INTRODUCTION

This report is not a budgetary exercise in cost cutting. Nor is it a rearranging of the deck chairs on the Titanic. While the need for comprehensive review of Divisional resources and costs was initiated by the budget cuts (past, present, and pending), our recommendations are neither entirely driven nor circumscribed by budgetary constraints. Many of the recommendations in this report merit serious consideration and action regardless of the ongoing financial crisis. Several explore new directions. Others address longstanding inequities in faculty workload and departmental structure. Still others are short-term accommodations to current fiscal conditions. We offer no specific way forward, but rather we present a series of recommendations aimed at building on our strengths, advancing our aspirations, and positioning ourselves for the future. This report is intended to mark the beginning of a broad reflective conversation.

SUMMARY FINDINGS

Assumptions and Principles

We followed a set of principles based on the Dean’s charge to the committee as well as the assessment of the Division that he presented at the Town Hall meeting on September 29, 2009.

The starting point is the fact that the Division has an unusual disparity in size and mission of units (ranging from programs that deliver almost entirely lower-division teaching to largely graduate-granting degree programs, with everything in between). This disparity has created structural inequities in degree and kind of workload that are intensified by budget fluctuations. Given the short-term need to gain savings (a permanent cut of $1,066,800 in 2009-10, with a projected additional permanent cut ranging from $975,000 to $1,950,000 beginning 2010-11) and the long-term prospect of increased constriction and dysfunction of the Division (the distortion and potential disappearance of departments through uneven retirements), how should the Division imagine the future?

The default scenario, allowing budget cuts to occur without correction, and retirements to occur without a broad, Division-wide plan for recapturing the vacated FTE, is unacceptable. The Division has a current total of 106 FTE filled by Academic Senate faculty. 24 of these faculty are retirement-eligible; open FTE will be reduced from the current 39 to 12 and then 10 after the 2009-10 budget cuts have been absorbed. The Dean has assumed 85-90 filled FTE as a planning number, based on estimated retirements and separations, with 10 open FTE the current minimum the Division can maintain for a variety of uses, including salary upgrades, research, and graduate support. Retirements are estimated conservatively (using a standard formula for retirement eligibility based on age and years of service) because they are hard to predict; if the
Division has more retirements than we have assumed here, then the cuts to Unit 18 faculty in Languages and Writing could be mitigated. Retirement upgrades also provide additional funds that could be used to restore research and graduate student support.

To guide our thinking on cost savings and possible reconfigurations, we followed two main principles.

a. To maintain the viability of all current teaching programs: consider the recombination of curricula (Gen Ed and major requirements, graduate seminars, language courses), faculty, and staff; evaluate how our current programs can be reorganized to avoid redundancies and enhance effectiveness.

b. To support and retain our high-quality faculty: all faculty should have equal access to graduate education and equal responsibility for the undergraduate curriculum.

**Recommendations and Rationales**

1. The number of departments in the Division could effectively be reduced. We discuss four basic alternatives: (a) integrate faculty from the smaller departments into a smaller number of existing and/or reconfigured departments; (b) conjoin three departments under one administrative support unit; (c) combine the three smaller departments into one larger department; and (d) remap existing departments.

2. There could be greater integration of the Language curriculum into departments and programs that have a more direct relation to the Division’s overall academic mission. Several alternatives are discussed. Curricular offerings in foreign language instruction are reevaluated. Actions that could be considered include (a) eliminating language offerings that support small or marginal curricular programs while focusing resources on languages that support major programmatic initiatives; (b) restricting access to language instruction to those students who need it to fulfill degree requirements; (c) expanding the use of interested ladder-rank faculty in the delivery of the language curriculum; and (d) ensuring greater integration of graduate students into language instruction, especially first year language instruction.

3. The writing curriculum (the Writing Program itself as well as the College Core courses) could be more unified in its administration. While there are various ways to conceive this remapping, we considered two alternatives to the status quo: (a) moving the Writing Program to join the Colleges under the VPDUE; (b) moving the College Core writing programs, or a subset, into the Division of Humanities to collaborate with the Writing Program and to be integrated into the ladder-rank FTE-holding departments.

4. Irrespective of #2 and #3, language, writing, and Core Course instruction could make greater use of graduate student instructors (GSIs). Greater integration or coordination of the curricular offering of these units with our graduate programs could be an important step in this direction. Humanities graduate programs need additional sources of graduate
support. Increasing the use of GSIs in the curricula of these programs offers a significant, as yet untapped opportunity to support graduate students in all disciplines with an interest in second-language pedagogy and/or pedagogy in college-level composition.

5. Every ladder-rank faculty member should have the opportunity to participate actively and fully in graduate instruction. It is clear that the Division currently lacks the resources to adequately support the current five graduate programs. If this objective is to be realized, it must be through the integration into existing graduate programs of faculty from departments without graduate programs, the reconfiguration of graduate programs, or the creation of alternatives based on models at other UC campuses, such as graduate groups. We discuss various options for such reorganizations, particularly as they affect American Studies, Feminist Studies, and History of Consciousness. These scenarios are intended to help frame the next stage of wide consultation within the Division and with relevant groups across campus.

Structure and Content

This report consists of two sections that reflect the ATFR’s charge, followed by a conclusion. The first section (Budget) focuses on immediate “substantial and significant” savings; the second (Reorganization) addresses longer-term prospects for how “existing departments, academic programs, and research units might be remapped or reconceived to reduce expenses and build opportunities.” We took this latter part of the charge as an invitation for a collaborative and collective imagining of the intellectual and research enterprise of the humanities “writ large.” This means developing a vision that could help us survive in an extended period of resource scarcity while creating a more dynamic and effective structure for supporting research and teaching.

BUDGET

Faculty Retirements/Separations

Faculty salaries account for most of the Division’s budget, and therefore retirements and separations offer the greatest potential for budgetary savings. In practical terms, this means that no department will be guaranteed any replacement of lost FTE’s for at least the next two years, and no department is likely to expand in size except through consolidation, recombination, or transfer of FTE. The Task Force estimates (based on announced retirements and data from previous years) that there will be around 8 retirements at the end of academic year 2009-10, and another 5 in 2010-11. The Division can therefore reasonably expect a gross savings of at most $616,000 to help cover its immediate $1 million budget shortfall, and an additional $385,000 in 2010-11.

The Division currently has 106 Academic Senate faculty. We recommend that the Division establish a minimum Divisional size below which it will not drop.
Language Program

1. Instruction could be reduced or phased out in languages that have weak or little connection to existing majors or programs of study. These languages could include (in alphabetical order) Hebrew, Hindi/Urdu, Portuguese, and Russian, unless outside funding for them can be secured. We estimate that the Division could save around $108,000 in 2010-11 and an additional $74,000 beginning 2011-12. If all of these languages were eliminated, total permanent savings would be around $182,000.

2. The number of courses offered by the Language Program in most or all foreign languages could be reduced. We estimate that around half of the students enrolled in Language Program courses need the language for their major. Enrollment priority should be given to majors and minors in Classical Studies, German Studies, Italian Studies, Language Studies, the minors in East Asian Studies and Jewish Studies, and majors and minors that require foreign language training (Global Economics, Health Sciences, LALS, Linguistics, Literature). In addition, greater consideration should be given to those languages that help prepare a professional work force that serves the state of California and the Pacific Rim. Total savings would depend on the extent of the course reductions, but could be as much as half of the Language Program’s current budget.

3. Encourage departments to identify graduate students who have the skills to teach foreign languages. Hiring preference should be given to graduate students where language training would be an important element of their graduate study and essential for them to compete in the academic job market. Total savings would depend on the number of graduate student instructors (GSIs) who are willing and able to teach in the Language Program. We think the savings would be modest over the next two years, but it could be a mechanism for keeping instruction in some languages viable. It would also have the programmatic advantage of providing more opportunities to support and train graduate students, and it would contribute to an alignment of graduate programs and curricular offerings in languages.

4. To bring UCSC more in line with other UC campuses (such as UC Berkeley), “basic training” should be restructured as a 5-quarter (rather than 6-quarter) sequence for the following languages: French, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish. Other restructurings are possible. The Division would save around $75,000 per year.

Writing Program

The Humanities Division does not receive adequate continued funding to put the Writing Program on a sustainable budget. The Division and VPDUE together are funding the program with an additional $100,000 for 2009-10, of which the Humanities share is $60,000.
1. The central administration needs to establish a budget model that covers the actual cost of mounting the Writing Program’s curriculum.

2. In order to offer greater oversight and also to eliminate redundancies in the personnel process, Writing courses and College Core courses could be administered by the same unit, either the VPDUE or the Humanities Division.

3. The number of graduate student instructors (GSIs) teaching Core and Writing courses could be increased. Hiring preference should be given to graduate students where college-level composition pedagogical training would be an important element of their graduate study and essential for them to compete in the academic job market.

We think the savings will be modest, perhaps $60,000 per year if there is a new budget model and considerably more if a significant number of GSIs are hired. In addition, this could enhance graduate support and faculty connections to graduate programs.

Staffing

Retirements and a judicious redistribution of staff personnel (preferably in connection with some departmental restructuring) may create a net savings of $100,000.

One opportunity for immediate savings could come from combining some staff functions across departments, especially small departments (such as American Studies, Feminist Studies, and History of Consciousness). This could eliminate duplication of functions and result in greater efficiencies without staff layoffs and without necessarily requiring any integration of the curricula of these departments. The Division should consult with the relevant staff as it explores this possibility.

REORGANIZATION

Faculty Retirements/Separations

Faculty attrition rates will affect each department differently. Retirements and other separations may have an especially large impact on the curricula of very small departments (American Studies, Feminist Studies, History of Consciousness). Retirements and other separations could exacerbate curricular and structural inequities that already exist not only in these departments but also in the Division at large. We have an unusual range of departments, some with largely lower-division curricula, others with an undergraduate major but no graduate program, still others with large undergraduate and graduate programs, and one with a graduate program but no undergraduate major.

1. Ameliorating curricular gaps created by retirement and separations should be a high priority for the Division, especially at the undergraduate level. We realize that open FTE derived from retirements are used not only to support faculty hires but also to fund graduate recruitment and support, faculty recruitment and start-up, faculty upgrades, faculty retention, research, new initiatives, and to cover investments in human capital
(equipment, supplies, and other operational overhead). Shoring up the undergraduate curriculum in the fields most affected by retirements must be judiciously weighed against these other Divisional needs.

2. In the longer term, moves towards the recombination or consolidation of American Studies, Feminist Studies, and History of Consciousness may enable their curricula to be mounted more efficiently, strengthen their emphasis on interdisciplinarity and diversity, and help to ease curricular inequities. We have detailed several scenarios below under Interdisciplinary Studies.

**Language Program**

The uneven enrollments in the different languages taught by the Language Program suggest some opportunities for recombination. Because enrollments in Spanish greatly exceed enrollments in any other language, Spanish is considered separately.

1. There has long been a push in the Division to develop a Spanish major. Given those efforts by faculty in Literature and Languages, among others, we recommend several options for making the study of Spanish at UCSC more coherent and more visible. We recommend that the Division consider the following alternatives for language instruction in Spanish:

1a. Move Spanish language instruction to a new Department of Spanish Studies that would include a Spanish major and incorporate faculty from other departments (e.g. History, Literature). This department would be a new strength for the Division. It would add to the Division’s focus on diversity and could build cross-divisional connections to departments in Social Sciences, notably LALS. However, relations to existing graduate programs and clusters, such as hemispheric Americas studies, would need to be considered. The structure of remaining faculty in Literature would need to be considered, in order to maintain current strengths of that department (comparative and transnational rather than divided by languages). Languages would need to be considered in this context as well (see the options outlined below).

1b. Move Spanish language instruction to Literature. On the positive side, this might integrate undergraduate instruction in language and literature and enhance graduate support; and it might encourage more coherent and formal ties to hemispheric Americas studies in the Division and across campus. However, neither of the two Academic Senate faculty who teach Spanish for the Language Program are literary scholars; and the Literature department might not be the best avenue for promoting courses in pedagogy, applied linguistics, bilingualism, etc.

2. We recommend that the Division consider the following alternatives for foreign language instruction in languages other than Spanish:

2a. Move language instruction in Chinese, Greek, Hebrew (if it is maintained), Japanese, and Latin to History; and move language instruction in French, German, and Italian to
Literature. These moves would place language instruction directly in ladder-rank FTE-holding departments whose intellectual goals are closely aligned with it. If this is done, the creation of a new Spanish Studies department would result in no net increase of administrative structure. However, it would eliminate an autonomous Language Program.

2b. Keep language instruction in languages other than Spanish in the Language Program. This would enable Language faculty to maintain their autonomy.

Writing Program

Many instructors in the Writing Program are also instructors for College Core courses. This creates redundancies in the hiring and personnel process, but also suggests some opportunities for recombination that might greatly enhance C1/C2 collaboration.

1. We recommend that the Division consider the following alternatives for the Writing Program:

1a. Move Writing to the VPDUE’s Office. The VPDUE would then work with the EVC to assure secure and continued funding for Writing. The Division would lose the benefits of enrollments as well as the disadvantages of administering the Writing Program. The VPDUE has indicated his willingness to place the Writing Program under the Division of Undergraduate Education for several pedagogical reasons, one of which is to facilitate the collaboration of Writing with the Colleges.

1b. Combine Writing with another department in the Division, such as Literature or a new Department of Creative Writing. This alternative might appeal to graduate students who could find GSI opportunities closer at hand. Writing Program faculty might benefit from intellectual exchanges with ladder faculty; and a ready department would exist for future restoration of the journalism or communication and rhetoric minors. Conversely, Writing faculty could risk losing their pedagogical and disciplinary autonomy.

1c. Keep Writing as a separate, autonomous program within the Division. Funding and personnel issues would remain a challenge; however, the Writing Program might be better able to sustain itself as a nationally recognized professional program that can continue to recruit faculty seeking a viable teaching career.

Interdisciplinary Studies

Interdisciplinarity is a traditional Divisional strength. Interdisciplinary departments and programs in the Humanities have crafted cutting-edge intellectual visions, represented non-traditional scholarly fields, and recruited women faculty and faculty from underrepresented groups in numbers higher than the Divisional and campus averages. Most of the Division’s interdisciplinary departments are very small, and consequently face greater challenges in the current fiscal crisis.
Specifically:

a. Separations and imminent retirements in History of Consciousness have created a situation in which this internationally recognized program can no longer accept new graduate students.

b. Despite years of planning, American Studies and Feminist Studies still do not have graduate programs. This situation, which is unlikely to change in the near to medium-term, means that the Division’s pool of potential dissertation supervisors does not adequately reflect the diversity of its faculty.

c. Curricular and structural inequities within the Division are particularly evident in the very small interdisciplinary departments: two of these departments have an undergraduate major but no graduate program, while the third has a graduate program but no undergraduate major.

We recommend that the Division consider the following scenarios when planning for the future of interdisciplinary studies. While these scenarios would probably not generate short-term savings beyond what would be achieved by staff consolidation (see above), each has longer-term intellectual advantages. These scenarios follow the Dean’s suggestion that no program of study in the Humanities be eliminated while also adhering to the stricture that no additional administrative structures be created.

**Scenario 1: Facilitating faculty transfers**

1a. Maintain existing interdisciplinary departments and facilitate faculty transfers into these departments from larger departments. This scenario would strengthen existing departments, maintain their autonomy, and affirm the Division’s commitment to interdisciplinary studies. However, alone it provides no resolution of the curricular and structural inequities mentioned earlier. Faculty transfers into the smaller interdisciplinary departments may potentially weaken the Division’s larger departments.

1b. Facilitate faculty transfers from small interdisciplinary departments into larger departments, and relocate interdisciplinary majors and/or graduate programs from these small departments into the larger department(s). This scenario could achieve more staff savings than described above and could further strengthen the large departments. However, the small departments’ intellectual and curricular autonomy would be decreased, and the number of students in interdisciplinary majors may decline.

**Scenario 2: Opportunities for reconstitution**

2a. History of Consciousness could be rethought as a *Division-wide* graduate department that incorporates faculty from other departments, including American Studies and Feminist Studies. Faculty participation could be institutionalized through joint appointments whose MOU’s would specify a participating faculty member’s curricular responsibilities in each department. This scenario could provide the Division’s faculty
with greater access to graduate students, and graduate students with a broader range of faculty expertise, than is available under existing departmental structures. However, it might compromise History of Consciousness’s pedagogical and curricular autonomy. The extent to which faculty from other departments would participate fully in this reconfigured graduate department would depend on the details of the joint appointments.

2b. American Studies and Feminist Studies could be encouraged to form a single larger department that would administer their existing majors. This larger department could develop partnerships with graduate programs in History, History of Consciousness, and Literature, and might eventually develop its own graduate program. This scenario would provide a new structure for critical race and feminist studies that might increase UCSC’s visibility. It would address the lack of an ethnic studies program on campus while transcending established ethnic studies paradigms. However, the role of graduate education in this scenario is unclear. Differences between American Studies’ and Feminist Studies’ visions of a graduate program would have to be negotiated. If this larger department were to develop a graduate program separately from History of Consciousness, the result might be a net increase in administrative structure.

2c. History of Consciousness could be encouraged to join with Feminist Studies and American Studies to form a single larger department with undergraduate and graduate programs. This scenario would resolve the curricular and structural inequities that currently exist among these departments. Whether the result would advantage interdisciplinary studies (as a large department) or disadvantage interdisciplinary studies (because it would shrink from three departments to one) is not clear. To be avoided is an outcome in which one of American Studies or Feminist Studies chooses not to participate in this reconstitution and is left marginalized.

2d. American Studies and Feminist Studies could be maintained as separate departments specializing in undergraduate teaching. Their faculty could be incorporated individually into existing graduate programs in other departments through joint appointments. This scenario would provide the relevant faculty with access to graduate supervision without additional or reconfigured administrative structure. However, these departments’ visions for graduate education would be compromised, and to the extent that their faculty is incorporated into other departments, their undergraduate curricula might suffer.

Possibilities for Larger Reorganization

In our discussions with different constituencies the issue of combining Humanities with some other Division (such as Social Sciences or the Arts) arose more than once. It is not obvious that combining Divisions is desirable, fiscally or otherwise.

Some of the fiscal issues include the following. Combining Divisions might lead to the elimination of administrative and staff positions. However, the duties of remaining administrators and staff would increase in complexity. This would presumably lead to reclassification and increased salaries, with the result that there might be no net salary savings. Combining Divisions would create a much larger unit, but that unit would have
just one representative on the Council of Deans. In the long term, combining Divisions would likely lead to an increase in mid-level administrators and staff (e.g. Associate Deans).

1. We recommend that plans for any contemplated merger of Divisions or any other large reorganization adhere to the following principles:

1a. No additional administrative structures should be created.

1b. Reorganization should have a curricular rationale.

1c. Reorganization should result in a decrease (not an increase) of overall expenditures.

CONCLUSION: WHAT IS NOT ADDRESSED IN THIS REPORT

There were various scenarios and issues that Task Force discussed only briefly, if at all. Some were suggested by ATFR members, others were brought up by students, faculty, and staff in the Division at large. We end with several issues that we believe are worth discussing further and one overall point.

First, the idea of a broad graduate group, with a small executive committee and an affiliated faculty with short-term commitments of 5 years, came up repeatedly, often in the form of an interdisciplinary unit associated with History of Consciousness and/or some combination of faculty in transnational feminist and American studies. The Task Force also discussed the possibility of an interdisciplinary graduate group. Our review of campus models for graduate groups suggested to us that such an option would lead to an increase in administrative costs and administrative structure, and hence our preliminary conclusion from this limited data is that the graduate group is not practical in the current fiscal climate. Second, the idea of an interdisciplinary unit that would house the small area-studies majors and minors was suggested as a way of consolidating programs currently administered by History and Literature. Third, given the current suspension of admissions to the graduate program in Philosophy, there was some discussion of the potential for linking the Philosophy undergraduate major to a reconfigured History of Consciousness, as a way to create a new theoretically oriented graduate/undergraduate program. We simply did not have adequate time to consider fully the latter two scenarios.

We close with a final caveat that is perhaps the most important among all the ideas we did not pursue. Our charge was narrowly framed and limited to the Humanities. It assumed that the Division would have to address the budget cuts on its own, without coordinated planning involving the other academic Divisions, the Academic Senate, and the central administration. We believe that reconstitution of the Division should be addressed in the context of decision-making processes in all these other units. The campus as a whole has a broader responsibility to support the Humanities that is not yet recognized by, or built into, the current process. For example, even as we suggest fairly draconian potential cuts to the Language Program, we believe the future of language
instruction at UCSC has campus-wide significance that goes beyond the Division’s need to prioritize its aspirations. We urge the campus leadership to take the initiative to protect and define the future of language instruction at UCSC. Likewise, we urge the campus at large to participate in rethinking the core liberal-arts education that has been developed and delivered so successfully at Santa Cruz. That rethinking has already begun under the auspices of this Task Force. Broader participation and leadership are required—at UCSC, in the UC system, and in the state of California—in order for the Humanities to maintain the integrity and quality of its academic programs and to build opportunities as it reduces expenses.
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