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Executive Summary

Dwight Eisenhower is famously said to have remarked that “plans are useless, but planning is indispensable.” In this spirit, the Humanities Division Academic Plan for the years 2007-2011 is as much process as result. Planning is a continuing conversation. In anticipation of such a conversation involving department chairs and their faculty it is clearly best to assume a continuing discussion of the strategies here proposed, their ramifications, and the best ways to seek their implementation. It must also be pointed out that this Plan seeks to address two different audiences: the central campus leadership, including the Academic Senate; and the chairs, faculty and staff of the Humanities Division. The former group should be aware of the place and value that the Humanities Division brings to the campus mission of research and instruction, while the latter group must understand the necessity of living within its resources. If, as the Campus Provost has pointed out repeatedly, our goal is a “balanced and healthy campus,” then a more vibrant presence of the Humanities is essential; without adequate resources, however, this goal cannot be achieved.

Unlike the campus as a whole, this Plan argues for a genuine setting of priorities, not simply a listing of everything that is deemed important or desirable. In other words, this is very much a plan for survival. The chief problems facing the Humanities Division — the need to live within its allocated resources, the demand to resolve the funding of the Writing and Language Programs, the vision of access to graduate work for all faculty, and the goal of preserving at the highest level of quality its strongest programs — are articulated and ranked in order of importance.

This Academic Plan proposes a structural realignment of resources within the Division, with an emphasis on building strength in the core disciplinary departments (History, Linguistics, Literature, Philosophy) contingent on those strengths being leveraged to support the interdisciplinary or “emergent” programs (American Studies, Feminist Studies, History of Consciousness). At the same time, greater flexibility and inter-departmental cooperation will be expected in the delivery of graduate instruction. The goal of these moves envisions a realignment of the Division’s structure in order to preserve all of its academic units while providing access to graduate work for all of its departments. The plan lists a limited number of clear divisional strengths (world cultures; languages and literacies; philosophy of science and technology; gender/sexuality studies) which are to serve as the basis of further development, and as the basis for reconciling competing interests between core departments and interdisciplinary programs, avoiding redundancies and building on existing synergies. To this end, the plan targets modest investments of FTE for the departments and languages plus a very limited number of synergistic positions that build upon those recognized divisional strengths. Units may compete for these positions destined to satisfy specific interdisciplinary desiderata with priority going to those requests that successfully argue their relevance to more than one program. Finally, the development of performance measures is proposed in order to guide individual department planning with a view to using available resources better and to positioning departments as well as the division for access to further resources.
Preamble

This “revised” plan should be understood as an addendum to the Academic Plan previously filed by Dean Gary Lease in 2005-06. While some of the arguments and conclusions differ from that plan, the basic premises are the same and presuppose the ongoing funding challenges to the division and resultant “paucity” of available FTE. In addition, this draft includes an impact statement regarding UCSC Humanities and proposed performance measures for divisional departments. The aim is to define a comprehensive vision and plan of action for the division, beyond the more immediate question of allocating the very small number of FTE available to effect the changes and directions described.

It should further be noted that this plan has been crafted within the preexisting framework of a Campus Academic Plan that presupposes rapid growth in the physical and biological sciences while diminishing the relative size of the humanities and the other divisions. Thus, while the approach taken here is necessarily one of pragmatism and accommodation with decisions already made, I would like at least to raise a question about potential outcomes. Investing in the sciences is justified by the expectation of an increase in indirect cost recovery dollars generated by large research grants. Other campus sectors can expect to profit through the redistribution of these “opportunity funds” from units that readily generate such dollars (i.e. sciences) to those where research funding opportunities are scarce (i.e. humanities). The resulting impression is that the humanities are subsidized by the sciences, and therefore a build up in the sciences is for the general good of the campus. This is indeed the model of the “research university” that has guided the growth of higher education in this country for the last half-century. And within the context of UCSC, which has suffered as a campus from disproportionately low internal as well as external funding for the virtual totality of its existence, the Campus Academic Plan would seem to be following common sense in advocating for growth in the sciences as the way to preserve and enhance UCSC’s mission in a rapidly evolving technological and globalized environment.

It would be worth at least a moment to reconsider the validity of the proposed model. First, it should be noted that external research grants and contracts, no matter how generous and no matter what the field, never “fully” recover the indirect costs of doing the research involved. Instead, the university receives only the “negotiated rate” of indirect cost recovery as determined by prior agreement with the grant-giving institution, government agency or private foundation. These “negotiated rates” are by definition well below the true cost of university research, which entails not only the salaries of researchers and assistants and the cost of materials/equipment but also the infrastructure of labs, offices, special facilities, utilities, information and communication networks, in sum the physicality of the university campus as such. Who pays for the basic construction of the university? In the case of a public land-grant institution such as the University of California, the answer is clear: the dollars that come to the campus from the state’s taxpayers in the shape of FTE lines and building subsidies are generated by the simple arithmetic of student credit hours, and thus are a direct function of enrollment. In this scenario, then, it would be the high enrolling departments in social sciences and
humanities that would in effect be subsidizing the construction and maintenance of scientific research capacities as well as faculty lines in the sciences. And to some extent, it is the duty of the university to allocate resources where they are needed and not just where they are generated (whether we are talking enrollment generated dollars or funds generated by indirect cost recovery on research grants). And while indirect cost recovery is never full, even a partial recovery of costs via negotiated rates helps mitigate at least some of the enormous costs of building the university, a task which it should be acknowledged all sectors of the academic enterprise work to meet, albeit in different ways and in different capacities.

On the other hand, there is also a tremendous cost differential to be accounted for in deciding which campus sectors to grow. Again, a comparison between the sciences and the humanities is instructive in this regard. Start-up costs currently run about 10 times higher for a hire in the sciences than in the humanities, not to mention differences in basic salary between the disciplines which I will set aside here. If we calculate infrastructure needs in the form of labs and buildings, the difference rises exponentially. To accommodate 40 new FTE in the sciences, about $100 million dollars in facilities will be required. In fact, it has been repeatedly stated that those allocated FTE cannot lead to hires unless we find a way to pay for constructing the buildings that will house them and their research capacities. Consequently, every new hire in the sciences costs the equivalent of some 50 hires in the humanities. The point here is not that we should hire humanists because they are cheaper than scientists, but that the campus needs to think hard and deep about its priorities and possibilities given its historically specific profile or “niche.” UCSC is remarkably strong for a campus its size across all fields and disciplines from arts to engineering and it has selective loci of real excellence (Astronomy/Astrophysics, Marine Biology, Genomics, Linguistics, History of Consciousness, Economics), but will the addition of 40 or more FTE in the sciences propel us into the same category as the state’s major science campuses: Stanford, UCSF, UCSD, UCD, UCB, CalTech (each of which has far more in the way of committed FTE’s and research infrastructure than we can reasonably match)? Is this gamble worth the sheer cost of the effort? Especially when its corollary might well be to lose our current competitive edge in the humanities, arts, and social sciences?

There are alternative visions, of course. In the early 1980’s, for example, both Duke University and NYU made a deliberate decision, based on the above cost analysis, to invest in the humanities to make their mark. Both schools, incidentally, made a point of raiding UCSC faculty and positioning themselves as our direct competitors to the point where today we find ourselves outgunned by them in terms of salary, research dollars and graduate student support. Yet our historic reputation of strength in the humanities still on occasion allows us to prevail. Building a bit more ambitiously on that historical strength could still put us clearly on top, not only as the best West Coast humanities school but the best nationally and internationally. On the other hand, that historic edge could well disappear and disappear irrevocably if we don’t take action. If we succeed, as the Campus Plan hopes, with success in the sciences, perhaps that is a fair trade-off for the campus. But if we fail to reach excellence there and at the same time lose our ground in the humanities, the campus will be doomed for a long time to come. That said, the
ensuing divisional plan strives to envision continued excellence for the humanities within the reduced commitment of the existing campus plan and with the hopes the campus gamble turns out right.
Preface

Readers of this plan will notice that it differs considerably from traditional documents of this sort. My goal is to present a concise assessment of the major challenges and opportunities that confront the Division of Humanities.

My position, not surprisingly, is that the humanities are a vital and necessary part of a world-class university and will continue to play an essential role for a very long time. The value of the humanities cannot be measured by the metrics common to higher education at the dawn of the 21st century. The humanities will never rival the sciences or engineering for extramural contracts and grants, the humanities will never achieve student-faculty ratios comparable to our closest pedagogical cousins in the social sciences, and the humanities are unlikely to garner donations comparable to those brought in by arts and professional programs. But these things simply do not begin to capture the extraordinary value and contributions made by the humanities.

At the same time I believe those of us in the humanities are poorly served by lament and consternation. We must learn to exist and thrive within the emerging restrictions of our resources, we must seek out new sources of financial support, and we must do a better job of communicating with the public, with the state legislature upon which we are so heavily dependent for funding, and with our colleagues in other disciplines, including those in the sciences and engineering.

The journey we have before us is not impossible, provided we confront these challenges and we receive some modest assistance from the campus. We are asking for a hand up, not a handout. Our challenge is to organize our curricula and our departments in ways that are achievable and sustainable given the resources available. We must set reasonable and attainable priorities and then we must develop an implementation plan that is above all else achievable. And we must be willing to keep at this for a very long time.

This will be a formidable challenge for this Division. Whether because of optimism or failings, we have not been willing to confront the resource limits that have so starkly confronted us. We have not been willing to make the normative choices that have been required. By avoiding the choices we have not avoided the consequences, we have simply ceded the decisions to others. It is time for a change.

The picture this plan paints of the humanities at UCSC is austere but it is not bleak. The accomplishments of the faculty are many and our programs are highly acclaimed. Our students go on to successful careers, making varied and significant contributions to their communities. The task before us is more about opportunity than loss. The resources being made available to the Division are sufficient to maintain the high quality research and instruction that is the hallmark of the humanities at UCSC. The challenge is to make the most of the opportunities before us. Because we have such strength in our programs, because we have such talented faculty and students, a modest investment will pay large dividends for the campus.
I remain convinced of the importance of the humanities and the value of our many and varied contributions. It is up to those of us in the humanities to demonstrate, if not in quantitative metrics then in qualitative ways, the importance and applicability of our work.
I. The Value of Humanities

On all sides there appears to be a rare public consensus both in California and across the nation: At the beginning of the 21st century, higher education in the United States, and especially in California, is at a critical juncture. Continuing reports from the Carnegie Commission, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the California Higher Education Policy Center in San Jose, all emphasize the problems facing universities in our contemporary society: Insufficient funding, the need to make choices about what is most important for our future education, and the inability to meet students' curricular and training needs.

At the same time the social fabric of California appears to be ever more fragile: Our youth are subject to violence on urban street corners and in rural schoolyards; homeless roam our cities in ever increasing numbers; random crime makes life more and more uncertain; and in a shrinking economy fewer and fewer people seem able to avoid the ravages of want. Cultural, political and religious divisiveness reign supreme, while gerrymandering and excessive dependency on fundraising have led to the paralysis of legislative bodies. In many people's minds the heart of these pervasive difficulties is to be found in the lack of a shared commitment to community in its broadest and most inclusive sense, the disappearance of a shared agreement on the values and obligations that are necessary for the construction of community on the one hand, and the elimination of destructive egoism on the other.

It is precisely in education, however, that American society has sought for over 200 years to establish a base for the building of the American community. In this century higher education has been viewed as the most powerful form of this enterprise. Yet, as the remaining 21st century looms before us, California no longer can be assured that its higher education institutions can serve this profound purpose. As the former UCSC Chancellor Karl Pister repeatedly emphasized, "...declining support for higher education from the state is... putting at risk our state's most valuable resources-the leaders of tomorrow-by depriving them of the educational opportunities that they will desperately need, the very opportunities that fueled prior generations." Prominent among those challenges that face us now are the growing ethnic, linguistic and cultural diversity of the state, with attendant problems of limits on education and unequal opportunities for development; the increasingly complex if not intractable problem of human interaction with the environment; the problem and opportunity of developing a system of education to prepare young people for life in the 21st century; the problems and opportunities associated with the advance of technology, particularly computer and electronic technology; and the problems and opportunities presented by the complex mutual interdependencies of all aspects of the physical, social and cultural worlds.

Traditionally, and especially in universities of ever-increasing specializations, it is the humanities that are central to understanding these problems and advancing cultural solutions. It is precisely in the humanities that the key skills and elements for the
formation of community are intensively studied, inculcated and perfected: The ability to express oneself clearly and accurately; the skill of critical evaluation, both of ideas and actions; the courage to make choices based on shared values and priorities; and the opportunity to conduct an intensive conversation with the traditions, present and past, that help make us who we are, and above all who we will be. This linkage of past, present and future; this skill and commitment to making judgments; this ability to communicate effectively with others both inside and outside of your culture; this pursuit of knowledge about yourself and others: These make up the core of humanities at UC Santa Cruz. And these are both content and outline of our community, our common culture, and in turn the blueprint of our common society. If we hope for a future devoid of violence and committed to common survival; if we strive for a society more fair and supportive of all its members; if we ache for a world more stable and less dangerous than our present one; if we seek cooperation and tolerance: Then we must work hard and unstintingly to foster the best humanities presence in our universities we possibly can. In turn, this means not only support for the present ensemble, but deep concern for humanities in the future; it means not only who teaches and trains the youth of California in the humanities now, but above all who will do so in the years to come; it means, in other words, not only care and support of our current undergraduate efforts, but also the nurturing of our graduate programs.

At this critical moment, when we need to produce a strong class of new humanities faculty to train our next generation in the process of cultural formation, there has been a significant funding shortfall across the country for graduate and post-graduate fellowships during the past two decades. The latest statistics show that students earning a humanities PhD spent more than eight years in graduate school, by far the highest median figure of any field. Yet among humanities PhDs, over 80% had a commitment to continue work in academe; this compares with just over 50% of all doctorates combined. The sad fact of the matter is that precisely when we need them, graduate students in the humanities have fewer and fewer sources of financial support, must work longer to finish their studies, and nevertheless sustain the highest commitment to higher education.

This is a problem that is recognized nation-wide. In its 2004 report entitled *Reinvigorating the Humanities: Enhancing Research and Education on Campus and Beyond*, an American Association of Universities (AAU) Task Force strongly encouraged member universities to form campus-based task forces to plan ways to bolster and reinvigorate the humanities in academic and national life. The Task Force suggested that scholars and administrators explore ways to clarify and to communicate the mission of the humanities, enhance research and teaching, and further integrate the humanities into all scholarly pursuits of knowledge, regardless of the discipline. Finally, the report reaffirmed that universities have a fundamental responsibility to educate people so they can contribute effectively to society and that the humanities have and will continue to play a central role in fulfilling this fundamental responsibility. Among the specific recommendations made by the Task Force is the admonition to University presidents and chancellors that they should make the humanities a major focus in institutional strategic planning, and should regularly emphasize to the university and the broader community the fundamental importance of the humanities.
The situation is no different at Santa Cruz. Among the most precarious operations of the Humanities Division at Santa Cruz is its graduate program. Though the History of Consciousness program is internationally praised and the Linguistics graduate program is ranked among the top 10 in the country, the overall condition of our programs, including Literature and History, is precarious. Budgetary cutbacks have made it necessary to abandon previous plans for growth. Particularly impacted are minority and foreign students. Despite a drive by the Office of the President and the campus leadership to boost graduate enrollment levels, a severe annual shortfall in funding available for graduate teaching and research assistants continues to hamstring our efforts to grow. The consequences are not far to seek: We are able to offer our prospective and continuing students only the barest of support as they pursue the completion of their graduate work. Without crucial fellowship and assistantship support, hundreds of talented students will decline their acceptance to UCSC or will be unable to complete their degrees and graduate to worthwhile careers. This threatens the national prominence that our programs have achieved. Moreover, it deprives us of the real intellectual and cultural contributions that our humanities graduates would make to society.

UCSC cannot attain the status of a world class university without maintaining and enhancing its world class programs in the humanities.

The humanities play a central role in the economy by contributing to the production of intellectual capital. The human creative genius is reflected in music, films, books, computer software and countless other works that emanate from human imagination and human creativity. There is a clear and undeniable relationship between knowledge derived from the humanities and success, including success in science and engineering. The links are creativity, reflection, and introspection. All of us, including scientists and engineers need grounding in the humanities to open the world to new and different ways of thinking and to recognize and respond to the ethical dimensions of their work. A further case in point is offered by the recent front-page article in the Armed Forces Journal (May, 2007), penned by Lt. Col. Paul Yingling, where he bemoans the lack of American generals who hold advanced degrees in humanities or social sciences, or who have proficiency in a foreign language. The article goes on to blame much of the current debacle in Iraq on the inadequate levels of humanistic and language learning in our officer corps. The humanities, the author suggests, are not only necessary for promoting creative intelligence or critical thinking in its students but also for modeling and

---

1 The school-to-work transition is clearly more difficult for the humanities and social sciences graduates. The picture changes considerably, however, if one looks beyond the several years following graduation. The unemployment experiences across the two educational streams are almost identical for individuals in the 35-44 year old age category and, once beyond the age of 45, the humanities and social science graduates actually experienced significantly fewer weeks of unemployment over the survey period (5.4 weeks vs. 9 weeks for the applied grads). A similar story holds true for wages where hourly wage rates for both genders with humanities and social science degrees catch up and then overtake those of their applied counterparts in the over 45 year old age group. See Value added: humanities and social sciences degrees—evidence supports long-term employment success. Torben Drewes. Spring 2002 issue of the OCUFA Forum. Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations Forum.
engraining the kind of moral courage military leaders (but I would add, all leaders) need to resist their manipulation at the hands of a civilian, political administration such as the one we have today. This may be an unusual example but it is indicative of the resurgent value of the humanities we also encounter in the need for ethical re-examination of our rampant scientific and technological development, as well as of our cultural values and modes of social representation, the indispensable need for truly in-depth knowledge of the history and languages of other cultures with whom we must interact in a globalized society, the ability to write and communicate effectively in our media-saturated world where instant telecommunication has become the norm. All these developments put humanities in the very forefront of our societal concerns and make humanistic study more than ever the fundamentally basic research, indeed the infrastructural bedrock, of the knowledge-driven enterprise that is the university today.

American culture incorporates the heritage of many people and thereby provides a unique context for multicultural understanding. By acknowledging the validity of their culture, the humanities provide new opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals. Because the humanities are essentially participatory, they open avenues to create, recreate and renew open dialogue within a society. The role played by the humanities in reconciling American diversity—a diversity of both ideas and peoples—is not always appreciated. When the latter part of the Twentieth Century presented American higher education with unprecedented challenges and opportunities for expansion, it was the humanities that led the way to incorporate into American culture a number of groups and ideas that had previously been excluded from the American cultural conversation.

The humanities also play a central role in university outreach—building the bridges that span the borders to bring underrepresented communities and individuals into contact with the university. Studies have demonstrated that the humanities, by accessing a variety of human intelligence and cultivating the higher order thinking skills, enhance the learning environment on campus, develop in students a positive emotional response to learning, and improve overall academic performance. The report of the 1997 University of California Task Force on Outreach frames the aims of outreach as "achieving diversity" in the university by "providing students in disadvantaged circumstances access to all the necessary tools to equip them for admission to the University's most selective programs and campuses."

The most important value of the humanities is in their very existence and being—humanities for the sake of humanities. The humanities teach us how to understand ourselves and the society in which we live. Through literature, philosophy and history—expressed through the mediums of language and writing—we speak to our children about what inspired our parents and what inspires us today. They constitute recreation in the Aristotelian sense of "re-creation," the rebuilding of the rational domain of human existence.

It is against this backdrop, that this planning document was developed.
II. Impact of the Humanities at UCSC

In the fall of 2006, Humanities 1 opened its doors as the first campus building specifically dedicated to the needs and aspirations of the Humanities Division, the last academic division to benefit from its own building. Humanities 1 is fittingly only a few feet away from the original site of the campus groundbreaking in 1964 at Cowell College, the college that remains historically the closest linked to the humanities.

The humanities at UCSC have always and continue to be understood in the most capacious sense as encompassing the totality of what it means to be human, including the many ways human beings in different times and places have interacted with each other as well as the nonhuman world. And this has meant that over the years, UCSC humanities have consistently been at the very forefront of interdisciplinary and collaborative research efforts, to such an extent that UCSC’s impact on the wider development of the humanities nationally and internationally far outweighs the Division’s relative youth and small size.

For example, UCSC’s renowned History of Consciousness department was among the very earliest graduate programs on the campus and one uniquely designed to be broadly interdisciplinary, extending to the arts, the social sciences and the natural sciences from the get go. The legacy of that program is that of unparalleled innovation and the modeling of entirely new fields of inquiry. For example, it was HOC Professor Gregory Bateson (whose death made front-page news in Europe in 1981) who elucidated the logical conundrum he first called the “double bind,” an expression which is now idiomatic in our culture with only a very few remembering its academic origins here at UCSC. Norman O. Brown moved from his signature work in classical mythology to the study of Shia Islam in 1982, well ahead of his time and prophesizing back then to disbelieving audiences that this inquiry would one day be crucial for all Americans to understand. Donna Haraway’s early exploration of the radical shifts brought about by human interactions with new technologies and the resultant concept of the “cyborg” as the hybrid locus of human and machine once seemed daring, even fanciful. Now, her analyses appear self-evident and commonsensical in our technology-saturated environment, while her work on cyborgs continues to inspire work not just in humanities but also in the arts, in medicine and engineering.

And in the 1980’s, UCSC Humanities faculty founded the Center for Cultural Studies, one of the very first research centers dedicated to broadly humanistic inquiry. Now every UC campus and hundreds of universities worldwide have similar humanities centers dedicated to interdisciplinary and deeply collaborative work. From the beginning, UCSC’s Center for Cultural Studies has been one of the most successful and exemplary models for such humanities-based research centers. It is also the case that Santa Cruz is recognized as one of the two birthplaces for the entire development of cultural studies itself as a humanities research emphasis (the other being, of course, the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in Birmingham, UK). In this case, UCSC’s impact has been double, at once intellectual and institutional, through the creation of new research
methodologies and the invention of new institutional structures for such research to take place. And in regards to the field of cultural studies, UCSC’s pioneering role in the critical studies of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality is uncontested with a dynamic faculty that sports many superstars in this arena.

In addition to leading edge interdisciplinary programs in Feminist Studies and American Studies, UCSC’s more traditional departments also feature forward thinking paradigms for the 21st century. Both History and Literature have gone well beyond the traditional, nation-based organization of those fields by placing their subject matter squarely in an unprecedented world frame of reference. In a post-9/11 world, nothing is more urgent than teaching American students, scholars and citizens to grasp historical processes and literary/cultural expression within a truly global framework. Recently, students and faculty in the History department produced the first-ever curriculum situating US history within the context of world events.

UCSC is also home to one of the top 10 NRC-ranked linguistics departments in the US. Having long ago abandoned the concept of local language specialists, the UCSC Linguistics department has been a leader in the study of language structure and theoretical linguistics, including most recently the exciting new developments in computational and experimental linguistics. Among the many exciting outcomes of the department’s research we find Clarissa, a voice-operated computer system pioneered by a Linguistics faculty member and her graduate students as well as what is arguably the most widely appreciated application, contributed by UCSC Linguistics alumnus Marc Okrand, who invented the Klingon language for Star Trek.

UCSC also hosts the earliest Humanities Multi-Campus Research Unit (MRU), on Dickens and 19th-Century British culture, which since its inception in 1981 has spawned dozens of books and scholarly articles as well as an annual weeklong summer institute that attracts scholars and visitors from around the world. In 1982, the Western Humanities Alliance (WHA) was founded at UCSC in an association with Stanford and UC Berkeley to promote interdisciplinarity via an annual conference. Today, WHA has grown to include over 25 universities between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Coast, and its annual conference is still widely acclaimed and attended as the only ongoing interdisciplinary gathering in existence. By coincidence, Dean Van Den Abbeele has also been serving as WHA president since 1999. And in 1985, former Graduate Dean and Professor of German Literature, John Ellis, was instrumental in founding the National Association of Scholars, which has become the leading conservative scholarly society in the US.

These are remarkable achievements for such a young, small and resource-challenged unit as the Division of Humanities at UCSC. Indeed, there is every reason to believe the collective impact of the humanities at UCSC, as detailed by this small sampling of divisional achievements, far outstrips the observable record of any other university in the world, so far as the humanities are concerned. That we are in the very top ranks is corroborated by our scholarship and teaching being ranked 6th in the nation among public universities in the Arts and Humanities, according to the study, The Rise of American
Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era. Our emphasis throughout remains on developing new and critical frames of reference for understanding our place as human beings in the increasingly complex world we inhabit. Those frames of reference allow us to develop all-important changes in perspective by the introduction of spatial or geographical differences (transnationalism and globalization), of temporal differences (history), and of semiotic differences (languages, cultures) as the key by which to begin to understand current identities and traditions. This emphasis on critical thinking that goes well beyond the transcendence of given categories and imagining ourselves “out of the box” is not just theoretical but has come to define the all-important concept of innovation, which is currently a primary concern of those interested in the management of more effective business practices as well as the further development of science and technology (see for example, Andrew B. Harpagon, How Breakthroughs Happen: The Surprising Truth About How Companies Innovate [Harvard Business School Press, 2003]). As such, the humanities with the knowledge it generates in writing, language, history, culture and critical thinking is in fact where the most basic level of basic research takes place, basic research which it is then for the arts, social sciences, natural sciences and engineering to “apply” to the more local and particular fields of inquiry that are their own.

When he established the foundations for the modern university in Germany in the 19th century, Von Humboldt described philosophy as the “queen of disciplines,” to the extent that its field of inquiry was to reflect upon and adjudicate the way all other fields organize and think themselves. While the specific humanities discipline of philosophy at its best still operates in this fashion, that general research into the most basic ways we think more accurately and fully describes the very mission of the humanities writ large and as we have practiced it and continue to practice it exemplarily here at UCSC, the home of the single most important and influential humanities faculty in the world.

Finally, I would like to include an historical challenge dating back to the campus’ earliest planning efforts, specifically to two key ideas promoted by founding Cowell Provost, Page Smith, which could not be realistically implemented in his time but which have a distinct relevance and possibility of actualization today. One idea was for an emphasis in what he called World Civilization as a distinctive component of UCSC’s profile in the Humanities. For many reasons, this was not a practicable idea in the early days of the campus, including the generally Eurocentric understanding of the humanities nationwide in those days which precluded the proper training and placement of Ph.D.s with expertise spanning a wide array of the world’s myriad cultures and traditions. Today, as I will document below, we are not only in a position to fulfill Smith’s idea as a particular UCSC branding of the humanities but the current global environment in the wake of 9/11 and other recent events makes such an emphasis a necessity for the educated citizenry of this country in the 21st century. Smith’s second idea concerned the need for flexibility and interdisciplinary innovation at the graduate level, an idea exemplified by the early development of the History of Consciousness program. To what extent can – and must – the Division reinvigorate the graduate environment at UCSC in the direction of Smith’s original vision?
III. Divisional Strengths

The division of Humanities is the home to many and varied foci of academic and intellectual strength. For the purpose of this plan, I will aggregate them into four categories: (1) World Cultures and Civilizations; (2) Languages and Literacies; (3) Philosophy of Science and Technology; and (4) Gender/Sexuality; as well as a fifth potential area in the study of Religion and Society.

World Cultures and Civilizations

More often referred to under the trendy rubrics of “transnationalism” and “globalization,” a world-centered frame of reference turns out to be fundamental to a number of programs in the Humanities Division. Curiously, it is the small size of our Humanities departments that provides an edge in establishing a global studies emphasis. Traditional humanities departments are often subdivided by a national or regional focus on their subject matter (one studies German literature, Chinese history, or American culture). Hence, interdisciplinarity begins on the micro level by transcending these national or regional boundaries: Comparative literature, Mediterranean studies, diasporic cultures, postcolonialism, etc. At Santa Cruz, we are in an unprecedented position to launch research initiatives and teaching programs that take the world itself as the principle of organization.

Most exemplary in this regard is the History department, which sports a Center for World History matched by a curriculum and a faculty that take World history as a primary arena of teaching and research. World history has emerged in recent years as many historians - like other scholars -- have become interested in theoretical, comparative, and developmental issues that do not fit well within traditional spatial boundaries: diasporas, global trade, environmental change, the history of science and technology, and transnational interaction. The project of world history as a field of research is informed by social theory, new socio-historical methodologies, and cultural analysis, yet it must be centered in issues of historicity on a global scale. And as mentioned above, the “Globalizing U.S. history" project provides a new lower division curriculum for United States history that reflects cutting edge research regarding the impact of the world on US history, as well as the impact of the US on the world. It aligns for the first time major dates in U.S. history with world historical processes, among them the eighteenth century Atlantic revolutions, the development of the U.S. national state, the struggle over the abolition of slavery and for women’s suffrage as well as global patterns of migration. While a leader in the creation and development of the world history model, the department needs a good 4-5 additional positions to realize its clear potential to become the primary location nationwide for the study and delivery of this important new and rapidly developing field.

One promising offshoot of this world history emphasis is a proposed new program in Ancient World Studies. Traditional Classics programs typically limit themselves to the study of ancient Greece and Rome. At UCSC, we are close to being able to project an
absolutely unprecedented program that studies ancient civilization from West Africa through China and Japan, with an especially strong capacity in the study of ancient Israel and the Near East. A possible endowed chair in ancient India is also being pursued (in conjunction with the South Asian initiative, discussed below). With scholars interested in ancient Africa and China, the proposed program in Ancient Studies will also be a major contributor to improving campus diversity.

The Literature department has long professed an interest in world literature, despite some longstanding debate over the use of that term. The department clearly has a potent transnational component but it needs some key developments to achieve truly world reach: Arabic literature, Indian literature and Asian literature are clear lacunae with additional needs in Eastern European and African diasporic literatures. Literature is not only a department that has ceased to grow but one that has dramatically shrunk in the last decade and a half (with a loss of 11 out of 47 FTE or some 23% of its faculty corps) while its enrollments, productivity and workload have increased. An immediate infusion of 3-4 FTE is necessary just to keep the program in the NRC top 40, but the department should actively seek other means of increasing its strength (via split appointments, crosslistings with other departments, etc.).

Elsewhere in the division, Linguistics has implicitly had a global reach by its broadly theoretical approach to the study of linguistics, and the department has also been specifically involved in research on globalization and language extinction. The department of Feminist studies has long insisted on the transnational dimension of its work on the status of women in different cultures around the globe. And American studies can claim a world perspective by dint both of its general emphasis on the study of race and ethnicity and of its concern with American culture as a transnational if not worldwide phenomenon. Finally, there is a burgeoning cross-disciplinary interest across the Division in the study of California as a ready-to-hand incarnation of the mix of world cultures in situ. Such a research agenda can be supported by the development of a new MRU based at the UC Humanities Research Institute at Irvine and has a unique opportunity to obtain local and state funding while providing benefits to the people of California by creating a better understanding of our culture and history.

Languages and Literacies

Of course, any move in the direction of global or international studies is moot without serious attention to the issue of foreign languages. Currently, UCSC teaches 13 ancient and modern languages at various degrees of depth (five languages are covered by a single Unit-18 Lecturer and are thus particularly at risk). A concerted effort needs to be made to add languages and add depth to the existing languages. In particular, languages that have both international importance and a significant base of heritage speakers already among our students should be considered: Korean, Vietnamese, Tagalog (Pilipino), Punjabi, Farsi. The current financial state of the Languages Program and the Humanities Division made any such growth prohibitive until the recently signed MOA with the Central administration to place the program on stable financial footing. Upgrading the 3 currently vacant SOE lecturer positions to ladder-rank faculty would not only set the
program on a par with other academic units but would enable more successful
grantsmanship to obtain funding to support language instruction (not only from the
classic Department of Education Title VI Series but also the recently enacted National
Security Language Initiative [NSLI] signed into law January 5, 2006). There are also
numerous donor possibilities, especially with regards to the abovementioned California
heritage languages. We should also heed the work of the UC Language Consortium,
which is developing sophisticated new online programs for language instruction,
especially in less commonly taught languages. Finally, a more aggressive use of EAP
and other study abroad opportunities (including in conjunction with
Monterey/Middlebury) should be pursued to help manage foreign language enrollments
(the fastest growing in the Division) and accelerate student progress. An intensive
summer session languages institute could also benefit the campus in this area.

Improvements in the language program are also crucial in the context of various area
studies initiatives that have been proposed for development in conjunction primarily with
the Division of Social Sciences but with other campus divisions as well. In addition to
fledgling programs in East Asian studies and Asian American studies, a major initiative
in the area of South Asian studies is under serious consideration by the divisional deans
and a group of donors headed by the past president of the UCSC foundation. While
endowed chairs may be possible in such areas as ancient Indian civilization, Indian
literature, Indian film, or Indian women’s studies, we cannot leverage Title VI or NSLI
funds in this area without improving our language offerings dramatically.

On the other hand, we should acknowledge the major strengths across the division in
language study of all kinds (including linguistics, literature, the writing program and the
languages program), and a combined development of these could readily position UCSC
as a national center of excellence in language literacies and understanding, in line with
the proposed campus theme in the area of visual and verbal communication. Linguistics
is a top 10 NRC-listed department that faces imminent retirements as well as fierce
competition from other universities. A small investment of 2-3 FTE could secure the
department’s status and perhaps move it to the very top.

The Literature department contributes to this strength not only by its emphasis on textual
art and in the area of translation theory/studies, but also by its strong Creative Writing
program (one of whose faculty members recently won the National Book Award). The
program, as it currently stands, is one or two FTE away from being able to offer an MFA
degree. An appointment in nonfiction writing would enable this upgrade while
leveraging the traditional campus interest in journalism and creative nonfiction (an
interest that has led several of our alums to Pulitzer prizes but which the campus has
never been able to fund adequately or responsibly). UCSC Humanities also administers
the campus writing program, whose funding future like that of the Language program
rests upon the MOA currently being negotiated between the Humanities division and the
central campus administration. Under the currently proposed Campus Academic Plan,
there will be no need for increased funding of the Writing program to the extent that
“freshman enrollments will stay static” even as the campus grows through increased
numbers of transfer students and graduate students. Should this assumption prove false,
however, and increases in the freshman class occur, provisions should be made for supporting the mandated part of the writing curriculum.\(^2\) Finally, here too lie significant opportunities with Summer Sessions both for preparatory writing courses as well as institutes for creative writers. In addition, there are tremendous untapped opportunities building bridges between the campus programs and the significant, active writers community in the city and region.

**Philosophy of Science and Technology**

There exists concentrated interest in the critical study of science and technology (STS) across a span of departments in the division. Philosophy, in particular, has made this area its primary focus of attention but other departments and faculty exhibiting strength in this area include Feminist Studies (Barad) and HOC (Haraway). This strength also has the ability to make strong alliances with similar research in other divisions. STS at UCSC offers a framework through which to address questions – about how scientific and technological innovation and knowledge practices are related to questions of globalization, diversity, and justice – that are simultaneously intellectually valuable and societally relevant. The focus on diversity and justice looks at the role of technoscientific practices in the global redistribution of resources and wealth and in the shaping of global cultures. Access to and control of knowledge, from what questions get asked in the first place to how these questions are addressed, fundamentally affects what decisions are made and who has the power to make them. Other research might address questions of equity, diversity, justice, and involvement of a range of actors beyond the human in the production of scientific knowledge. This divisional strength obviously also connects closely with the campus theme, Advanced Technology and Society, and many of our faculty and units working in this area are already working with colleagues across the campus. STS is also a clear growth area in the Humanities, as evidenced by developments at other universities, and we can expect greater emphases and strengths as we replace retiring faculty with new Ph.D.s. Nonetheless, it makes eminent sense to dedicate at least 1-2 FTE to build more coherence and depth in this area, and allow us perhaps to launch a more organized curriculum in STS.

**Gender/Sexuality**

As mentioned above, UCSC has long been a leader in the study of gender and sexuality

\(^2\) The issue is, of course, not particular to UCSC and has been addressed at other campuses, as in a recent statement from the UCSB undergraduate council: “Due to the tight budget situation, funding for the Writing Program was cut by approximately $125K this year. Consequently, the Program was unable to offer enough writing classes to supply the demand. Because this demand is mandated by university requirements, with few alternatives available to students, the Council reasoned that the Writing Program should enjoy special protection from the vagaries of campus budgets. The Council therefore strongly recommended to the Executive Vice Chancellor that a solution be found whereby funding for the Writing Program is stably maintained at a level that's capable of meeting the mandated demand for writing courses.”
issues, with many prominent researchers and foundational thinkers on our faculty. Indeed, the success of the proposed Feminist Studies Ph.D. rests upon its unique capacity to leverage participation (at various levels from cross-listed courses to joint appointments) from significant numbers of faculty inside the division and well beyond it. The Institute for Advanced Feminist Research (IAFR) represents the research and outreach dimension of this UCSC strength. There is also a very active group supporting the program in gender and sexualities. Feminist theory has also long been a distinct strength in Literature and History of Consciousness. A major emphasis of the History department is on the role of gender in specific historical periods. And American Studies has stated its need for an expert in the place of gender and sexuality in American culture. There is also great deal at stake today in the intersections between gender and technology that has been the focus of attention of scholars in FMST, HOC and philosophy. Feminist Studies is the division’s smallest department with only seven FTE. They need at least one more position to deliver their Ph.D. responsibly. Further growth of at least 2-3 FTE in the area is warranted, but these should capture the interdisciplinary strength of the field by being available to all interested departments who could compete for the positions and/or find creative ways to share them.

Religion and Society

There is one other subject matter of obvious world interest that the campus does not currently teach, namely the study of religion. While we are clearly not in a position to mount a full-blown religious studies curriculum, we do have strong but hidden strengths in the study of particular religions in their social context. In addition to the developing BA in Jewish studies, there is a Muslim studies initiative, a recently endowed chair in Sikh Studies, and major scholars on campus working in the theory and history of religions (Lease), and in the ethnography of contemporary Christianity (Harding). 2-3 well-placed hires shared between Humanities and Social Sciences in this area (Islam, East Asian religions, African and African-American religions, etc.) could enable a highly novel program to emerge whose interdisciplinarity would be guaranteed by the distribution of its faculty among a number of host departments (Literature, History, Anthropology, HOC, Sociology, etc.). I might add that it has been my personal opinion for some time now that we in the secular academic world ignore the serious study of religion (and not only its fundamentalist forms) at our peril.
IV. Building Disciplinary Strength and Promoting Interdisciplinarity

The recent analysis by CPB of comparative program size throughout UC reveals the disproportionately small size of the UCSC humanities compared to our sister campuses. The gist of the comparison is derived from analysis of the core or pillar programs (history, literature, linguistics, philosophy), with progressively less comparison data available for FST, AMS, and HOC, our interdisciplinary departments. (These units began as interdisciplinary programs with faculty from different units joining together to develop innovative curricula. At some point, though, these interdisciplinary groups evolved into strict departments. As a result, we have more departments than the division really ought to, while observing a net loss of interdisciplinary opportunity and goodwill.) And while linguistics and philosophy are small at 10 FTE each, literature and history are downright anemic at 35 and 23 FTE respectively (cf. UCSD has 64 in Literature and 38 in History, or UCSB has 93 in Literature and 51 in History). Investment in these two departments is urgent to maintain quality. Appointments there need not, however, exclude affiliations or split appointments with other units, especially the interdisciplinary programs. Indeed, such arrangements would garner quicker and more enthusiastic decanal support for those FTE.

At the same time, the Division needs to establish a better set of incentives and rewards for interdisciplinary work, including teaching in other programs. To accomplish this, the Division might establish an interdisciplinary fellows program that would support faculty working temporarily in another unit for the further development of interdisciplinary research and/or teaching deliverables. There is also a tremendous need to locate appropriate venues for experimental teaching projects, new course development, etc. One option might be to develop closer affiliations with College courses to enable such fermentation.
V. Connection to Campus Themes

As should be clear at this point from the above remarks, the Humanities division can clearly be a lead player with regards to the following four campus themes: transnationalism/globalization, identity and heritage, verbal and visual communication, science and technology studies. With regards to human and environmental health, some important developments are in place. We have the major contributions of Marc Cioc in History both as a major scholar and as editor of *Environmental History*, and the Philosophy Department has regularly offered, and plans to continue offering, courses in environmental ethics, environmental philosophy, and (hopefully) courses on debates involving biological, ecological, and environmental diversity. Wlad Godzich (Literature) is developing courses in medical humanities, and the Language program provides the medical Spanish side of the curriculum for the Health Sciences major. Nonetheless, this area has shown significant growth potential in the humanities at other campuses, and it is to be expected that it will be better represented as we hire new faculty to replace our upcoming retirees.
VI. Reinvigorating the Graduate Environment

The contradiction between a wonderfully talented, creatively interdisciplinary faculty and the hardened silo walls of our academic departments and divisions is nowhere more acute than in our graduate programs. In particular, the graduate programs in HOC, Literature, and Philosophy as well as the anticipated programs in Feminist Studies and American Studies share tremendous commonalities and synergies while remaining discrete disciplines of study. Each of the programs has its own raison d’être, recruitment pools and placement possibilities and these need to be respected as such for their continued success. On the other hand, the enrollment pattern of the students themselves indicates a great deal of transit between these programs (and others as well). Over half of the graduate students enrolling in HOC seminars are from other departments and most HOC students are taking seminars in other programs as well. The question then arises as to whether this graduate “environment” should not be recognized as such and be made part of how we conceive and plan graduate education at UCSC. If we look beyond the overt departmental designation of seminars, we begin to see a cluster of distinct emphases and distinctive strengths that define the reality of graduate work at UCSC as well as the research strengths of the faculty involved in graduate instruction. What we need to do is make the existence of these clusters more visible and find appropriate support structures for them, while understanding the necessity of channeling students through the existing set of degrees. Among the most prominent of these graduate clusters are science studies, gender/sexuality studies, philosophy, critical theory, cultural studies, literary theory, and political theory. There may be others, and these clusters themselves may – indeed should – morph over time in to other as yet unforeseeable emphases. Moreover, such clusters can and do interact as much with programs in other divisions as with the other departments in our division. Such a flexibility and bracing interdisciplinarity helps realize Page Smith’s initial vision of HOC. Support for the graduate clusters could be supplied by linking them to research groups funded by the Institute for Humanities Research (IHR).

Within this scheme, we need then to consider the future shape of HOC, which once was a broadly interdisciplinary program but in more recent years has become itself siloed as a stand alone department. While some replacement positions are crucial to protecting program quality with the imminent wave of retirements, HOC might consider bringing a small and highly select cadre of our most research prominent and interdisciplinary qualified faculty into the program through split, joint or even whole appointments. A more “leveraged” HOC model would then go a long ways toward realizing the above-described revival of the graduate environment, one more in tune with the reality of the graduate student enrollments and study patterns. Cross-departmental agreements such as the pending MOU between HOC and AMST (where the latter supplies an assured number of GSI slots in return for opportunities for its faculty to teach seminars for the former) could help advance such an agenda by more closely relating graduate student expertise to teaching possibilities.

A second order of concerns has to do with the kinds of preparation we give our students
for careers in the humanities other than becoming university professors. The poor job market for Ph.D.’s is not news, and yet constructive solutions are far and few between. Major professional organizations such as the Modern Language Association (MLA) can find no better solution than admonishing graduate degree programs for accepting and graduating too many students. A comparison with other divisions reveals something important, however. In the sciences, social sciences, and even the arts, the normal or even optimal career outcome is not in the university teaching and research corps but in private industry, government agencies, venture startups and the like. That many humanities Ph.D.s find jobs in the publishing world, media, internet communications, historical societies, archives, museums, libraries, state and national park interpretive services, state and federal arts and humanities organizations, etc. should no longer be viewed as a form of failure but affirmed as part of the societal benefit humanities graduate degrees offer. Many of our Ph.D.s who find careers in these and similar areas are often better paid and more successful than their academic counterparts. It is time we acknowledge this reality and include some preparation in our graduate curriculum. Such preparatory work is often labeled “public humanities,” and there have even been proposed degree programs in this area. Rather than invent yet another degree program, however, and one destined to be viewed as second tier from the get go, the issue would be to provide some coursework and perhaps internship possibilities that could assist our students in pursuing such career paths if they so choose. This is not an expensive option but one that would go a long way toward restoring integrity to the humanities Ph.D., especially as the campus seeks to enlarge its share of graduate students.
VII. Research Support, Development, and Space

Coordination and development of our research infrastructure in the humanities is of paramount importance to the realization of this plan. Rationalization of the research enterprise can be accomplished by organizing our disparate and variably funded research units under the umbrella of the IHR. These include Center for Cultural Studies, IAFR, Dickens MRU, Linguistics Research Center, Ray-FASC, Center for World History. By themselves, these units are generally underfunded and understaffed. Their potential collocation and pooling of staff may allow for some small economies of scale that will ease the delivery and organizing of colloquia, conferences and other events. The IHR could also hold a distinguished visiting professor, both for campus visibility and potential recruitment. The division has contracted a grant writer to help spearhead more aggressive applications to government agencies and foundation boards. Finally, a recalibration upwards of the rate of indirect cost recovery dollars available to support humanities research is vital to the success of the division in addressing issues of solvency while trying to support the research mission of the faculty.

Similarly, an augmentation in the I & R formula is necessary in the face of the increasing role of facilities in humanities research and teaching, the rising cost of staff, equipment, computing, supplies and expenses, etc. Concomitant efforts need to be made to increase staff salaries while mitigating the effects of increasing workloads, on the one hand, and finding greater efficiencies, on the other. As for space, the new Humanities building 1 will help for the time being, but within the next five years, pressures will mount for room in H/SS 2, currently housing the offices of the Social Sciences division. Social Sciences is scheduled to move out by the end of that time, but if that doesn’t happen, there will be an increasing premium on space. At the same time, the Humanities division has to shoulder both initial and ongoing costs for the building, a contingency that represents a significant new budgetary burden that must be figured in any fiscal planning.
VIII. Challenges to the Humanities at UCSC

Currently, the Humanities Division faces a unique set of challenges whose outcome will determine the division’s long-range future. Some of these challenges are structural and inherent to the kind of organization that the Humanities division is. Others are transitory in nature but no less perilous. Still others risk turning recent history into a permanent condition/disability. A number of these challenges have been eloquently and accurately treated in the previous academic plan.

Perhaps the most serious challenge to the Division remains the ongoing misalignment between divisional aspirations and its available resources, a situation that requires an inordinate number of FTE to be kept as open provisions, with the result of keeping faculty lines out of departments in our Division that have remained consistently flagged as strikingly undersized compared to comparable institutions (the smallest in the UC system, excluding Merced). Also, Humanities holds a disproportionately large share of its FTE as open provisions compared to our sister divisions (44 out of 153 FTE or 28.8% for Humanities while other divisions range from 6.4 to 18%). The reasons for this situation are varied and complex. They include the costs incurred by the Division to administer the Language and Writing programs, the need to buttress a resource-poor infrastructure for humanistic research, and an inadequate I & R support formula that disadvantages the Humanities. Clearly, the solution to the last two lie in a campus renegotiation of the I & R allocation formula and of the percent of opportunity funds redirected to Humanities research, as well as a more aggressive pursuit of development efforts and grant-getting. As for the support of the Language and Writing programs, work continues on an MOU between the Division and the Center designed to stabilize those units’ funding in such a way as to protect teaching capacity and allow for merit pay increases to faculty in those programs. A further predicament is occasioned by the fact the Humanities Division is the only academic division to hold so-called “reserve” FTE, a total of 14. A more equitable redistribution of these across all five divisions, with each holding 3-4 FTE in official reserve as diversified risk management, would prevent a catastrophe in any one division should a severe budget crisis demand their recall to the Center and would allow Humanities to make a better, more committed use of those FTE.

A second challenge concerns properly organizing the Humanities Division. Like most academic units, it is actually in an uneasy relation between two different kinds of organizations: a maintenance organization AND an adaptive one. So-called maintenance organizations are typically concerned with the socialization and training of people for roles in other organizations and in the society at large. Schools and churches are the major examples of maintenance organizations. Adaptive organizations, on the other hand, are organizations intended to create knowledge, innovative solutions to problems, and the like. The research laboratory is the prototype of such organizations, and universities (as research organizations rather than teaching organizations) would also belong in this category. While all university divisions face a split mission insofar as they partake in both these kinds of organizations, the humanities face a particular challenge in negotiating this organizational contradiction to the extent that funding sources for
research are restricted and public demand for basic teaching high. Similarly, the division within our instructional corps between so-called teaching faculty (or lecturers) and research faculty (ladder) aggravates this tension by the implicit (and sometimes explicit) suggestion that university faculty either only teach or only do research, a public stereotype that has certainly damaged the general reputation of higher education in this country. The challenge is to think what our mission is and then to align our resources (including human resources) with that mission. We do not have the luxury of organizing ourselves like Xerox Parc, nor should we reduce ourselves to a General Motors equivalent of education, concerned with nothing more than the most efficient churning out of BA’s, MA’s, and Ph.D.’s. It is the case, though, that some units lean more toward one type: HOC is a stellar adaptive organization, a veritable engine of intellectual innovation and discovery, but has very little of a maintenance organization to it, even to the point of being unable to reproduce itself; while the Languages Program maintains basic instruction for the need to learn foreign languages in an increasingly global and diversified world, but has limited adaptability in its current incarnation for lack of a research apparatus.

A third challenge concerns the relation between disciplinary strength and interdisciplinary reach. To some extent, this challenge could be viewed as a corollary of the first insofar as discipline-based departments remain more concerned with reproducing their knowledge base and tradition while the interdisciplinary imperative corresponds to the need for intellectual adaptation and innovation in a rapidly changing world (including the rapidly changing world of ideas). UCSC has its own particular profile in this regard, to the extent that it has a tremendous reputation for all kinds of interdisciplinarity and yet has a highly rigidified institutional structure that in fact makes interaction between departments, let alone divisions, extraordinarily difficult. On the other hand, if one studies the profile of individual faculty members, one discovers that they are often interdisciplinary to the bone in their teaching and scholarship, and despite the manifest lack of encouragement/incentive the campus provides for them. While the Division and the campus have incontestably profited from the activities of such faculty, it would be foolhardy to assume the continuation of such positive behavior in the absence of better institutional support and reward.

A fourth challenge stems from the growing size of the campus and the enrollment pressures that will continue to mount on individual programs. After years of struggling to meet enrollment targets, the Humanities departments are going to have to plan for a future (and already in most cases a present) where over-enrollment is the rule. It is no longer simply a question of building enrollments but of managing curriculum. Departments are going to have to reexamine their course requirements and delivery in this environment, paying much more attention to streamlining their majors, eliminating bottlenecks, and making better use of summer sessions and extension to carry out portions of their teaching mission effectively and efficiently.

The burgeoning wave of retirements in the Division constitutes a fifth challenge, one that bears both obvious risk and tremendous opportunity. With some 22% of the faculty retirement-eligible in the next five years, a great deal of faculty recruitment will have to
be pursued simply to maintain our current strengths. For some units (History of Consciousness and Linguistics, in particular) the change in ranks will be almost wholesale. Careful planning is required if these units are to be safeguarded. Across the division, a great deal of care will also have to be taken, in general, not to replicate the same age disequilibrium with a younger cohort but to make sure of program continuity long-term by an appropriate spread of ranks and age. Finally, replacement positions will not be automatically returned to their units of origin but will be reallocated within the general framework and directions to be established by this plan.

In summary, the Division needs to develop by a careful deployment of new FTE, an equally careful redeployment of retirement-generated FTE AND a disciplined effort to create the budgetary conditions that would allow for at least some of the currently open provisions to be allocated back to departments for use as faculty lines. In any case, a concerted use of all three of these FTE sources should enable the Division to develop in appropriate and positive ways. At the same time, a controlled rhythm of recruitments will have to be orchestrated in order to maximize the recruitment efforts without unduly burdening departments and their staff with more searches than can be successfully run.
IX. Planning Parameters

Any effort to plan effectively within a complex organization must be informed by three circumstances: the past, the present, and reasonably inferred future circumstances. For the first time in the recent memory of the Humanities Division at UC Santa Cruz, all three conditions are in place. We have a very good understanding of the conditions that have shaped and will continue to shape the degrees of freedom available to the Division and the campus. For the purpose of this exercise, three are paramount.

First, UC has moved from being a university that was financially supported by the state to one that is now state assisted. This change has resulted in ever decreasing rates of marginal state support for UC with the resulting greater emphasis on extramural funding sources—student fees, contracts and grants, and philanthropy. Programs that have the will and ability to leverage these sources of revenue will thrive. Those that cannot, or will not, will be hard-pressed to survive. This change has also placed great emphasis on the efficient delivery of instruction and research. Programs that are able to reduce their marginal cost of instruction while maintaining their pedagogical effectiveness and student demand, will have more degrees of freedom than programs that cannot or will not provide more efficient instruction. There is little to suggest these funding circumstances will change in the long-term. If anything, they are likely to become more pronounced.

Second, UCSC has suffered under the twin burdens of its relatively late birth within the UC system and its varied attempts to create a campus that was markedly different from the other established UC campuses. It was clear from the founding of the campus that the aspirations associated with creating a college-based undergraduate institution were at odds with the funding conventions of the UC system. At first, start-up funding provided to the campus made it appear that sufficient resources would be available to realize the contrarian vision. Over time, however, the remorseless workings of state and UC funding conventions forced the campus to conform or make costly trade-offs. For example, at a time when graduate students were funded by UC through a weighted formula based on the greater cost of graduate instruction relative to undergraduate instruction, UCSC graduate enrollments grew little. Now, with weighted enrollments only a distant memory, UCSC is attempting to expand its graduate programs and the number of graduate students at the same marginal funding rate it receives for undergraduate students. Nowhere was the contrarian view of the campus more pronounced and long-lived than in the humanities and nowhere have the degrees of freedom—real and imagined—been more constrained than in the humanities.

We must also appreciate that the breadth of academic programs within the Division as well as the structure of campus academic organization are both rooted in the past. From the perspective of academic management, our campus is relatively decentralized. This has many consequences—some beneficial and some not. Interdisciplinary academic appointments are made both easier and more difficult by this circumstance—more difficult when appointments must cross lines of divisional authority and funding. Fundraising for some disciplines and programs is easier than for others. The availability of contracts and
grants is much more pronounced in the sciences than they are in the humanities. And given existing pedagogical norms, instructional efficiencies are more readily captured in programs outside the humanities. Within the Division, academic programs were too often created with too little attention to the constraining effects of available resources.

Third, while UC still maintains a fund-based system of budgeting, it is becoming increasingly the case that monies are fungible—all money is green as many have come to say. The decentralization of faculty FTE to the academic divisions has enhanced the fungible nature of monies. This is another way of saying that we in the divisions have the responsibility, now coupled with greater authority, to make choices about how we deploy our funds. As a result, planning within an academic division is not, and indeed cannot be, limited to academic planning as we have come to think of it. Divisional planning has come to encompass a broad range of choices that includes the traditional foci of academic planning—faculty appointments, curricular expansion, and program creation—as well as a host of other basic operational needs that include funding for research, graduate student recruitment and support, staffing levels, equipment and computing purchases, and the like. Divisional planning must now include thinking about costs that were previously unheard of or were handled at the campus level. These include such things as partner hires, salary upgrades at the time of hire, housing allowances, and the like.

Upon entering this deanship a year ago, I found a unit facing a significant over-commitment of available financial resources. To be candid, far more had been committed than was available to the Humanities Division. Since then I have sought to continue Dean Lease’s efforts to establish an atmosphere of budgetary realism and stability, with a mechanism now in place that will allow genuine planning and spending within the financial means of the Division. This return to fiscal responsibility has re-established at least to some degree the credibility of the Humanities Division with the central administration and has re-set the expectations of the humanities departments to a more realistic level. At the same time, I continue to make provisions for the creation of a financial reserve that will permit the Division to meet unanticipated emergencies without plunging us back into a serious imbalance. Until the Division’s other difficulties are resolved, however, this challenge will remain “live” and very grave.

How, then, can the Humanities Division establish its priorities and rank them most effectively?

First, we must plan for a division that is stable and complete at the enrollment plateau articulated for this round of the campus planning. In the future, as the campus grows to higher enrollment plateaus, the division can expand to become larger and more comprehensive, but attaining stability is more important than sustaining dreams, especially given the debilitating effects the lack of stability has had on the division over the past three decades.

Second, we must plan for a future that will require greater flexibility from the division. In the past two decades, we have experienced three episodes of financial cutbacks in state funding of significant magnitude (the division actually lost seven of the faculty FTE it
earned from enrollment growth during this period). At the same time, we have witnessed a sharp decline in the marginal level of state support associated with growth. We have every reason to believe these two trends will continue into the future and we must plan accordingly. And we must become more entrepreneurial, we must expand our efforts in fund raising and in obtaining grants. What was in the past funded by state funds must in the future be funded from alternative sources.

Third, it is clear we don't have sufficient FTE to build out each department in the traditional model to the numbers identified in the individual departmental plans. It is also clear that we lack sufficient FTE to front fund retirements within the existing departmental model. We must either surrender our aspirations or come to grips with the fact that if we are to attain our aspirations we must do so in ways that take advantage of the opportunities available to us. Therefore, if we are to move forward - to meet the programmatic desiderata - we must do so in a way that capitalizes on our interdisciplinary strengths, that recognizes the centrality of and necessity of the pillar disciplines and departments, and that acknowledges the lack of other viable alternatives.

Earlier in this document, I noted that universities exist as two very different organizations operating side by side: the maintenance organization and the adaptive organization. The aspirations of faculty are primarily realized through adaptive organizational structures while the requisites of the institution are realized though the policies, procedures, and hierarchical structures that together comprise the maintenance organization. The fixed and disciplined organizational structure of the maintenance organization, as expressed in the traditional departmental model, need not be the only way to advance and support the adaptive structures necessary to implement our aspirations. The graduate and research environments - the core of our adaptive organization -- can be supported by organizational structures that lie outside the mold of traditional academic departments. Developing adaptive organizations to advance these aspirations, together with establishing the alternative maintenance structures necessary to support their operations, is both possible and necessary.

Given our earlier observation that individual faculty members tend to be interdisciplinary while departments tend to resist such intellectual boundary crossing, the most prudent course of action would be to place the majority of faculty lines in the pillar departments (History, Literature, Linguistics and Philosophy) while simultaneously requiring them to hire faculty who can and will significantly contribute to FS and AS. In line with the above, HOC must be revaluated in terms of its intellectual foci as well as to its structure and place within the division. Finally, a concerted effort needs to be made to build up the languages, not only as a necessary infrastructure for the humanities and the campus as a whole but also to capture more of the adaptive synergies enabled by language study as one of the primary strengths of the division.
X. Goals and Priorities

One area in which improvement will, of course, be sought, but in which Humanities already excels is to be found in the campus emphasis on diversity—of faculty, instruction, and research. The Division of Humanities contributes substantially to the diversity of the campus in all these ways and will continue to do so over this planning period.

In regard to faculty make-up, the Division is 49.5 percent female in contrast to the campus, which is 35.4 percent female. In addition, the Division is made up of 28.7 percent ethnic minority faculty; again, this contrasts to the campus, which is made up of 24.1 percent ethnic minority faculty. The Humanities Division has always, and will continue to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. In its administrative make-up, the Division has made an effort to create diversity in department chair representation in the humanities with the goal of encouraging diversity at the structural and policy levels. Of the nine department and program chairs during 2007-08, four are women and one is an ethnic minority. The Center for Cultural Studies and the Institute on Advanced Feminist Research are both directed by women. Furthermore, it is important to note that the Humanities Division has a history of supplying excellent (and diverse) administrative talent to the campus and the UC system.

Five Humanities Division faculty were selected as “Distinguished Professors” for five-year terms ending in 2006-07. Of these five faculty, two are women. Humanities faculty engage in wide ranging research. Many faculty work in areas such as race and ethnicity, gender studies, foreign language, world history, ethics, popular culture, and contemporary issues. Across the humanities departments, these are among the most commonly shared themes in both curricula and research.

More specifically, the Humanities Division promotes diversity through its wide-ranging curricula. Nearly every humanities department offers courses with emphases on diverse cultures, spanning the entire globe. These curricula have, in turn, attracted a diverse body of students in programs such as American Studies, Language Studies, History of Consciousness (at the graduate level), and Feminist Studies.
XI. Summary of Resource Needs and FTE Allocation Principles

Given the preceding discussion of divisional strengths and challenges, certain principles should obtain in deciding the allocation of the very few new FTE the Division can expect to receive. The same principles should apply to the reallocation of FTE lost to retirement or separation.

1) fit to plan
2) divisional importance (interdisciplinary impact)
3) specific ways the position will improve program quality
4) curricular/enrollment need
5) department performance measures (detailed below)

If we simply add up the resources in FTE required to realize the divisional strengths detailed in Section III of this document, we arrive at an initial figure of 15-25 FTE (a number surprisingly close to the number proposed by CPB in their Comments on the Ten-Year Academic Plans, i.e. an increase of “at least 12” FTE over the original EVC recommendation of 6 FTEs to be allocated to Humanities under the campus plan, or a total of “at least” 18 new FTE). Based on the data in Section III, the numbers might break down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Maximal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Ethnicity</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS (Philosophy?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimal, Middle and Maximal Distribution appear as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Maximal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Ethnicity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS (Philosophy?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The minimal projection is aimed only at preserving existing strengths without providing the resources needed either to establish excellence in those fields or to support new ventures (i.e. religion/ south Asian studies). Linguistics will be minimally protected without seizing the potential it has to be the best in the nation. History and Literature get some help but not enough to garner true excellence. FMST gets the minimal position it needs to launch its graduate program but no more. Languages get the infusion they and the division desperately need to stabilize them. Only 3 out of 9 proposed synergistic positions are available to pull the division together in the interdisciplinary ways envisioned in this document and realize the intellectual strengths of the division.

The maximal projection truly allows us to realize the principal strengths of the division in ways that will advance their research agenda, earn a genuine reputation for excellence and be in a position to garner greater outside funds (through grants and development).

Finally, such projections of FTE allocations are to be understood as provisional and contingent upon department performance in terms of their optimal and creative use/deployment of existing resources, effective curricular planning and delivery, research excellence and commitment to outreach and development. The timed delivery of these FTE is also to be determined by annual performance evaluations of the departments. FTE are a precious resource to be earned, not an entitlement, and so this planning document concludes with a discussion of possible new metrics and evaluative categories to be used in the assessment of program readiness to make maximum use of allocated resources. It is to be hoped that such a transparent program of annual department evaluations will help empower departments to find their own ways and means to greater resources, productivity and recognition.
XII. Department Performance Measures

A way of calling attention to institutional needs and differentially rewarding units that are responsive is through the use of an annual department evaluation. Departments can be evaluated in three broad areas: (1) the extent to which they provide a quality learning environment, (2) the extent to which they are maintaining or enhancing their academic quality and reputation, (3) the extent to which they are responsive to institutional needs (that are not captured in terms of 1 and 2). The use of an annual evaluation provides a useful way of reminding departments (and faculty) of all the ways that faculty members can support the university, and is especially effective at informing everyone that many of the things that are important to the institution are given little attention nationally by the academic disciplines and their professional organizations. Under such an arrangement, departments that are most valuable to the institution can be rewarded, and the many kinds of faculty work that make a department valuable to an institution can be recognized. Some key categories relevant to departments in the division include program excellence, cooperation w/ other units and best use of synergistic relations; curriculum and enrollment management; involvement in summer sessions, and extension; judicious use of leaves/ TAS requests, entrepreneurial spirit, grantsmanship, outreach/s social impact, and a general ability to find creative ways to manage their own affairs.

I feel such a system of annual evaluation could be very useful if properly developed and implemented. It has the potential to benefit all parties and be a constructive catalyst to improve the institution. It has the added benefit of getting Humanities back in the game, as it were. When UCSC uses the simple metrics such as total contracts and grants or student credit hours, PBSci and SocSci look like they are the ones pulling the wagon. But if one includes the catalog of faculty generated "products" included in integrated departmental evaluation forms, pulling the wagon becomes a more complex idea and academic units can be properly recognized for the many other things they do. Obviously, the details of what constitutes a proper set of performance measures for UCSC remains to be developed and this will be a charge to the Humanities Council of Chairs in the coming academic year. (A fuller discussion of this general issue of department evaluations is included as Appendix I).
XIII. Next Steps

Under this plan, some departments can expect a moderate influx of FTE directly. Others will have to compete for FTE made available for synergistic competition, and others may have to find more creative ways to achieve their FTE objectives with non-state funds (development). Most likely, every department will have to engage in all three ways at one point or another to advance its long-term goals and objectives. Even more importantly, individual department objectives as well as general divisional ones will require departments working with each other as well as with units in other divisions. As such, the kind of long-range and strategic planning envisioned in this document is very much wedded to a communitarian ideal.

Near the beginning of this document, we mentioned the historic role of education in this country in the support of community well-being. The converse is equally true, namely that the advancement of the educational enterprise itself is dependent upon solid principles of community, such as those outlined in the UC Declaration of Community: “The fundamental purpose of the University community is the preservation and advancement of learning and the pursuit of truth in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual respect. A university is a community in which the intellectual freedoms of teaching, learning and research are guaranteed absolutely. While such a community comprises many visions of knowledge and enlightenment, its central mission is characterized by a common intellectual quest” (p. 7). Academic development, such as proposed in this planning document, presupposes both agreement on a process for moving forward and an allowance, even a strenuous encouragement, of reasoned difference of opinion in intellectual matters. We all share the same intellectual project of supporting and encouraging the persistent engagement with ideas that defines humanistic inquiry at its best while differing profoundly, even passionately, on the content of those ideas.

By strengthening the pillar departments of the Humanities division in accordance with the recognized intellectual strengths of the faculty, we wish not only to maintain and build upon their high quality but also see that strength as the key to a renewed vigor and creativity in the ever-shifting terrain that is the ideal of interdisciplinarity.
Appendix I

Departmental Measures

It is imperative that we as a division – as departments – submit to greater accountability and take greater responsibility for the management of our affairs. The reasons for this are threefold:

1. We must acknowledge that the University of California is under increasing pressure, from government, from students and their parents, from alumni, from regulatory agencies, and from donors to be more accountable in what we do and greater accountability in the expenditure of the money we receive.

2. Following from this, we must exercise greater responsibility over our affairs by making the best and most efficient use of the resources available to us – by becoming better managers and stewards of the public trust.

3. Finally, we must actively seek to change the conversation of accountability from the prevalent but narrow focus on money – as measured by student credit hours, contract and grant activity, and philanthropy – to a more comprehensive notion of our responsibilities and accomplishments.

To these ends, I am proposing to establish a system of department performance management that is built on the idea that what we produce is more important than what we do coupled with the notion that what we produce is more multifaceted than the existing standard measures – an integrated model of faculty responsibilities. Departments will be evaluated in three broad areas: (1) the extent to which they provide a quality learning environment, (2) the extent to which they are maintaining, if not enhancing, their academic quality and reputation, (3) the extent to which they are responsive to institutional needs (that are not captured in terms of 1 and 2).

The use of an annual evaluation will provide a useful way of reminding departments (and faculty) of all the ways that faculty members can support the university, and is especially effective at informing everyone that many of the things that are important to the institution are given little attention nationally by the academic disciplines and their professional organizations.

The items featured in this evaluation will be the product of the faculty. They will represent the things being in one or more academic departments – a compilation of the best practices contained in annual department reports. The use of an integrated model for faculty responsibilities coupled with an annual department evaluation represents a more robust conceptualization of faculty work – one that provides critics of higher education with a better and more complete description of what university life is like and how it is different from other forms of education. At the same time, it represents an important tool to foster thinking in a constructive way about how the faculty resources can be used most effectively.
Appendix II
Summary of Departmental Plans

Below are synopsis of plans submitted by the Division’s academic departments and research units. The plans contain detailed reports of the present condition of each and their aspirations for the future. The individual plans can stand on their own merits and there is no need to offer a critique in detail. The departments, programs and research units have represented themselves well and have laid out the issues of importance to their maintenance and development. Nevertheless, summaries of the major issues and challenges including descriptions of the ways in which the departments contribute to campus planning priorities are included. The full department plans can be read in full at the following url:

http://humwww.ucsc.edu/deansoffice/ten_year_plans/TOC.html
or
http://humanities.ucsc.edu/administration/deans_office/AcademicPlans/

THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS AND PROGRAMS

American Studies

• The Department requests three (3) FTE during the planning period:

  1 Diaspora/Asian American/Pacific Rim (offer made; awaiting candidate assent)
  1 U.S. Political Cultures (search underway 07-08)
  1 Queer Studies/Gender/Sexuality

• The American Studies Department is increasingly attentive to multi-cultural, comparative, and relational approaches to the culture of the United States and its place in the world. At UCSC, this department has taken primary responsibility for interdisciplinary ethnic studies curriculum.

• In terms of faculty diversity, American Studies is one of the most diverse departments in the Humanities Division and on campus. Because of a retirement, the department presently has underutilization of Asian Americans and Women. Assuming the success of the appointment that is currently made, this underutilization should be eliminated.

• All American Studies courses address social justice in some way: queer studies, African American Studies; Latino(a) Studies, Native American Studies, or Comparative and Relational Social Identities.
• American Studies undergraduate students are a highly diverse subset of UCSC students (more than 60% are women and nearly 50% are members of underrepresented minority groups).

• American Studies aspires to open a Comparative United States Studies graduate program, developed on a graduate program “group” model. In order to do so, it needs a stable faculty who can provide on-going mentorship and curriculum.

• The Department is in need of a senior leadership position (the current Chair is from outside the department).

• The Department has natural connections with Feminist Studies, History, Literature, History of Consciousness, Anthropology, Sociology, Politics, Community Studies, LALS, and Education.

• Investments in American Studies will provide UCSC students alternative ways to view American history and its institutions. They will promote the building of ethnic studies programming at UCSC. They will contribute to the diversity of the campus. They will add to the growth of graduate programs and graduate students on the campus.

Feminist Studies

• The Department requests three (3) FTE during the planning period:

  1 Science/Technology/Medicine
  1 Policy Studies
  1 Political Economy/Political theory

• Feminist Studies has a good balance of tenured/untenured faculty and a healthy age profile

• The recent appointment of a senior leadership position promised to stabilize the program, but that person has now requested transfer to another department.

• The Feminist Studies department is one of the oldest and largest departments focused on gender and sexuality studies in the United States.

• The Feminist Studies department aspires to create a graduate program and is ready to launch this through the use of a graduate “group” concept.

• The Feminist Studies faculty is 100% women. The department faculty is short of full representation due to underutilization of Native Americans.
• Recent hires have expanded the range of specializations to include Feminist Science Studies and Latin American and Latino Studies, including feminist aspects of cyber studies.

• One (1) FTE from a resignation is being held centrally in the division and has been re-deployed to other areas of need in the Division.

• Areas of concentration in the undergraduate major are Representations; Race, Class, and Ethnicity (within the United States); Nations and Cultures (outside the United States or comparative with the United States); Movements, Institutions, Policy, and Legal Studies; and Feminist theory.

• The Department has natural connections with American Studies, History, Literature, History of Consciousness, Anthropology, Sociology, Politics, Community Studies, Psychology, LALS, Education and, now, with the Physical and Biological Sciences.

• Investment in the Feminist Studies Department will add to the diversity of the campus (people) and curriculum (emphases/areas of study) and will enhance the reputation of the campus in the growing interest areas of feminist research and ethnic studies. They will add to the growth of graduate programs and graduate students on the campus.

History

• The Department requests eight (8) FTE during the planning period:

  1 Early Modern Atlantic World/North America (search underway 07-08)
  1 Sikh, Punjabi and South Asian studies (search underway 07-08)
  1 United States, twentieth century, transnational
  1 Ancient Rome/Late Antiquity
  1 European Women’s/Gender History
  1 Islamic world
  1 West Africa, 1400-1850
  1 Colonialism and Imperialism

• To be competitive and to provide students with a solid preparatory background, the History department must be able satisfactorily to cover time (decades/centuries), place (region/nation), cultural emphases, gender theory, critical race theory, and newer views, such as transnational, and global.

• Presently, the department faculty are mainly tenured and over the age of 50. Recruitments in the department have been slow but steady, with recent hires connected to a senior retention and the consequent building of Asian history. At least three (3) FTE resulting from resignations/retirements have been held centrally at the Division and re-deployed to other areas of need in the Division.
• The department has connections inside the Division with American Studies, Feminist Studies, Literature, and Philosophy, and outside the Division with Art History, Film and Digital Media, Sociology, Anthropology, LALS, Politics, and potentially with the Physical and Biological Sciences.

• The department has underrepresentation of women and Native Americans among the faculty yet it has a good record of outreach recruitment. Therefore, FTE allocations to this department hold great promise for further diversification of the faculty.

• The department curriculum is highly diverse, with course offerings in African American, Chicano(a)/Latino(a); Caribbean, Asian, Islamic, African, and World History.

• Investments in the History department will directly contribute to the diversity of campus’s undergraduate and graduate curricula. Investment in this department is essential to allow UC Santa Cruz to be competitive among research universities and to assure that UCSC graduates have appropriate background in the history of the United States and its institutions, and knowledge of other places and time periods in the history of our world.

**History of Consciousness**

• The Department requests FTE allocations in advance of planned retirements. In order to accomplish this, the Division would need to set aside one (1) FTE for recruitments one year in advance of each faculty retirement, assuming an even retirement trajectory (e.g., not more than one retirement in a given year)

• History of Consciousness is among the most successful graduate programs in the University of California system in terms of selectivity, time to degree, and placement of graduates

• The History of Consciousness faculty are all tenured and most are over the age of 50. Retirements of senior faculty in the program and faculty renewal/replacement are a primary concern for this academic planning period.

• History of Consciousness faculty composition generally reflects the diversity of Ph.D.s in the country, with the exception of Native American and Chicano/Latinos.

• History of Consciousness faculty have sponsored a number of UC Presidents’ Postdoctoral Fellows.

• Graduate study topics in History of Consciousness include: Cultural Studies; Women of Color; Feminist theories and Practices; Cultural and Historical Studies
of Race and Ethnicity; Studies in History, Religion, and Myth; Racism and Imperialism, reflecting the interests of the senate faculty housed in the program.

- History of Consciousness graduate students are very diverse with the number of applications from students of color and women remaining high. Graduation rates of students of color and women are impressive.

- The Department has current, and can strengthen connections with American Studies, Feminist Studies, Philosophy, Literature, Anthropology, Sociology, Film and Digital Media, History of Art and Visual Culture.

- Investment in this unique interdisciplinary graduate program will maintain its reputation as a premier graduate program in the UC system and will allow the placement of interdisciplinary PhDs in academic departments across the country.

**Linguistics**

- The Department requests two (2) FTE during the academic planning period:
  
  1. Experimental linguistics (search underway 07-08)
  2. Computational linguistics (search underway 07-08)

- The current faculty profile is unbalanced: all ten ladder rank faculty are full professors and most are over 50 years of age.

- The field of Linguistics is moving to a closer integration of theoretical and experimental work broadly construed – including language processing, speech perception, psycholinguistics, and computational linguistics.

- There is a strong desire to maintain the department’s NRC ranking as one of the top ten linguistics graduate programs in the United States both in scholarly quality and in effectiveness of teaching Ph.D. candidates.

- The department contributes substantially to the administration of the campus (Ladusaw/Chung), especially for its size. This contribution weakens the department’s ability to achieve its academic goals.

- The department has not had opportunities (new FTE lines) to be able to realize its years of efforts to increase diversity of the faculty. Linguistics has used affirmative action diversity funding to bring promising junior scholars in syntax, semantics, and phonetics, with substantial language interests in South Asian languages, Romance languages and American Sign Language for multi-day visits to campus. There is presently underutilization of women, Native Americans, African Americans, and Chicano(a)/Latino(a)s.
• The department has connections with Philosophy, Psychology, Computer Science, Education, Languages, Literature, Engineering, UARC

• Investment in this program will maintain a “jewel” among the UCSC undergraduate and graduate departments and will allow for UCSC graduates to be prepared to de-code language as it is used in various ways in society and to enter emerging fields such as natural language processing and computational linguistics.

**Literature**

• The Department requests eight (8) FTE during the academic planning period:

  1. Creative Writing: Poetry
  1. Pacific Rim Literary and Cultural Studies
  1. Modern German Literature and Culture
  1. Asia-Pacific-American Literary and Cultural Studies
  1. Shakespeare/Early Modern Literature
  1. Anglophone and Comparative Modernisms/Avant-Gardes
  1. Ancient Mediterranean Literary and Cultural Studies
  1. East Asian Literary and Cultural Studies

• The department proposes development of faculty positions in order to meet the challenges of an evolving field of study and to meet the departmental mission to integrate traditional forms of literary study – such as attention to linguistics, formal and generic aspects, styles, national and regional traditions, and periods and movements – with the new developments in the field (particularly expansion to comparative, transnational, and global studies, and development of new research and pedagogical tools made possible by electronic technologies)

• Presently the department faculty are mainly tenured and over the age of 50. Recruitments in the department have been slow but steady. A half dozen FTE resulting from resignations/retirements have been held centrally and re-deployed on a temporary basis to other areas of need in the Division or for temporary uses in the Literature department.

• The department has connections with American Studies, Feminist Studies, History, Linguistics, History of Consciousness, LALS, the Language and Writing Programs, Film and Digital Media, and Theater Arts.

• Literature is a diverse department in terms of faculty make-up. Underutilization areas are women and Native Americans. The department has an excellent record of outreach recruiting and a strong record of attentiveness to diversity concerns.
• The Literature curriculum is diverse, with course offerings in various national literatures and with courses that focus on postcolonial, non-western, race, gender, and class interpretation of literature.

• The Literature department contributes heavily to the administration of the campus, particularly in the Colleges (co-Provosts of Cowell and Kresge Colleges).

• Investments in this unique configuration of disciplines and literary studies in a consolidated “comparative” department, will assure that UC Santa Cruz students have the opportunity to study important literary works and theories that are influencing the present culture. Investments of FTE in this department will aid the campus and division in meeting its affirmative action and diversity goals.

Philosophy

• The Department requests four (4) FTE during the academic planning period:

  1  Philosophy of Science (Senior)
  1  Social/Political Philosophy
  1  Asian Philosophy (CCI)
  1  History of Philosophy

• The department has made a number of recent non-tenured hires and is well-balanced in terms of rank, with five Assistant Professors, one Associate Professor, and four Full Professors, including one new senior professor who chairs the department. This stable of ten ladder rank faculty is presently handling a robust undergraduate program as well as a fledgling graduate program. The graduate program proposal was predicated upon a faculty of twelve (12) FTE, and it is important that the department reach at least this level to attain its goals and to stabilize the graduate component.

• The faculty composition falls short of reflecting the diversity of Ph.Ds in the country in the areas of women, African-Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans. But the department has made inroads on this issue through the augmentation of its By-Law 55 faculty (with an Asian woman) and through the hiring of temporary academic staff. Although availability of women in philosophy is lower than in most fields, allocation of additional FTE to this department, combined with good outreach practices, will allow the opportunity for increased diversity.

• Philosophy department faculty have connections with other campus units such as biology (bio-ethics), Business/economics (ethics), history (classics and history of philosophy), Feminist Studies, Politics, environmental Studies, Linguistics, Legal Studies, and Engineering.
• Investment in this department will provide opportunities for UC Santa Cruz students to develop critical thinking, writing, and analytical skills that will serve them well in today’s workforce.

The Language Program

• The Language Program is currently searching for three ladder faculty to fill vacated LSOE positions and to provide leadership in re-modeling the program with a view to enhancing its research and teaching profile. The candidates will also be expected to train and supervise graduate student apprentices. Continuous funding is assured for the current array of language offerings through the recently signed MOA between Humanities Division and the CP/EVC. Additional funding will be needed to develop new language offerings; otherwise, new languages will only be able to be added if current languages are reduced and/or if external funding is found.

• The Language Program presently serves the campus by offering courses of study in:

  Arabic
  Chinese
  French
  German
  Greek
  Hebrew
  Hindi
  Italian
  Japanese
  Latin
  Portuguese
  Russian
  Spanish
  Spanish for Spanish Speakers

• Courses are offered primarily by professional-level staff (SOE and Unit 18 Lecturers) and a few qualified graduate students (typically selected from Literature, Linguistics, or History of Consciousness graduate programs). The quality and level of UCSC language instruction is high and the summer is utilized for Spanish, French and Arabic instruction.

• As would be expected, the Language Program faculty make-up (senate and non-senate) is diverse, though African-Americans and Native Americans are underrepresented among the senate faculty. In 2004-05, the full time lecturers consisted of eleven (11) women and eight (8) men and the part-time lecturers were made up of ten (10) women and four (4) men. There were four (4) Asian women, six (6) Latina women and three (3) Latino men among the non-senate
faculty. Three open FTE (currently being searched) have the potential for adding diversity to this unit.

• The Language Program has the potential for connections with every academic department on campus. It offers one means of assisting in the retention of Spanish-speaking students at UC Santa Cruz through the Spanish for Spanish Speakers program. It serves students with an interest in language study and students who want to study abroad. Current active contributions to majors are with: Language Studies (Linguistics), Global Economics, Health Sciences, Music, East Asian Studies, Latino(a) and Latin-American Studies, World Literatures, Art History, Philosophy, and Education.

• Investments in this program will allow for the preservation of the current range of language offerings and preparation of UC Santa Cruz students to enter an increasingly global, multi-national work force and a growing non-English speaking California population.

The Writing Program

• The Writing Program requests the return of any retirement FTE (Security of Employment Lecturers) that turn over during the planning period. Their plans also include expansions that would require an additional FTE for programmatic growth.

• Presently, for the reasons outlined in its planning document, the Writing Program is primarily a first-year Writing Program offering:
  
  o 24 Entry-Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) courses in fall (through the College Core course system) and during second, third, and fourth quarters of enrollment to help most students clear the UC ELWR requirement so that they are not barred from further enrollment at the University
  o Provides the majority of C2 curriculum through Writing 2 courses (Campus General Education Requirement)
  o Offers three upper-division special service courses

• Courses are taught primarily by professional-level staff (SOE and Unit 18 lecturers) with some graduate student instructors coming primarily from Literature, History of Consciousness, Linguistics, Environmental Studies, Sociology, and Digital Arts and Media.

• In 2004-05, the Writing Program faculty was made up of 19 Unit 18 lecturers and 4 Lecturers with Security of Employment. Of the Unit 18 lecturers, eight were men and eleven were women. Among the Senate faculty three are women and one is a man. African-Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, and Chicano/Latinos are underrepresented in the make-up of the senate faculty.
• The Writing curriculum provides special sections that meet the needs of various groups, especially multi-lingual students.

• A tutorial program is combined with the EOP Program so that all tutors receive training in how cultural questions affect students’ relation to reading and writing.

• The Writing Program has potential for connections with every department/program on campus that wishes to provide writing instruction to its majors at the upper-division, in the discipline. Presently, these connections are largely personal, based on established relationships between departments and individual writing instructors (Environmental Studies, Anthropology, Education).

• Investment in this Program will help meet campus goals of retaining ethnic minority students, especially second language learners, and of improving the writing skills of UC Santa Cruz graduates in all fields.

THE RESEARCH UNITS

Institute for Humanities Research

The IHR was established to enhance the environment for humanities research on the UCSC campus through scholarly conferences, guest speakers, colloquia, research units, faculty fellowships, small grants for faculty, and graduate student support.

The Institute has sustained serious cuts to its base budget since 2001-02. In order to continue to support Humanities faculty research and to continue to work of the Institute, one (1) FTE is required to be set aside in the Humanities Division.

Center for Cultural Studies

The Center for Cultural Studies builds on UC Santa Cruz’s strong history of innovative, interdisciplinary, and cross-Divisional Studies. The Center organizes and supports clusters of faculty and graduate student working on cutting edge research in humanities and social science. It organized conferences, lectures, film series, scholarly visits, workshops, and discussion groups, and has always been active in fostering and supporting events and activities addressing diversity issues.

Institute for Advanced Feminist Research

The Institute for Advanced Feminist Studies sponsors projects that are historical, international and interdisciplinary in their conception and collaborative and activist in their practices. The goal of the IAFR is to facilitate sustained conversations among individuals who do not ordinarily have the opportunity to brainstorm and act in concert:
scholars, activists, artists, journalists, and public intellectuals, people of different generations and people from diverse social and geographical backgrounds.

The Institute for Advanced Feminist Research will enjoy its last year of divisional funding in 2007-08. In the absence of some unexpected windfall, the current director’s primary job will be to locate external funding to keep the Institute in operation.

**Dickens–Multi-Campus Research Unit**

The Dickens Project is the only Humanities Division Multi-Campus Research Unit, receiving funding from the Office of the President for its programming.

The Literature Department academic plan notes the importance of being able to replace the current Project Director, preferably somewhat ahead of his retirement.