

**Department of Comparative Literature Review Report**  
**Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences and the College of Arts and**  
**Sciences**  
**April 10, 2003**

**Summary of the Review Process**

The committee appointed on November 22, 2002 to review the Department of Comparative Literature consisted of Professors Michael A. Williams (committee chair; Chair of Near Eastern Languages & Civilization, UW); Collett Cox (Asian Languages and Literature, UW); Ray Jonas (History, UW); Gaylyn Studlar (Program in Film and Video Studies, University of Michigan); Roland Greene (Department of Comparative Literature, Stanford University); James Michael Holmquist (Department of Comparative Literature, Yale University). All committee members were supplied in advance with copies of the self-study document produced by the Department of Comparative Literature, guidelines for conducting the review, the 1992 review documents, Graduate School Exit Questionnaire Summaries, and Graduate School Representative Reports for doctoral students' general and final exams.

The UW members of the committee met on December 5, 2002 to discuss first impressions from their survey of the provided materials, and a general discussion of procedures for the review. The UW members met on December 19 with the Deans for the charge meeting and reviewed a variety of areas to receive attention during the review process. On December 20, the UW committee members met with Professor Gary Handwerk, Chair of Comparative Literature (CL), for a preliminary interview regarding the status of the department and planning for the site visit. Subsequently, in coordination with Assistant to the Dean Heidi Tilghman, Michael Williams and the other UW members planned the specific agenda for the site visit of January 28-29, 2003.

The entire committee met for the first time at a dinner meeting on January 27, 2003 and shared general observations derived from the self-study materials. In the following two days the committee interviewed Department Chair Handwerk; Prof. Marshall Brown, coordinator of the CL graduate program; Undergraduate Program coordinator Prof. Willis Konick; Acting Divisional Dean of Arts and Humanities Robin McCabe; faculty representatives from the Cinema Studies, Textual Studies and Theory and Criticism groups within CL; the assistant professors in CL; CL program staff; representatives from the undergraduate and graduate students in CL; and a group of chairs from various Humanities departments. Sessions were also held with about 9-10 individual faculty who had requested interviews. At the conclusion of all of the interviews the committee had a lunch meeting with Chair Handwerk. After assimilating its preliminary findings in an executive session, the committee concluded the site visit on the afternoon of January 29 with the exit interviews with the Deans.

The extensive information supplied in the self-study documents and the significant number and variety of individuals and groups whom we were able to interview during the

site visit provided more than sufficient basis for the following findings, which we respectfully submit:

### **Findings and Recommendations**

Overall we find the Department of Comparative Literature to be an unusually strong academic program—at least as strong as it was at the last ten-year review, and stronger in many respects. It is important to note that the department has maintained and in many ways enhanced its overall strength during period in which CL departments nationally have not fared so well on the whole. CL departments in one sense are a prized commodity in higher education—they exist as Ph.D.-granting units at perhaps fifty institutions, and their presence correlates closely with AAU membership and other indications of institutional character; but in another sense they are a difficult burden, because the discipline, a kind of permanent vanguard in relation to the national literature departments, changes with a fluidity that is unusual even in the academy, and CL departments can quickly fall behind or become irrelevant. In the best of circumstances, such departments have to be reinvented all the time, with the participation of the adjacent units (who may be tempted to feel that such a reinvention comes at their expense).

The committee feels that the University of Washington is fortunate to have such a unit, and that it is an asset that should not be taken for granted. The department is doing many things quite well, even with limited resources, but it is also at a point where it could be even stronger. Happily, the conceptual tools for this department's next reinvention are all in hand.

It occurred to the committee that there is a unifying theme in most of the various findings and recommendations summarized in what follows. Most of the recommendations trace back to a fundamental sense that the greatest advantage to the CL department, its various programs, and the other units in the College with which CL has closest association, will derive from a focus on the department's identity as a *CL department*. There are less attractive alternatives in sight: it could conceivably become merely an appendage to its subunit in Cinema Studies, or a holding pen for several activities that have no other homes; but the committee believes that its success will come down to reimagining the relations among all these things under a reinvigorated agenda for CL as incorporating these subunits and activities but not being overwhelmed by them. Recommendations for next steps in the most prominent areas of need and growth come down in most instances to maintaining a clear self-consciousness regarding the distinctive mission and role implied by that identity.

#### Leadership and Governance

One of CL's clearest assets is its strong leadership. The current chair has done a truly remarkable job in providing direction and cohesion to the department. He embodies the rare phenomenon of a strong leader who is held in genuine affection. Professor Gary Handwerk has fostered a climate of both collegiality and high standards, and seems generally trusted as a leader with sincere commitment to all of the programs within CL.

The chair also has considerable skill in working and negotiating with higher administration in ways that have significantly benefited CL. This has resulted in relatively high morale (given the larger context of constraints at the University) among staff, students and faculty in CL.

The director of graduate studies, Professor Marshall Brown, is another strong leader who is admired and liked by his constituency, a distinguished scholar whose own work and activity connected with the Modern Language Quarterly brings national attention to the UW. And the director of undergraduate studies, Professor Willis Konick, has again provided just the kind of leadership that is needed for this dimension of the department. A popular teacher himself, he appears to have a sober perspective on what an undergraduate program in CL should offer.

Governance in the department seems on the whole to be handled appropriately for a program of this type. Most people seem to feel that they are a part of the decision-making process even without very frequent and elaborate faculty meetings, and outside of meetings there is a conscientious and effective effort to communicate information to the relevant members of the department through e-mail and other media.

#### Staff

Like most departments at the University, CL could be helped by increased staff support, and will likely require this at some point as programs within the department continue to grow. However, at the moment the level of staff support seems to be meeting needs adequately. This is due in large measure to the obvious talent, experience, resourcefulness and dedication represented by the current staff. It is also fortunate that the half-time advisor who has had to absorb responsibility for advising the huge increase in undergraduate majors through the Cinema Studies program happens to have her other current half-time appointment in a related area of Drama.

#### Undergraduate Program in General

The CL undergraduate program has experienced significant growth since the last review, especially with the addition of the Cinema Studies (CS) option. The latter will be discussed at greater length below.

With regard to the regular CL major, the committee identified two principal needs: First of all, the department should consider whether there are ways in which the core theory courses required by CL majors might be better coordinated so that students experience a clearer progression from course to course in content and theoretical development. Students who were interviewed had great praise on the whole for quality of instruction in individual courses. However, there is a sense that core courses tend oftentimes to reiterate instruction in some of the same theoretical principles, repeat some of the same readings from scholarship or examples from literary classics, etc. There may be ways in which the faculty can more effectively plan the content for the overall list of core courses

so that students moving through this curriculum have more of an experience of progression and growth.

Secondly, an attempt should be made to increase the variety in literature courses available to students. In particular, undergraduates whom we interviewed expressed the need for CL to continue to expand the global range of offerings. Since the last 10-year review the department has clearly been making progress in this direction, with—to mention only two examples--the hiring of Yomi Braester (East Asian literature) and the recent move of Cynthia Steele (Latin American literature) fulltime into CL. The committee recommends that this widening of the global coverage in its literature curriculum remain a priority. This should be kept in mind in connection with the next full hire in CL (see below). In addition, the department should actively explore ways in which its global breadth in literature offerings might be expanded through resources among existing faculty in other units (e.g., Near Eastern Languages & Civilization, Asian Languages & Literatures, the Jackson School of International Studies, Classics). It seems to the committee that there is still undeveloped potential here for cooperation with significant mutual benefit. This may include, for example, exploring instances where already existing courses in such related departments, or the creation of new courses, might be adapted/created as team-taught and/or cross-listed offerings and strengthen core curricular needs of both CL as well as the other units.

To enhance both the quality of its undergraduate instruction and the training of its graduate students, the department should consider establishing more uniform internal criteria for TA training (including TAs who are students from other departments). This could consist of a departmental TA orientation and/or specific training with faculty of the programs (e.g., Cinema Studies or Literature) in whose courses the TAs will teach.

#### Cinema Studies Option in the Program Undergraduate

Among the most visible developments in the department since the last 10-year review has been the creation of its highly successful Cinema Studies (CS) option, and both the impact to-date and future possibilities surrounding this important step warrant special comment. The committee agreed that the UW should be proud of the flourishing CS undergraduate program in the department. In their discussions with the external review committee, students from this program were uniformly articulate and enthusiastic in their praise of their professors and of the CS concentration.

CL's decision to integrate an undergraduate curriculum devoted to CS is not an unprecedented one in academe. CS exists under many different academic rubrics. In some institutions it is freestanding, of departmental or even school status (UCSC, USC); in others, it is housed in communication studies departments (University of Texas-Austin, UNC-Chapel Hill), or in English departments (University of Pittsburgh), or combined with Theatre (UCLA, UNLV). At the UW and the University of Iowa, it finds its home in a department of CL.

However, it appears that the implications of this choice for the department at UW should be subject to more discussion than has apparently occurred. The department needs to think about what CS should be and how CS as envisioned at UW—in terms of curriculum, faculty, and degree programs—will best be addressed within the boundaries of the unit's established identity and mission.

One of the typical results of starting a CS curriculum is the rapid growth of student numbers in the major. This certainly has occurred at UW, though there is some indication that the numbers have leveled off. In response to student interest in the subject area, one CS-trained specialist has been hired (Jennifer Bean). Other courses are taught by faculty who have shifted to instruct in this area (e.g., Willis Konick; Steven Shaviro; Yomi Braester), and some faculty have research interests that suggest that they will likely have an increased profile within the CS curriculum.

While the department has been remarkably successful in managing this quick expansion, faculty (and staff) are in grave danger of being over-stretched by crowded courses and insufficient resources. In light of these and other challenges, the following is an assessment of current and possible academic programs in CS within the department and suggestions for ways to address programmatic issues:

We found that neither faculty, students, or staff seem to have serious issues of concern regarding the curricular structure, advising process, or admissions procedures as they relate to the CS undergraduate major. Students, on the whole, seemed happy with their experience in the major. In our conversations with students, we were impressed by their articulateness and their commitment to the field of study. Critical studies ("theory") was often cited by students as being the academic area that they thought represented the unit's greatest strength. They stressed the importance to them of the expertise and involvement of selected faculty from all ranks.

The most obvious problem with the undergraduate CS curriculum is its success: too many undergraduates wish to major in cinema studies within the department relative to the number of faculty available to teach them. The department sees the problems with the undergraduate curriculum primarily as being the result of these numbers. With their role in the department defined primarily by the servicing of large numbers of undergraduate majors, faculty will end up trapped by the need to continually offer curriculum requirements to undergraduate majors rather than being able to teach specialty courses related to their research interests or to develop a graduate CS program (see below).

The expansion of the CS faculty requires immediate attention. Faculty have shown stamina and commitment as they wait for the university to supply additional hires and resources to serve swelling numbers of majors. We feel CS could be academically strengthened by the hiring of at least one additional faculty member in the CS area, and we therefore strongly endorse the department's prioritization of this need in the self-study document. Even if the undergraduate program is expected to remain at its current size, the number of faculty must be increased. Assuming that Willis Konick is interested in retiring within the next few years, a new faculty member would be needed who could

cover those courses in cinema that he currently teaches. Adding faculty would be beneficial even if the number of majors were to shrink. If this happened, then faculty could turn their attention to graduate students and to teaching of non-majors in the College who might wish to take CS courses but not major in the field.

If the department is to retain its rigorous academic profile, then it must avoid thinking that the CS major has to be available to every student who wishes this major. On the contrary, entry into the major should be rigorously selective, so that both the number and quality of majors can be controlled. Most obviously, the undergraduate program in CS can also be strengthened by developing a set of prerequisites that will make entrance more selective. This would create a talented and interested undergraduate constituency that would elevate the reputation of the CS major and, possibly, have the ancillary benefit of helping to stem over-enrollment in this major option.

The CS undergraduate concentration has a coherent curricular design, and faculty appear to be working hard to make for satisfactory delivery of the curriculum that allows students to take the courses needed to graduate in four years. The only serious issue that was raised regarding curriculum design in the current concentration was by students who transfer into the major. Some transfer students complained about the difficulty of completing the needed second year of a foreign language before taking a CS class (usually focused on a national cinema) in language other than English. This constituency needs to be considered, but the committee does not recommend that the current language requirement for the cinema studies major be dropped. On the contrary, we believe that this requirement ultimately strengthens the major and also secures its identity as complementary with the established mission of a department of comparative literature. The language requirement and a strong requirement in cinemas of the world as the focus of comparative studies can help facilitate a greater sense among CS majors that they are fully part of the department as a single community.

However, consideration should be given to more discussion with local feeder community colleges about standardizing the basic courses that prepare students to transfer into the program. Also, while the committee feels strongly that there should be no compromise on or diluting of the current language requirement, some thought needs to be given in the future to the relationship between foreign language proficiency and CS courses. Does the current requirement really depend upon and cultivate the expansion of the students' language skills or just serve to give them knowledge of the cinema of a different nation or culture? Some CS majors observed that apart from the Spanish national cinema course, few or none of the other national cinema courses are actually taught in the national language. Future progress in the expansion of study-abroad activity among CS majors could be one step in helping to make the language requirement a more meaningful component in the degree.

Aside from these minor issues, the undergraduate major in CS is well worth maintaining and strengthening, but it will require effort on the part of the UW administration as well as the department to make sure that sufficient resources go to hiring faculty and/or limiting the numbers of majors to alleviate the problems of over-enrollment in

undergraduate teaching. If new hires of regular faculty in CS take place in joint arrangements with language departments, then these faculty should have specific training in CS. They should have expertise and interest in undergraduate teaching, as well as a commitment to the academic mission that the department represents.

These will be the challenges for the department to take on (and, in some cases, resist), if it wants to undertake a serious effort at improving its already good undergraduate program in CS and increase the intellectual commitment of students to the department. It would be presumptuous of us to try to design the curricular shape of CS programs for the department, but curricular planning needs to be undertaken that takes into consideration students' interests and needs. It must also provide a challenging structure that places the undergraduate major firmly within the context of an intellectually rigorous CL department. The CS major should be structured in a way that ensures an intellectual meeting point with the broader undergraduate CL major. Could this involve modifying the CS major requirements in such a way as to increase the exposure of CS majors to literature? Would it help, as one committee member reflected, if CL renamed itself "Comparative Literature and Cinema" and had a curriculum to match? In any event, consideration might be given to questions of this sort, which emphasize the core identity of the unit, and contribute to a strong sense of coherence.

Many students desire that a production area be added in the curriculum. Production courses are not currently offered in CL, but students sometimes pick up experience in this area through other sources—on campus and off. However, while cinema studies majors often benefit from some taste of production, we do not recommend that the department go in the direction of adding a production element to the major. Not only is creative production extremely expensive to establish and maintain, but the kind of student who would be attracted to the major that incorporates production courses would no doubt change. It is likely that enrollments would go up in the CS major, but the link between the CS option and comparative literature majors would be diminished. Succumbing to the pressure of students who want to make films will result in the creation of a different model of CS, one that could lead the curriculum in a pre-professional direction more appropriate to an art or film school curriculum, and endanger the cohesiveness and sense of mission that the CL department currently enjoys.

In short, we encourage the swiftest possible implementation of improved infrastructure for the CS program so that it can continue to offer an excellent, humanities-based education to its majors, but we also encourage the department to limit entrance into the major and to think through carefully the relationship of cinema studies to comparative literature at the most basic "philosophical" level.

### Graduate Program

The department's graduate program has been quite successful over the past ten years and seems generally very healthy, particularly as measured by the placement of recent Ph.D. graduates. The size of the graduate student body was significantly reduced in accordance with the recommendations of the last review. There is some sentiment in the department

that a slight increase in the total enrollment is now needed, in order to ensure a critical mass of enrolled students in each area of the graduate program. (Other faculty seemed less concerned about increasing enrollment, at least in the core graduate seminars, since critical mass can be supplied through the participation of students from other disciplines.)

Reduction in total graduate student enrollment since the last review has allowed greater emphasis on quality and the results have been quite positive. Chairs from related departments who were interviewed registered the impression that the quality of CL graduate students has definitely improved over the last decade. Sustained attention to quality certainly has resulted in a placement record of Ph.D.s from the department in recent years that has been very good.

The cutback in graduate student enrollment has also been one factor helping to enable the provision of at least some support for almost every graduate student in the department who requests it. In spite of the general feeling voiced by several faculty that support for graduate students in CL is relatively good at the moment, it does remain the case that competition for the very best graduate students is high, and there will need to be increases in support in the future if the department is to set competitive standards.

Graduate students who were interviewed had praise for the mentoring they have received from the faculty. They feel supported to develop as scholars and perceive that such development is expected of them. There was praise for the chair, graduate program director and other faculty for the encouragement and coaching provided to students in the presentation of seminar assignments, colloquium papers, etc. One category of mentoring where there is room for improvement—as is true in many departments—is socialization into the basic realities of professional life in academia.

An important concern expressed by both graduate students and the graduate program director is for mechanisms to improve a sense of community and coherence among the students. Marshall Brown indicated that consideration is already being given to reviving a core pro-seminar for all CL grad students and the committee endorses this plan. We suggest that such a seminar might well be constructed around issues concerning the history and evolution of comparative literature as a field of study. Something like this would be an example at the graduate level of what the committee feels is the importance of maintaining focus on the department's identity *as a CL department*.

#### Cinema Studies and the Graduate Program.

There are currently insufficient faculty resources to embark on a full-fledged graduate program in Cinema Studies. Only after the above-mentioned hiring of additional faculty in CS is accomplished, and some sense of control of the numbers of undergraduate majors is achieved, would we recommend that a graduate program be considered. Currently there are insufficient resources both to create a graduate program and to meet the needs of the undergraduate curriculum. As noted above, new hires are required who have established credentials or outstanding promise for undergraduate teaching. But thought should be given to the possibility of hiring at least one faculty in CS who



understands the particular challenge of teaching graduate students and who has an interest in leading future discussion within the unit and with other units about interdisciplinary ventures in the teaching of visual media at the graduate level.

The department will need to think about what could be done to establish attractive graduate offerings in CS that would suitably match the aims of its students as well as the strengths of the department, its location, its faculty, and its anticipated financial resources. A certificate program in CS or the development of cinema courses as offerings under the "Theory and Criticism" rubric would give CL graduate students useful formal training in CS. An additional specialty in CS would improve the employment odds for CL Ph.D.s in a tight job market. Since CS is often seen as a "draw" for undergraduates, faculty with expertise in the area are often thought of as valuable commodities who can sustain or improve enrollments in a unit. Providing graduate students with training in this field of study would also create a larger pool of potential teaching assistants for the undergraduate CS courses at UW and enhance the performance of such TAs in these courses.

There could be ancillary benefits in reaching out to other units on campus with graduate students and faculty interested in cinema. With proper cultivation of departments and faculty in English, Anthropology, Women's Studies, French and Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, Germanics, History, Art History, etc., students with a wide range of interests might also be encouraged to take graduate courses in CS. This would be one strategy for ensuring a reliable constituency of graduate students interested in visual media/film study without embarking on a full-tiedged graduate program that the department seems unready to take on, primarily because of lack of appropriate faculty resources. As well as identifying graduate students outside of the CL department interested in such a possibility of cross-departmental work in CS, it might be useful to establish meaningful contact with faculty outside of the department who might contribute important interdisciplinary perspectives to CL graduate students' emerging interests in film and visual media.

Programs do not establish new directions overnight. There will need to be sustained conversations among CL faculty and between the department and the administration as to the direction of and resources to be committed to the CS component of Comparative Literature. We urge the administration to encourage the unit in this discussion and to provide the administrative and material support that will give energetic faculty and students the means for creatively casting the CS program in the future, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, in ways that will enhance Comparative Literature rather than move in directions that might be incompatible with its established mission. Cinema Studies should enhance the unit's proven successes, not pull the unit into areas where it does not wish to go, or where it cannot reasonably be expected to succeed. As has already been emphasized with respect to the undergraduate CS option, any graduate CS program, if developed, needs to have a clear focus or unique intellectual mission that articulates well with the department's existing graduate programs.

The college will need to support the department in this effort to carefully think through CS within the department rather than to rush into plans (at the undergraduate or graduate level) for which it does not have adequate resources to establish or sustain.

### Textual Studies

The Textual Studies Program (TS) underwent a recent full review five years after its inception and the committee report dated August 26, 2002 underscored the excellence, importance and potential of the program; recommended the maintenance and increased support for the program; and recommended that in the immediate future TS be housed in the CL department.

Our committee concurs with the above recommendations, but we wish to underscore the importance of giving attention to how TS may be incorporated as an integral part of the mission of the CL department. In other words, rather than simply viewing CL as a temporary administrative holding pen for TS, the department and members of the TS program should more vigorously articulate the actual place of TS within CL. Though it seems to us that an intellectual case for TS's location within CL has not yet been laid out we feel that such a case can most certainly be made, and in ways that could capitalize on the considerable success and potential of the TS program. Its real integration into CL could be of benefit both to the TS program and to the CL department, offering a permanent organizational and resource base for the strengthening and growth of the former while adding unique and valuable element to the identity of the CL department at UW.

To take the broad view, TS is an emerging field nationally, and UW is lucky to have one of the handful of recognized programs. It might be especially exciting to think of TS as a counterpart (and counterweight) to CS in the next stage of the department's development. Nearly all other TS programs, where they have affiliations with other units, are aligned with English departments; a department of comparative literature that had a strong TS component would be unusual, if not unique. Graduate students would come out of UW trained in two of the emphases that are most attractive to prospective hiring departments, and undergraduates would choose between these emphases or join them in creative ways. It seems to the committee that regularizing the relation of TS to CL is a natural next step in the development of both.

It was clear from the committee's interviews with faculty and graduate students from the TS program that there is intense enthusiasm for the intellectual experience provided by the TS seminars and colloquium activities. Leaders of the program indicated that their highest funding priority is for increased support to bring visiting scholars to campus for contributions to these seminars. While we certainly understand the attraction to both students and faculty of having interaction with outstanding visiting scholars, it seems to the review committee that this strategy for the primary investment of funds should be seriously reconsidered. Our view is that the wiser investment of available support at this time would be toward a permanent faculty line in TS. This will likely require a somewhat larger level of funding, but we suggest that the strategy might be more far-sighted and

contribute to expanding the committed core of resident faculty. The latter will be needed in order for the potential of TS at UW to be realized.

### Relation of Comparative Literature to National Literature Departments and Programs

The department's self-study document refers to CL's "nodal" function within the Humanities. At present, at least on the graduate level, CL does appear to function as a node in its relationship to national literature departments, though we found that this perception was not shared evenly by all national literature faculty (and even sharply dismissed by one interviewee).

We find that there would be both room for and mutual benefit exploring ways of strengthening the links with other university units, and building upon CL's existing and potential function as a "node" in order to strengthen national literature departments. One dimension of this effort would involve greater emphasis upon the period and genre literature courses within CL or in conjunction with these departments, at least ensuring that they are taught more regularly. As has been mentioned earlier, the department has been moving toward expanding its non-European coverage. This should continue, and the department should explore untapped potential here by actively expanding and strengthening curricular and faculty linkages with such departments as Asian Languages and Literatures and Near Eastern Languages & Civilization. Moreover, the department should explore the potential for interdisciplinary connections and collaborations beyond the boundaries of the humanities as organizationally defined at the UW. For example, there may well be untapped but natural opportunities for mutually beneficial initiatives with interdisciplinary programs in the Jackson School of International Studies. At least some of the Title VI programs might afford resources for funding foreign language trailer sections that could help with some of the CS national cinema issues discussed above. The Title VI programs also have resources that could benefit some of the initiatives important to the TS program.

A very practical dimension in the enhancement of linkages with national literature departments and other units should involve discussions about how TA positions might be shared and exchanged among these units, in ways that would both provide greater predictability in the allotment of these resources as well as broaden the range of teaching experience for graduate students in several units.

Another fundamental and practical consideration concerns the potential for joint hires in CL and other units. The review committee feels that because of the centrality of CL in the humanities the College should seriously consider making an exception to the usual caution in making joint hires (i.e., to avoid placing pre-tenured faculty in double-jeopardy). There are mechanisms to insure fairness in promotion and evaluation procedures, and the economy and value (in terms of both program enrichment and professional development of faculty) that could result justify the administration's attention to where such well-targeted joint hires might be made.

### Development

Finally, as the leadership in the department realizes, increased development efforts are going to be important to its future strength. With its growing number of majors, there will be an expanding constituency of graduates and friends of the department with interest in and potential for investing in CL's future. The incorporation of both CS and TS within the department's core could present opportunities for increased engagement with media and technology sectors of the community at the local, regional and national levels.

### Summary

In sum, the review committee was impressed with the remarkable overall strength of the Department of Comparative Literature in both its undergraduate and its graduate programs, its vital contributions to the humanities at the UW, and its future potential. Progress since the last review has been distinct and significant. There is a better balance than ten years ago between its roles at the undergraduate and graduate level.

The department must now carefully consider how best to capitalize on the gains it has made in the quality of its graduate program, as well as the burgeoning growth in undergraduate population and its incorporation of the innovative areas of Cinema Studies and Textual Studies. In taking the next steps in its development, the department should above all ensure that focus is maintained on its distinctive mission as a department of comparative literature. To date this identity has been the heart of its contribution within the College. If that mission is kept in focus, the department has the potential to serve, in the words of one interviewee, as a unique "center of attention for rethinking the humanities" at the UW.

Respectfully submitted by:

Professor Michael Williams, Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilization  
(Chair)

Professor Collet Cox, Department of Asian Languages and Literature

Professor Ray Jonas, Department of History

Professor Gaylyn Studlar, Program in Film and Video Studies, University of Michigan

Professor Roland Greene, Department of Comparative Literature, Stanford University

Professor James Michael Holquist, Department of Comparative Literature, Yale  
University