-Principal (Academic)*
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Executive Summary

The Internal Academic Review Team (IART) based its report on the Jewish Studies Program Unit Self-Study (Unit Study), the report of the External Consultants (Dr. Eliezer Segal and Dr. Daniel Boyarin), a meeting held with the External Consultants, a meeting with Dr. Justin Lewis and his colleagues and three meetings of the IART to consider both the written and oral submissions. The report and recommendations that follow represent a consensus view of the IART.

The report is divided into five sections: Section 1- The Undergraduate Program, Section 2 - Administration of the Program, Section 3 - Program Resources, Section 4 - Community Relations, and Section 5 - Conclusions and Summary Recommendations. In each section, we highlight the strengths, the weaknesses and recommendations.

In comparison to similar programs at Queen’s and Jewish Studies programs at other universities in North America, Jewish Studies has done remarkably well in providing high quality courses as a BA Minor program. Dr. Lewis and his fellow instructors are dedicated to the mission of Jewish Studies and the university. They are to be commended for their accomplishments given the minimal resources available for the day-to-day operations of Jewish Studies. A number of issues are detailed in the report particularly with respect to the administrative structure, resources and the relationship between Jewish Studies as a program and the community-at-large. Out of the analysis of these issues, there are six key recommendations:

• The director’s position should be made full-time and should be staffed by a tenured or tenure-track faculty with a record of scholarship in Jewish Studies and significant experience in administering undergraduate programs.

• The director should be supported by a full-time secretary, while the Queen’s Theological College and the Department of Religious Studies should continue to supply administrative support in specific areas as required.

• A governance structure be created to provide guidance and support to the Director in the development and implementation of policies and program activities.

• Additional financial resources be made available to compensate affiliated faculty who participate in the administrative activities of Jewish Studies beyond the teaching of undergraduate courses.

• A renewed effort be made to raise funds to create an endowed chair in Jewish Studies.
Finally, the IART observed that some of the issues related to the administration of Jewish Studies may be symptomatic of systemic issues related to the administration of all similar small programs at Queen’s University. We recommend that the Dean of Arts and Science review and address these issues in the context of all similar small programs at Queen’s University.
Introduction

The Internal Academic Review Team (IART) has based its report on the Jewish Studies Program Unit Self-Study (Unit Study), the report of the External Consultants (Dr. Eliezer Segal and Dr. Daniel Boyarin), a meeting held with the External Consultants (17 January 2006) and a meeting with Dr. Justin Lewis and his colleagues (31 January 2006).

The IART held three meetings to discuss the Jewish Studies Program (JS) at various stages of the process (31 October 2005, 11 January 2006 and 16 March 2006). A draft report was circulated on 6 March 2006. Based on written comments and the meeting of 16 March 2006, the report was finalized and represents a consensus view among the IART.

The report is divided into five sections: Section 1 - The Undergraduate Program, Section 2 - Administration of the Program, Section 3 - Program Resources, Section 4 - Community Relations and Section 5 - Conclusions and Summary Recommendations. In each section, we highlight the strengths, the weaknesses and recommendations.

Section 1 – The Undergraduate Program

The courses in the undergraduate program are taught by a combination of the director, tenured and tenure-track faculty whose primary appointments are in other departments and in one case, at the Royal Military College (RMC) and adjunct appointees. As described in the Unit Study (pg. 3), the program has gone through three permutations with a shift from “religion to a broader engagement with Jewish civilization” being the outcome. Courses range over the humanities, social sciences, religion and language as they relate to Jewish Studies. The program offers a Bachelor of Arts (BA) – Minor Concentration.

There are several impressive points to make about the undergraduate program. For a small program dependent on extremely limited resources (see below), there appears to be a very high level of commitment by the faculty to provide quality undergraduate education consistent with the goals and standards of Queen’s. Evidence for this observation can be found in the number of courses offered, their enrolments and how this program compares to similar programs at Queen’s (e.g., Canadian Studies) and to undergraduate Jewish Studies programs at other universities across North America. Even with only 10 concentrators in 2005-2006, several of the courses in Jewish Studies have solid enrolments on a yearly basis drawing students from other programs presumably looking for electives to meet their academic interests.

Notwithstanding governance and resources issues, which are dealt with in subsequent sections, what is lacking in the Unit Study and in the conversations the IART had with Dr. Lewis and other teachers in the Jewish Studies program is a clear vision of the future of the program. Is the vision to maintain the program “as is” or to grow the program into a BA majors program? If it is the latter, how is this to be accomplished? What the Unit Study does offer (pgs. 38-41) are requests for resources, many of which are reasonable...
and would be beneficial in resolving some of the current weaknesses in the program, but it is unclear that even if these requests were all met how this would lead to increased enrolments and future BA majors program. There is a shared responsibility between the Office of the Dean of Arts and Science, the Director of Jewish Studies and the other academic members to develop this vision and resource it appropriately.

Section 2 – Administration of the Program

Like the undergraduate program, the administration of Jewish Studies has gone through three permutations. The current administrative structure for Jewish Studies is in the hands of a half-time director whose job description is limited to teaching and administration, and some community outreach. The position is a renewable, contract position. Administrative support (i.e., financial management, student support and secretarial services) are provided by the Queen’s Theological College and the Department of Religious Studies.

As noted in the Unit Study (pg. 17), there was originally an Executive Committee made up of academics and community representatives, but this was disbanded under Dr. Tulchinsky’s directorship. Under the current director, Dr. Lewis, no new advisory committee has been proposed and while Dr. Lewis has held meetings with the faculty, there is no ongoing structure in place. This is not so surprising given Dr. Lewis’ position is only part-time, his relatively new status as an academic and the myriad of other responsibilities Dr. Lewis has as director of Jewish Studies.

There is no doubt in the collective view of the IART that Dr. Lewis has worked extremely hard to carry out all of the administrative functions required of any head of a department, its undergraduate coordinator and all of the committee functions (e.g., library representative) necessary for the sustainability of an undergraduate program. It is also clear that Dr. Lewis has played a leadership role in meeting his commitments to the wider university and Kingston community in the organisation of the Harry Rosen Memorial Symposium and Bep and Sal Fransman Memorial Lecture Series.

It is also obvious that many of the problems facing Jewish Studies stem from the current administrative structure. The Unit Study and the meetings we held with the External Consultants and Dr. Lewis and his colleagues made it clear that improvements are required with respect to the director’s position, administrative support and the governance of the program. The director’s position should be a full-time position and preferably filled by tenured or tenure track faculty member who has previous administrative experience coordinating an undergraduate program. While there may be a need to draw on administrative expertise from the Queen’s Theological College and the Department of Religious Studies (especially for financial administration), there needs to be a full-time secretary to support the director and the program. Thirdly, a governance structure needs to be put in place. Three options might be considered: a) an advisory board made up of mostly tenured and some tenure-track faculty from Queen’s who have an interest in Jewish Studies regardless of whether they teach in the program who would provide advice and support to the director and who the director would be obliged to meet on a
regular basis; b) a committee made up of the director and the teaching members of Jewish Studies who meet on a regular basis and are prepared to participate in the administrative functions of the program (e.g., academic advising, curriculum development, library acquisitions, etc.); or c) some combination of (a) and (b). A starting point would be to develop a constitution for Jewish Studies that defines the governance structure of the program.

Section 3 – Program Resources

On the one hand, Jewish Studies like other programs at Queen’s (e.g., Canadian Studies) suffers because of a general lack of resources committed to it. In previous sections, we have already documented the limitations of having a director whose position is only half-time and where there is no dedicated administrative support. Beyond these issues are the problems related to full-time faculty whose positions are in other departments and depending on adjunct faculty to teach courses integral to the program. In our view, Dr. Lewis and his colleagues are to be highly commended for their dedication to the program and making it work. To sustain the program, the director requires resources both “to buy” full-time faculty to teach courses and to compensate adjunct faculty so that they can participate more fully in the administrative/operational activities of the program.

On the other hand, Jewish Studies has an endowment, which even many departments do not have. The importance of the Harry Rosen Memorial Symposium and Bep and Sal Fransman Memorial Lecture Series to Jewish Studies, the broader university community and the Kingston community should not be minimized.

It is our understanding that a substantial amount of money was raised towards an endowed chair in Jewish Studies. It is unclear to the IART why the Advancement Office has chosen not to continue to fundraise to complete this project. Raising the remaining funds, creating an endowed chair that would bring a noted scholar to Queen’s on a secure basis who might also be director of Jewish Studies at some point in the future would go a long way in resolving some of the other issues already identified.

Section 4 – Community Relations

The blurring of relations between the director of Jewish Studies and the Kingston community has generated tensions for the program since its inception. As a starting point, what needs to be made clear is that Jewish Studies like any program at Queen’s and those who teach within it are protected by the principles of academic freedom and the collective agreement. There can be no room for outside interference in how the Jewish Studies program is operated or what is taught in the classroom because someone outside the university disagrees with the course content or something said or written by any of those who teach in Jewish Studies in pursuit of their scholarly interests.

While any director or teacher within Jewish Studies is perfectly within their rights to play whatever role they want in the community, there should be no expectation on the part of the university or in the community that the director has any formal or informal
responsibility to play a community role. If this is in the formal current job description of the director, it should be removed and if it is informally implied, the practice should be stopped. In addition, other recommendations such as making the director’s position full-time and creating a formal governance structure without community involvement would also go some way in reducing the tensions between the director of Jewish Studies and the community.

A fine balance is required on the part of the director and the university. The continued financial support of the community is required should the Advancement Office renew its efforts to fund an endowed chair in Jewish Studies. There is also something positive to be gained if the community has a role in the Harry Rosen Memorial Symposium and Bep and Sal Fransman Memorial Lecture Series. These roles have to be clearly defined and any community representation must be within the broader context of an understanding that the decisions made must conform to the broader goals and values of the university linked to scholarship and academic freedom.

Section 5 – Conclusions and Summary Recommendations

Jewish Studies has only existed as a program for 13 years at Queen’s. Over this time, there have been three directors and three revisions to the program. In comparison to similar programs at Queen’s and Jewish Studies programs at other universities in North America, Jewish Studies has done remarkably well in providing high quality courses as a BA Minor program. Dr. Lewis and his fellow instructors are dedicated to the mission of Jewish Studies and the university. They are to be commended for their accomplishments given the minimal resources available for the day-to-day operations of Jewish Studies.

For Jewish Studies to grow, we would recommend the following:

- The director’s position should be made full-time and should be staffed by a tenured or tenure-track faculty with a record of scholarship in Jewish Studies and significant experience in administering undergraduate programs.

- The director should be supported by a full-time secretary, while the Queen’s Theological College and the Department of Religious Studies should continue to supply administrative support in specific areas as required.

- A governance structure be created to provide guidance and support to the Director in the development and implementation of policies and program activities.

- Additional financial resources be made available to compensate affiliated faculty who participate in the administrative activities of Jewish Studies beyond the teaching of undergraduate courses.

- A renewed effort be made to raise funds to create an endowed chair in Jewish Studies.
Finally, the IART observed that some of the issues related to the administration of Jewish Studies may be symptomatic of systemic issues related to the administration of all similar small programs at Queen’s University. We recommend that the Dean of Arts and Science review and address these issues in the context of all similar small programs at Queen’s University.