

Department of Comparative Literature Self-Study
(November 2002)

Table of Contents

I:	Overview: <i>Comparative Literature at the University of Washington</i> — <i>Where We Are, Where We're Headed</i>	1
II:	Faculty Profile	8
III:	Departmental Staffing and Governance	
	A: Staffing	10
	B: Governance	13
IV:	Graduate Programs	
	A: M.A. and Ph.D. Programs in Comparative Literary Studies	15
	B: Program in Theory and Criticism	22
	C: Textual Studies Program	26
V:	Undergraduate Programs	
	A: Comparative Literary Studies	30
	B: Cinema Studies	36
VI:	Development and Outreach	
	A: Recent Development Initiatives	45
	B: Texts and Teachers Program (K-12 Outreach)	47
VII:	Conclusion: <i>Priorities in Moving Ahead</i>	49

I: Overview

Comparative Literature at the University of Washington Where We Are, Where We're Headed

"If humanity is to survive and avoid new catastrophes, then the global political order has to be accompanied by a sincere and mutual respect among the various spheres of civilization, culture, nations, or continents, and by honest efforts on their part to seek and find the values or basic moral imperatives they have in common, and to build them into the foundations of their coexistence in this globally connected world."

Vaclav Havel

"We have all the answers, it is the questions we do not know."

Fyodor Dostoevsky

Where We Are

Comparative Literature is, by its nature, an anomalous academic discipline—in a certain sense less an independent discipline than a nodal point for the intersection of a variety of academic disciplines. This was true at the inception of the field in the 1950's and 1960's, when Comparative Literature took as its task the study of literature across and beyond the traditional boundary lines of national literature departments. It was equally true in the 1970's, when Comparative Literature departments became one of the most common locations for the cross-disciplinary blending of philosophical and methodological discourses that came to be called "theory." And it remains true today, as Comparative Literature looks toward even broader interdisciplinary linkages within literary studies, but also with the arts, with the social sciences, with media studies, and with other fields of academic inquiry. Although one can canvass our activities (as the catalog description of our department does in fact do), Comparative Literature will continue to be defined less as a distinct discipline than as a place for working through the connections within and across disciplinary fields of study.

This point holds true in institutional as well as intellectual terms. A Comparative Literature Department cannot be assessed simply as a department, for that would miss the centrality of its role in fostering a network of academic enterprises. Most departments engage in cross-departmental collaboration and interdisciplinary studies, to be sure, but they are rarely as central to the identity of a department's institutional function as they are for Comparative Literature. Thus even as we make reference to the standard measures of our scholarly and instructional activities—productivity and efficiency measures on which we think we fare well—we want to use this self-study to emphasize some less-visible aspects of our work. Our success (and our limits) should be measured in large part by how well we are serving an integrative role for intellectual and pedagogical activities at this university.

At the same time, we do have at the heart of our discipline a set of shared skills, a common commitment to both the nature and purpose of specific interpretive techniques. We work with texts—though increasingly texts of very different kinds—bringing to bear

strategies of reading that attend in particular to their aesthetic and rhetorical dimensions, aspects often left out of account in the informational use of texts by other disciplines. Such analysis aims to understand better the way in which aesthetic representations do particular kinds of social and cultural work, not simply reflecting, but contributing to the shaping of values and beliefs in specific societies. Doing this well requires two sorts of training that are at the center of our program—the development of an historical awareness that can take account of the context within which any specific text needs to be read and the fostering of a trans-cultural awareness that depends upon linguistic skills, including fluency in the original languages through which particular cultural traditions have been created. We have as well a sense of shared purpose in the transmitting of these skills, the belief that the study of literary and cultural texts plays an indispensable role in coming to understand from within people and societies different from ourselves and to see how their beliefs, their values and their behavior have evolved over time.

Our students benefit most from participation in our field when they perceive the openness of our discipline as an opportunity, taking advantage of the independence and flexibility we allow them for creating their own programs. More so than in national literature departments, where students encounter a large number of general requirements, each student in Comparative Literature needs to create his or her own program, his or her own field of study. We have made significant progress in this regard with our graduate program, where a reduction in numbers over the past ten years has made it possible to advise and mentor students more closely. Although this happens informally for many undergraduates as well, we acknowledge a need to create more formal mechanisms for providing guidance to our undergraduates as well. At the same time, the continuing popularity and growth of both of our undergraduate programs attests to the fact that what we have in place works well; tenth-day enrollment figures for Autumn Quarter 2002 show that Comparative Literature is now the second-largest department in the humanities, with a total of 154 undergraduate majors (as with all departments, the internal count of declared majors runs consistently higher than these figures, which include only students enrolled in courses in a given quarter).

Our faculty has traditionally been and remains an extremely productive one. A quick (and probably incomplete) count shows that since 1995, the group of twenty-three faculty on our current departmental roster has published eight single-authored books and edited thirteen volumes of various kinds (collections of essays, editions of primary works with critical introductions, etc.). They have published four major volumes of translation, edited four special issues of journals, and produced a variety of other work--creative writing and volumes of essays. In addition to numerous shorter works (reviews and dictionary entries, along with essays), they have published seventy-five articles of more than ten pages in length in a wide range of the most prominent journals in their fields. Several more monographs are finished and under contract with various presses, as are dozens of additional articles. In the last ten years, various faculty have been Guggenheim and Woodrow Wilson fellows or scholars at the National Humanities Center and the Stanford Humanities Center. They have received a total of ten Royalty Research Fund grants; five have been junior or senior scholars in the Simpson Center for the Humanities. Among the local activities they have organized are three major conferences in the last several years, a 1997 inaugural conference for the Textual Studies Program, a 1999 film series and colloquium on "Ethnicity in Contemporary European Cinema," and the 2001

conference of the North American Society for the Study of Romanticism. Faculty have participated in collaborative research groups dealing with such topics as “Performing the Subject in Eighteenth-Century Drama and Opera” and “Nature and Its Publics in the Tropics.”

As a nodal point for academic intersections, Comparative Literature is dependent, more deeply dependent than most departments, on the vitality of the units that surround it. Most immediately important are those in the humanities—defined broadly to include such fields as philosophy, history, and the arts. But we depend a great deal as well on the general university climate, on whether this institution continues to find the sorts of temporary and long-term funding to allow interdisciplinary work and new programs to flourish. Given its close working relationship with other departments, Comparative Literature serves a good barometer of the health of the humanities in general

Our own assessment would be that we have built a solid program that can boast a number of significant achievements over the last few years, but that this program has a number of goals still to accomplish and that our success rests upon a fragile foundation. To some extent, this fragility is inevitable; the small faculty FTE count of Comparative Literature makes it particularly vulnerable to faculty losses, ebbs and flows of student interest, and other normal institutional changes. But the situation also reflects the perpetual resource deprivation of the University of Washington (which hampers our ability to build as quickly or as solidly as we should) and the particularly acute state of faculty salaries, faculty attrition, and faculty morale in the humanities.

Our goal in this self-study is not so much to map out a predetermined plan for the next five or ten years, but instead to reflect upon whether we are asking the right sorts of questions, attending to the most telling shifts within and among disciplines, for us to pursue the best opportunities for cross-disciplinary work and institutional collaborations both within and beyond the University of Washington.

Looking Back

Looking over the last decade, we note two distinct phases of transformation in the department. A number of dramatic changes were initiated soon after the last departmental review, concerning faculty appointments, the size of the graduate program and the undergraduate curriculum. The most notable change stemmed from Dean Joe Norman’s decision to formalize the involvement of various faculty with Comparative Literature by creating a new set of partially salaried appointments in the department (12 newly salaried faculty slots, totaling 3.17 total faculty FTE, were added in September 1993). The effects of this change, long urged by then-chair Ernst Behler, have been quite significant and decidedly positive for the department. Not only have these shifts made it easier to fashion a coherent departmental curriculum, especially at the undergraduate level, but they have also fostered increased participation by these new faculty in departmental governance and service. As the review committee had urged, the department embarked at that time upon a long-term process of reducing the size of the graduate program and a comprehensive review of its undergraduate curriculum. The results in these areas have been equally dramatic. Graduate student numbers are now less than half what they were ten years ago; the undergraduate curriculum was completely revamped in fall 1993 and further revised in spring 2001. An implicit message of the last

review—one to which we think we have attended—was that the department should not simply reduce the size of its graduate program, but also see this process as a way to improve the quality of that program and to gain resources that could be productively reallocated toward other departmental priorities.

This initial set of changes created the foundation for further transformations in the department that have occurred over the last five years. The single most significant change has been the establishment in fall 1998 of Cinema Studies as a separate track within the undergraduate major. This effort has, from our perspective, been a major success, not only in terms of the popularity of this field among students, but in the way that Cinema Studies has fostered cross-departmental collaboration within and beyond the humanities. Four years into its existence, Cinema Studies now includes 107 declared majors, has granted 70 B.A. degrees in the last two years, sends 20-25 students on internships each year and sponsors a number of independent student projects. It has achieved this size—larger by itself than all but three entire departments in the humanities—despite receiving very few new resources from the College: one new faculty line, one half-time staff position, two TA slots, and modest operations and administrative funding. The program has been able to grow at this pace only because numerous departments in the humanities have been contributing resources in an ongoing way—by loaning faculty, cross-listing courses, building new courses into their own departmental curricula, and hiring with an eye upon the needs of this program.

Soon after setting up Cinema Studies, we embarked upon a review of our undergraduate literary studies program that sought to assess and adjust the curriculum created in 1993 in response to our last ten-year review. The 1993 changes had streamlined the curriculum, establishing a pair of core courses (CL 300, 400) and a small set of regionally based literature courses (CL 320-3), around which students could shape their other coursework. Our goals for the changes made in spring 2001 were to define more specific learning objectives for the core courses in the major and to encourage all students to undertake a more broadly international course of study. In addition, we have in the last few years introduced a number of new courses at the 200-, 300- and 400-levels, several of them in conjunction with the Texts and Teachers outreach program (which involves UW faculty in ongoing pedagogical collaborations with area high school teachers), others designed for general education purposes or specifically for the needs of first-year students. Perhaps most importantly, we have shifted a large part of the resources gained by shrinking our graduate program toward regularizing and expanding the key offerings in our undergraduate curriculum. Where we once had difficulty in staffing core courses, we now schedule both 300 and 400 twice a year and typically teach most courses in the 320 sequence at least once a year. The results of these changes on enrollments have been positive; although we had wondered whether the addition of Cinema Studies would decrease the number of literary studies majors, that number has not only held steady, but in fact increased over the last five years, reaching a ten-year high of 58 as of Autumn quarter of this year.

The combined effects of these programmatic changes on quantitative measures of departmental performance are clearly visible. Of the overall departmental increase in curricular student credit hours over the last five years (from about 9,500 to around 12,000), the bulk of the increase has come from larger enrollment in upper-division undergraduate courses, more than compensating for the drop in SCH at the graduate

level. It should be noted that across four of the five years covered by College-collected data, the departmental ratios for SCH/faculty FTE are significantly higher—generally more than 20% higher—than the College and Divisional ratios at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

After several years of gradually reducing the size of the graduate program, we embarked upon a wide-ranging review and revision of almost all aspects of that program. Starting five years ago, we began moving toward a system of guaranteed support for entering students (5-year packages for M.A. students, 4-year packages for post-Masters students) that now has us supporting the large majority of continuing students. We have worked on enhancing the professional development of these students, completely redoing a Ph.D. exam system that tended to slow students down excessively, developing courses and providing financial assistance to foster their professional development, mentoring them more closely during their time here, and striving to align teaching positions better with their individual career objectives. Especially given the small number of students we graduate annually and the recent nature of these changes, it would be premature to assert that we can, even several years into this restructuring, draw any definitive conclusions about the results. But the string of awards accumulated by current or recent students is impressive, the list of graduate student professional activities is striking, and a good number of recent graduates have obtained first-rate academic positions in the last several years (at institutions such as St. Olaf College, Hamilton College, Duke University and National Taiwan University). The reduction in size of the graduate program has, in our eyes, produced a Ph.D.-oriented program that is both more efficient and stronger overall than the program of ten years ago, with better students who receive better overall training in every respect. At the same time, we still face significant challenges, as the section on this part of the department will indicate in more detail: we face recurrent difficulties in recruiting students, we lack the reliable fellowship support that would let our students develop as well as they could while here, and we continue to lose more students by attrition to other programs than we would like. Relying almost exclusively on TAships to support students inevitably slows their research progress, and the uncertainty of a number of those slots consistently hampers our recruitment efforts.

Less visible than these changes, but at least as important, are the efforts that the department has made to strengthen and expand its collaborative activities with other units on campus. The range and number of our cross-listed courses, the extent of both short-term and long-term exchanges of faculty and teaching assistants with other departments, and the number of our cross-departmental programs and research groups have all expanded significantly in the last few years as the department has aggressively sought to fulfill its role as a nodal point within the humanities. These activities have, we think, benefited both those units with which we collaborate and the College as a whole—not only promoting more efficient use of resources by effectively sharing them, but bringing together faculty and students from a number of different fields in shared pedagogical and scholarly enterprises. At the same time, there is a limit to how successful Comparative Literature or any single department could be in this regard. At a certain point, direct action by the College in support of more general integration of courses might prove more effective than the informal, bottom-up efforts on which we have relied thus far.

As well as things have gone in many of our own programmatic areas, the state of the humanities at the University of Washington raises major reasons for concern. Since

1997, Comparative Literature has lost a number of its most active and renowned senior faculty—Professors Ernst Behler, Hazard Adams, Tom DuBois, Stephen Jaeger, Srinivas Aravamudan, and Eugene Vance. In a pattern typical of the College and particularly evident in the humanities, these faculty have generally not been replaced by faculty with comparable seniority and institutional experience, even taking account of the addition of Henry Staten in 1998 and the recent transfer of Cynthia Steele into the department; additions to the department have been at the junior level (Jennifer Bean, Yomi Braester) and focused primarily on creating a foundation for the Cinema Studies program. Indeed, if one deducts the faculty FTE devoted to Cinema Studies (approximately 2.5), departmental FTE is—at 7.67—below the level it reached after the additions made as a result of the last ten-year review (when it went from 5.5 to 8.67).

Looking Ahead

What are the right questions to be asking as we look ahead? One involves the relation of the humanities to other academic disciplines, and whether we can use existing structures, such as the Program in Theory and Criticism or the Textual Studies Program, as mechanisms to enlarge our collaborative involvement with units outside of the humanities. A second involves the relation between literary and visual or media studies. This topic will be central to our reflections upon our undergraduate program, in particular, as we consider what form the long-term relationship between the two tracks there—literary and cinema studies—should take. How might students in each track best benefit from exposure to the content and the students of the other? What degree of integration or overlap between the tracks would be most attractive to and beneficial for them? A third question concerns the strategies that might best maintain our momentum toward developing a globally oriented curriculum in literary and visual studies. How can we foster intelligent connections across the regional or area concentrations that currently define both our curriculum and most of our own research activities? How much breadth is desirable or possible for graduate or undergraduate students?

That Departments of Comparative Literature, no matter how strong, rest upon fragile foundations is a truism, but particularly relevant to the department here at the University of Washington. Though staffed by a distinguished faculty, supported by an excellent staff, with solid graduate and undergraduate programs, Comparative Literature remains deeply dependent upon the vitality of other departments at the university—especially, but not solely, within the humanities. The pronounced generation gap within the humanities at large, with very few newly tenured associate professors or newly promoted full professors, means that the department has been unable to renew itself in its traditional way, by adding faculty from other departments as they gain tenure or promotion. The last two associate professors we sought to add to our department both left for other institutions, so that the department is in the position of having in the last ten years added only one unsalaried faculty member, apart from its two assistant professors, younger than the cohort added at the time of the last ten-year review. This is not a narrowly departmental issue, but one that is increasingly urgent for the humanities as a whole.

Our newest program, Cinema Studies, is likewise poised on a tenuous foundation. Developing it in the directions that we would wish to do, or even sustaining it in its

present form, will be possible only if new College resources are made available. Recent budget cuts have delayed our request to hire a second core faculty member, a need that becomes increasingly critical with each passing year. Jennifer Bean remains the sole full-time faculty member in this program, the one individual with comprehensive training in film studies. As our experience last year indicated, her absence (on a UW Presidential Faculty Development Fellowship), or indeed the absence of any faculty member teaching core classes regularly, immediately creates huge gaps in the curricular offerings for this track.

One ongoing issue that we need to continue to find ways to address is the dispersion of our faculty and students—moderated, but certainly not eliminated, by the joint appointments and resource-exchange arrangements we have pursued. Most of our faculty remain selectively or intermittently involved with the department, making it hard for them to have a good overall sense of what the department does or how it works. Likewise, many graduate and undergraduate students find it difficult to maintain simultaneously their necessary alignment with an outside department and a strong affiliation with Comparative Literature.

With a relatively small base of alumni and no obvious constituency (such as a heritage community) to which we might appeal for support, we have not yet devised an effective strategy for fund-raising efforts. We are somewhat better off than we were five years ago; we now have a departmental discretionary fund and some regularly available funds to support graduate student activities—thanks largely to contributions from our own faculty. We are, moreover, preparing to launch a series of public events on topics in film, a first step in what we hope will be more active efforts in what seems our most promising avenue for pursuit of outside support. This will be, in any case, an area upon which we need to focus considerable attention after the departmental review process is over.

Insofar as one goal of the review process is to nudge departments toward serious, substantive discussion of their collective present and future, this self-study can already count as a significant success. We have not always found consensus in our discussions with one another; indeed, in a number of areas we have found substantial disagreements that will take considerable further discussion to sort out. But we have, at least, identified what we feel are most of the main issues about which we will need to keep talking over the next several years.

II—FACULTY PROFILE

Like many Comparative Literature departments in this country, the University of Washington program had its origins and still retains its primary strength in European national literatures. In 1993, for instance, after the changes made at the time of the last ten-year review, the department counted nineteen faculty with salaried appointments, eighteen of whom had their primary or original UW appointment in a European literature (English—6, Germanics—5, French—4, Scandinavian—2, Slavic—1), the sole exception being Professor Ching-hsien Wang, whose expertise is in classical Chinese literature. Even within that profile there have been obvious gaps; the department did not at that point add any salaried faculty in Spanish or Italian literature, despite persistent interest in those fields at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and it has never had a salaried faculty member in Classics. The department has long had particular strength in 18th and 19th century literatures, although in 1993 it also had a very strong group of medieval scholars. In terms of genre, it has traditionally been more oriented toward narrative than toward poetry or drama (particularly in terms of course offerings), although it does include faculty with interests in the latter areas as well. Even before the inception of the Program in Theory and Criticism, the department was also defined by strong faculty interest in the field of literary and cultural theory, an emphasis that continues through the present.

Departmental losses over the last few years have shifted the make-up of the department in significant ways and magnified some of the imbalances that existed previously. The department has lost both faculty affiliated with Scandinavian (as well as a third, Tom Dubois, who was never a salaried member of Comparative Literature, but who supervised courses in the area of folklore). It has lost two of its three medievalists, making its coverage of periods before 1750 very thin, and, with the retirement of Hazard Adams, lost one of the key faculty members who did significant work on poetry.

At the same time, recent additions have allowed the department to grow stronger in other ways. We have a significant core of faculty now working in cinema studies. Although Jennifer Bean is the only faculty member appointed wholly in this field, Yomi Braester, Gordana Crnkovic, Willis Konick, Albert Sbragia, and Steve Shaviro regularly teach courses on film. A number of faculty in other departments (Sabine Wilke and Eric Ames in Germanics, H el ene Collins and Vinay Swamy in French, and Susan Jeffords in English) teach courses that can count toward the Cinema Studies major.

Likewise, the department took seriously the injunction from the last department review to broaden its international scope. The first full-time hire made solely within Comparative Literature was dedicated in 1999 to hiring someone working in an Asian literature; we interviewed applicants in both Chinese and Japanese, deciding in the end to hire Yomi Braester in part because his work in film complemented emerging directions in the department. The recent shift of Cynthia Steele from Spanish/Portuguese to Comparative Literature provides a similar benefit. We now have for the first time a faculty member working on Spanish literature, someone who works in an area we have long sought to cover (literatures of the Americas) and someone who works on film as well.

In terms of long-term planning, our goals are to restore strength to areas that have grown weaker—particularly earlier periods of European literary history—even while we

continue to pursue more global coverage in our faculty expertise and curricular offerings. This can happen in part as current faculty adjust and expand their range of interests (as in the efforts by Willis Konick and others to reshape our undergraduate curriculum, or through our participation in the team-taught, Humanites Center-sponsored Danz courses). It can happen as well by drawing new faculty on campus into our activities both formally and informally (for example, Leroy Searle and Monica Kaup from English will be team-teaching a course on literatures of the Americas next year). But this process will also necessarily involve working to establish new connections with other literature departments—with the field of Japanese within Asian Languages and Literature, with Near Eastern Languages and Civilization, and with Classics—and to reestablish some traditional ones (with Scandinavian Studies). At the same time, continued hiring across campus both in traditional fields and in new areas such as postcolonial literatures is essential if we are, over time, to achieve our goal of combining within our departmental framework a broadly historical, globally oriented literature program and a strong, interdisciplinary cinema studies program.

III:A—Department of Comparative Literature Staff

The staffing structure in the Department of Comparative Literature, although resulting from a series of disconnected budgetary actions and personnel situations, has proven in practice to be an efficient approach to providing for the administrative needs and the student and faculty support of the unit. The current staff is as follows: one 0.5 FTE Professional Staff *Administrator* (shared with American Indian Studies at another 0.3 FTE); one 1.0 FTE Classified Staff *Secretary Senior*; one 0.5 FTE Professional Staff *Academic Counselor, Senior* (shared with Drama at another 0.5 FTE), who serves as undergraduate adviser; one 0.5 FTE Classified Staff *Program Coordinator* (until recently shared with FIUTS at another 0.5 FTE), who serves as graduate adviser.

Ten years ago, the staff was made up of one 1.0 FTE Classified Staff *Administrative Assistant B* who handled department administration and graduate student advising; one 1.0 FTE Classified Staff *Secretary Senior* who supported the department at 50% and supported the research of former chair, Ernst Behler, at 50%; and one 1.0 FTE Classified Staff *Secretary Senior* who supported the department at 50% and served as undergraduate adviser at 50%. In time, with staffing changes and budget cuts, the secretarial position that handled undergraduate advising was reduced to 50%. After the former chair concluded his 20-year term in 1997, the secretarial position that supported him was cut by 50%. Since the person who filled that position had been a long-time employee in the department, it was decided to add the 50% advising line to her remaining 50% position and retain her at 100%. At that point, the advising position reverted to being supported by various temporary funding arrangements. In 1999, with additional funds awarded to the department in support of the Cinema Studies Program, the 50% advising position was restored and upgraded to *Academic Counselor, Senior*. In 2000, the duties of the department administrator were divided to accommodate a shorter work schedule for her, and a separate position of *Program Assistant* was created to manage the graduate program work.

This complex history of the staffing in Comparative Literature over the past ten years leads us to the present day, where our department has different tasks divided neatly under the responsibility of each employee. Although our department has grown and expanded, we are operating at a reduced staffing level compared to ten years ago in terms of FTE (2.5 FTE compared to 3.0 FTE), even considering that the administrator and undergraduate adviser positions have been upgraded in recent years. Our only full-time employee is the secretary who handles all of the day-to-day tasks, contact with students, faculty, and the general public, course descriptions, book orders and general support of the chair and the department. The administrator handles budgets, payroll, curriculum, and other large-scale planning duties; she also supports the chair directly in numerous activities. The other two half-time employees cover undergraduate and graduate advising, respectively, while also providing back-up for a number of general office functions. In addition, two of the four staff in the department perform the same tasks in different units on campus. In this way our department represents a working model of job and resource sharing across campus units, a pragmatic response to the continued stagnation of resources for funding academic programs at the university.

The growth of Cinema Studies has been the largest factor in shaping realignment of staff duties. Since the Cinema Studies major option was added in 1998, the number of

undergraduate majors in the department has tripled and the demand for student services provided by the academic counselor has increased proportionately. In response to the need for job and internship opportunities for students, for instance, the academic counselor, together with the Center for Career Services and other arts advisers on campus, coordinated an Arts Internship Fair, now an annual event during Career Week in January. Since 1999, the academic counselor has become more involved with the professional advising community (APAC) on campus, via additional training offered through the Adviser Education Program, and by attendance at annual conferences such as the UW/WA State Community Colleges Advising Conference. In addition, the liaison role of the academic counselor with other units on campus has increased, as well as participation in outreach and recruitment events such as: Summer Gear-Up, Dawg Daze, Diversity Academic Fair, Essence of Success, and Plan-A-Transfer Day. In a similar way, the splitting off of the graduate coordinator position has made it possible for that staff person to focus more consistently on that aspect of the program, with a clear benefit in our ability to track its results in a number of areas: the status of individual students, academic progress, career placement.

The Comparative Literature staff work well together, complementing and supporting one another in many ways. They have quarterly staff meetings in order to share information and raise concerns, or simply as an opportunity to get together and talk about what is going on in the department. With staff members all working different shifts and focusing on separate tasks, it can be easy to lose track of what the others are doing. The staff meetings enable them to catch up and inform one another of what is going on in their respective areas. Although the administrator is the supervisor of all the staff and oversees the department operations to make sure things run smoothly, each staff person really handles her own tasks independently. There is a very pleasant and supportive work environment in Comparative Literature office, one that we feel filters down through all those who work, teach, and study in the department. This unit can boast harmonious collegial relations among staff for the past 10 years at least.

While Comparative Literature runs smoothly and efficiently with the existing staff, it is important to note that needs do exist. Our departmental secretary has worked in Comparative Literature for 16 years and has been at the top of her salary range for many of those years. We would like to award her the Career Enhancement Growth Program (CEGP) steps in recognition of her service to the department and for having taken on additional tasks as needed due to changes in staff, restructuring of positions, maternity leaves, and the change in department chairs. As well, we hired our graduate adviser at the top of her salary range one year ago. We would like to award her the CEGP steps in recognition of her excellent work in the department, and having taken over, mastered, and expanded the position in a short time frame. Our budget thus far has not allowed us to fund these CEGP steps, and in the context of recent and possibly recurring operations budget cuts (two in the last four years), we are not likely to be able to do so. Another area of future need is expansion of our undergraduate adviser position to full-time status. We have thus far handled the large increase in undergraduate majors largely by having the departmental adviser focus a greater proportion of her time on that role, while transferring other duties to the senior secretary. If the number of majors continues to increase in the future, our undergraduate adviser could easily become overburdened. Another area of need is for ongoing help in web development and

maintenance. We have pieced together the funds to hire an hourly web master to upgrade our departmental website this year, a change that has been long overdue. As more and more information is disseminated through the web, this is an area we know will remain an urgent need, but not one that any current staff member can oversee in an ongoing way. This could, however, be an area where resources could be shared among more than one department.

III:B—Departmental Governance and Communications

Departmental governance in Comparative Literature is very much shaped by the way the department is constituted, in particular, by the fact that the majority of the faculty in the department hold partial appointments. Most often, Comparative Literature is the secondary appointment for these faculty, with a national literature department being their home unit, the one that originally hired them and the one where they keep their primary affiliation. This affects both their degree of identification with Comparative Literature and their ability to be broadly involved in departmental activities in an ongoing way. For most faculty, participation in departmental meetings, administrative roles, committee duties, and even such things as graduate student supervision, are an additional second layer of responsibilities that they add on top of what are in many cases already heavy responsibilities in their home departments. Given that 25%-salaried faculty teach only a single course each year in Comparative Literature and that they have their faculty offices elsewhere, these faculty in particular tend to be involved and familiar with only a few specific aspects of the overall department activities.

Over time, the department has developed modes of functioning that are, at least in part, a response to this situation. Comparative Literature is not a department that holds frequent (or even regular) department or committee meetings, and it is a department where the bulk of the work in directing the department is done by the small group of core faculty who have full-time positions in the department, assisted in important ways by some of the 50% faculty. Most of the day-to-day work of running the department is done by the chair and the four key program directors—the Graduate Program Director, the Director of the Theory/Criticism Program, the Undergraduate Program Director and the Director of the Cinema Studies Program—in cooperation with the staff person responsible for each of these areas. These individuals typically also take the lead in defining the long-term direction of the department and in identifying areas in need of attention. They were, for instance, the group most deeply involved in preparation of the departmental self-study. As a rule, departmental and committee meetings get scheduled as particular needs arise—for recurring business such as graduate admissions in winter quarter, for salary discussions in the spring or promotion cases in the fall, or more intermittently as particular problems or proposed programmatic changes arise.

In the absence of regular meetings, it is particularly important that other channels of communication be used effectively so that people know what decisions are being made and why—not just faculty, but staff and students as well. We make extensive use of e-mail as a way of handling much routine business, as a way of circulating information about departmental activities, and as a way of providing background information preparatory to committee and departmental meetings.

Over the last few years, we have also evolved a model of having ad hoc working groups address particular issues, trying in this way to involve more individual faculty in consultation about the specific areas of the program in which they are involved. The undergraduate curricular changes implemented in fall 2001 emerged from one such group, as did the redefinition of the CL 300 core course, which emerged from discussions among the four faculty who had had primary responsibility for teaching the course in the last few years

In the context of the departmental review, we have also rewritten our departmental by-laws to make them more accurately reflect various changes in how the department functions that have taken place in the last few years. The terms and role of the Executive Committee (in approving committee assignments and the departmental curriculum) were clarified, and some additional changes (such as formally assuring membership of a graduate student representative on the Graduate Studies Committee) were made. These changes were discussed and approved in a departmental meeting on November 8, 2002.

Whether the various groups in the department—faculty, staff and students—are satisfied with these arrangements, both with whether the procedures in place are the appropriate ones and whether, in practice, they work the way that they should be working, are questions that the review committee could usefully explore for us.

IV:A—M.A/Ph.D Program in Comparative Literary Studies

Current Status

In his 2002 annual address, President Richard McCormick singled out “expanding the international dimensions of our education” as a high priority for the University of Washington. “Students and faculty who have first-hand knowledge of other places, other cultures, other ways of looking at life, are indispensable to this state and this nation,” he continued. It is evident that Comparative Literature plays a central role in transmitting this sort of international cultural education, both on this campus and nationally. Its mission is to bring together students and faculty with broad, interdisciplinary interests and experience in the study of numerous cultures, present and past, and to pursue the open-minded and critically aware examination of their intellectual and artistic lives, of the shaping influences they have had on one another, of their growth and their divergences. On campus, the Comparative Literature department helps create coherence within international studies in the humanities, while reaching out (both through its core faculty and through the Program in Theory and Criticism and other interdisciplinary projects) toward the interpretive and creative disciplines in the social sciences and the arts.

The Comparative Literature graduate program at the University of Washington is an interdisciplinary humanities program with literary and cultural studies at its core and the mastery of two languages other than English (plus a third at the basic reading level) as one of its defining requirements. Students take approximately a third of their courses within the department and two-thirds in individual language and literature departments (often in cross-listed courses). They have great flexibility to construct their programs around an individual emphasis while being required to concentrate in a single language and literature. At this point, the majority of students in the program are full-time students, aiming for completion of the Ph.D. and likely to pursue an academic career. But we continue to encourage enrollment in the program by students with other career goals as well, and have a small contingent of part-time or intermittent students as well.

The number and range of graduate courses offered in Comparative Literature (either solely or cross-listed) fluctuates substantially, in ways that are in the end hard for us to control completely, since most faculty fit their Comparative Literature teaching around departmental schedules that offer them and us less flexibility than we would ideally like to have. Increasingly, Comparative Literature offerings emphasize courses in theory and in cultural criticism, both the history of criticism sequence (CL 507-10) and the courses in cultural criticism and ideology critique (CL 530-35). Indeed, the overall ability of the department to offer coverage across literary history has diminished in recent years. With the retirement of Professor Vance and the departure of Professors Jaeger and Fuchs, the department now has the services of only three faculty members regularly working in periods before 1800 (Wang, Vaughan, and Fisher), two of whom have, within this department, focused mostly upon undergraduate courses in the recent past. Consequently, the training of our students in literary history and practical literary criticism has fallen primarily to the national literature departments, although we have tried wherever possible to encourage faculty in other units to create and to cross-listed courses that would be of interest for our students. This is a matter of concern both for us

and for our students, who noted it as one of their primary points of dissatisfaction when surveyed this fall about the program. Even small changes here—an additional two or three literature seminars a year—would make a considerable difference.

1993-2002

The graduate program has seen considerable changes over the last ten years, sparked in part by recommendations made in the last departmental review report. The most visible of these is a significant reduction in overall size; at the time of the last review there were over 90 students registered in Comparative Literature, whereas currently there are 41 students active in the program, 30 formally registered for fall quarter, four others abroad. Beginning in 1993, we instituted increasingly selective admissions criteria; from a high point in 1992-93 when nearly two-thirds of applicants were admitted, the average number has dropped to about one-third in recent years, with actual admission offers now ranging from 15-20 a year (compared to 66 in 1992-93 and 40 in 1993-94). The average GPA of incoming students has risen from 3.49 to 3.73 in 2001 and 3.83 in 2002, and average GRE scores of these same students have shown an upward trend (though verbal scores tend to vary a good deal from year to year, depending in part on how many international students are in the entering class).

As the program has grown smaller, it has proven possible to support a much higher percentage of continuing students and, starting in 1998, to guarantee incoming students financial support of specific kinds from the point at which they first enroll. This has been an important shift, since recent trends have shown us that students are much less likely to enroll in our graduate program without such support than used to be the case; the number of incoming students without support has dropped dramatically over the last ten years. Offers to incoming students typically consist of five years post-B.A. or four years post-M.A. support, with the large majority of this support in the form of teaching assistantships. The length of the guarantee also varies according to when students begin receiving support. There is normally one research assistantship to offer an incoming student each year. TA positions can often be extended by a year, sometimes longer, but this is done on an annual basis, as funds allow and curricular needs determine. During the current academic year, a total of 24 Comparative Literature students hold TAs in nine different departments. Where in the past we had a high proportion of terminal M.A. students, the large majority of entering students now anticipate doing doctoral work. Even with these changes, recruiting students has proven to be a challenge, with many of our top applicants declining our offers—sometimes for more prestigious programs, sometimes for programs that offer a better fit for their interests, but very often because we cannot match the kinds of guaranteed fellowship support that better-financed institutions can offer. Indeed, we are now at what we would consider the minimum threshold for the viability of our graduate program; dropping below 40 would likely have a negative impact upon our ability to offer an adequate range of courses and to create the clusters of students in specific fields that are crucial for their education. Entering cohorts smaller than the five and seven of the last two years are simply too small; ideally we would enroll eight to ten new graduate students each year.

With so many of our graduate students teaching in other departments, we also face an issue peculiar to us and a few other units such as Linguistics, that we are routinely

dependent upon decisions made by other departments in our own ability to recruit and support students. This situation was aided considerably after the last ten-year review, when the Dean assigned two TA positions annually in English and Germanics to Comparative Literature students, an arrangement that has worked well, we think, for all the departments involved. Appointments with other departments happen on a much more ad hoc basis, a situation that produced a serious recruitment crisis last spring, when we found ourselves unable to make offers to incoming students in several areas because our applicants were placed on a second-tier waiting list in those units. The effect was quite significant, producing the second smallest incoming class in a row and shrinking the graduate student population to its lowest point in the last ten years. We would hope that during the current year (before the admissions process gets underway winter quarter) we will be able to formalize some of these cross-departmental arrangements, lest we find ourselves handicapped in recruitment for a second year in a row. Our students take courses in the departments where they teach, helping to maintain advanced graduate study in several departments, factors that should make it possible to formalize TA arrangements with them. At the same time, we hope to improve the overall coordination with relevant departments in handling applications.

One goal in decreasing the overall size of the graduate program was to enable us to work more closely with our individual students on their professional development as scholars and as teachers. That has meant for us a number of different initiatives in the last few years, with successful ones getting structured permanently into the program. Academically, our goal is to mentor students in a consistent and ongoing way, in a context where most of our students have widely dispersed courses and working arrangements with many faculty members outside the department. One important step in this direction was revising the M.A. and Ph.D. exam systems; changes in both were instituted in 1999. The M.A. exam, which was felt to be insufficiently rigorous, has been replaced by a master's essay requiring advanced research and critical skills, a project intended to prepare students in specific ways for Ph.D. work. We significantly revised the Ph.D. examination system as well, with three goals in mind: 1) to streamline a process that in practice seemed to be encouraging students to spend longer than we intended on exams, 2) to increase the involvement of the supervisory committee with all parts of the exams (in the past, individual faculty often read only some portions of the exam, and on occasion had very little idea what the other exams covered), and 3) by redefining the exam areas, to emphasize the need for students to develop core strengths in specific areas within their primary literatures, complementing their comparative work with the sort of expertise in a specific national literature that would make them viable job candidates in national literature departments. Most students are in fact now completing their qualifying exams in a timely and effective fashion. Moreover, these changes have contributed to addressing one problem noted in the last departmental review, that a few departmental faculty were doing the vast majority of the graduate supervision. Especially in the last five years, thesis and dissertation supervision has been shared more much more broadly among members of the department. Connected to these changes, we also sought to enforce stricter time limits and formal satisfactory progress regulations, resulting in a number of long-time students completing their degrees and others leaving the program.

Along with these formal changes, we have also sought to more actively integrate incoming students into the program and to get them thinking as early as possible about

how they wish to shape their individual courses of study, and to mentor them more consistently throughout their careers. The role of the Graduate Program Director has thus become a more active one, from entry interviews with new students to continuing oversight of continuing ones. Last spring we instituted spring conferences as well—mandatory for new students, optional for continuing ones. Over half of the graduate students in residence met with either the Graduate Program Director or the chair to confer about their programs, indicating that this is an effort we should continue. Given the increasing importance of professional activity prior to going on the job market, we have worked actively to help students in this area. We encourage their participation in academic conferences, and have been able to more than double the stipends we can provide for attendance at such events. We have several times run a successful publication colloquium to give students experience in evaluating one another's professional work and in preparing their work to submit for publication—an initiative we intend to continue. We have continued to support the long-running Comparative Literature graduate student colloquium in the spring, which offers students from our own and a number of other departments the chance to formally present papers and to gain feedback on their work in process. Looking toward the start of their independent careers, we have paid considerably more attention to preparing interested students for the academic job market. Rather than developing our own elaborate program for a group of students that is typically fairly small in any one year, and often very diverse, we have tried instead to direct students toward relevant career advising in other departments, such as English.

Preparing students professionally, especially at this institution, means helping to inform them about how to pursue internal and external fellowship support. With no departmental fellowships available (apart from a single Graduate School RA award and a single recruitment award funded in part by the College, in part by the department), it is imperative that our students show initiative in seeking other funding sources that would allow them to focus on their research. We have been enormously pleased with their recent success in doing so. The students in our program have, over the last several years, collected an impressive number of awards and succeeded in a high percentage of their applications (see Appendix M). In the last five years, Comparative Literature students have won six College-sponsored scholarships (one Alvord and five Macfarlane awards), as well as two West European Travel Grants and numerous FLAS (Foreign Language Area Study) scholarships for the study of foreign languages. We have had two Fulbright recipients in the last three years, as well as recipients of government- or institution-sponsored graduate fellowships in Japan, Italy, Taiwan and Germany (DAAD) and one student serving as the Humanities Center intern at the University of Washington Press.

In lieu of other support, most of our graduate students depend upon the teaching assistantship support available through Comparative Literature, either in the department itself or in a national literature department. Overall, our current students gain considerably more classroom experience than used to be the case and, wherever possible, in a range of settings suited to their own career objectives. Many TAs begin in our own 200-level courses, typically beginning as assistants in lecture courses and then moving on to CL 240: Writing about Literature; others start as foreign language or composition instructors in one or another national literature department. Individual faculty members work in an ongoing way with TAs assigned to them; for those teaching CL 240, who

have independent responsibility for designing and teaching their own separate sections, the department has for many years had a fall orientation, with weekly follow-up meetings through the fall, classroom observations, and further supervision throughout the academic year. Those assigned to other departments receive their training there. As curricular needs and staffing make this possible, we now try to rotate students in other departments back into Comparative Literature for at least one year, and we can on occasion assign students to teach upper-division courses. We have, for instance, been successful in requesting Summer Quarter funding to make this possible. Above all, we now aim for a better alignment of TA assignments with the professional objectives of individual students by consulting more closely with them as they move along.

With most of these changes instituted within the last five years, it is still very early to try to assess their cumulative effect; the first students admitted with guaranteed support, for instance, are just now beginning to finish their degrees. Yet we have already noted what we would argue is a trend toward an improved job placement record. Of 15 students completing their degrees since spring, 2000, five have won excellent tenure-track positions—at the National Dong-Hwa University of Taiwan, St. Olaf College, the University of Redlands, Hamilton College, and Duke University. Four of the others were longtime students who had been out of touch. Of the remaining six, two have chosen to remain at Microsoft rather than apply for academic positions, two are currently teaching at UW (one of whom is actively seeking academic employment), one is teaching as a lecturer at a university in Japan, and one is teaching at a local private school. While the sample remains small, the change from the previous fifteen is notable. Of these there were also five tenure track positions, but not at comparable institutions: Evergreen State College, Shih Hsin University, University of Southern Mississippi, Shih Chein University, and Houghton College. One works for the UW graduate school staff, one teaches at a local community college, one at a private school, two are on our records in temporary academic positions, three work in business fields, and the status of one is unknown.

Looking Ahead

Many challenges remain, some institutional, some departmental. Serious faculty losses and program cuts have affected nearly every modern language and literature department on campus, with an inevitable ripple effect upon our ability to recruit, retain and train students. The gaps in faculty are visible both in generational terms (this department reflects the humanities in general in having virtually no faculty between the ages of 40 and 50) and in coverage, both of earlier periods of literary history and in emerging areas such as post-colonial literatures. This situation is, we feel, a contributing factor to the departure of a number of promising students in the last few years, although personal reasons have also played a part in many of the decisions. Of nine students who entered in the fall of 1997, for instance, four have left, one has completed his degree, three are writing dissertations, and one is taking exams. Of seven students who entered the program in the fall of 1998, five have left (in three cases to live abroad); of the twelve who entered in the fall of 1999, six remain active in the program, and we expect most or all of them to earn Ph.D. degrees. This retention level is lower than we would like given the small number of students we admit, although the last two years do look better. With

just one exception, the students who have left the program recently were ones who sought (and completed) a terminal M.A. degree. The result of recent attrition, however, is that our program is not only small, but likely to shrink even further unless we rebuild with incoming classes in the next few years; ten current students are at dissertation stage, with five of them very likely to finish this year. Given that overall graduate new enrollment has increased from 2274 to 2879 in the past ten years, raising our current numbers nearer to our target enrollment of 50 seems a reasonable goal.

An equally serious issue, even more difficult to address adequately, is the lack of fellowship support available at the University of Washington; we simply are not in a competitive position even with many peer institutions in being able to offer students fellowship support either when they arrive or when they reach the dissertation stage. Financial aid is essential in recruiting students, and it is imperative for Comparative Literature to have dependable sources of support for students along the lines of other departments. We have, however, made efforts to increase the visibility of our program for potential applicants, recently redesigning our program brochure and currently redoing our departmental Web site to make them more attractive to applicants. We also did a mailing of program information to literature departments around the country a few years ago, an activity that may be worth repeating intermittently. Overall, our application pool has been holding fairly steady, smaller than it used to be, but still with a good number of strong potential recruits.

Finally, there is the question of community, a phenomenon endemic to Comparative Literature departments that results from the dispersal of students into their principal language departments. Students not teaching in Comparative Literature sometimes feel that they do not know one another as well as they might and that the department is less cohesive than it might be.

We have encouraged our students to supplement the spring colloquium (which has served a valuable function in having at least some students work closely with one another) with internal social events and/or discussion groups; an attempt to establish ongoing activities around film topics is under way this year. We have also considered offering an introductory seminar to be encouraged or possibly even required for new students, although finding a suitable topic and pitching such a course appropriately for the diverse group of incoming students would be a challenge. One such course, focused on translation and translation theory, was offered two years ago, with fair success, but faculty resources have not been readily available to renew the attempt, and with incoming classes small, the viability of that seminar is uncertain. Experiences later in the program might serve comparable ends, with either literature seminars or publication seminars bringing together students at specific points of their trajectories here.

At this point, our primary goal with regard to the graduate program is to monitor in an intensive, ongoing way, the changes we have made in the last several years, trying to assess how well they are working for our students and how satisfied our students themselves seem to be with the program as they experience it.

Priorities:

- 1) Increasing the number of graduate fellowships available at both the incoming level and for dissertation work, a goal that will require a mix of both departmental and university

initiative.

- 2) Increasing both quantity and breadth of literature offerings by departmental faculty, i.e., comparative courses dealing with the periods, genres and modes of literature.
- 3) Working to insure and to increase the stability of TA appointments by formalizing arrangements where TAs are regularly placed and attempting to institute new arrangements of this kind, where possible, with other departments on campus.
- 4) Explore the feasibility of establishing a Cinema Studies graduate certificate program, as students recommended when surveyed about the graduate program (an initiative discussed at more length under the section on Cinema Studies).

IV:B—Graduate Program in Theory and Criticism

The Ph.D. Program in Theory and Criticism was one of the earliest cross-departmental programs to be developed in the humanities at this university, with courses offered and students formally enrolled starting in 1990. Although housed in Comparative Literature, it is a joint-doctoral program with thirty-one faculty from ten participating doctoral programs (Asian Languages and Literature; Classics; Communication; Comparative Literature; Drama; English; Germanics; Romance Languages and Literature; Scandinavian Studies; and Slavic Languages and Literatures). The program establishes a supplemental curriculum for interested students for concentrated work in the history and theory of criticism and leads to a Ph.D. in the respective field and a graduate certificate in Theory and Criticism. Despite having no College resources dedicated specifically to it, it manages every year to offer a substantial range of graduate courses, nearly all of them cross-listed among multiple departments (in each of the last two years, 11 core seminars were offered, with total enrollments of 158 students in 2000-01 and 122 students in 2001-02). Most of these courses are not special topic courses, but permanent offerings in a broadly defined curriculum intended to give students a historical and theoretical context for the interpretive practices in literary and related humanistic studies.

By its very nature and structure, the Program in Theory and Criticism epitomizes the role of Comparative Literature as a catalyst for cross-departmental collaboration and interdisciplinary studies. It is less an area of study than a site for intellectual exchanges and cooperation, less a specialized field of inquiry than a node in a network of academic enterprises. It thus serves valuable functions for students across and even outside the humanities, by creating comparative contexts for intellectual inquiry and by encouraging their contact with a broad range of national cultures and theoretical traditions. Theory and Criticism courses typically bring together students from a striking diversity of departments, with six or eight different fields often represented in a single course, and students enrolled from areas well outside the humanities (such as the School of Education, the Departments of Dance or Drama, or the School of Architecture*). This mixture is, for faculty and students alike, a tremendous source of intellectual energy and excitement. In the context of these seminars, students learn a great deal about how other students, with different training, approach similar theoretical issues and interpretive problems, thus sharpening their sense of their own disciplinary premises. Moreover, the program plays a significant role in attracting applicants to graduate study at the University of Washington—not only for Comparative Literature, but for the other participating departments as well. At the other end, as students finish their Ph.D.'s, the certificate can play a tangible role in making them more attractive as job seekers; many departments in the humanities nowadays include "expertise in critical theory" among their desiderata in job descriptions. When asked about the value of the program for them, a number of participating departments mentioned the advantage it can give their students on the job market. At the same time, it should also be noted that many, probably the majority, of the students registered in the program's courses are not formally enrolled in the program, a sign that these course offerings serve a wide array of differing needs for different students.

Several modifications have been introduced over the last few years in order to change the program from a self-contained unit into a more open and effective structure

and to respond to two emerging problems—a decline in the mid-1990's in the number of students formally enrolled in the program and recurrent difficulty in staffing the Colloquium in Criticism that had, since the program's inception, served as a capstone course. The most notable change was the decision, voted by the faculty in 1998, to drop the stipulation that the six courses required of students for completion of the degree be taken in addition to the coursework requirements of their home department. This stipulation amounted to requiring an additional year of coursework, with the result that many interested students declined to enroll in the program. In the new system, students may count theory courses both towards fulfilling the requirements of the program and towards any appropriate requirements in their home department, thus greatly reducing their overall coursework requirements. This has resulted in a significant increase in the number of students completing the certificate; the average from 1992-97 was 0.7, while the average over the last five years has been 2.6. Whereas the program had only ten students in 1992, three years after its inception, it has over the last few years averaged over twenty active students.

Despite increasing the flexibility of the coursework requirements, it remains the case that a number of students who pursue the graduate certificate find themselves taking somewhat longer to complete their degrees—a logical outcome of the additional breadth they are attempting to acquire in their studies. This issue was addressed at the program's inception by creating two TA lines that could be used to support students for one or more quarters while they were doing additional coursework. Those lines were not, however, permanently funded, and vanished after three years—one large reason for the decline in enrollment in the program in the late 1990's. It would, in our view, create a significant inducement for interested students to pursue the certificate if additional TA support were available for those who might require it. Having a few TA lines dedicated to the program, some quarters perhaps made available by the participating departments, others newly funded by the College, would facilitate student access to the program.

A second revision made in the program was to increase the range of designated courses that could count toward the certificate. Before 1998, only Theory and Criticism courses offered through Comparative Literature and (in the case of the History of Criticism sequence) English could count towards coursework requirements. Now, however, Theory and Criticism faculty are allowed, indeed encouraged, to cross-list courses that they teach in their own departments as well. Likewise, courses in theory and criticism taught by non-program faculty are now accepted towards Theory and Criticism coursework requirements on a case-by-case basis, after evaluation by the director and the program faculty. Far from jeopardizing the integrity of the program, these changes have rejuvenated it by extending its reach and making it easier for students and faculty to participate in it.

Another significant change made in 1998 was eliminating the Colloquium in Criticism from the curriculum. This decision was taken rather reluctantly, as the Colloquium had historically played a very important role both within the program and the academic community as a whole, by serving as a focal point for the study of theory on campus and offering faculty and students a unique venue for collaborative work with invited critics, theorists or writers. However, as participation in the Colloquium declined and attempts to revitalize it failed, it became clear to us that the Colloquium had outlived its function and that we had to find new ways to serve its old aims of involving program

faculty and students in ongoing ways. Some of the functions served by the original colloquium are now accomplished by new units on campus; the Simpson Center for the Humanities and the Taylor Institute for Transnational Studies, for instance, both support collaborative faculty/student research groups, and have permanent funding available for this purpose. In this context, it becomes clearer that the role of the Program in Theory and Criticism is to provide curricular continuity for the interdisciplinary study of theory. The breadth of its course offerings and the regularity of their appearance in the curriculum allow for long-term planning on the part of students and faculty, complementing the intensive, yet typically shorter-term activities of more specialized research groups on campus. Rather than choosing at this moment to try to revive the Colloquium for Criticism, then, we feel that it makes more sense to investigate possibilities for establishing long-term collaboration with other programs involved with theory, such as Philosophy or Anthropology or the History of Science—trying to cross-list courses, alerting our students to courses of interest to them elsewhere, and publicizing the existence of the program more broadly among social science departments on campus.

This last project (or desire) brings us to the question of the very definition of “theory” and hence of the mission of the program as we presently understand it. Although the term “theory and criticism” has always been employed by us in the very broad sense of inquiry in the grounds of practices in literary and related humanistic studies, it cannot be denied that from the inception of the program, the emphasis has been on the sort of blending of philosophical and critical discourses often referred to under the name of “critical theory.” The very successful sequence of courses on the History of Criticism and Literary Theory (CL 507-8-9-10), all of which are offered at least once each year, is a good example of this, as is the pair of courses dealing with cultural criticism and ideology critique (CL 530-5) and CL 502, designed to deal with specific critical movements or approaches to theory. There are many good historical and institutional reasons for this emphasis on literary theory and it is clear that it serves a vital role within the humanities. The question, however, is whether other aspects of “theory” should be added to the “critical” core of the program, whether we need to think more broadly about what “theory” is likely to mean in ten or twenty years. Indeed, the meaning of the term “theory” has evolved dramatically over the last ten years as the social sciences, media studies and even science studies have increasingly imported concepts and methodologies from the humanities and imparted their own in return. This points to a significant reshuffling of the traditional disciplinary boundaries between the humanities, the arts, the social sciences and the natural sciences, which is bound to have tremendous theoretical and institutional consequences in the future.

Priorities:

- 1) Investigating possibilities for more active collaboration with units on campus that have not thus far been regularly involved with the program, i.e., whether some courses can be cross-listed with them and whether student migration across fields can be more actively encouraged.
- 2) Exploring avenues for obtaining dedicated TA support for graduate students formally enrolled in the program.

3) Periodically revisiting the issue of whether some capstone experience for students would be desirable.

IV:C—Graduate Program in Textual Studies

The Textual Studies Program is an interdisciplinary graduate program that draws on the expertise of nearly sixty UW faculty, librarians, staff members as well as distinguished visitors from other institutions to provide students with a foundation for professional, multidisciplinary study of literary, historical, artistic, architectural, legal and electronic texts. The Program was inaugurated by a large-scale international conference that took place in 1997 and featured fifty prestigious speakers from Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, England, France, Israel, Russia, Scotland, and the U.S. The Program began offering its sequence of graduate core courses in Winter 1998 under the auspices of and with financial support from the Walter Chapin Simpson Center for the Humanities. In Spring 2002 the Graduate School appointed a committee to review the Textual Studies Program, which led to an enthusiastic recognition of its academic excellence and the recommendation that the University make it permanent.

In Autumn 2002, the Program established its home in the Department of Comparative Literature until such time as significant funding (the program was a finalist for a University Initiatives Fund award in the 2001 competition) and the development of an undergraduate curriculum will allow the creation of an independent Center for Textual Studies at the University of Washington. In the meantime the Comparative Literature Department provides an ideal home for the Program as it can best represent its interdisciplinary character and its diverse participating faculty from the Humanities, Social Sciences, Arts, Architecture, Education, Information Science, and Law. Because we conceive of Textual Studies as a metadiscipline which can merge with and influence any discipline that depends on access to texts, documents, and artifacts, Textual Studies complements well other programs in the Comparative Literature Department, e.g., Theory and Criticism, and Cinema Studies. The philosophy guiding Textual Studies has been from the very inception to establish a broadly interdisciplinary set of courses whose ultimate aim is enlightenment rather than vocational training, i.e., developing an informed appreciation of the fact that the texts upon which all disciplines depend remain unstable and come with their own particular histories of transmission, alteration and reception; and teaching that the details of those histories and their theoretical and methodological implications are crucial to our understanding of what those texts mean.

Textual Studies is the oldest discipline dealing with the production, maintenance, preservation, and transmission of texts. Its concerns, both conceptual and historical, stand at the core of the liberal arts and of human culture, and embrace systems of communication in oral cultures; the composition of manuscripts; the history of the book; principles of editing and textual criticism; revisions of literary works, and their adaptation in, for example, film; evolving legal definitions of authorship, intellectual property, and copyright; the restoration of paintings, historic buildings and monuments; and, especially in recent years, the impact of electronic media on the production and dissemination of texts. Research in all disciplines concerned with human culture and institutions, from language and literature to architecture and the law, depends in a fundamental way on texts—documents and material representations that embody and transmit the ideas, values, assumptions and historically shared forms of communal life. Hence the centrality

of libraries, archives, museums and other collections of documents and artifacts: they are, in a material way, our history.

The primary goal of the Textual Studies Program is to develop a much needed awareness among our faculty and students that texts are not pristine, ahistorical objects; that they suffer alteration through use, decay or editorial tampering; that they are problematic records of authorial intentions or historical meanings; and that the varying forms of texts are as important as, indeed cannot be separated from, the message they convey. The knowledge that texts have a history of creation, transmission and transformation is crucial to any engagement with the less visible, but no less pervasive, presence of all forms of material and intellectual culture—from the visual and performing arts, to architecture, to the construction of social strata and gender distinctions. The Program's goal is to teach students how to "read" creatively rather than be dominated by the manifold texts that inexorably shape our experience, but to achieve this by carefully investigating the very foundations of that experience.

The defining features of our program are its interdisciplinary reach and methodological breadth. We extend the history of the book to the present and future world of electronic texts, but are also concerned to show how, for instance, the principles of textual editing apply to the history of Chartres Cathedral, Rembrandt's paintings, and Shakespeare's London. Where other programs to which we may compare ourselves focus on, say, the book as physical object, or on bibliographic training and research, our program is committed to taking the idea of "text" beyond manuscript, printed, and electronic books to a range of historical artifacts by which humans structure meaning, express ideas and communicate values. We are also interested in texts as intellectual property, and in the ways texts are produced, transmitted, received and preserved in societies ancient and modern.

Since words exist in both oral and written forms, and can be preserved and transmitted in varied languages and media, textual studies provide fundamental critical tools relevant to almost all aspects of human culture. Furthermore, it requires little expansion of the meaning of "text" to embrace human artifacts produced for the transmission of ideas and cultural values that depend on semiotic systems other than the alphabetic or pictographic representations of the world's many languages. Consequently, our Program reaches out to include, for instance, music, architecture and the visual arts. Because of the important ways in which texts function and circulate in human societies, textual studies will also apply to, and be informed by, disciplines such as law, education, communications, and information science. Questions regarding intellectual property and copyright, for instance, raise crucial legal and ethical issues; and evolving concerns with defining, and assessing, literacy in our modern, technologically advanced society inform efforts to improve pedagogy and communications.

The Program currently offers doctoral certification in the field of Textual Studies as a complement to a Ph.D. in other programs at the University of Washington. To be admitted to the Textual Studies Program, a candidate must be currently enrolled and in good standing in a Ph.D. program at the UW. Certification in Textual Studies is achieved by completing, in addition to existing requirements for the original Ph.D., a total of 30 credit hours in Textual Studies, including the four core seminars in Textual Theory, Oral and Scribal Texts, Printed Texts, and Hypertext. These four core seminars provide

graduate students with a foundation for professional, multidisciplinary study of oral, handwritten, printed and electronic texts, and acquaint them with major theories and practices of textual editing. The remaining ten seminar credits are obtained in approved courses offered by participating units. In addition to the required coursework, candidates must provide evidence of formal participation in Textual Studies, either as an active member of a Textual Studies research group or by completing a Ph.D. dissertation on a topic connected with textual research and scholarship. Before advancing to dissertation work, the student will demonstrate his or her general knowledge of the field of Textual Studies by completing an examination or writing a critical essay on an assigned topic. A student's Ph.D. supervisory committee must include at least one member of the Textual Studies Faculty.

Student enrollment in the Textual Studies seminars has been strong and consistently interdisciplinary, with as many as seventeen students in a single seminar, representing seven departments. Additional auditors at these seminars have been a regular feature as well, including faculty. To a large measure this success in participation is due to the Program's use of distinguished experts in Textual Studies from other institutions who spend a good part of a week here, contributing to the core seminars and offering public lectures. In addition, colleagues from other departments at the UW regularly lead sessions in these seminars. As many as fifteen UW faculty from some half-dozen departments, as well as four external visitors, have participated in a single seminar. This practice has been instrumental in maintaining the program's links with UW faculty from a variety of fields and giving it national and international visibility. This has also permitted us to offer well-attended lecture series (see the eleven lectures during the 2001-2002 year listed in Appendix E of our self-study document), and most importantly it has enabled students to form intellectual and personal connections with our visitors that have enhanced their career development and opportunities, including invitations to participate in the prestigious biennial conference of the Society for Textual Scholarship and requests for reviews and articles for publication in *Text*, the leading journal in this field. (For the faculty and student response to these features of the program's core courses, see pages 6-7 of the Review Committee's Report.)

By any objective measures, Textual Studies at the University of Washington offers a unique and original program of graduate (and, potentially, undergraduate) study. In the external consultant's appendix to the Program Review Committee's Report, Professor W. Speed Hill (Graduate School, CUNY) compared us extremely favorably with the University of Virginia, which he called "the place (if not the program) of choice," saying that "Washington's program is more genuinely interdisciplinary." He goes on to state flatly that none of the other alternative programs a prospective student in the field might consider joining (i.e., Boston University, Columbia University, the University of London) "match Washington's breadth and intellectual coherence."

To take advantage of the current strengths, we have underway a number of strategic and practical initiatives. These will, we trust, expand and deepen the influence and importance of Textual Studies to faculty and students at the UW. We have begun discussions about inaugurating an undergraduate minor in Textual Studies, and to this end are conceiving four new interdisciplinary courses which will provide a common core for our minors. The general outline of these courses currently looks like this:

1. **WHAT IS A TEXT IN THE 21ST CENTURY?** This first course will consider the interactions between oral and written, written and printed, printed and electronic texts, with illustrative case studies, such as the oral Torah in classic Rabbinic Judaism; the transformation of printed literary texts into hypertext; and the legal and technological constraints on communication and ownership/authorship in the computer age.
2. A course on **THE HISTORY OF WRITING TECHNOLOGIES** will examine how human societies have graphically represented their languages, information, speech and ideas—from cave paintings and papyrus scrolls to American Sign Language and electronic bits.
3. A third course, on **ELECTRONIC TEXTUALITY**, will locate our present electronic media in their appropriate historical and theoretical contexts. It will survey historical developments in electronic reproduction and delivery of texts and consider the theoretical advances required for adequately assessing texts that combine features both aural and visual, verbal and graphic, static and dynamic.
4. Finally, **COMPARATIVE TEXTUALITY** will investigate the common theoretical foundations of textuality that are shared by many fields: for example, literature, architecture and the visual and performing arts.

In addition to these curricular plans, we are also contemplating submission to NEH of a grant proposal (earlier submitted to the Humanities Center) to support an interdisciplinary colloquium that will broaden discussion of common issues in the field and draw together faculty and graduate students on a more regular basis than we have managed heretofore. A fuller description of plans for developing the program can be found in Appendix R, which includes portions of last year's self-study document and the program review report.

V:A—Undergraduate Comparative Literary Studies

Overview

Our undergraduate literary studies program seeks to train students in the critical analysis of primary texts, that is, in understanding how the rhetorical and aesthetic features of texts (not exclusively literary texts, but all forms of cultural documents) contribute to the ways in which those texts help shape (and not simply reflect) social values, attitudes and beliefs. Doing this well requires that they develop an understanding for how historical and cultural contexts bear upon the meaning of texts, an understanding that we think students can acquire particularly well through comparative historical and cross-cultural study. Thus our courses are designed to foster breadth—breadth in students' exposure to multiple literary and cultural traditions, but also breadth in their exposure to different interpretive disciplines and modes of inquiry. We expect our students to learn to read carefully (and to understand why this is important); we expect them to write effectively. We expect them to have some understanding of the nature and importance of secondary criticism, and to develop their facility in locating and assessing such materials. We also emphasize the acquisition of foreign language skills, requiring students to have at least mid-level competence in one foreign language, i.e., sufficient preparation to read texts in their chosen language with a high level of comprehension and minimal reliance on a dictionary. Foreign language skills are in part a practical matter, meant to give students a tool for direct linguistic access to the cultural traditions they study, but they are also a way to heighten their general awareness of how languages work; learning a foreign language is meant to be a valuable step for them toward understanding how to use their native language more effectively.

The basic requirements in our undergraduate literature program are, by intention, relatively few—two required core courses and two from a set of regionally based literature courses. CL 300 serves as a gateway course for majors, an introduction to the nature and purposes of comparative literary study, and is intended to be taken soon after students declare the major. The other core course, CL 400, focuses upon developing students' sophistication in understanding the methodologies and theoretical debates in literary studies. In addition, students are required to take two different courses from a series of regionally based comparative literature (CL 320-1-2-3) classes that cover Europe, the Americas, Asia and developing nations. All students thus have at least one opportunity to work with literature outside their primary field of study.

Minimizing requirements is meant to take advantage of what we see as a strength of comparative literature programs in general—the flexibility that students have in designing their own course of study. They can mix courses in a number of different ways, specializing in one particular national literature if they wish, or working across several, or focusing on the comparative orientation that the department's own courses emphasize. Although most students exceed this minimum before they graduate, our total credit requirement (50 credits, with no prerequisite courses in literature required) is lower than that of other humanities (or College) departments, which also tend to prescribe much more closely the particular courses or range of courses that students are required to take.

The openness of our program needs to be balanced by ongoing efforts to help individual students create continuity and coherence in their studies—here we would note

both successes and areas in need of continued attention. Countering the inevitable dispersion of our students across departments and creating a sense of intellectual community are important issues; while some students thrive in an independent setting, others feel the need for more active connection with their departmental home. This issue is crucial as we think about future hiring needs for our department. It is essential for us to have a set of core faculty who take responsibility for the overall undergraduate literature program, faculty who teach more than one course regularly and who can serve as visible anchors for students in the program. Whereas the department had several full- and half-time faculty in this role in the early 1990's (Konick, Rossel, Dornbush, Reinert), the list of such faculty is now shorter, in part because several departmental faculty now divide their attention between cinema studies and literary studies. Related to this issue of faculty resources is the need to provide more active, ongoing guidance and mentoring for individual students. But we might also benefit from instituting a required senior seminar, an occasion for students to reflect collectively upon their academic careers and to work on projects that would serve as a culmination of those careers.

Our 200-level courses are, in our judgment, an essential piece of our curriculum. The department has long had a major role in general education in the humanities, being one of the few humanities departments to offer large-enrollment courses designed to introduce and attract students to the study of literature. These courses serve a particularly important purpose for us in simply making students aware that our department exists; unlike English or the foreign language departments, we cannot presume such awareness. But we think these courses also offer students a chance early in their academic careers to broaden their intellectual horizons, to read more widely than they might otherwise have done, and thus to become aware of the range of cultures that exist outside the United States. Maintaining these courses has been difficult in the last few years, with faculty devoting time to other emerging areas within the department and other programs in the humanities. Some of this drop-off is balanced, however, by the increased enrollment in our 300-level courses, which also enroll a significant proportion of students from outside the department wishing to satisfy general education requirements. One of our goals for the next several years is to reinforce our presence in general education courses.

Besides our upper- and lower-division literature courses, we also teach between twelve and eighteen sections annually of CL 240: Writing in Comparative Literature. This course is taught by teaching assistants who are trained and supervised by a faculty member (Jean Dornbush) throughout the academic year. It offers a distinctive route for students to satisfy the College writing requirement, allowing them to focus on analytical writing about literature drawn from an international context. The course has proven to be popular among students, drawing a significant share of its enrollment from older, more advanced students. Testimony from faculty and staff on campus (for example, Debby Hatch, the writing consultant for CIDR) confirms our sense that this course is effectively meeting its main objective of improving students' writing.

Our graduates enter a wide variety of careers; although some are persistently popular, such as teaching, the range is such that there are no predominant trends. We would hope that they bring with them from their university training skills in writing, in oral communication, and in languages that serve them well in those careers.

1992-2002

We have spent considerable time over the last ten years in trying to design, implement, assess and then adjust the curricular changes that came about as a result of our last ten-year review. The current program was, in large measure, implemented in 1993, but it has taken much more time and effort to be able to offer a robust set of course offerings corresponding to that curriculum. At present, however, both the number and range of our undergraduate courses—particularly at the upper-division level—are up significantly from ten years ago. We are now able to offer both of the required core courses (300 and 400) twice annually, and typically offer 5-6 courses each year from the 320 sequence. Recent faculty additions have made it possible to offer 321, 322 and 323 on a more regular basis, adding considerably to our global coverage, and we typically offer several special topic courses each year. Moreover, these 300-level classes are often linked to course requirements of other programs on campus (Program on Africa, Program on the Environment, as well as several academic departments) in ways that let them serve multiple audiences and multiple purposes.

The 1993 curricular changes established a pair of wholly new core courses (CL 300, focused on literary studies, and CL 400, an introduction to theory) and required students to do one from a set of regionally based comparative literature courses (Asia, Europe, the Americas, developing nations). In 2000-01 we conducted a review of this new curriculum, which led to two significant modifications for fall 2001. First, we established a new set of course objectives and a new catalog description for our gateway course (CL 300), trying to convey more clearly to both faculty and students our shared expectations about the learning objectives in this course. Second, we added the requirement that students take two (rather than just one) from the CL 320 sequence, thus insuring that they will gain exposure to some literature outside of their primary area of study, whatever that main area might be. At the same time, we have been experimenting with other types of courses that may find a permanent place in our program—senior seminars, and new thematic and interdisciplinary courses meant to attract students from a range of different disciplines. Jane Brown and Hellmut Ammerlahn have designed new courses for our 300-level Themes in World Literature series, some of which have been cross-listed with the Department of Germanics; Jean Dornbush has developed a new senior seminar that was cross-listed with the Department of English.

In the last few years, faculty have also worked on designing courses that would serve specific general education purposes, both lower-division students at the university and high school students through the Texts and Teachers program. This year, for instance, Willis Konick has revived a course not frequently taught by us in the past, CL 211, as a large-scale course on literature and film, specifically targeted to incoming students and linked to the Freshman Interest Group Program. This course reflects our desire to globalize our curriculum, not only including literary and cultural texts from a wider array of traditions, but figuring out provocative ways of juxtaposing representative works from those traditions against one another; its topics run from novels by Kafka, Fitzgerald, Solzhenitsyn and Mahfouz to the films of Renoir, Spielberg and Cimino. Gary Handwerk is team-teaching (with Michael Shapiro in Asian Languages and Literature) a second fall offering also targeted toward first-year students, with links both to the FIG program and to the Interdisciplinary Writing Program. The Texts and

Teachers Program (covered in more detail in a separate section of the self-study) has led to the creation of two new departmental courses, one a globally oriented literature course, another a course on literature and the environment.

Over the last few years, we have also been working to make our foreign language requirement easier for students to understand and to navigate. The problem here is that different language departments construct their curricula in quite different ways, so that it can mean something very different in terms of language fluency to take a 300-level class, even a 300-level literature class, in German or Chinese or Spanish or Latin. It would, from our perspective, be advantageous if there were greater uniformity across departments (at least related departments, such as those in European or those in Asian languages), so that we could more readily assess how far individual students have gotten in their ability to read texts in the original languages. Short of that goal (a perhaps unrealistic one), we have tried to track students more carefully in their progress and advise them earlier about the specific expectations for them with regard to their chosen language.

We have also hoped to encourage an increasing proportion of our undergraduate majors to participate in study abroad programs and to apply for fellowships that would take them abroad. These numbers, however, remain small, with only four of the total number of graduating seniors in the last academic year having studied abroad. We have also tried to help inform them about and to encourage them to apply for scholarships. Recent graduates of the department have in the last two years held Fulbright Scholarships for study in Spain and Quebec, and gone on to graduate programs at Berkeley, Cornell and NYU. Last year's winner of the Dean's Medal in the College and the President's Medal as the outstanding graduating senior campus-wide came from Comparative Literature.

The effects of recent departmental changes and programmatic emphases seem positive, if hard to assess in any definitive way. We are particularly pleased that the overall number of literary studies majors has held steady, even increased slightly, even after the introduction of our Cinema Studies track. While the numbers fluctuate a good deal from year to year, our internal count has shown an average of 53 registered majors over the last three autumn quarters, as compared to numbers in the low 40's in the early 1990's; our Autumn Quarter 2002 tenth-day enrollment count is 58. We have granted 37 B.A. degrees in literary studies over the last two years, a slightly higher number than the average of 14 from 1992-98. Our senior surveys (usually involving both anonymous written surveys and telephone interviews) also attest to a high degree of satisfaction with the program—both the quality of the core courses in the major and the flexibility that the program allows students. Student evaluations for our undergraduate courses are typically above the College and divisional norms—with one important factor that needs to be taken into account in assessing them. Our department routinely sends evaluation forms to faculty teaching every single course in a given quarter, and we get results back from a very high proportion of our overall course offerings (thus, in 2000-01, our instructors had *every* 200-level course and 75% of all 300- and 400-level courses evaluated). So we maintain a high level of student satisfaction across an unusually high percentage of formally evaluated courses.

Issues

We see several important issues facing the undergraduate literature program at this point. While the overall curriculum and course offerings are in good shape, there are fewer core faculty members specifically identified with that program than in the past, an issue both for students and for giving the program overall direction and guidance. As with the Cinema Studies program, the issue is not simply whether students get the courses they need (and, of course, whether those courses are well taught), but whether they can gain the intellectual continuity and opportunities that come from having identifiable core faculty members whom they can get to know and with whom they can work on a regular basis. Students typically rely upon faculty members whom they have seen in multiple classes as resources for larger projects, professional advice, letters of recommendation, etc.

Given the recent addition of Cynthia Steele to our faculty, we can now cover reasonably well the main fields to which our curriculum commits us (with global postcolonial literatures perhaps the most notable gap). But we face a pressing need to identify a set of core faculty with *general* responsibility for our undergraduate curriculum, faculty who would work as a group on its overall shape and who would in a given year be teaching more than a single course. In addressing this problem, our sense is that the best alternative for strengthening Comparative Literature's undergraduate programs over the next several years may be our traditional path—increasing the number of partial appointments in Comparative Literature and insuring that a sufficient number of those are at the 50% level that allows individual faculty to take a more active role in departmental business. Relatively small changes here, the addition of as little as 1 faculty FTE, would have a considerable positive impact upon the pedagogical coherence of our program. While such appointments should be made with attention to field coverage, a primary consideration in making them should also be adding a core of people who are interested in long-term involvement with strengthening the department's undergraduate offerings and mentoring the department's undergraduate students.

Having focused our expectations for students at the early and middle parts of their careers, we would like to do the same thing in a more systematic way for the end of their careers. First, we want to examine the question of what our seniors do, specifically asking whether some defined culminating project would be possible and desirable. Second, we want to consider how to mentor them more effectively throughout their careers here—whether we can find ways to offer them better advice in making use of the flexibility that we allow them. Related to this issue is the relatively low level of community among our students. This is not self-evidently a bad (or at least, an alterable) situation; it is in part a consequence of expecting our students to focus much of their energy outside the department (in one or another national literature department) and allowing them considerable latitude in selecting courses. But it is a situation about which we need to know more, one where we need to track in an ongoing way how our students actually feel about the departmental environment we create for them. Third, we want to keep looking for ways to enable more of them to study abroad during their time at the university, believing that such stays can be among the most intellectually stimulating and transformative experiences that students can have during their academic careers.

In addition, the question of the long-term relation between our two undergraduate degree tracks needs to be considered. At this point, we have an institutional anomaly in that our cinema studies students are required to take a pair of courses in literature and/or literary criticism. Whether we should, in a world that relies more and more on visual modes of representation, require our literature students to gain some familiarity with non-written texts (film, painting, music), is a topic that we need to examine seriously. Both of our groups of students, cinema and literature majors alike, might benefit from more systematic training in comparative work with both visual and written texts is an issue that goes to the heart of what our core courses might look like in the future.

Priorities:

- 1) Strengthen our core undergraduate teaching group by adding over the next few years several additional partially salaried appointments, either new 25% appointments or by increasing the percentage of affiliation of some current, partially-salaried faculty members.
- 2) Explore possible ways of implementing a capstone course or capstone experience for all, or at least a significantly higher proportion, of our undergraduate majors.
- 3) Experiment with developing and offering new, mixed-media courses that have students comparatively analyze various kinds of visual and written texts.
- 4) Continue developing and offering innovative courses that satisfy general education needs as well as those of current or potential departmental majors.

V:B—Cinema Studies

Current Status and History

After discussion over a number of years among interested faculty and the Dean's Office in the College of Arts and Sciences, Cinema Studies was established in fall 1998 in the Department of Comparative Literature as a separate track within the undergraduate major. From its inception the program has attempted to be analytical in orientation, interdisciplinary in structure, and international in its expectations about what students must experience and learn. The program focuses in particular on the study of the history, theory and practice of cinema with special attention to understanding how films function as a distinctive mode of transmitting and critiquing cultural values and practices.

Two sequences of three core courses each have been developed for the program: Theory of Film (Analysis, Critical Concepts, Genre) and History of Film (from its origins in 1895 to the present). Majors must take at least three of these courses with at least one from each sequence. Many, of course, opt to take more. These core courses are complemented by upper-division film elective courses taken in Comparative Literature and any relevant University of Washington department in consultation with the departmental advisor. There is a two-year foreign language requirement to prepare students for work in at least one national cinema course. Cinema Studies majors must also complete a minimum of 10 credits in Comparative Literature core courses pertaining to literary history or theory and regional literatures. CL 270 (Perspectives on Film: Introduction) or equivalent is a pre-requisite to declaring the major. We have also sought to build a program that provides considerable balance between academic and practical training; Cinema Studies maintains a vibrant internship program with placements in dozens of film-focused organizations and businesses. This program was developed in close collaboration with the Carlson Center; designated Cinema Studies undergraduate learning fellows for the 1999-2001 academic years helped to rapidly develop a network for film internship sites ranging from the Seattle International Film Festival to ShadowCatcher Entertainment and New Line Cinema to local television networks. Nearly one-fourth of all Cinema Studies majors participate in an internship experience in a given year, well over half before they finish their degrees.

At its inception, a director was appointed to the program, Albert Sbragia (French and Italian), and one tenure-track appointment was made, Jennifer Bean. Professor Bean remains the only full-time faculty appointment in the program. Additional program faculty have consisted of several partial appointments, Professors Willis Konick and Steven Shaviro (shared with Comparative Literature and English respectively), and, more recently, Professor Yomi Braester. Professor Claudia Gorbman of UW Tacoma does not have a formal appointment in the program, but has been helpful in establishing its parameters and maintaining its professional integrity. Professors Susan Jeffords (English) and Eric Ames (Germanics) have also taught core courses. The program regularly coordinates joint-listed and elective courses with other faculty and departments on campus, in particular, but not exclusively, with national language departments. One indication of the teaching quality in the program was its nomination last year for a Brotman Unit Award for Instructional Excellence.

Despite receiving limited new resources to date from the College—one faculty FTE, one half-time staff position, two TA slots, and modest operations and administrative funding--the program has experienced a rapid growth. The program currently has over 100 majors, making it independently one of the largest programs in the humanities on campus, and has graduated 35 students per year on average the last three years. The program offers courses to approximately 1,000 students per year. We have had a successful record of placing our graduates in strong graduate degree programs in film studies at institutions such as the University of Chicago, University of Texas-Austin, University of Australia-Melbourne. In only four years of operation we have developed interdisciplinary ties with faculty from across campus and with faculty at both the Tacoma campus (Claudia Gorbman) and Bothell campus (Constantin Behler, Daniel Jacoby). We also collaborate closely with various film and community organizations in the Puget Sound region, ranging from the Seattle International Film Festival to Wiggly World Studios to the Northwest Psychoanalytic Film Study Group.

The early growth of the program was greatly facilitated by a \$63,000, two-year Tools for Transformation award funded in January of 1999. The award provided money for one month of summer salary over two years for the program director, one quarter release time from Tacoma for Professor Claudia Gorbman, allowing her to teach in the program in spring 2000, one nine-month RA position, two one-quarter TAs, purchase of start-up equipment for the program including TV, VCR and DVD players and dubbing equipment, and the purchase of DVDs for instructional purposes. The program has also worked closely with Classroom Support Services in these formative years to develop or retrofit suitable classroom spaces for film courses. A \$46,000 Allen Endowment grant in 1999 helped stimulate much-needed growth in pertinent library holdings. The program has also collaborated with the Media Center at the Undergraduate Library to build a growing collection of videos and DVDs available for course reserves and student study.

The program has been dedicated not only to fostering excellence in the classroom but also to promoting film culture, discussion and analysis at all levels of university life. In 2000 the program, with Support from the Office of Undergraduate Education, offered a workshop on "Teaching Film in the Undergraduate Classroom." Students majoring in cinema studies have created a Student Film Appreciation Club and an annual "Student Film Showcase" with assistance from Cinema Studies faculty. In spring 2000 the UW hosted a first annual Graduate Student Film conference and Short Film Festival entitled "Outsider Hollywood." Support from the Simpson Center for the Humanities, The Center for West European Studies, the Office of Undergraduate Education, the Goethe Institute, Cinema Italia and other campus and off-campus organizations have allowed us to promote numerous campus activities over the past four years. Symposia with screenings have been held on such topics as Ethnic Identity in Contemporary European Cinema, New Italian Cinema, Early Soviet Cinema, Akira Kurosawa, Pedro Almodovar and Stanley Kubrick. In many cases, these symposia are held in conjunction with courses offered by the program on campus and with the participation of K-12 teachers in the Puget Sound Area. This past year faculty members Jennifer Bean, Yomi Braester and Eric Ames organized a series of symposia on the impact of digital technologies on the critical and historical paradigms of cinema studies with the participation of noted scholars such as Tom Gunning. The program is currently working with The Northwest Psychoanalytic Film Study Group, Cinema Seattle and the Center for the Humanities in

preparing *Luminous Psyche: Selected Films of Max Ophuls*, for which Cinema Studies faculty and members of the psychiatric community will present and lead discussions on Ophuls' films. Faculty also regularly give lectures and presentations for major film organizations in the area including the Seattle International Film Festival, The Seattle Art Museum, 911 Media Arts Center, etc.

Where We Are Going

As a wholly new program, Cinema Studies has offered us an opportunity—rare in recent times—of designing and implementing from the ground up an undergraduate program shaped by conscious reflection about pedagogical objectives. Strengthening the coherence, range, and rigor of that academic program will be our first objective as the program continues to develop and grow. By working to bring together diverse faculty from all three UW campuses, we hope to foster a breadth of courses and academic expertise in film studies that will make the University of Washington one of the premier research and teaching centers in the discipline. Taking advantage of our location within Comparative Literature, we envision a program that is uniquely comparative in nature, providing our students with a firm grounding in general cinematic history and theory, but also giving them expertise in one or more foreign or indigenous cinematic traditions. Taking advantage of our location in a city with a vibrant cinematic tradition, we will continue to increase the range of professional experiences we can offer our students. Our broad aims for the next few years include:

- 1) addressing the most pressing needs of our students, including developing strong writing skills, devising a gateway course for majors, giving interested students exposure to the production and screenwriting aspects of the cinematic enterprise, and assisting the rising population of graduate students at the University of Washington working with cinema
- 2) fostering a multidisciplinary environment for the research and teaching of cinema on campus
- 3) enhancing Cinema Studies' international character
- 4) integrating Cinema Studies into the larger film community of Seattle and the Pacific Northwest and developing its public profile

1) Addressing student needs:

We feel that the Cinema Studies program has been built on a solid foundation of pertinent core courses in the history and theory of cinema, elective courses, foreign language preparation and national cinema courses. Now that we have been in operation for a few years, it is time to reflect on the growth and direction of the program, the range of course offerings, the size and format of core courses, the number and kind of required courses. One major change to our core course offerings that we envision is to make CL 301: Film Analysis a required gateway course. This would ensure that all students receive exposure to the fundamental elements for film analysis necessary for their work in other courses. It would also allow us to use this course as a pre-requisite for some of our more advanced courses for majors to ensure that students enter these courses with a shared basis for achievement and excellence. In transforming CL 301 into a required

course, we would plan to offer it twice a year. At the other end of the spectrum, the program needs to offer more advanced seminars and special topics courses for its students. Insufficient faculty numbers have thus far limited these offerings and have likewise kept us from being able to provide small-enrollment capstone courses.

As a discipline in the humanities, one of the greatest tools we provide to our students is the ability to think critically and to develop their thought into coherent and persuasive analytic writing. Although such writing is a component of all of our courses (our 200-level courses, for instance, already require regular writing of papers, on which instructors provide significant feedback), we need to address the ongoing development of writing skills in our students. Student numbers have quickly overwhelmed our ability to provide what we would wish in terms of opportunities for this. The program has worked in the past with the Interdisciplinary Writing Program to provide writing links with C LIT 271 and 312, and will continue to do so. We view such collaborations as essential to the education of students in our courses. Nevertheless, it has become apparent that the issue of writing about film has to be addressed in an even more direct fashion. How we will get there remains a topic of active discussion, though we may well choose to target a few specific courses for clearly defined writing experiences; making any progress in this area, however, is crucially dependent upon the availability of enough faculty to address issues such as class size (upper-division Cinema Studies courses are now almost always open to fifty or more students).

A further, quite specific mode of writing is also essential to the education of many students who seek to embark on a career in the film industry—screenwriting. Persistent demand from students for training in this area and in a second one, film production, indicates directions the program should investigate over the next few years. Our program is small and analytical in focus, with the considerable financial resources needed for production not readily visible, so that it would be unreasonable to expect to provide a major film production component for the near future. On the other hand, the reality of the aspirations of our students and the demands of the film industry and film schools require that we seek to find ways to provide some degree of film production competence as an opportunity for our students. We have explored several means of supplementing our program in this sense, including offering individual study opportunities, collaborating with the UW Extension certificate program, locating filmmaking internship opportunities for our students, collaborating with the Office of Undergraduate Education to provide minimal financing for creative film projects and screenings, and working with CARTAH to provide video production opportunities as final projects within some of our courses. We shall continue in these efforts. To better coordinate independent studies and internships we have assigned a dedicated faculty member to work with students. The exciting new development on campus pertaining to film production is the establishment of the Center for Digital Arts and Experimental Media. Collaboration with the Center is underway and includes admitting Cinema Studies students in DXARTS video/filmmaking courses and DXARTS students into Cinema Studies courses, joint-listing of courses and the creation of new courses that would be of interest to both groups of faculty and students. One such pilot course, dealing with “Experimental Cinema,” will be taught by Jennifer Bean in the 2003-04 academic year.

Another reality that Cinema Studies welcomes and needs to plan for is the increasing amount of graduate student interest in cinema, including a substantial number

of dissertations on cinema. Because of our limited staffing, Cinema Studies faculty have thus far offered graduate seminars only infrequently, although faculty regularly work with graduate students from a wide array of disciplines on projects, independent studies, M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations. As staffing improves we hope to address the current ad hoc situation through the institution of a *Graduate Certificate in Cinema Studies*. This initiative would be modeled upon the Graduate Program in Theory and Criticism, and allow students to obtain graduate certificates in Cinema Studies at both the master's and doctoral levels. Certificates would be awarded after the completion of all degree requirements in the student's home department or school and fulfillment of the Cinema Studies requirement (e.g., three courses—fifteen credit hours—for the M.A. Certificate, and five courses—twenty-five credit hours for the Ph.D. Certificate). The Certificate program would have an appointed faculty advisor and a steering committee to deal with ongoing curricular and administrative issues. Students who opt for the certificate program will be able to cogently integrate the study of cinema within the broader field of their graduate research, acquiring an interdisciplinary subspecialty that will strengthen their versatility as teachers and scholars. A formalized certificate program in cinema studies will also catalyze and sustain the strength of our undergraduate curriculum. M.A. and Ph.D. students enrolled in the program would enlarge the pool of qualified candidates for staffing teaching assistant positions in Cinema Studies courses.

2) *Fostering a multidisciplinary environment:*

The location of Cinema Studies in the Department of Comparative Literature has helped us stress from the outset the multidisciplinary potential of film studies. From the beginning we have worked closely with faculty from different departments and with interdisciplinary centers on campus, in particular the Center for the Humanities and the Center for West European Studies. The presence of Cinema Studies has also contributed to the hiring of faculty in various departments who work specifically on cinema, including Eric Ames (Germanics), Yomi Braester (Comparative Literature—Chinese literature and film), and Vinay Swamy (French and Italian Studies). We hope to continue to increase the interdepartmental and interdisciplinary dimensions of the program, both to foster faculty collaboration as an end in itself and to broaden the range of study options available to students. We will continue to circulate information concerning film courses and events on campus (our development of a program website will be a useful resource in this sense). We will encourage faculty collaboration through mechanisms such as cross-listed courses, team-teaching, guest lecturers, sequencing of courses, etc. We need to look particularly closely at how to establish links with departments beyond the humanities, especially in the arts and social sciences and with particular attention to increasing offerings in Third Cinema. We need to work to expand our ties with faculty at both the Tacoma and Bothell campus, including finding ways to bring faculty from those campuses to the Seattle campus to teach.

It is important, too, that we find the means to enable faculty and graduate students to migrate more freely across departmental lines to participate in the teaching of film courses. In winter 2000, support from the Office of Undergraduate Education allowed the program to offer a workshop on "Teaching Film in the Undergraduate Classroom." A possible expansion of this model would be a *Film Teaching Institute*. The institute could bring together faculty and graduate students in an intensive summer seminar in film

theory, criticism and pedagogy with microteaching sessions and hands-on technology training. The UW Institute for Teaching Excellence and CIDR could be possible partners.

3) *Enhancing Cinema Studies' international character:*

The location of Cinema Studies in the Department of Comparative Literature dictates for our program an emphasis on international cinema and foreign language learning which is not the case for most Cinema Studies programs in the United States. It is crucial for our program to constructively embrace this direction as a way to enhance both our students' education and our own research. New students entering our program often question why they must develop advanced proficiency in a foreign language and culture. After all, they argue, film and the cinematic image are transnational. In answering that question, we seek to have our students understand that the cinematic image is not global in any facile sense, but constructed on the basis of culturally specific modes of thought and expression. The filmic image perceived from a different cultural standpoint is to a certain extent a translated image, interpreted through a different set of visual, cultural and linguistic norms than those that produced it. By giving our students a solid preparation in at least one particular foreign language, culture and cinematic tradition, we provide them with a gateway to explore the cultural specificity of filmic images and narrative traditions and to engage that specificity in a meaningful dialogue with their own culture.

To realize the above goals and make the foreign language component of their education as meaningful as possible requires working closely with the various foreign language departments on campus. This means advising students early on how they may best fulfill their language requirement, creating and promoting national cinema courses within home departments, establishing more cross-listed courses (for which purpose CL 315: National Cinemas was recently created), and involving faculty with strong interests in film more actively in program planning. Recently, the program has begun to offer language trailer sections in some of its national cinema courses by collaborating with such units as the Center for West European Studies. We would also like to create study abroad possibilities that would be specific to Cinema Studies majors, not necessarily creating new programs, but collaborating with existing programs in ways that increase their utility for our students, while establishing ties with cinema studies faculty in foreign institutions with which we have exchange agreements. Recent renovations at the UW Rome Center have enhanced opportunities for film study there, for instance. The Italian Studies program regularly incorporates cinema in its courses offered in Rome and will be pioneering film-related internship opportunities for Cinema Studies students studying in Rome. We hope to eventually extend this model to other overseas sites and create the opportunity for our majors to study a national or indigenous cinema in its own cultural context as a capstone experience in the program. The program would especially like to enhance opportunities for the study of lesser-known non-Western national and indigenous cinemas through on-campus screenings and symposia, student and faculty exchanges and an increase in UW faculty who teach in these fields.

4) integrating film studies into the larger community

The program to date has been very aggressive and successful in promoting film culture both to the campus community and the general public. We plan to continue offering annual film series and developing opportunities for conferences, visitors, coursework and internships with on-campus and off-campus organizations. Several of our members sit on the committees and boards of various local film organizations and regularly participate in off-campus events such as the Seattle International Film Festival. Now that the program has had a chance to graduate its first majors and to achieve recognition in the local community, the time has come to build on our good will and embark on an effective strategy for fund-raising efforts. The program has begun working closely with the Office of Development for the Humanities to establish a list of fundraising priorities and strategies, to develop our website and newsletter as outreach mechanisms, to establish a fundraising advisory board, and to reach out to potential donors both on a collective and individual basis. Within the Department of Comparative Literature, Cinema Studies is probably the unit with the most possibilities to raise funds to benefit our programs and students.

Priorities and Plans

Cinema Studies is a young program that has experienced tremendous growth and gained considerable exposure in its four years of existence. In the current climate of limited resources, it is important for us to manage that growth in a cogent and sustainable fashion. At the same time, it is important for the College and University to assist the program so that it can continue to maintain the type of quality education and research that has characterized its first years and to meet the challenges of the future.

The most pressing need in the program at the moment is the hire of a second core faculty member. At its current size of over 100 majors and 1,000 enrollments per year, the program cannot continue to function with only one full-time faculty member. While the program has taken advantage of shared appointments, those faculty members have divided duties and cannot consistently provide fulltime commitment and service to the program. At present, Professor Bean is the only faculty member with comprehensive training in film studies. A second core faculty member will not only provide much needed assistance in teaching core and advanced courses, but would help shoulder the burden of individual studies, senior seminars and theses, graduate student supervision, and the many requests we receive for assistance with film related events and courses. In a new hire, we would look for a generalist with strong training in film history and theory, together with special expertise in one or more of the areas the program should be developing, such as Third and indigenous cinematic traditions or screenwriting. The Department as a whole shares the sense of the core faculty members in cinema studies about the urgency of this hire.

One of the reasons the Cinema Studies program was able to take root quickly on campus has been the presence of various faculty members working in film studies within their own disciplines. The program has taken advantage of this situation by utilizing faculty with teaching appointments in Comparative Literature for the staffing of core courses, while tapping resources in other programs for sustaining elective courses. As we grow, we will continue to reach out to faculty on campus to help nourish this discipline at

the University of Washington. We are fortunate that the long overdue presence of a Cinema Studies program at the UW has encouraged existing faculty to intensify their teaching and research in film and has encouraged departments to hire new faculty with an eye to film studies. To help solidify the growth of the Cinema Studies core, we would propose consideration of shifting some current faculty appointments more fully into the program. The most pressing of these moves would be to transfer Steven Shaviro, who now works primarily on media and film, to full-time status within Comparative Literature. A partial appointment for Albert Sbragia would further integrate the director into the program and provide an additional teaching strength, as would partial appointments or even course buyouts for one or more junior faculty. The University of Washington holds among its faculty one of the most important scholars in film sound in the United States in Claudia Gorbman of the Tacoma campus. Finding the means to have her teach courses at the Seattle campus and become actively involved in Cinema Studies in a more regular fashion would be a great boost to the program.

Currently the College of Arts and Sciences supports the program of Cinema Studies with two teaching assistantships per year, a number that the department has managed to supplement creatively in the last four years. We have endeavored to be as efficient as possible in our use of these resources by tailoring the individual teaching preferences of program faculty to their need for teaching assistant support in their classes. But there are key goals, such as increasing our large-course offerings at the 200-level or improving writing instruction for which we would need additional dedicated TA lines.

The program has already submitted a request to the Dean's Office for permission to institute a \$15 enrollment fee in the 200-level Cinema Studies courses to help shoulder the burden of purchasing DVDs and videotapes and renting 16 mm film prints to be used for lesson preparation and classroom screening. This will help the program to sustain these costs over the long run without the constant pressure of searching out short-term grants or compelling professors to spend their own money to buy or rent course materials.

In just four years of existence, the Cinema Studies program has become a vibrant addition to the academic diversity and educational experience at the University of Washington. The program has experienced an initial burst of growth and will continue to expand in the upcoming years. Our most pressing challenges for the immediate future involve maintaining the quality of our current core program while seeking to complement that core with necessary learning opportunities for our students that we have not yet been able to provide. To meet these challenges we need to find creative ways to increase and reallocate our instructional resources and to enhance our campus scholarly community.

Priorities:

- 1) Adding a second fulltime faculty line to shore up our core program, increase scholarly expertise in one or more areas of need in the program, and provide fulltime commitment and service to the program.
- 2) Shifting some current faculty appointments more fully into the program to allow us to offer a greater diversity of courses to meet the educational needs of our students including writing instruction senior seminars, special topic and capstone courses, and graduate certificate courses.

- 3) Enhancing cinema studies on campus at large through strengthening existing ties with other departments which incorporate film study, providing forums for scholarly exchange and instructional training for faculty and teaching assistants, and encouraging the integration of cinema studies into the UW's study abroad programs
- 4) Expanding opportunities for undergraduate students to study abroad, both by tailoring aspects of currently available programs for their particular interests and needs and by supplementing those programs with such elements as internships at the foreign sites.

VI:A—DEVELOPMENT

Development efforts in Comparative Literature have started from a relatively thin foundation—we are a fairly small, recently established unit, not one that had in the past systematically cultivated relationships with alumni, and lack the sort of natural constituency that a heritage community, for instance, provides to many other departments in the humanities. Five years ago, the department had no money in its discretionary account and less than \$15,000 in a single departmental fund designated for graduate students. Progress since then has been tangible, providing us with more of a basis upon which to build. Our discretionary fund currently receives the \$1,000 or so a year we need to fund some general departmental activities, our graduate student fellowship fund is now set up as a revenue-producing endowment fund and contains over \$35,000, and we have a separate fund to support ongoing graduate student activities, the Sally Ryan Fund, which provides several thousand dollars annually for graduate student professional activities. Some significant contributions to these funds have come from outside donors, but the bulk of the increase in our fund-raising is due to the generosity of departmental faculty. A large boost in the endowment fund, for instance, resulted from the Microsoft Challenge of several years ago; we hope to see a further jump in the endowment fund as a result of the current, College-funded matching grant program.

It has long been clear to us, however, that the most attractive possibilities for fund-raising efforts may lie in the area of cinema studies, and that efforts there would be a natural consequence of getting this program well established. Thus, in that program's second year, we produced an inaugural newsletter to mail to alumni and other potentially interested individuals. The conference on "Ethnicity in European Cinema" was designed in part to create the kind of visibility for the program that might lead to further development activities. Sustaining this momentum has proved difficult in terms of faculty time and other resources; getting a new academic program off the ground involves considerable work of its own. But as the program has acquired some stability, we have returned to the idea of how we might utilize the opportunities that film might offer as a way of creating the community links that make development efforts possible.

Appended to this section, then, is a description of the community film forums that we hope to get underway next February. We will, of course, continue to pursue opportunities that arise in other areas as well—here, as elsewhere, trying whenever possible to collaborate with other departments in joint efforts. Our main priority in this area is continuing to accumulate funds for support of graduate students; the lack of graduate fellowships remains a serious barrier to successful recruitment and professional development of graduate students. But there are a range of other valuable objectives, from undergraduate film projects or foreign study opportunities to faculty research activities, that deserve our long-term attention.

HAVE I SEEN THIS FLICK BEFORE?
(Community Film Forums Sponsored by Comparative Literature)

Genre is the envelope filmmakers grab when they want to pack their films into a wrapper and mail their films to you. The pages inside the envelope may be unfamiliar, but the cover itself is comforting and customary. You receive a large, brown envelope like any other, with stamps on it like any other, and an address on it—your address. If you're lucky the stuff inside the wrapper will amuse you, strike you as original. But the envelope repeatedly rubs off on the material inside. You recognize something quite predictable, and you say to yourself, "Have I seen this flick before?"

Filmmakers, even the most unusual or outrageous, need such envelopes. They draw upon film conventions: the love story, the crime story, historical epics, shadowy stories about shady people, big drama producing tears, hysteria, sometimes joy. During this series of presentations, this cinema showcase, we will examine five familiar genres, drawing upon examples from films you may have seen. Thus, for the last presentation, we will examine a film that intentionally jumbles up all five genres, David Lynch's *MULHOLLAND DRIVE*. This film may seem mysterious at the start, but once we disentangle its genres, slit open and line up its envelopes, it won't seem mysterious at all.

Willis Konick, a member of the Comparative Literature Department, will act as your host for these sessions. He will be assisted by other faculty members in the Cinema Studies program. Come and enjoy this lively exploration of current and classic films.

The schedule:

Wednesday, February 12
 Wednesday, March 5
 Wednesday, March 26
 Wednesday, April 16
 Wednesday, May 7
 Wednesday, May 28

The genres:

1. Crime film (Albert and Willis)
2. Melodrama (Steve and Willis)
3. Historical film (Yomi and Willis)
4. Love story (Jennifer and Willis)
5. Film noir (Willis)
6. *MULHOLLAND DRIVE* (Willis)

We are reserving Kane 110 for the event.

VI:B—University of Washington Texts and Teachers Program (Department of Comparative Literature)

“Texts and Teachers” is an innovative educational outreach program developed at Brown University and funded there over a nine-year period by the National Endowment for the Humanities. This program is designed to foster *ongoing* curricular development and collaboration between university literature departments and high school language arts programs in a way that traditional NEH seminars have rarely managed to accomplish. Courses are initially developed in summer workshops and then taught in parallel in the different institutional settings. While some adaptations occur, reflecting the obvious differences between students at different levels, the intent is for all the participants in a given course to teach, as much as possible, the same materials in similar ways. The involvement of the Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Washington with this program began in summer 1999, when Professors Gary Handwerk and Willis Konick, along with four teachers from two area high schools, attended a two-week workshop at Brown designed to launch a branch of the program in the Puget Sound area. Since then, we have evolved and expanded our activities, adding links to two new high schools, conducting summer workshops in 2001 and 2002, and developing two new courses specifically designed for the program. With the knowledge we have gained about how to run a program like this successfully, we hope to be in a position to apply for a major NEH grant in 2003, one that would allow for significant expansion of our efforts. At the same time, we are exploring various ways in which sustainable funding for the program might be secured.

Two features make Texts and Teachers particularly exciting and notably different from other university-sponsored humanities outreach activities. First, it involves the high school teachers from the start in helping design the courses that are to be taught, making them partners in a shared educational project. They help define the course topics and they offer advice on selecting texts, thus beginning a conversation that can continue over many years. Second, it encourages ongoing interaction between the college and high school classes. Texts and Teachers programs typically involve visits by the high school students to the university campus to participate in the linked course, along with visits by the university faculty to the high schools, where they do classroom teaching. The benefits of involvement flow in both directions, with teachers in the different settings sharing their educational experiences and expertise. High school students find themselves involved with a challenging curriculum, one where the university link creates an additional incentive for their serious engagement with the materials. University students benefit by having their studies focused upon specific pedagogical objectives, by having to ask what value the works they study have for an audience very different from themselves. Both groups of students are energized by sharing the same classroom, learning from one another more about how people learn.

Over the past three years, we have also tried to build upon the Brown model, looking for ways to foster additional interaction among the various groups of students. By making the UW link for one course a senior seminar, for instance, we were able to involve the university students more actively in the pedagogical exchanges. Students in that setting worked on group projects (dealing with the reception history of various texts)

that they could present to the high school teachers and students; they produced teaching manuals for these texts, with several of the groups visiting the high school classes to discuss their projects and all of their manuals eventually being circulated to the high school teachers. We also experimented (less successfully in our first try) with using Catalyst's EPost to link classes electronically. Although their server proved unable to handle large numbers of participants simultaneously and this link had to be abandoned, we plan in the future to pursue the long-term goal of technology-based interactions.

We think that the program we have in place already indicates the sort of long-term pedagogical potential it offers. Our experience suggests that we are collecting not only a cadre of teachers, but a cadre of students as well. Because we are a large public university, a significant number of the students we meet in high school classes can be expected to show up in our college classes, as has already proven to be the case. We thus form long-term academic relationships with students that provide a more integrated transition between their high school and college careers. In that context, our ability to work with them on developing specific intellectual and academic skills is enhanced. Not only can Texts and Teachers classes help high school teachers challenge their students to read new and different sorts of material—Garcia Marquez's *News of a Kidnapping* alongside Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, or Alice Walker's *The Color Purple* alongside Faulkner's *Go Down, Moses*—they offer a chance to work on student writing in a more continuous way, using our university classes to follow up on the sorts of analytical writing that their high school classes began to foster.

At this point in time, we have put in place most of the pieces we think we need to be able to apply for an NEH grant that would allow us to expand the program significantly. We have designed new courses specific to the University of Washington (ones that mesh with the broader pedagogical objectives of the Department of Comparative Literature) and experimented with how best to introduce them in the summer workshops. We have successfully established links with new high schools (Roosevelt High School in the Seattle School District and Lake Washington High School in the Lake Washington School District) and contacted other schools that have expressed interest in future involvement (Nathan Hale High School). We have spoken with additional university faculty about their possible involvement with the program, both UW humanities faculty and a faculty member at Seattle Pacific University. In addition to scheduling a third summer workshop next year, we hope to use the upcoming year to prepare a grant application for the December 2003 NEH deadline. their high school classes began to foster.

VII—Conclusion

Priorities in Moving Ahead

Our departmental self-study has, in its preceding pages, identified a large number of issues that will engage us in the next several years, areas of departmental functioning that will be matters of ongoing concern for us. As we look ahead, however, we see a subset of this larger agenda that demands our immediate attention. The priorities that we list here are, with considerable departmental consensus, the matters that seem to us most vital for sustaining and strengthening the institutional foundations of our academic endeavors.

Top Departmental Priorities:

- 1) **Approval of an additional faculty line in Cinema Studies** would allow us to move forward in several areas of curricular improvement within our Cinema Studies track: to design and implement a gateway course for all majors, to expand our offerings of senior seminars and special topic courses, to proceed with discussion of a graduate certificate program in Cinema Studies, and simply to guarantee that our regular core courses can be offered in a reliable, predictable way.
- 2) **Obtaining funding for graduate fellowships**, both at the dissertation stage and for incoming students, is our highest development priority and a goal that will require close collaboration between the College and us. This is the single most important step that we could take in enhancing the professional development of our graduate students.
- 3) **Adding several additional partial faculty appointments** from among faculty already on campus is essential for revitalizing our department from within. These faculty would be selected with an eye to the role that they could play individually in helping us provide additional coherence in our undergraduate curriculum and closer mentorship for our undergraduate majors.
- 4) **Increasing our development efforts and fund-raising success** is for us, as for all programs in the College, likely to be an ever-more important task as a way of maintaining even our basic instructional budgets.
- 5) **Increasing the proportion of our students who participate in study abroad programs** is key to the comparative, multi-national basis of our discipline. Many of our graduate students already do this; we need to continue supporting them in their efforts. We need to aim for comparable success with our undergraduate students as well, by encouraging them to see study abroad as a natural component of their academic work, by collaborating more closely with programs already in existence on campus and by working to adapt current programs or to develop new ones that would serve the specific interests and needs of our students.
- 6) **Renewing the effort to provide integrative experiences for our students**, whether graduate or undergraduate, is important as a way of counteracting the anonymity of a

large urban university and the inevitable dispersion of our discipline. We will, later this year, begin active discussion with our students about what sorts of activities might best fulfill this purpose and work actively to have specific ideas implemented by next fall.