



Department of English
Box 354330

To: Marsha Landolt, Dean of the Graduate School
John Simpson, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Michael Halleran, Divisional Dean of Humanities
John Slattery, Associate Dean of Academic Programs
Fred Campbell, Dean of Undergraduate Education and Vice Provost
Debra Friedman, Associate Provost

From: Alan Fisher, Associate Professor, Department of English *AF*
Chair, Department of Germanics Review Committee
John Rahn, Professor and Associate Director, Department of Music
Christine Ingebritsen, Assistant Professor, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature
Irmengard Rauch, Professor, Department of German, University of California, Berkeley
Judith Ryan, Professor and Chair, Department of Germanic Languages and Literature, Harvard

Subject: The Report of the Department of Germanics Review Committee

The review process began in 1997 with the Department of Germanics Self-Study. This was made available to our committee, along with a list of CVs and a copy of the 1987 review. Our committee began work Winter Quarter 1998, in a preliminary meeting with Marsha Landolt, Dean of the Graduate School, Michael Halleran, Divisional Dean of the Humanities, John Slattery, Associate Dean of Academic Programs, and Debra Friedman, Associate Provost. Later that quarter we met with Richard Gray, Chair of the Germanics Department, Christine Ingebritsen consulted members of the European Studies group about the department's participation in the European Studies program, and the chair of this committee met with Manfred Bansleben, director of elementary language study and Teaching Assistant training. On April 6 and 7, we were joined by our outside members for a site visit, during which we held individual interviews with Helmut Ammerlahn, Manfred Bansleben, Charles Barrack, Diana Behler, Richard Gray, Gunter Hertling, Stephen Jaeger, Dorothee Ostmeir, Joseph Voyles, and Sabine Wilke. Three members of the department were unavailable: Jane Brown, Brigette Prutti, and Caroline Wiedmer. The committee also interviewed Erik Ruehr and Anneliese Wuichet, the departmental administrative staff; Klaus Brandl, a lecturer who works with several departments in matters of language acquisition; a group of graduate students; and a group of undergraduate majors.

The self-study was aware of the problems and concerns addressed in the report of eleven years ago, and it gave evidence that these had to a large extent been resolved. The main continuing problem was flat enrollment, and the administrators in our preliminary meeting asked us to look hard at this issue and give it due weight in our recommendations. Beyond this issue, however, the committee thought it could function best simply by listening to what people had on their minds. The self-study is an impressive document, and we wanted to determine whether the department lived up to it; we also wanted to see if any tensions beset the department that a review committee's wisdom might alleviate.

In general we think that the department lives up to its self evaluation. It works very hard and does a lot with a little. Its members take their teaching mission seriously, yet also produce scholarship that currently ranks them 12th in the nation. This had been their ranking in 1987, as well, and though several

people have left since then, they have retained their status through wise and productive hiring. They attract competitive graduate students with less funding than many comparable institutions have to offer. The undergraduate majors that we met seem lively and proud to be studying German. The department is aware of the enrollment problem, and its members are attempting to meet it in a variety of ways. The spirit with which they work together seems constructive and energetic, based upon a balanced program in language, literature, and culture. The department seems in fine shape, in a word, and more importantly, it seems also to know how to keep itself that way. Our general recommendation is that it be allowed to continue to do so.

Since review committees are supposed to provide recommendations as well as general evaluations, this report will go into more detail. The rubrics suggested by the Graduate School in October 1996 are Quality, Value to Students, Role within the University, Resources, and Objectives. The report will follow these rubrics, add its reflections upon the enrollment question, and will conclude with a summary of its recommendations both to the department and to the administrators whose actions affect the department.

1. Quality

Under this rubric come a good many issues, some of which are best judged from outside the university, others best judged from within. The department's ranking of twelfth in the nation shows it to be highly regarded by outside observers; its members are respected for their academic training, for the research they produce, and for the research by graduate students that they direct. Within the university, the department is known for a language program that has won a university teaching prize and an exemplary training program for TAs; its members have the respect of their colleagues in other departments when their paths cross on councils and committees or in such settings as European Studies and Comparative Literature.

Their teaching seems exceptionally effective, if we can judge from the enthusiasm we encountered among the undergraduates we interviewed. The students were pleased with what they were learning, with the size of the classes in which they were learning it, with the availability and support of the faculty, and with the rigor and challenge of the program. They spoke with the sort of respect that people show when they are challenged—and have succeeded in the challenge. It is difficult to estimate the overall quality of entering students, because the SAT is a crude instrument of measurement, especially in the humanities fields. Judging from the lively and forthright students we interviewed, however, we suppose that the quality overall is high, and probably higher than the university average. German is known to be a difficult language, compared to some other paths that students might take through the language requirement, so that it is not surprising to have those who choose it also do well in it. Students perform impressively well on exit tests, which indicates both good instruction and good students to instruct. It is also impressive that they not only do well but are pleased in several different ways with what they are doing: some with how interesting the language itself is, some with how meaningful the literature is, some with how well their studies are training their minds generally, some with how well it prepares them for a contemplated non-academic career. To hear all these opinions in a single interview is to have evidence of a program that appeals in many different ways, that challenges minds—and that is effectively managed and taught.

The graduate students we interviewed were not so diverse as the undergraduates—nor quite so remarkably energetic. They seemed tired, as graduate students often will, particularly in the spring quarter, but tired as they were, they too were pleased by the major aspects of the program they joined. The graduate advisor told us that they were good students, though probably not the very best available, rather better, on the whole, than one could expect from the level of support that could be offered to them. Some students chose this program over ones that could offer them more in order to work with particular faculty members; others chose it because of its TA training, the reputation of which extends beyond the

bounds of the university. We shall have more to say about support under the rubric of "Resources," more to say about the TA training under "Value to Students."

The rubric of "Quality" also includes collegial atmosphere, and this issue is the main one on which the recommendations of this committee depend. The 1987 report found two morale problems in the department, one caused by "salary compression," the other caused by dissension over how the field of Germanics should be constituted. The first problem has not gone away, needless to say, in this department or anywhere else in the Humanities, but it is not something that departmental action can control, and nobody dwelt upon it in any of the interviews we conducted. The other problem could be controlled within the department, and it would seem that the department has successfully controlled it. At a distance of eleven years it seems probable that much of the dissension concerned the claims of "new" emphases, under names like "cultural studies," not merely to join the old ones, but to replace them. People who had devoted their lives to the kind of research being displaced were not willing to go gentle into the good night being prepared for them by theorists of the new; proponents of the new, on the other hand, saw defense of the old as roadblocks to their own progress and that of the field as a whole. Such problems were common in humanities departments in the years around 1987, but passions now seem calmer generally, as people on both sides of this divide recognize and respect what the other side is doing. Nearly every interview we conducted mentioned the extraordinary "harmony" with which department members interact: one person near retirement said he kept on working for the sheer pleasure of sharing the departmental atmosphere; another confessed to having had a sharp dispute that very morning, but disputes, he assured us, were conducted without creating enmities or threats to one another's work. Nobody to whom we spoke even hinted, let alone declared, that the department was an unpleasant place to work or that he or she felt captive to a misguided program. Even if this show of harmony had been carefully planned, the fact that they could so plan it would be impressive. All testify to an atmosphere of mutual respect, which all find precious, and which all work hard to preserve.

The cause of this amity is not simple like-mindedness. The department has people old and young, working in all the main literary periods and in linguistics, using methods and approaches both traditional and new. We speculate that the amity has two main sources, one negative and one positive. The negative source is a determination on all sides not to allow disputes within the department to develop into divisive turf wars; this seems to be the "thou shalt not" of the department's current atmosphere. The positive source is their agreement on the importance of teaching the language, first and foremost—to basing the study of Germanic culture, as well as literature, upon a solid grounding in the language and its expressive potential. Not to adhere to this principle, remarked one older member, would be like "selling his shadow"; others said it less vividly, but with equal conviction. Whatever their diversity of interest, on this principle they could agree. And this agreement, moreover, has a practical, as well as a notional dimension: everyone shares the duties of language teaching beyond first-year level, so that each member concretely demonstrates to the others that he or she is supporting their common effort.

A practice like this is labor intensive, of course, but it seems to us wise. It is good for a department to be proud of its common effort, for a feeling like this stimulates, rather than drains, the energies of its individual members. Students, too, seem to appreciate the emphasis on learning the language, whether their interest is in linguistics, literature, or practical affairs. But an irony may lurk in the midst of this good cheer. Language teaching is a "service," even if deemed an important and mutually supportive service, because no link is recognized between language-teaching and professional advancement. It is hard work that the university simply takes for granted, except for odd moments when language teachers receive a prize. On the one hand, therefore, the mutual engagement with language teaching is the source of a departmental atmosphere that enables productivity; on the other, even the most cheerful energy has its limits, and language teaching, despite its benefits, is sometimes perceived as a burden. Most members would not willingly shift this burden to lecturers, as is done in some departments; they think it important to be involved in it themselves, and they have ethical objections to the exploitation involved in

lectureships. Yet several members also declared that if they could change anything, it would be the "service teaching" load and its diversion of their energies away from scholarly projects.

It is odd, perhaps, to find a potential source of trouble within a practice that also confers a major benefit, and it is difficult to propose a practical recommendation on this issue. We are unwilling to recommend a change in program emphasis, because the current one seems the source of so much that is good about the department. We are unwilling to recommend that the department shift these courses to lecturers, because we, too, share their ethical concerns and believe that the benefit of the emphasis might thereby be lost. Departments that hand unglamorous fundamentals over to temporary or adjunct workers not only lose sight of their center, but create perceptions of privilege and status that sap the energies of department members. But we are also unwilling utterly to ignore the muted, but audible, cry for help. It would be ideal if the college endorsed the department effort by allowing the department to hire another person. Failing that, however, we recommend in the strongest terms that the college must allow the department to hire a replacement for Gunter Hertling when he retires. The department uses its existing resources wisely, in our opinion; to cut back on them would be unfair to its efforts and destructive to department morale; it might also set in motion the sorts of energies that deplete a department's internal strength.

The self-study demonstrates that the members of this department work at least as hard, and in some cases much harder, than their counterparts in comparable departments. We did not hear much complaint about the workload itself, but we did hear some regrets about their inability to tailor it in such a way as would facilitate their research. It would help them considerably, many agreed, if they could schedule their class obligations in such a way as would leave them a quarter for research every once in a while. This is not a request made by the Germanics department alone, needless to say, but it would certainly be welcome to them, and an increase in their productivity would ensue.

Everyone we spoke to was satisfied with the leadership provided over the last few years by Richard Gray, and many volunteered the sentiment that they would like to see him continue in the post for another term. We heard no complaints about the other department officials and advisors, either, and so we conclude that the department is in good shape with regard to its leadership. A look at its membership list shows that the gender balance in the department is in good shape, too; minority appointments, on the other hand, are hard to make in a field like Germanics, and the few candidates that become available, from time to time, can demand higher salaries than this university can afford.

2. Value to students.

As we have testified already under "quality," we sense overall that the undergraduates themselves place a high value on this program. They like its rigor, and they feel supported by the faculty in their pursuit of it. The department encourages study abroad, and many of the undergraduates we spoke to took advantage of this program—and reported that they found themselves very well prepared for it when they entered upon it. The department has been interested in finding ways of creating new value, with the institution of a German minor and the program in Business German. The minor makes it possible for people to include Germanics study with their pursuits in other fields; the program in Business German has been growing since 1993, and its students have given strong showings on externally administered tests.

The graduate students, too, seem a good fit for the program they have joined. The MA program requires a certain breadth of study, before students focus upon their PhD specialties, and most of the students we interviewed seem to approve this emphasis. They thought that the breadth, coupled with the strong TA training program, would make them competitive as prospective teachers, as well as scholars, in the job market. The department supports this interest in teaching by its participation in PEW Trust Initiative, a series of lectures by people in the region who are not necessarily from research universities,

offering a different point of view from the research-university "profession," talking about teaching and informing PhD candidates about small colleges and other sorts of teaching jobs.

Though the graduate students were mainly cheerful about their program, they had some specific suggestions about the program that will pass along here. They would appreciate having some two-credit course possibilities, in order to square up the three-credit offerings to the rule of five. They find it difficult to get as many period overviews as they would like, some students wondered if linguistics could be better represented at the graduate level, and though student input is requested when MA reading lists are made up, some wonder if it is truly heeded.

3. Role within the university

The purposes of the program are given succinctly in the mission statement at the end of the self-study, and they need no repeating here. The need for the program at the university can be measured best, perhaps, by the general need to understand the German language, the need for an educated person to have a knowledge and understanding of German culture, both what it has been and what it is now, and the specific need among students of many literatures to have an understanding of literature that was written in German.

German is not at this time an international lingua franca, but it is still for several reasons an important language to know. Its affinity to English, for one thing, makes it important to speakers of English who want a deeper understanding of their own language. Important scholarship is done in German, especially in the humanities and social sciences, and it is an extremely important language for anyone seeking an historical understanding of contemporary thought in several fields. German having been the dominant language of science, history, and philosophy in the 19th and early 20th centuries, many important concepts which still guide our thinking were originally launched in German language documents. Many of these documents exist in translation, of course, but translation necessarily selects and blurs and blunts, however accurate and sensitive a translator might be. To grasp a complex thought in its historical specificity, one has to be able to understand the language and culture in which that thought was composed. One thinks, for example, of the difference between reading Freud in German, as opposed even to the "official" English translations, and the chair of this committee has felt the difference between reading Kant in a language that supports his thinking and reading Kant in English, which tends not to. If no other use remained for a Germanics department at an institute of higher education, this one alone should suffice.

This is not to say, however, that no other uses remain. Germany is not the world power it once was, but a re-unified Germany promises to have an important part to play in the economic and political world of the next century. Business and professional German are important for a person to know, therefore, if that person's business or professional life will intersect with the German sphere. German works of literature have left a mark on people's memories, too—and probably a larger mark than that of many languages, owing not only to the innate excellence of the works but also to the prominence of German thinking and culture in the early part of this century and in the century before. Knowledge of these works should be maintained and refreshed, not only for the excellence of the works themselves but for the sake of understanding works in other languages that these works influenced. The "needs" I mention are educational, of course, not practical, and there is no guarantee that strong educational reasons cause people to break down doors to get at that education. But the reasons for German strike us as strong and enduring. Enrollments might fluctuate, but the need will continue, and interest in it will never entirely disappear.

The department's relationship and service to other programs is considerable. The self-study gives the details, but we can mention that several members have joint appointments with Comparative Literature and that three of its members are among the founders of European Studies. Members are active in the

Film Studies program; they participate in the Katz lectureship committee; and a standing committee exists in the department, charged with the duty to formulate new proposals and responses to new initiatives—and to seek the cooperation of other university units. Germanics is active in the university as a whole.

4. Resources

First under resources is financial support from the university. The graduate program could use more support in a couple of specific ways. The graduate students would like to see another RA-ship made available to the department, not directly for recruiting, but to give one quarter of support apiece to three advanced graduate students a year. They value the experience and course credit they get from helping out in literature courses, but wonder if this, too, could be monetarily compensated. The faculty is confident that the department reputation and that of the TA program are strong enough to compete with any program in the land, but worry that other programs with more generous support can lure away prospective graduate students. One possibility, perhaps, would be to divide up current recruitment funds fewer ways and make individual packages larger, but the graduate advisor thinks this idea unwise. The graduate program at present is as small as it can be and still be functional, and the department would rather take its chances with the current arrangements than get better students and have a less good program to offer them when they get here.

The department is active among entities outside the university that might help them with support like this. It might be able to firm up these connections by setting up a Standing Committee, a Visiting Committee or Advisory Board, which the Department Chair can establish in consultation with David Wu, the Assistant Dean for Developmental and External Affairs in the College of Arts and Sciences. Christine Ingebritsen reports that the Department of Scandinavian has set up such a board, and that its effects are already being felt as benefits.

There are a few more graduate students than there are assistantships to support them, but the ratio does not seem particularly extreme, not a lot better or a lot worse than that of other departments in the humanities. Among their attractions is a seminar room and library, outfitted with standard editions, reference works, and three computers, which seem constantly in use when the room is not being used for other purposes.

5. Objectives

One objective, in recent years, has been to overcome the ill feeling that attracted the attention of reviewers eleven years ago. That objective has been met, we think, through the pursuit of a more general objective, which is to hold together a comprehensive program of Germanic language and literature, come what may. This has been the present direction of the program, and it also seems to be their future goal.

The question arises whether it ought to be their future goal, or whether it can be in a changing world. It ought to be, we think, not just because it is a valuable goal in abstract terms, but because it holds the department together as a productive unit, provides an excellent educational experience for graduate and undergraduate students, and even provides a base for department growth in a world where "change" may affect other Germanics programs even more adversely. Given the range of different approaches to the field represented in the department, we believe that it is exceptionally well positioned to respond to whatever new impulses may emerge in Germanic studies in the coming years.

In our preliminary meeting, we were asked to come up with answers to certain specific questions, each with a bearing on future goals: we were asked to judge how well the department manages the resources it has, whether the size of its graduate program should be larger or smaller, how successful their area studies courses are, what would happen to the department if the university language requirement

were abolished or if special hostility to things German persisted, what is our real estimate of their productivity, and what advice we can give to them in the face of their own worry about the decline of interest in Germanics. Some of these questions have been answered already: they manage their resources in exemplary fashion, the size of the graduate program certainly should be no smaller, and they are a highly "productive" department, if measured by the quality of their language instruction, the enthusiasm of their advanced undergraduates, the steadiness of their graduate students, and research that is respected by the field in general.

This report has not addressed the question of the area studies track in the major, which currently does not thrive as vigorously as the language and literature track. The main differences between the two, however, turn out to be a different proportion of introductory courses for each and additional advanced language study in the language and literature track. The students we talked to all valued the advanced language study, and any student undertaking it is almost ipso facto in the language and literature track. To cancel the area studies track, we think, would be unwise; all it costs the department is one extra introductory cultural studies course, popularity among majors might swing back its way, and it may prove popular for those undertaking a German minor.

Nor has this report addressed the question of the current unpopularity of things German or the possibility of the university's abolishing the language requirement outright. The first of these problems shows no sign of worsening, and there is no reason to predict that Germany will decline in importance as a player on the world stage. The second would do great damage to any language program, Germanics among the others, and it would also damage the university's overall reputation. It would certainly send a message to every foreign language department that their contributions to the university were no longer valued, and members of those departments who could leave would find a way to do so as soon as possible. It would send a message to every department in the humanities that excellence in that division is no longer valued. If the university is seriously contemplating a step of this kind, it will have to find its own wisdom to deal with the devastation it will cause.

6. The enrollment problem.

The 1987 report commented on a decline in Germanics majors of "approximately 45%" over the decade before it was filed and gave a variety of speculations over why the decline may have occurred. Germany itself seemed no longer to be a "world power"; German scholarship was not so much "in the forefront" as it once was; people still remember the Nazis with "revulsion"; German language teaching is being cut back in the public schools. All these problems seem as much in force in 1998 as they were in 1987, but the self-study shows exactly the same number of officially counted majors in 1997 as in 1986: 36. The department's own count of declared majors in 1986 was "approximately 45," compared to its count of 47. The problems have not gone away, in other words, but the decline has not become worse.

Within the last eleven years, there has been a rise and fall, and this pattern seems to have obtained nationwide. The figures provided us suggest that the department has at least held its own against the forces of decline; in competition with similar programs across the country, it may even have fared better. The decline of majors from 1990-95 in this department is about half of what it has been over that period in the country as a whole.

The Germanics department is not complacent about enrollments; many different sorts of steps have been taken to support them. Most of them involve improving, rearranging, or updating traditional offerings—without watering them down. The department varies its language teaching at all levels with conversation, film, and cultural elements, to go with the grammar. It has introduced a variety of 2-credit modules to be attached to the basic 3-credit grammar instruction in the second year. In the opinion of Klaus Brandl, the specialist in language-acquisition strategies whom we interviewed, Germanics is open

to and taking advantage of most of the new ideas in the language-acquisition field. Statistics seem to bear out the wisdom of their approach: the fall 1997 enrollment of 458 in the first-year courses is more than half again as large as that at Minnesota, although Minnesota demands six quarters of language, compared to U.W.'s three. It is adding a track in Business German, to be inaugurated next year, a track that begins with add-on modules for the second year language courses, proceeds into a pair of courses specifically designed to give certification in business vocabulary and the idiom recognized by German businesses, and concludes with internships in German businesses or in businesses with a strong involvement in German trade. The department maintains close ties with the European Studies Group, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics, and we interviewed students in all three fields who were heavily involved in Germanics. More speculatively, chairman Richard Gray has been seeking solutions in the community outside the university. Gray is actively agitating for a return to German instruction in the Seattle public schools, and though the common perception of the problems faced by the public schools leads to pessimistic estimates for the short-term success of such efforts, in the long run the public schools are the right place to put pressure. For if good German instruction can be made available, or more available, the supply of potential majors in German would seem likely to increase, as would possibilities for employment. Faculty involvement in the community is done on the faculty member's own time, of course; it is not remunerated by the university, and it has no official place in this report. The fact that Gray and others are willing to expend their energies in such an involvement, however, does seem relevant to the overall picture. The German department does not rest plumply upon the importance of German culture and a vague assumption of good will. No one is more aware of their potential problems than they are, and their efforts to deal with them should not be taken lightly.

Sagging enrollment in Germanics is a nationwide phenomenon, but the wisest response to it locally, we think, is not to weaken a strong department for the sake of a perceived trend. In a odd way, there is an opportunity here, as well as a threat. The effect of this decline will be felt where programs are the weakest, and no doubt some programs in Germanics will be obliged to contract or shut down in various places. Those that remain should emerge all the stronger. The department here ranks twelfth nationally. Its unity and energy suggest a strong survivor. The current dip may be temporary, as other dips appear to have been; in the long run this department may have a chance to improve its national standing by standing strong in the midst of the crisis, and we think it deserves the university's support in its attempt to do so.

The committee thought of three other ways to fight the decreasing enrollment problem, and it offers them here possible avenues:

- Consult with John Keeler, of CWES, on the possibility of adding "trailer courses" in German to certain of the European Studies courses.
- Institute a translator certification program.
- Continue its current involvement with European studies, but in particular come up with more innovative proposals like the one recently submitted by Sabine Wilke.

The committee is aware, as it suggests these, that the department may be close to the limit of the energy it can collectively expend. The department already does a great deal; but perhaps these suggestions will help it do more without increasing its burden overmuch.

7. Summary of recommendations

To the higher administration, we suggest that they may continue their support. It is an excellent department, which deserves it. More specifically, we think that the Germanics Department would be very well served by the addition of another member. At the very least, however, it must be allowed to retain

its current size when Gunter Hertling retires. Given everyone's confidence in the leadership of Richard Gray, we can recommend that he be appointed to another term as Chair of the department, should he be willing.

To the department we recommend in general that it keep the faith as it has been doing. If our specific suggestions have been few, the reason is that the department has come up with so many innovations on its own. The few suggestions we have made, in tabular form, are as follows:

- The establishing of "trailer courses" attached to European Studies offerings
- The continuing of their close and innovative involvements with European Studies, Film Studies, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics.
- Possible institution of a translator certification program
- Establishment of an advisory and support board among people outside the university.
- Establishment of an RA-ship to divide among graduate students in their exam year, if funds can be raised for it.
- Continued involvement with the Business School, with the Business German track.

Beyond this, we have nothing to recommend specifically. To return to general recommendations and evaluations both, we think that the department is strong and is particularly to be praised for its determination to maintain a rigorous program of high intellectual quality amidst a good many pressures towards reducing their offerings in quality and scope. We recommend that it continue—and that the university administration support its continuance.

Augustine McCaffery

From: J. Slattery [jts@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Friday, May 22, 1998 1:20 PM
To: Augustine McCaffery; Jill Conner
Subject: Germanics Department Review (fwd)

May 22, 1998

Dear Dean Slattery:

The outside members of the program review of the University of Washington Department of Germanics concur with the report of committee chair Alan Fisher. As outside reviewers we find ourselves in the felicitous position of commenting freely on the Germanics Program as well as on the review process.

The very thorough 1997 internal review reflects well the academic and administrative competence of department chair Richard Gray, as well as his ability to lead a very cooperative and collegial, yet individual group of faculty. In turn, this success is reflected in the satisfaction of both the interviewed graduate and undergraduate students.

As is well known, the elementary German language program at the University of Washington serves as a paradigm nationwide not only for the teaching of German, but also for the teaching of foreign language generally. The undergraduate major/minor programs are innovative in their diverse tracks, while the graduate program can boast a creative, energetic faculty spanning several generations of eminent scholars, who command international stature.

The varying and individual efforts of faculty such as the vital outreach to Microsoft, to the Seattle public schools, to volunteer teaching in the inner-city, ought not only be encouraged, but furthered and, indeed, rewarded. Directions such as these bespeak widely held visions of the expanded mission of universities in the twenty-first century.

Similarly, the position of foreign language learning itself in the United States is at a crucial crossroads in which it is recognized that international communication and interactions cannot depend solely on foreign nationals. Germany and the German language play an essential role in the EU with Frankfurt as the financial center. It is regressive to argue in favor of a reduction in foreign language learning/teaching, since a language is the most defining characteristic of a given society.

It is incumbent upon the University of Washington as the premier institution of higher learning among the Northwestern states to continue to support and exploit the full and varied array of language, literature/culture, and linguistics offerings which its devoted and eminent faculty enetically develop and nurture.

As mentioned in the meetings with the Deans, we can only applaud both the Administration and the Department for vigorous and successful recruitment of valuable faculty since the 1987 review. Compared with similar efforts in other German departments, this is a truly outstanding and enviable achievement.

It was a pleasure working with the knowledgeable and affable internal committee members, Professors Fisher, Ingebritsen, and Rahn. Please let us know if we can be of further help in completing the 1987 review of your Germanics Program.

With best wishes, we remain

Sincerely, Judith Ryan and Irmengard Rauch