Report of the Humanities Task Force, December 2009

Introduction and Summary of Recommendations

Our Task Force was appointed by EVC Scott Waugh and Senate Chair Michael Goldstein on August 28, 2009, and we met ten times during Fall quarter to develop and articulate the plan detailed in this report (see Appendix A for Charge Letter). We saw our charge as having three main components, which we have tried to address holistically:

1. Reconsider the administrative configuration of the Humanities at UCLA in line with changing configurations in the world and within the academy.
2. Help alleviate the strain on some elements of the Humanities due to current and projected budget cuts by finding ways to address specific aspects of our current situation that do not function optimally.
3. Develop new programs and institutional structures "that will catapult the Humanities to the forefront of its various disciplines" (Charge Letter).

Of these, the second is clearly the most pressing, but it was not the overriding concern of our group. Instead, we have tried to take a longer view of things, considering not only how the Humanities might be optimally situated at UCLA to survive the current fiscal crisis, but also how it might be transformed according to developments in the Humanities over the past decades, as an orientation and set of disciplines, and how we imagine it might usefully develop over the next decades.

Considering budgetary issues separately, there are three areas of particular concern. Language instruction is labor-intensive and tends at UCLA to employ non-ladder instructors unprotected by tenure. Because of this, we expect there to be substantial pressure to ease the language requirement, which would not only blatantly contradict all three of the "chief campus priorities of excellence, diversity, and community engagement" (which our charge letter reasonably reminds us to "bear in mind"), but would also in our opinion be disastrous on multiple levels.[1] Similarly, UCLA's Writing Programs, like language instruction, relies heavily on lecturers; our concern for the language requirement is matched by a concern to protect Writing II, a successful and highly regarded program that already embodies precisely the kind of innovative approach our group was charged to conceive. We are relieved that plans are underway to fund this program separately and adequately, and so, beyond applauding those plans, we have set this issue aside. A third concern, addressed in our final section, is the uneven faculty workload across the Humanities Division.

Because of our wish to consider the longer view, we begin our report with a concise exposition of the Humanities and the budget. We then proceed to consider each of our principal organizational recommendations in its own section, beginning with language instruction; in each of these sections we consider also how new configurations might address budgetary concerns. Our final section addresses particular issues that are best addressed within the context of our larger recommendations.

The following summary of our recommendations follows the structure of our report. While we have found it useful to present our report according to a set of broad administrative reorganizations, they cannot be easily separated from each other, for each depends on the others in crucial ways. Together, these recommendations are both grounded in the current realities at UCLA and responsive to the ways that the Humanities has been rethought and reorganized at other institutions.

The Humanities Task Force recommends:

1. **That we maintain—and, where possible, strengthen—the language requirement.**
2. **The creation of a year-round UCLA Language Center.** As part of this recommendation, we further recommend:
    - **a.** The implementation of Online Language Instruction, overseen by the Language Center. In line with caution expressed by some members of the taskforce, we recommend that a pilot course be developed first in order to assess the pedagogical and economic viability of online language instruction.
    - **b.** That the degree of interaction between on-campus residences and undergraduate education be increased to enhance language instruction.
    - **c.** That a partnership be forged with the Center for World Languages for the development of the Language Center.
3. **The consolidation of several existing programs and departments into the Department of European Languages and Cultures.** This new department would absorb the present departments of French and Francophone Studies, Germanic Languages, Italian, Slavic Languages and Cultures, and Spanish and Portuguese, along with the Scandinavian Section and, possibly, the European Studies IDP.
4. **That the administration consider creating a new Department of Linguistics**, incorporating the Departments of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, and including, as appropriate, theoretical linguists from the language departments.
5. **The creation of a world-class Humanities Institute** where the most innovative and transformative scholarship in emerging fields within the Humanities forms collaborative knowledge networks with existing departments and centers as well as other scholarly fields and divisions, such as Social Sciences, Information Sciences, and Arts and Architecture. As part of this recommendation, we further recommend:
    - **a.** The appointment of a Director of the UCLA Humanities Institute, to work closely with an Advisory Board, composed of faculty from all areas of campus, the library, and individuals outside the University.
    - **b.** A standardization of compensation packages for Center Directors and greater integration of staff resources under the aegis of the Humanities Institute.
    - **c.** That the Humanities Institute provide support for grant applications (both individual and institutional), and that the Humanities Division administers grants so that a portion of the indirect costs returns to the Division and directly funds infrastructure for the Institute.
    - **d.** That the Humanities Institute be explicitly declared as a fund-raising target in future UCLA capital campaigns.
    - **e.** The stepwise creation of a general Bachelor's degree in the Humanities, with specialized tracks and minors, to be housed in the Humanities Institute. The major should be built incrementally, beginning with interdisciplinary "cluster" courses and thematic GE classes offered by the Institute, laying the foundation for a minor and eventually a major. These courses could also serve the department-based curricula in the Humanities, as part of their pre-majors.
    - **f.** The creation of an interdivisional major and minor in "Digital Humanities" or "Digital Studies."
    - **g.** The creation of new graduate certificate programs as add-ons for any Masters or PhD program in areas such as "Digital Scholarship" or "Secondary Education."
6. **The consolidation of the Center for Digital Humanities and the Center for Social Sciences Computing, under the aegis of the IDRE-HASIS consortium.**

7. **The institution of a minimum enrollment policy throughout the College and University, including the Humanities.**
8. **That departments institute workload policies that calibrate overall course load to a faculty member's aggregate teaching activities.**

The Humanities and the Budget

The Humanities constitutes the core of the liberal arts. The *artes liberales*—which might be translated as "the arts of the free"—are sometimes cast as a costly luxury for those fortunate enough to evade honest toil. This criticism assumes that the relevant freedom is *economic*. But the fundamental concern of the liberal arts is *intellectual* freedom (which, we may note, regularly leads to and protects political and economic freedom). These are the arts that liberate us from blind or ignorant acceptance of the assumptions, values, and institutions into which we are born, enabling us both to understand sympathetically and to distance ourselves critically from what we find, thus enabling us to make up our own minds about their accuracy or worth.

Research in these arts seeks to examine, understand, and critique existing ways of structuring, theorizing, expressing and interpreting the human experience. At its best, it also creatively imagines new ways of structuring, theorizing, expressing, and interpreting our lives in our evolving world. If we look at those who constitute our canons—from Socrates to Sartre, Milton to Marx, Buddha to Jefferson, Hildegard to Luther, Nietzsche to Arendt, Dickens to Dylan, Woolf to Morrison, Michelangelo to Langston Hughes—we see how deeply, and how much, thought changes the world. When Mikhail Gorbachev was asked about his decision to disassemble the brutal Soviet regime—arguably the most important world event of our lifetimes—he cited his readings in Western novels and philosophers, not the power of our military or our economy. We still face a world stage on which regimes and worldviews that censor and repress free thought seek to dominate. There is a reason for censorship and repression: ideas matter. The various disciplines in the Humanities, each in its own way, take these ideas as their subject matter. They seek to understand, to criticize, to celebrate or eviscerate, and to further develop the various ways we have of understanding ourselves, our societies, our cultures, and our lives—in short, of understanding humanity.

We in the Humanities at UCLA understand ourselves, as educators, to be involved in *higher* education. Our aim is to educate students so that they can both understand and rise above the ambient culture and its assumptions and make up their own minds about what to embrace, what to reject, and what to improve. Such education requires not just familiarity with or exposure to culture—indeed, students arrive with more exposure to our popular culture than many of us can hope to sustain—but also the ability to critique, assess, interpret, and compare. And this requires not just knowledge, but also training. It requires a student to learn to think in new and perhaps uncomfortable ways—ways that require discipline and practice. As a result, a higher education in the liberal arts is a highly labor-intensive activity. It requires one mind engaging with another: modeling, listening, correcting, suggesting, prodding, denying, affirming, and evaluating thoughts and their expression. It is personal training for the mind. When it goes well, the student is forever freed from the confines of thought into which he or she was born, ready to tolerate uncertainty and ambiguity, difference and foreignness, ready to take on new ideas and think them through fairly and judiciously, to make thoughtful and intelligent contributions to civil discussion on contentious topics, and to use their intelligence, knowledge, and creativity to rethink and transform the world they find, for the better. When it goes well, this education creates idealists who are not extremists.

A liberal arts education, then, takes its place alongside the military, a free press, and constitutional law, in securing a free society. If it is a luxury, it is a luxury as modern medicine is a luxury: a large-scale institution that emerged only as the result of centuries of development, whose goal is the preservation and enhancement of human life and human dignity.

Higher education, with its aim of improving the human mind, culture, and communication, will inevitably produce graduates who are well prepared for a changing, flexible, global marketplace. Our goal is not only to prepare students to enter the marketplace and take their station as productive employees. Rather, our goal is also to produce educated human beings capable of understanding and *shaping* both the marketplace and society at large—intelligently, creatively, insightfully, knowledgeably, and independently, as they see fit.

Our Task Force has been asked "to develop recommendations for supporting and enhancing the Humanities" in this time of budgetary crisis. While we are well aware of certain problems in our Division—problems we address here—we also note that the crisis is in the *budget*, not in the Humanities. It may be that the *most* important thing we can do, to produce a thriving Humanities Division in the years ahead, is to undermine the pervasive myth that our work constitutes a financial drain on the university—that we are an antiquated parasite charitably tolerated by an otherwise self-sufficient body.

The spreadsheet in Appendix B, which is based on the latest available UCLA student credit hour figures (2008-09) and on the fee levels and total general fund expenditures for 2009-10, shows the Humanities generating over $59 million in student fee revenue, while spending only $53.5 million (unlike the Physical Sciences, which come up several million dollars short in this category).[2] Writing Programs alone generates $4.3 million dollars in fee revenue at a cost of only $2.4 million. These profits will increase as student fees increase; they would be even greater if we figured in a share of the over-enrollment subsidies due from the state. In pursuing our vital, non-profit mission of advancing knowledge and teaching, the Humanities is not only a bargain, but also a profit-generating entity. Massive cuts in the Humanities instructional budget are not only destructive to the core mission of the University; they are also financially unjustifiable.

In what follows, we make recommendations for supporting and enhancing the Humanities. We realize that our recommendations do not fully address the currently projected, massive, short-term deficit. Indeed, much of the administrative reorganization that we recommend will entail start-up costs rather than immediate savings (although the latter should follow, and soon). Yet, considering that the long-term costs of implementing deep, short-term cuts could deal an incalculable blow to the Humanities at UCLA, we urge the administration to provide sufficient support to weather the short-term storm, so that the suggestions that follow will be given adequate time to both improve our mission and (further) streamline our Division for the 21st century.

The Creation of a UCLA Language Center, Enhanced by Online Learning

The taskforce strongly recommends that we maintain—and, where possible, strengthen—the language requirement.[3] A single year of language training is already a travesty and many students emerging from high school language classes cannot pass a college-level language exam. Our language classes and GE courses offered in language and literature departments attempt to ensure that our students possess very basic, fundamental skills that will enable them to access and engage the world at large. While one year of language acquisition provides limited ability to communicate with others (let alone immersion into a culture), it nonetheless provides a necessary opportunity to develop cognitive skills, to make cultural and linguistic associations, and to begin

the process of engaging with communities, as the Chancellor's Academic Plan mandates. In fact, community engagement will not be possible without robust language instruction.

The teaching of languages at UCLA, currently spread across a multitude of departments, could benefit from a regrouping and/or amalgamation; with this in mind, **we recommend the creation of a year-round UCLA Language Center**. Active use of the Summer Sessions would produce two immediate and direct benefits: (1) pressure would be lessened upon those language programs that are currently overburdened between September and June; (2) revenue could be generated during the summer to fund both lecturers and graduate students.[4]

We estimate that as much as 40-50% of language teaching could be moved to the summer, and even more if we consider the undeveloped potential for an affiliated Online Language Program, based upon the profitable, technically established model in place for the last five years at UCLA's TFT. Enrollments and income will both grow. Non-UCLA students could be specifically targeted, not only from elsewhere within California, but also abroad. UCLA's great reputation would assure the popularity of our online courses, especially given the complete lack of competition today in the "high-end" realm of learner-centered, distance pedagogy.

While some members of the Task Force regard online learning with wariness, **we recommend the implementation of online language instruction, overseen by the Language Center.** To further this aim, we recommend that a pilot course be developed first in order to assess the pedagogical and economic viability of online language instruction. Online learning offers the potential to achieve several concrete goals: improvement in students' time-to-degree; a lessening of pressure in overcrowded classrooms; the generation of funds in order to save lecturers' positions; and the emergence of UCLA as the leader in *top-quality*, i.e., not cut-price, distance education. (See Appendix C for further justification and funding models for an online program.)

Because many students might prefer to avoid the added expense of summer study, a respectful hierarchy would need to be established among participants. If languages were indeed offered year-round, it would be only fair to give Majors and Pre-Majors in the relevant departments first choice during the school year. Language instruction that is traditionally oversubscribed, such as Chinese and Spanish, could require transfer or "external" students from other departments to satisfy their language requirements during the summer. (Some members of the Task Force objected to this piecemeal privatization of our instructional offerings.)

It would seem both logical and beneficial to shape the Language Center's operating philosophy along the lines of UCLA's current Center for World Languages (CWL), which already connects and coordinates language research, teaching, and evaluation programs. The CWL develops innovative methods of second-language education, advocates for their implementation, and facilitates their transfer both into formal classrooms and more informal settings. On top of these ongoing activities, CWL offers programs in partnership not only with other campus departments and schools, but also with public and private institutions throughout the USA and abroad. The three ways in which the CWL's philosophy could be the building blocks of a Language Center might be summarized as follows:

- Conduct research that increases understanding of language acquisition, teaching and assessment
- Design, manage and evaluate language programs for the first two years of undergraduate degree
- Build partnerships with academic institutions, government agencies, and private organizations, thus working towards greater levels of federal funding

With this alignment of interests and philosophy, **we recommend that a partnership be forged with the CWL for the development of the Language Center.**

UCLA's Title VI Centers would also benefit from this centralization of resources, given that they already (and consequentially) speak directly to the institution-wide support of language teaching. Gestures of support on a campus-wide scale are often key to the procurement of federal resources. We would, therefore, be bolstering our own future in the field of language-centered pedagogy by centralizing our resources in ways that show bold *institutional* support for the "less-taught languages" that distinguish elite universities.

The fundamental goal of the UCLA Language Center would therefore be to oversee the teaching of the first two years of undergraduate language learning at UCLA; a Director of Languages drawn from the Academic Senate faculty will supervise this process and guarantee appropriate faculty oversight. Each language will then, much as now, also have a Coordinator. Languages will thus be scheduled centrally in ways that will lessen the current competition for students and—just as importantly—allow for the teaching of all the languages that make us famous as a *world* university. The Language Center will increase efficiency, as it will streamline the management that is currently duplicated across many different departments, including labor relations with unions.

The expansion of brand new, richer summer offerings to students on campus, however, would admittedly require more effort and curricular development, growing almost *ab ovo*. Any modeling or reproduction of an intensive, residential summer program *à la* Middlebury, for example, would need to consider at least two obstacles before going ahead: (1) competition with existing residential programs around the US and; (2) the difficulties of keeping students on our gateless, urban campus 24/7 in order to maintain the "No English Spoken" policy of the most prestigious language schools. With this in mind, **we recommend that the degree of interaction between on-campus residences and undergraduate education be increased to enhance language instruction**. There are many ways in which language instruction and the other proposals in this document could be profitably developed in and around the residence halls. The residential communities on campus could be used as a superior environment both for team-taught, interdisciplinary courses and a wide range of sponsorship opportunities. Appendix D explains these ideas in greater detail.

The Consolidation of Departments

Conspicuous and effective regroupings are needed in order to address the fact that our current departments do not reflect the world inhabited by our undergraduates. Current configurations of departments of individual languages, or of languages and cultures, mirror post-World War II politics and the subsequent decades of Cold War isolationism, rather than the political, fiscal, and job-related forces of today's digitalized, endlessly collaborative networks or nations. Consolidating departments in order to reflect those global changes would also strengthen the constituency, claims, and demands of many smaller units in the Humanities. Given the freeze in FTE searches, smaller units *already* risk becoming obsolete as faculty leave and/or retire; they would, however, have greater security of identity in a larger group.

With this in mind, **we recommend the Consolidation of several existing programs and departments into the Department of European Languages and Cultures**, according to the following logic. The European Union has become a cultural, economic, political and social reality; its geo-strategic position as a privileged Atlantic partner with long and complex historical

ties to Central and Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and beyond are no longer accurately reflected in "national" departmental configurations given the obvious transformations which globalization has produced. Indeed, as both the *francophone* (Africa, Caribbean, Maghreb, Vietnam, Quebec, etc.) and Lusophone/ Hispanophone (Central and Latin America, the Caribbean, etc.) components of existing language departments indicate, many of the most popular and salient areas of intercultural inquiry are connected to European linguistic realities that are very much "global." Furthermore, those criteria that were applied in creating departments of Asian Languages and Cultures (ALC) and Near Eastern Languages and Cultures (NELC)—adapting and coordinating curricular offerings, fostering intellectual communities, etc.—also apply to the viability of a Department of European Languages and Cultures.

One might also consider recommending a single Department of Languages. However, in the end, it seems that a common identity pertaining to language instruction would best be achieved—in conjunction with cultural and historical contextualization—under the aegis of three larger departments in the division:

Asian Languages and Cultures
Near Eastern Languages and Cultures
European Languages and Cultures

A Department of European Languages and Cultures might incorporate the following existing departments:

French and Francophone Studies
Germanic Languages
Italian
Scandinavian Section
Slavic Languages and Cultures
Spanish and Portuguese

Comparative Literature might seem, to some, a natural fit within this newly formed department. However, we recommend that it remain an autonomous department. Its interdisciplinary, theoretical, and multilingual approaches to the study of literature and culture distinguish it from other literature departments. As a discipline premised on the idea that literary imagination transcends linguistic and geographical borders, Comparative Literature occupies a distinct and unique position in the Humanities as a clearinghouse of ideas not simply for other literary departments but across the Humanities and humanistic social sciences. Moreover, while some Comparative Literature departments in the country focus mainly on European literatures and cultures, the majority of faculty and students in the Department of Comparative Literature at UCLA work on non-European traditions.

Although the departments to be incorporated within this new department seemed clear to the Task Force, its naming gave us some difficulty. After all, the Department of Spanish and Portuguese covers Spain and Portugal *and* Central and Latin America and the Caribbean; Russian and Slavic includes a *Eurasian* element along with its Central/Eastern European element; and French also covers the *francophone* regions of the world. In the end, it seemed to us that "European" along with "Languages and Cultures" both best reflected this plurality and diversity, and best suited UCLA's institutional context.

Some of our colleagues will no doubt resist the consolidation we propose, arguing that departmental reputation will become harder to gauge unless each language group remains an

independent entity. They might also suggest that fund-raising initiatives are more difficult for a consolidated body. As we well know, however, fund-raising and development initiatives always pose a tremendous challenge in the Humanities, and one might very well argue that such initiatives could benefit from a rejuvenated model of linguistic and cultural study with strong connections to 21st-century realities. Others might argue that "smaller" language groups will find themselves marginalized. Given current budgetary restrictions, retirements will only further weaken or render obsolete "smaller" departments on campus who could thus achieve more significant representation through membership in a larger constituency. In fact, both in the United States and abroad, recent trends have included the successful creation of Schools of Languages, Divisions of Literatures, Cultures, and Languages, and Schools of Cultures, Languages and Area Studies. Many language departments in the United States are already grouped in various ways, as Departments of Modern Languages or Romance Studies. Such a model is fiscally responsible and can be justified through a multitude of philosophical and pedagogical criteria. Following that rationale and given that all UCLA language departments face common challenges, consolidation of the listed departments within a Department of European Languages and Cultures would provide several additional advantages:

- The coordinated training of graduate students in language acquisition pedagogy
- An improved articulation of graduate student recruitment (a successful model exists in the UCLA Department of History where different "areas" exist) and monitoring of job market prospects
- Curricular enhancements: the creation of graduate student requirements—in theory, methodology, etc.—that would improve enrollments in seminars currently duplicated across language units
- An ability for faculty to develop groundbreaking and innovative curricula based on scholarly interests: Mediterranean, Aesthetics, Avant-Garde practices, Postcolonial fields, Comparative Media Studies, etc.
- The opportunity for undergraduates to enroll in comparative courses (perhaps taught in "clusters") organized around literary movements, historical periods, critical approaches, etc.
- A possible incorporation of the European Studies IDP in the department
- Faculty personnel actions could be conducted (as they are in English, History, etc.) by sub-committees
- Future faculty hires could target scholars with broad interdisciplinary interests and conducted by faculty from multiple areas of specialization, thereby reinforcing departmental identity
- An improvement of coordination and/or articulation between departments and EAP, summer travel-study and a UCLA Summer Language Institute

In addition to this consolidation of departments, **we also recommend that the administration consider the creation of a new Department of Linguistics,** which would consolidate existing resources in linguistics, and which could collaborate in creative ways with the three new configuration of Languages and Cultures departments we are proposing, and with the proposed Language Center.

The new department would consolidate the Department of Linguistics, Department of Applied Linguistics, and colleagues in the language departments who currently work on either applied or theoretical linguistics. The new department would respect the genuine differences between linguists whose orientations are strictly applied or theoretical, and also create a more cohesive intellectual home for linguists whose work is invested in *both* theoretical and applied approaches,

or for linguists whose research cuts across languages and who could benefit from a closer association with colleagues working in a variety of departments whose main focus may not be linguistic. The new department would be an asset for undergraduate linguistic students who work on more than one language, and it would eliminate current redundancies whereby students can major in similar language and linguistic programs in several departments and programs. The new department would also address the needs expressed by some colleagues who lamented the elimination of the program in Romance Languages and Linguistics (RLL), which did provide possibilities for work across languages and linguistic approaches, and thereby broaden these possibilities beyond the restrictive framework of Romance languages. Given that ESL is already housed in the Department of Applied Linguistics, this new department would also work closely with the proposed Language Center.

The UCLA Humanities Institute

We propose to create a world-class Humanities Institute at UCLA, to help catapult the Humanities at UCLA into the 21st century. This Institute would work with and build upon the existing structure of departments, programs, and centers, and would both serve as a clearinghouse for interdisciplinary research and teaching, and address certain unmet needs of existing departments. The rationale for such an Institute includes following:

- We stand on an ever shrinking and quickly changing world stage. The Institute would put together short-term (three–five year) projects, to include research, teaching, and special events, that would address timely issues without committing to longer-term institutional structures.
- Dramatic changes in technology and in the availability of information have rendered the traditional divisions between fields far more permeable, increasing the possibility and fruitfulness of interdisciplinary research and teaching. The Institute would provide (in some cases, consolidate) the infrastructure for teaching and research between fields.
- Those same dramatic technological changes themselves must be the subject of examination, understanding, and critique by humanistic scholarship. The Institute could house such scholarship and develop an interdivisional major and minor.
- The Institute will provide an exciting fundraising opportunity for the Humanities Division, as we suggest seeking a donor whose name would be associated with it.
- Currently grants in the Humanities are administered through Social Sciences, at a cost to the Humanities Division. The Institute would provide guidance for grant applications, and work with the Humanities Division to return a portion of the indirect costs to the Division and to directly fund infrastructure for the Institute.
- The Institute would provide the administrative support for the organization of conferences, thus increasing efficiency in the Division.
- Currently we do not offer very general courses in the Humanities, with the exception of some lower-division courses in Comparative Literature. The Institute would expand the number and scope of such offerings, which would be similar to courses in GE Clusters, but with a focus on the Humanities, and could satisfy pre-major requirements for departments in the Division.
- The availability of such courses in the Institute could provide teaching opportunities for otherwise under-utilized faculty.

The UCLA Humanities Institute will become the site where the most innovative and transformative scholarship in emerging fields within the Humanities forms collaborative knowledge networks with existing centers and departments as well as other scholarly fields and divisions, such as Social Sciences, Information Sciences, and Arts and Architecture. To address

the challenges of the 21st century, the Humanities at UCLA must build upon existing disciplinary strengths but also break free of artificial (and wholly administrative) departmental and divisional boundaries to create bridges to South Campus and to cultivate emerging interdisciplinary fields on North Campus that include, but are not limited to, digital Humanities, transnational studies, informatics, disparity studies, postcolonial studies, and cultural mapping. The Task Force considered a more radical consolidation, perhaps even merging the Social Sciences and Humanities Divisions. Most members, however, believe that the Humanities Institute will provide a more effective locus of scholarly and educational activity, freely drawing upon all areas of campus while retaining its distinctive perspectives, without this administrative alignment.

The "New Humanities"

Robert Darnton, Director of Harvard's Library, argues that we are living in the fourth (not the first) Information Age: The first was the invention of writing around 4,000 BCE; the second was the turn from the scroll to the codex in the third century CE; the third was the invention of the printing press in the 15th century; and the fourth is the invention of the Internet and the World Wide Web.[5] The Humanities of the 21st century thus explores a universe in which print is no longer the exclusive or the normative medium in which knowledge is produced and/or disseminated; instead, print finds itself absorbed into new, multimedia configurations, alongside a web of information systems, digital tools, techniques, and media that have profoundly altered the production and dissemination of knowledge in the Humanities, Arts, and Social and Information Sciences.[6]

As Christine Borgman (UCLA, Information Studies) has suggested, the new Humanities research spaces of the 21st century are distributed, shared, and often virtual environments that not only link Humanities scholars with scholars in other disciplines, but also link them with digital libraries, online archives, computational laboratories, visualizations, and experiential centers.[7] Humanistic research has become significantly more collaborative, engaging Humanities scholars with technologists, librarians, social scientists, artists, architects, information scientists, and computer scientists in conceptualizing and solving problems, which often tend to be multi-disciplinary, high-impact, socially engaged, and global in scope. At the same time, the New Humanities is an outgrowth and expansion of the traditional scope of the Humanities, not a replacement or rejection of humanistic inquiry. We firmly believe that the role of the humanist is more critical at this historic moment than perhaps ever before, as our cultural legacy as a species migrates to digital formats and our relation to knowledge, cultural materials, technology, and society is radically re-conceptualized. It is to humanists that we turn to interpret the cultural and social impact of new technologies such as Google, to interrogate the ethical implications of stem cell research or nano-technologies, and to imagine new geo-political and economic configurations. The Humanities Institute may therefore aspire to be the centerpiece of UCLA in the 21st century.

Rationale for the Humanities Institute: Our Competition

Over the past two decades, many leading universities in the United States have recognized the profoundly transformative effect that new media and digital technologies have had on research and teaching. As one of the pioneering institutions in this area, the University of Virginia established the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities in 1992 "to provide researchers in the arts and Humanities with an opportunity to employ sophisticated technical support and advanced computer technology in the service of their scholarship"; it currently supports more than forty Digital Humanities research and curricular projects. In 2001, Stanford established the Stanford Humanities Laboratory, a collaborative research environment for supporting cross-disciplinary, technologically transformative, intellectually rigorous, multi-

institutional projects, bringing Humanities scholars together with artists, technologists, and scientists in a laboratory setting. Duke, a founding member of the international consortium HASTAC (Humanities, Arts, Science, and Technology Advanced Collaboratory), adopted a similar model for the establishment of its John Hope Franklin Humanities Institute. In 2007, Duke received a multi-year Mellon grant to build a "horizontal" program in Visual Studies, which operates—at all levels—at the interface between science, social science, and Humanities.[8] Other top-tier universities such as Harvard, Dartmouth, USC, Berkeley, Princeton, Georgia Tech, and University of Michigan have begun to hire aggressively in the multidisciplinary fields represented by the "New Humanities." In addition, centers, labs, and institutes devoted to specific sub-fields of Digital Humanities can be found at USC, Brown, University of Maryland, and MIT.[9] USC, in particular, has emerged as a leader in the field by harnessing a substantial amount of institutional and extramural support to create the Institute for Multimedia Literacy, the Institute for Creative Technologies, and *Vectors*, a radical reinvention of the electronic journal format.[10] USC has also initiated an undergraduate major in "Digital Studies," focusing on the cultural and social analysis and impact of new technologies. In short, to remain competitive and fulfill our mission, UCLA must act now to re-invent the Humanities (as the successful Mellon grant for "Transformative Support in the Humanities" made clear) by taking advantage of the momentum of foundation-building efforts that are already beginning to bear fruit and attract students, researchers, grants, and international recognition.

Institutional Rationale for the UCLA Humanities Institute

The UCLA Humanities Institute will be the gravitational centerpiece of Humanities research and learning across campus and include the following components:

1. The administration of new Humanities programs, including a new general "Humanities major" as well as a series of "add on" minors.
2. The administration of a new, interdivisional undergraduate program in "Digital Studies," which links the Humanities with Social Sciences, TFT, Arts and Architecture, Information Sciences, and Computer Science.
3. The administration of all Humanities research centers, including the Center for Jewish Studies, the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, the Center for $17^{th}/18^{th}$ Century Studies, the Center for the Study of Religion, and the Mellon programs, as well as reading rooms and laboratory spaces.
4. The interface between the North Campus arm of the Institute for Digital Research and Education—Humanities, Arts and Architecture, Social and Information Sciences (IDRE-HASIS), the Humanities Division, and Academic Technology Services.
5. A clearinghouse and technology pipeline for the administration of grants and research support in the Humanities (together with IDRE-HASIS).
6. The institutional home for new faculty lines (50-100% FTE) that embrace the new Humanities as well as visiting faculty, postdoctoral students, and distinguished lecturers.

Faculty in the Humanities stand to benefit enormously from greater engagement with other members of the Division and also from fostering exchange with other campus constituencies. Our recommendations for consolidating several departments into a Department of European Languages and Cultures represent an initial step in that direction as does the creation of a UCLA Language Center. These kinds of mechanisms would enable the Humanities to serve as *the center of gravity* for innovation. Incorporating transformations in literacy and underscoring the crucial importance of the internationalization of the learning experience, we have the opportunity to train a new generation of global citizens who have to adapt rapidly to the demands and exigencies of the world we live in. Our responsibility is to shepherd undergraduate students along in this

process, demonstrating how they can be ethically responsible, informed, equipped with self-understanding and cross-cultural awareness, concerned with civic responsibility and mindful of the global and interconnected digital world they live in. Those institutions of higher learning that have the courage to act upon such conversations will emerge as leaders—it is to them that others will turn for inspiration and guidance. A UCLA Humanities Institute can be precisely the space in which these common challenges can be addressed. Indeed, these are the pre-conditions of a vibrant, new Humanities.

Infrastructure: We recommend the appointment of a Director of the UCLA Humanities Institute. The Director would work closely with an Advisory Board (composed of faculty from all areas of campus, the library, and individuals outside the University). The Director would be responsible for implementing the programmatic objectives of the Institute *and* for major fund-raising and development initiatives. We believe that a commitment to establish a Humanities Institute as a role model of 21st-century education would represent an excellent development initiative as we seek to identify a potential donor whose name would be associated with the Institute.

Current Center Directors would continue to be responsible for their individual activities but these would be articulated with the overall activities of the Humanities Institute. **We recommend a standardization of compensation packages for Center Directors and greater integration of staff resources under the aegis of the Humanities Institute.** This recommendation also stems from what we consider to be a serious need to streamline compensation packages for Center Directors across campus. While we recognize that the operating costs of Centers and the directorship responsibilities vary considerably and should be taken into account, we nonetheless encourage the administration to create a more equitable university-wide system of compensation.

Grant and Research Administration: At present, the Humanities Division has neither the staff expertise nor the infrastructure for pursuing and administering extramural grants. Yet, Humanities scholars have been awarded millions of dollars from extramural granting agencies (such as NEH, Mellon, MacArthur, IMLS, NSF, Keck, and ACLS). We want to build upon and expand the baseline for successful grant applications and also have the grants administered through the Humanities Division so that a portion of the indirect costs returns to the Division and directly funds infrastructure for the Institute. The Institute will provide the administrative structure needed to converse directly with foundations, and increase the competitiveness for grants within the Humanities by identifying grant opportunities, coordinating both individual and institutional grant applications from UCLA, providing seed funds, and incentivizing faculty to go after large-scale grants that will bring indirect costs back to the Division. This cannot be done on an ad hoc basis, but must be systematically approached by working closely with foundations and development officers to track guidelines, programs, and opportunities.[11] **To succeed, the Institute must be explicitly declared as a fund-raising target in future UCLA capital campaigns.**

New Humanities Courses and Degree Programs: Our students were born in a world in which computing and information technologies are ubiquitous. Consequently, they are eager to use and apply these technologies to their own learning. Although many students are involved in the creation of their own expressive media presence through personal web pages and social networking,[12] they are infrequently engaged in either interrogating or applying these technologies in their learning and scholarship. In order to be successful in the world of tomorrow, there are significant technological, social, cultural, and intellectual skills that students need to master. These skills are fundamental to a liberal arts education and include literacy in both traditional and new media, the technical skills related to this literacy, the development of tools for critical analysis, the ability to navigate across, reconfigure, and evaluate different media forms, the

ability to negotiate and work across diverse cultures and communities, the ability to synthesize material and bring together different methodologies to solve complex problems, the ability to interpret and construct models for responding to real-world situations, the ability to critically evaluate the potentials and limitations of new technologies, and the cultivation of a broad understanding of the social, historical, linguistic, and cultural context in which they are learning and working. At its core, the Humanities must address these issues by teaching students to create and critique media content, to develop the necessary skills and abilities to evaluate this content, to manipulate and transform digital media technologies, and to develop the requisite literacy across media forms, including textual, aural, visual, and digital domains.[13] Both undergraduate and graduate students must develop these skills to be competitive in the workplace of the 21st century.

We propose the stepwise creation of a general Bachelor's degree in the Humanities, with specialized tracks and minors, to be housed in the Humanities Institute.

Beginning with the development of a series of interdisciplinary cluster courses and thematic GE classes that unite the Humanities and connect the Humanities with allied disciplines (such as History, Anthropology, Design | Media Arts, Information Studies, Film, and Architecture and Urban Design), these core courses would lay the foundation for the development of a minor and eventually a major. In this major, all students would take two years of approved "foundation" courses across the division, focusing on skills such as critical analysis, historical interpretation, language and linguistics, and comparative media studies. In years three and four of the major, students would develop (in consultation with departmental advisors) "specialized tracks," which may reflect existing majors or be new tracks that reflect current faculty interests and areas of expertise. These tracks, which obviate the need to create free-standing Interdepartmental Programs, are implemented and reviewed in 3-5 year cycles to allow for maximum flexibility, creativity, and innovation. Examples include: "Humanities, with a specialization in Digital Media"; "Humanities, with a specialization in Visual Studies"; "Humanities, with a specialization in Global Studies"; "Humanities, with a specialization in Linguistics"; "Humanities with a specialization in Spatial Studies"; "Humanities, with a specialization in Francophone Literature." Tracks will draw upon classes regularly offered by faculty within the Humanities as well as courses of study outside the division (such as in the School of Arts and Architecture, TFT, and Social Sciences). Tracks may also be free-standing minors.

In addition, we recommend the creation of an interdivisional major and minor in "Digital Humanities" or "Digital Studies," in which students are not only certified in the tools and technologies of new media but also engaged in the production of scholarly research using these tools and technologies. The major should include units across North and South Campus, and aim both to make North Campus students more competitive in the marketplace and to offer a technological approach to the Humanities that would attract "South Campus" students to North Campus.

On the graduate level, we recommend the creation of new graduate certificate programs as add-ons for any Masters or PhD program in areas such as "Digital Scholarship" or "Secondary Education."

Although the digital age is enabled by technological advances, it is less a collection of technologies than it is a wholly new scholarly environment—one that easily encompasses traditional scholarship, but offers significant and rapidly changing opportunities for experimentation and advancement in the way that the scholarly endeavor is practiced. Our students must be trained to cope with this world, critique it, understand its constraints and its possibilities, and conceive of intellectual pursuits that fully embrace, exploit, and inhabit this new

landscape of the mind. Over the next decade, our graduate students will need to master the tools of digital media and digital scholarship to remain competitive on the job market and to contribute directly to the design and development of the next generation of scholarly tools and methods. The purpose of the certificate is to certify training in the methods, tools, and media of digital scholarship as well as to encourage students to examine how digital scholarship is changing their respective disciplines and research. Courses will be formed from pre-existing classes in multiple participating departments, including language and literature programs, arts and architecture, history, information and social sciences, and others. The certificate may also be a prerequisite for the allocation of TA-ships, as more and more courses require students to acquire fluency with digital tools in the classroom. The certificate program will culminate in a digital portfolio of student research projects submitted to juried review.

Addressing Persistent Problems in a New Context

The creation of a UCLA Language Center and Humanities Institute, along with the consolidation of existing departments into the Department of European Languages and Cultures, will create a new context for addressing recurrent and persistent problems of efficiency in the Humanities. To conclude our report, we address two such problems.

Technology Pipeline

The North Campus arm of the Institute for Digital Research and Education ("IDRE-HASIS") represents a consortium of North Campus units (Humanities, Arts and Architecture, Social and Information Sciences) charged with providing leadership, vision, and technical support for digital research and educational projects. The IDRE-HASIS consortium currently includes the Center for Digital Humanities, Academic Technology Services, the Office of Instructional Development, the Institute of Social Research, the Experiential Technologies Center, and the Digital Library Program. IDRE-HASIS has developed a pipeline to provide faculty a single access point for staff resources and expertise in developing digital projects, to enhance communication between campus organizations involved in similar functions related to digital project development, to coordinate work efforts across the various participating organizations for inter-disciplinary projects, and to introduce faculty oversight into project development. IDRE-HASIS represents the interdisciplinary cyberinfrastructure and technological connective tissue necessary for pursuing extramural grants. The consortium is a model for interdivisional cooperation and the coordinated sharing of limited resources. We recommend that the Humanities Institute work closely with IDRE-HASIS to achieve its broad intellectual and administrative vision.

We recommend the consolidation of the Center for Digital Humanities (primarily a technical support center for undergraduate courses) and the Center for Social Sciences Computing. In this arrangement, existing laboratory spaces and programmer support staff would be shared by both divisions under the aegis of the IDRE-HASIS consortium, with appropriate faculty oversight for balancing educational and research technology support. Moreover, we strongly recommend that the Humanities Institute and Language Center interface with the Library in order to develop new digital laboratories in the Young Research Library using the successful model of the "Technology Sandbox" as a space for experimentation, collaborative work, digital curation/archiving, and interdisciplinary scholarly investigation.

Workload Policies and Minimum Enrollments

The new administrative structures proposed here will go some way toward addressing another issue the task force considered at length—the uneven faculty workload across the Humanities

Division. This uneven workload derives from the underutilization of some faculty and lowers student to faculty ratios in the division. These innovative institutional structures will provide enhanced opportunities for mounting classes with broader appeal and higher enrollments, providing new opportunities for faculty who have been frustrated by dwindling enrollments in their specific subject areas.

Beyond this, **we also recommend the institution of a minimum enrollment policy throughout the College and University, including the Humanities**. This policy would stipulate that any undergraduate course that enrolls fewer than 8 students will not be counted as a course for a faculty's annual course load. Rather, these students will be considered as multiple independent studies in the calculation of the faculty member's overall workload. This policy accords with guidelines established in the College several years ago in response to an audit of small courses. The recommended policy then was that lower division classes have a minimum of 12 enrollments, upper division a minimum of 8, and graduate courses a minimum of 4.

Under current division policy and organizational structure, many faculty fall below this number. A minimum enrollment policy would help solve underutilization issues and uneven faculty workloads in the Humanities Division, an issue that will necessarily be addressed with the proposed consolidation of departments. Faculty whose courses are insufficiently enrolled could be assigned to appropriate courses in the Humanities Institute, The Language Center, or the Writing Programs (as is already the case in at least one department). Department chairs will be responsible for making such assignments, and for assuring that faculty teaching in the writing program are sufficiently trained through the program's pedagogy course.

Further, the Task Force recommends **that departments institute workload policies that calibrate overall course load to a faculty member's aggregate teaching activities**, including the size of the classes they teach, the number of TAs they supervise, the number of dissertations they chair, the graduate students they examine, other independent studies they undertake, and other related tasks. Appendix E provides the Teaching Load worksheets used by the English Department and in Comparative Literature, as examples of how this might be done.

List of Appendices:
Appendix A: Charge letter
Appendix B: Spreadsheet (Cost-Revenue Analysis)
Appendix C: Online Learning at UCLA: The General Context and a Specific Proposal
Appendix D: Developing a Residential College System at UCLA
Appendix E: English Department & Comparative Literature point systems

Notes:

[1] In the 2009 Academic Plan (http://blog.evc.ucla.edu/), UCLA Chancellor Gene Block articulates four goals: Academic Excellence, Civic and Community Engagement, Diversity, and Financial Security, and further states, regarding Community Engagement: "UCLA should advance community-based, applied, and translational research—that is, scholarship that directly benefits Los Angeles and advances knowledge." Courses in the Humanities at UCLA teach students to understand the diversity of cultures, histories, and languages that constitute our global society. More specifically, there are more than 80 languages spoken in the LA Unified School district; at UCLA, we teach more than 50. This is both noteworthy in representing UCLA's commitment to academic excellence, and a true reflection of LA's global diversity. Were UCLA to curtail or suspend its language requirement, it would become a leader in another, less fortunate sense, becoming the first "English only" global university in the midst of what is probably the most culturally diverse city on the planet.

[2] Grants in the sciences almost never pay their full costs, so they actually erode resources from the general instructional program. A detailed economic analysis (see Appendix B) shows that English classes will actually serve as cash-cows for the rest of the UCLA in 2010-11 … A New York Times story of September 4, 2009 cited experts on the economics of higher education, and quoted the conclusion of Jane V. Wellman (Executive Director of the Delta Project on Postsecondary Education Costs, Productivity, and Accountability, and Senior Associate with the Institute for Higher Education Policy in Washington, D.C.) that "An English student, however, is generally a profit center. 'They're paying for the chemistry major and the music major and faculty research,' she said. 'They don't want to talk about it in institutions, because the English department gets mad. The little ugly facts about cross-subsidies are inflammatory, so they get papered over." RCM-based budgeting reveals the same fact. At the University of Illinois, as a report presented to the Faculty Senate demonstrated, a large Humanities department like English produces a substantial net profit, whereas units like the Colleges of Engineering and Agriculture run at a loss (see the commentary by the president of the American Association of University Professors at http://www.cary-nelson.org/nelson/corpuniv.html).

[3] Recognizing that one year provides an inadequate introduction to the study of a new language, the Task Force strongly urges the campus to revisit the language requirement in a few years with the aim of increasing the requirement or in some other way bolstering opportunities for language immersion for UCLA undergraduates. A second year of language instruction might overlap GE requirements, for example, following the model of some Writing II courses and upper-division literature and culture courses taught in the original language. As an emblem of our concern, we note that the vast majority of Education Abroad students from UCLA study either in English-speaking countries or within English-speaking environments in non-English-speaking countries.

[4] It will be important to protect the investment many language departments have already made in Summer Sessions teaching, so that they do not lose this valuable revenue stream.

[5] Robert Darnton, "The Library in the New Age," *New York Review of Books* 55, no. 10 (June 12, 2008).

[6] For a more extensive argument about Digital Humanities, please see the whitepaper, "The Promise of Digital Humanities," co-authored by Todd Presner and Chris Johanson. Available here: http://www.digitalhumanities.ucla.edu/images/stories/papers/promise%20of%20digital%20humanities.pdf

7 Christine Borgman, "The Digital Future is Now: A Call to Action for the Humanities," forthcoming in *Digital Humanities Quarterly*. Also, Borgman, *Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure and the Internet* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2007).

[8] The Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities at UVA: http://www.iath.virginia.edu/; Stanford Humanities Lab: http://www.stanford.edu/group/shl/cgi-bin/drupal/; HASTAC: http://www.hastac.org/; Duke's program in New Technologies in Society: http://www.jhfc.duke.edu/jenkins/; Duke's program in Information Science and Information Studies: http://isis.duke.edu; Duke's Visual Studies Initiative: http://visualstudies.duke.edu/; and the John Hope Franklin Center at Duke: http://www.jhfc.duke.edu/.

[9] The Institute for Multimedia Literacy at USC: http://iml.usc.edu/; The Institute for Creative Technologies at USC: http://ict.usc.edu/about; Vectors: http://www.vectorsjournal.org/; the Center of Digital Epigraphy at Brown: http://www.brown.edu/Research/CoDE/; Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities: http://mith.umd.edu/; and HyperStudio at MIT: http://hyperstudio.mit.edu/about.

[10] USC has been developing infrastructure to integrate digital media technologies into the Humanities for more than a decade. Their Institute for Multimedia Literacy (IML), founded in 1998 with funding from alumnus George Lucas, is an organized research unit dedicated to developing educational programs and conducting research on the changing nature of literacy in a networked culture. The IML's success has fostered a huge range of digital Humanities efforts across USC. USC feels that their undergraduate schools of Cinema/Television, Engineering, and Business are very well defined, and wants to have a similar kind of distinguishing and identifiable approach to their core undergraduate college experience. The Annenberg School's recent hiring of renowned convergence theorist/media activist Henry Jenkins away from MIT this year is yet another sign of the significant investment USC has made to embrace digital Humanities.

[11] Such grant and administration units already exist in several peer institutions and have demonstrated their effectiveness in obtaining external funding (see for example the Institute for scholarship in the Liberal Arts at the University of Notre Dame: http://isla.nd.edu).

[12] According to the 2005 Pew Internet and American Life project, more than half of American teenagers who use the Internet are media creators. Far from just passively "surfing" the web, these students are creating media, such as webpages, videos, music, blogs, stories, and other online content. This does not even include the vast number of students who also engage in multiplayer gaming, social networking, and other forms of web-based communication. For a full discussion, see Henry Jenkins and others, *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*, MacArthur Foundation (2006). The paper is available at: http://digitallearning.macfound.org/atf/cf/%7B7E45C7E0-A3E0-4B89-AC9C-E807E1B0AE4E%7D/JENKINS_WHITE_PAPER.PDF

[13] The New Media Consortium defined new media literacy as "the set of abilities and skills where aural, visual, and digital literacy overlap. These include the ability to understand the power of images and sounds, to recognize and use that power, to manipulate and transform digital media, to distribute them pervasively, and to easily adapt them to new forms." *A Global Imperative: The Report of the 21st Century Literacy Summit.*

Appendix A (Charge Letter)

UCLA

August 28, 2009

Associate Professor Carol Bakhos
Professor Ali Behdad
Associate Professor Pamela Hieronymi
Professor Ray Knapp
Professor David MacFadyen
Professor Kathleen McHugh
Associate Professor Steve Nelson
Associate Professor Todd Presner
Professor Teo Ruiz - CHAIR
Professor David Schaberg
Professor Shu-mei Shih
Professor Dominic Thomas
Professor Robert Watson

Dear Colleagues:

We are writing to ask you to serve on a joint Academic Senate-Administration task force to develop recommendations for supporting and enhancing the Humanities in this period of acute budgetary problems. We are very pleased that Professor Teo Ruiz has agreed to serve as chair.

As you know, UCLA faces the unprecedented challenge of cutting $131 million from our general fund budget. Under these circumstances, we have both the obligation and the opportunity to review all our organizational structures and processes in order to reduce costs and increase efficiency. In so doing we will strive above all to preserve and in some cases increase academic quality. It is important to bear in mind, as well, the chief campus priorities of excellence, diversity, and community engagement.

Periods of crisis provide unique opportunities for bold and innovative changes. Rather than thinking only about cost saving measures, we would like you to think of how to move the division forward in a new and creative fashion that will catapult the Humanities at UCLA to the forefront of its diverse disciplines.

The unique breadth and depth of UCLA's Humanities programs contribute to overall quality and also present challenges. Recent eight-year reviews of departments and programs have drawn attention to the problems faced in mounting language and writing programs as well as in recruiting faculty for many different majors in small departments. Resources – faculty positions and graduate student support – are stretched dangerously thin. While several departments have undertaken admirable and effective changes in their programs to enhance the quality of majors and increase the numbers of students in

courses, further changes could build on those qualitative improvements and help resolve the dilemmas the Division faces.

We are, therefore, charging you to look at the Humanities at UCLA and make recommendations to Tim Stowell, Dean of Humanities, and us for actions that will ensure intellectual vibrancy for the next decade while enabling the Division to weather the immediate budget crisis. We would like to receive your final report by the end of December 2009. We ask that you consider the Humanities broadly, but with a particular focus on foreign language and other small departments. In so doing, you should consider:

- Restructuring programs, including possibly merging departments or programs
- Streamlining majors, reducing unit requirements, and paring the number of courses
- Developing cross-school, cross-divisional and interdivisional majors or programs
- Developing research initiatives (e.g., digital humanities, a humanities center) and possibilities of extramural support

Please contact Lauri Ashford in the EVC/Provost's office at (310) 206-4056 or via email at lashford@conet.ucla.edu if you are unable to serve. Otherwise, you will be contacted soon to schedule the first meeting.

Sincerely,

Scott L. Waugh
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

Michael Goldstein
Academic Senate Chair

cc: Chancellor Gene D. Block
Academic Senate Chair-designate Robin Garrell
Assistant Provost Maryann Jacobi Gray
Assistant Dean Reem Hanna-Harwell
Vice Chancellor Steven Olsen
Dean Tim Stowell

Appendix B: Spreadsheet (Cost-Revenue Analysis)

Summary:

Department	Revenue	Expense	Net Earnings	Return on Investment
English	10,972,493	$10,165,104	$807,388	8%
Writing Programs	4,270,706	$2,426,336	$1,844,370	76%
Combined	15,243,199	12,591,440	$2,651,759	21%

	Revenue	Expense	Net Earnings	Return on Investment
Humanities	59,187,040	$53,502,184	$5,684,856	11%
Social Sciences	76,713,974	$69,328,732	$7,385,242	11%
Life Sciences*	36,906,482	$35,570,496	$1,335,986	4%
Physical Sciences	58,930,468	$62,082,713	($3,152,245)	-5%

**Excludes Basic Biomedical Sciences*

Please see detail worksheets for definitions/criteria of data elements.

Appendix B: Spreadsheet (Cost-Revenue Analysis)

English:

Department: ENGLISH

1. Student Credit Hours (SCH) taught (2008-09)

Course Level	Three-quarter average	Full Year (x 3)	SCH per Full FTE	Student FTE
Lower Division	3,983	11,950	45	266
Upper Division	9,905	29,715	45	660
Graduate	1,382	4,146	36	115
Total Student Credit Hours and Student FTE	**15,270**	**45,811**	**-**	**1,041**

Source: UCLA MP Tables produced by Chancellor's Office: http://www.aim.ucla.edu/mptables/mptables.asp

2. Fee Schedule (2009-10 - includes mid-year fee increase)

Category	UG Resident	UG Non-Resident	Grad Resident	Grad Non-Res
Reg Fee	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900
Ed Fee	$ 7,473	$ 8,169	$ 7,947	$ 8,295
Tuition	$ -	$ 22,021	$ -	$ 14,694
Total Fees per Student Category	**$ 8,373**	**$ 31,090**	**$ 8,847**	**$ 23,889**
Distribution of UCLA students btw Resident and Non-Resident	92.50%	7.50%	64.00%	36.00%

Sources: UCLA Registrar Office at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/Fees/gradfee.htm and Chancellor's office website at http://www.aim.ucla.edu/enrollment/enrollment_demographics_tqa.asp

3. Revenue Generated by English Student Credit Hours (Based on Table 1 and 2 above):

Category	Total Student FTE	*Resident FTE*	*Non-Res FTE*	Resident $	Non-Res $	Total $
Lower Division	266	*246*	*20*	2,056,733	619,209	**2,675,941**
Upper Division	660	*611*	*50*	5,114,298	1,539,732	**6,654,030**
Graduate	115	*74*	*41*	652,083	990,438	**1,642,521**
Total Fee Revenue - Student Credit Hour FTE	**1,041**	***930***	***111***	**7,823,114**	**3,149,379**	**10,972,493**

Source: Derived from Table 1 and 2 above

4. Total English Expenditures on State Funds Only in 2008-09: **$10,165,104**

Source: UCLA financial ledgers for June 2009 final

Appendix B: Spreadsheet (Cost-Revenue Analysis)

Writing Programs:

Department: WRITING PROGRAMS

1. Student Credit Hours (SCH) taught (2008-09)

Course Level	Three-quarter average	Full Year (x 3)	SCH per Full FTE	Student FTE
Lower Division	5,630.67	16,892	45	375
Upper Division	657	1,971	45	44
Graduate	39.33	118	36	3
Total Student Credit Hours and Student FTE	**6,327**	**18,981**	**-**	**422**

Source: UCLA MP Tables produced by Chancellor's Office: http://www.aim.ucla.edu/mptables/mptables.asp

2. Fee Schedule (2009-10 - includes mid-year fee increase)

Category	UG Resident	UG Non-Resident	Grad Resident	Grad Non-Res
Reg Fee	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900
Ed Fee	$ 7,473	$ 8,169	$ 7,947	$ 8,295
Tuition	$ -	$ 22,021	$ -	$ 14,694
Total Fees per Student Category	**$ 8,373**	**$ 31,090**	**$ 8,847**	**$ 23,889**
Distribution of UCLA students btw Resident and Non-Resident	92.50%	7.50%	64.00%	36.00%

Sources: UCLA Registrar Office at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/Fees/gradfee.htm and Chancellor's office website at http://www.aim.ucla.edu/enrollment/enrollment_demographics_tqa.asp

3. Revenue Generated by Student Credit Hours (Based on Table 1 and 2 above):

Category	Total Student FTE	*Resident FTE*	*Non-Res FTE*	Resident $	Non-Res $	Total $
Lower Division	375	*347*	*28*	2,907,312	875,288	**3,782,600**
Upper Division	44	*41*	*3*	339,232	102,131	**441,363**
Graduate	3	*2*	*1*	18,557	28,187	**46,744**
Total Fee Revenue - Student Credit Hour FTE	**422**	***390***	***33***	**3,265,102**	**1,005,605**	**4,270,706**

Source: Derived from Table 1 and 2 above

4. Total Expenditures on State Funds Only in 2008-09: **$2,426,336**

Source: UCLA financial ledgers for June 2009 final

Appendix B: Spreadsheet (Cost-Revenue Analysis)

Humanities:

Division of Humanities

1. Student Credit Hours (SCH) taught (2008-09)

Course Level	Three-quarter average	Full Year (x 3)	SCH per Full FTE	Student FTE
Lower Division	44,209.67	132,629	45	2,947
Upper Division	30,247.00	90,741	45	2,016
Graduate	7,714.00	23,142	36	643
Total Student Credit Hours and Student FTE	**82,171**	**246,512**	**-**	**5,607**

Source: UCLA MP Tables produced by Chancellor's Office: http://www.aim.ucla.edu/mptables/mptables.asp

2. Fee Schedule (2009-10 - includes mid-year fee increase)

Category	UG Resident	UG Non-Resident	Grad Resident	Grad Non-Res
Reg Fee	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900
Ed Fee	$ 7,473	$ 8,169	$ 7,947	$ 8,295
Tuition	$ -	$ 22,021	$ -	$ 14,694
Total Fees per Student Category	**$ 8,373**	**$ 31,090**	**$ 8,847**	**$ 23,889**
Distribution of UCLA students btw Resident and Non-Resident	92.50%	7.50%	64.00%	36.00%

Sources: UCLA Registrar Office at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/Fees/gradfee.htm and Chancellor's office website at http://www.aim.ucla.edu/enrollment/enrollment_demographics_tqa.asp

3. Revenue Generated by Student Credit Hours (Based on Table 1 and 2 above):

Category	Total Student FTE	*Resident FTE*	*Non-Res FTE*	Resident $	Non-Res $	Total $
Lower Division	2,947	*2,726*	*221*	22,827,000	6,872,393	**29,699,393**
Upper Division	2,016	*1,865*	*151*	15,617,585	4,701,896	**20,319,481**
Graduate	643	*411*	*231*	3,639,774	5,528,392	**9,168,166**
Total Fee Revenue - Student Credit Hour FTE	**5,607**	***5,003***	***604***	**42,084,358**	**17,102,682**	**59,187,040**

Source: Derived from Table 1 and 2 above

4. Total Expenditures on State Funds Only in 2008-09: **$53,502,184**

Source: UCLA financial ledgers for June 2009 final

Appendix B: Spreadsheet (Cost-Revenue Analysis)

Social Sciences:

Division of Social Sciences

1. Student Credit Hours (SCH) taught (2008-09)

Course Level	Three-quarter average	Full Year (x 3)	SCH per Full FTE	Student FTE
Lower Division	34,128.00	102,384	45	2,275
Upper Division	62,283.00	186,849	45	4,152
Graduate	10,051.67	30,155	36	838
Total Student Credit Hours and Student FTE	**106,463**	**319,388**	**-**	**7,265**

Source: UCLA MP Tables produced by Chancellor's Office: http://www.aim.ucla.edu/mptables/mptables.asp

2. Fee Schedule (2009-10 - includes mid-year fee increase)

Category	UG Resident	UG Non-Resident	Grad Resident	Grad Non-Res
Reg Fee	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900
Ed Fee	$ 7,473	$ 8,169	$ 7,947	$ 8,295
Tuition	$ -	$ 22,021	$ -	$ 14,694
Total Fees per Student Category	**$ 8,373**	**$ 31,090**	**$ 8,847**	**$ 23,889**
Distribution of UCLA students btw Resident and Non-Resident	92.50%	7.50%	64.00%	36.00%

Sources: UCLA Registrar Office at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/Fees/gradfee.htm and Chancellor's office website at http://www.aim.ucla.edu/enrollment/enrollment_demographics_tqa.asp

3. Revenue Generated by Student Credit Hours (Based on Table 1 and 2 above):

Category	Total Student FTE	*Resident FTE*	*Non-Res FTE*	Resident $	Non-Res $	Total $
Lower Division	2,275	*2,105*	*171*	17,621,481	5,305,198	**22,926,678**
Upper Division	4,152	*3,841*	*311*	32,158,893	9,681,892	**41,840,785**
Graduate	838	*536*	*302*	4,742,780	7,203,730	**11,946,510**
Total Fee Revenue - Student Credit Hour FTE	**7,265**	***6,481***	***784***	**54,523,154**	**22,190,820**	**76,713,974**

Source: Derived from Table 1 and 2 above

4. Total Expenditures on State Funds Only in 2008-09: **$69,328,732**

Source: UCLA financial ledgers for June 2009 final

Appendix B: Spreadsheet (Cost-Revenue Analysis)

Life Sciences:

Division of Life Sciences (excludes Basic Biomedical Sciences)

1. Student Credit Hours (SCH) taught (2008-09)

Course Level	Three-quarter average	Full Year (x 3)	SCH per Full FTE	Student FTE
Lower Division	18,120.33	54,361	45	1,208
Upper Division	28,138.00	84,414	45	1,876
Graduate	4,906.00	14,718	36	409
Total Student Credit Hours and Student FTE	**51,164**	**153,493**	**-**	**3,493**

Source: UCLA MP Tables produced by Chancellor's Office: http://www.aim.ucla.edu/mptables/mptables.asp

2. Fee Schedule (2009-10 - includes mid-year fee increase)

Category	UG Resident	UG Non-Resident	Grad Resident	Grad Non-Res
Reg Fee	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900
Ed Fee	$ 7,473	$ 8,169	$ 7,947	$ 8,295
Tuition	$ -	$ 22,021	$ -	$ 14,694
Total Fees per Student Category	**$ 8,373**	**$ 31,090**	**$ 8,847**	**$ 23,889**
Distribution of UCLA students btw Resident and Non-Resident	92.50%	7.50%	64.00%	36.00%

Sources: UCLA Registrar Office at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/Fees/gradfee.htm and Chancellor's office website at http://www.aim.ucla.edu/enrollment/enrollment_demographics_tqa.asp

3. Revenue Generated by Student Credit Hours (Based on Table 1 and 2 above):

Category	Total Student FTE	*Resident FTE*	*Non-Res FTE*	Resident $	Non-Res $	Total $
Lower Division	1,208	*1,117*	*91*	9,356,161	2,816,805	**12,172,966**
Upper Division	1,876	*1,735*	*141*	14,528,634	4,374,052	**18,902,686**
Graduate	409	*262*	*147*	2,314,847	3,515,983	**5,830,830**
Total Fee Revenue - Student Credit Hour FTE	**3,493**	***3,114***	***378***	**26,199,642**	**10,706,840**	**36,906,482**

Source: Derived from Table 1 and 2 above

4. Total Expenditures on State Funds Only in 2008-09: **$35,570,496**

Source: UCLA financial ledgers for June 2009 final

Appendix B: Spreadsheet (Cost-Revenue Analysis)

Physical Sciences:

Division of Physical Sciences

1. Student Credit Hours (SCH) taught (2008-09)

Course Level	Three-quarter average	Full Year (x 3)	SCH per Full FTE	Student FTE
Lower Division	53,739.67	161,219	45	3,583
Upper Division	14,295.67	42,887	45	953
Graduate	11,127.67	33,383	36	927
Total Student Credit Hours and Student FTE	**79,163**	**237,489**	**-**	**5,463**

Source: UCLA MP Tables produced by Chancellor's Office: http://www.aim.ucla.edu/mptables/mptables.asp

2. Fee Schedule (2009-10 - includes mid-year fee increase)

Category	UG Resident	UG Non-Resident	Grad Resident	Grad Non-Res
Reg Fee	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900	$ 900
Ed Fee	$ 7,473	$ 8,169	$ 7,947	$ 8,295
Tuition	$ -	$ 22,021	$ -	$ 14,694
Total Fees per Student Category	**$ 8,373**	**$ 31,090**	**$ 8,847**	**$ 23,889**
Distribution of UCLA students btw Resident and Non-Resident	92.50%	7.50%	64.00%	36.00%

Sources: UCLA Registrar Office at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/Fees/gradfee.htm and Chancellor's office website at http://www.aim.ucla.edu/enrollment/enrollment_demographics_tqa.asp

3. Revenue Generated by Student Credit Hours (Based on Table 1 and 2 above):

Category	Total Student FTE	*Resident FTE*	*Non-Res FTE*	Resident $	Non-Res $	Total $
Lower Division	3,583	*3,314*	*269*	27,747,673	8,353,832	**36,101,504**
Upper Division	953	*882*	*71*	7,381,355	2,222,262	**9,603,617**
Graduate	927	*593*	*334*	5,250,480	7,974,867	**13,225,347**
Total Fee Revenue - Student Credit Hour FTE	**5,463**	***4,789***	***674***	**40,379,507**	**18,550,961**	**58,930,468**

Source: Derived from Table 1 and 2 above

4. Total Expenditures on State Funds Only in 2008-09: **$62,082,713**

Source: UCLA financial ledgers for June 2009 final

Appendix C

ONLINE LEARNING AT UCLA: THE GENERAL CONTEXT AND A SPECIFIC PROPOSAL

Abstract

The following document outlines some of the challenges facing UCLA in the current economic climate; it also offers some solutions, specifically with regard to the threats facing traditional modes of education from digital spheres. The central argument is made by analogy with recent events in the nation's economy that have dramatically altered fields such as newspaper publishing and the entertainment industry. These industries are designed, just like education, to impart information; they have suffered greatly in recent years from the rapid expansion of web-based commerce. The same challenges have now come to traditional four-year, on-campus degree programs.

This paper, after explaining both the origin and likely trajectory of these issues in the field of higher education, then outlines how UCLA's Summer Session could be used for the development of monetized, high-enrolment classes in order to serve three purposes: (1) they will improve time-to-degree statistics; (2) lessen the pressure on classrooms during the regular year; (3) provide funds to save those lecturers in the Humanities whose jobs are currently under threat; (4) and brand UCLA as the leader in high-end, top-quality distance education. This same branding is proposed as the timeliest and most fitting response to the growing popularity of web-based learning worldwide.

The document concludes with concrete, cost-effective ways to build upon the current, successful model of summertime web-learning at UCLA's TFT program. An addendum offers scholarly evidence of the benefits of online learning not only for lecture-driven courses, but also for language instruction across the Humanities.

SECTION ONE: Recent Changes in Education: From the Physical to the Digital

A debate considered inconceivable even ten years ago has now come to the forefront of public attention: the validity – and therefore future - of traditional university education. Voiced initially in distant, obscure corners of academe, several "dire" predictions have today reached the national press and primetime media. They come on the heels of financial stresses and strains endured by associated fields, which – like universities - exist in order to impart information, such as newspapers, the music business, and cinema. Several major newspapers have gone bankrupt in recent months across the United States, while the nation's foremost music stores have collapsed in similar disarray. Two weeks ago, the DVD rental chain Blockbuster announced that it will be closing almost 1,000 stores, due to pressures from mail-delivery and online rental services. In the last quarter alone, its revenue has plummeted by a quarter.

Consequently one hears the related viewpoint that universities, despite such problems in the worlds of publishing and media, continue to operate as "olde-worlde" shops, in other

words on the basis of a fixed address, at which information is only imparted in situations of physical co-presence. Knowledge, according to this same opinion, can only be acquired by coming to a campus in person, living there, and then attending classes face-to-face with a teacher. From the students' point of view, this has certainly been both inordinately expensive and unlikely to change. Schools and colleges, as profit-making bodies, have long known that the education and prestige they offer has not been available in many other places. Competition, in a word, has been minimal.

It seems hard to deny that any prior isolation from competition, however, is now coming to an end. This is due to downloadable lectures at iTunes, for example, that could easily be monetized, or the after-hours and online institutions such as Western Governors University and the University of Phoenix. The latter school is currently the biggest in the United States, with over 400,000 undergraduates and almost 80,000 graduate students. The reason? Cost. These two universities have begun offering information from their classrooms (i.e., the same information) to people digitally, far away from any campus – and at the convenience of students. This move towards mobile, learner-directed education is more than opportune. In periods of high unemployment, people have more time on their hands in order to retrain or "re-skill" and, as a result, the attractiveness of online/distance learning skyrockets.

Cost for studying at these schools, on a unit-by-unit basis, will stay low, since the competition between similar institutions – all happily divorced from a physical location – is becoming widespread. Web-based companies must do battle with all of their competitors simultaneously, since each of them can market itself to anybody, anywhere, at any time. One possible development of this melee has been sketched out by The Washington Monthly. An article in the current issue predicts that some online college tuition could soon drop to the cost of $99 a month. Proof to support that hypothesis comes from a consideration of Straighterline, a young company offering "high quality, better supported, and lower cost required college courses - online, on your schedule." Offering what every student wants, this organization is undercutting every school in the nation.

The Straighterline courses are designed and overseen by PhD graduates, with 24/7 advice available by email. These tools also allow students, by way of example, to finish four courses for less than $200. The University of Phoenix, supposedly marking the low end of the market, would charge $6,300 for the same services. This would suggest that the market has a long way to fall – and online schools are multiplying with great speed, each time dragging the costs lower and lower. In the view of some observers, traditional colleges, requiring people to be on campus, need urgently to respond to these challenges.

Some additional evidence of wide-ranging changes: other once-profitable areas of traditional university praxis are also under threat, such as textbooks. Traditional texts can cost well over $100, but the peer-driven practice of organizations like Flat World Knowledge, working along the collective editorial principles of Wikipedia, can now offer students peer-reviewed texts for free. Likewise, all along the presumed "periphery" of higher education, at community colleges, web-based initiatives are aggregating their

resources. They are both lowering their costs and increasing their reach. Recognizing the benefits here, President Obama's education bill has just allocated $500 million for the creation of open-source and freely-available online courses at America's community colleges.

All in all, the traditional model of a few elite universities in a small number of hard-to-reach places is already facing challenges that – once more – mirror those recently faced by both newspaper journalism and the music/movie businesses. Peripheral bloggers in recent years have divorced small, individual texts from the proud isolation of centralized newspapers. Information now comes to us in smaller units and is no longer tied to a physical location, such as the city where the paper is printed or the shop where it is sold. The same is clearly true of the entertainment industry, with DVDs (once available only in certain stores) now becoming pay-per-view or download rentals and thus accessible anywhere. Finally, iTunes has long since made obsolete the notion of fixed information on discs (in fixed quantities), thus causing the demise of the LP/album as a business format. Customers today buy only the individual songs they want, when they want, and accordingly avoid the less appealing tracks. The result? Every single "megastore" owned in the United States by Virgin Records closed down this summer - forever. If the same thing is going to happen in higher education, then sooner or later degrees will be taken in various places – digitally and simultaneously.

SECTION TWO: The "University of Phoenix" Stigma

This summer, The Washington Post provided a concise overview of the general situation in higher education, supporting the contention that once information moves online, a widespread and cutthroat antagonism between schools will kick in with great rapidity. One could argue that the time-honored appearance of education has, in fact, already begun to morph into something entirely different: "The real force for change now is the market. Online classes are just cheaper to produce. Community colleges and for-profit education entrepreneurs are already experimenting with dorm-free, commute-free options. Distance-learning technology will keep improving. Innovators have yet to tap the potential of the aggregator to change the way students earn a degree, making the education business today look like the news biz circa 1999. And as major universities offer some core courses online, we'll see a cultural shift toward acceptance of what is still, in some circles, a University of Phoenix joke."

Herein lies the key. The joke in question is one of prestige. That prestige, in turn, is wholly dependent upon its status as an object of desire. In the current economic climate, "desire" has been roundly trounced by "need." For the great majority of the public, access to information is important, rather the need for discussion, debate, and other benefits of physical collocation with a professor – on a campus. Quantitatively, the University of Phoenix wins in spectacular form; qualitatively, however, the jokes may still be valid, and therefore a very serious response is needed to what Phoenix offers.

The article in The Washington Post continues (and here we repeat a paragraph from the main document submitted): "Not all colleges will be similarly affected. Like the New

York Times, the elite schools play a unique role in our society, and so they can probably persist with elements of their old revenue model longer than their lesser-known competitors. Schools with state funding will be as immune as their budgets." According to this logic, schools such as UCLA find themselves caught between a quantitative and qualitative modus operandi. And indeed, the delicate balancing act asked of any great state school is that they answer both to the demands of general and elite educations. Our ongoing success in this grey area has led in recent days to an extraordinarily high grade in the nationwide rankings of US schools by The Washington Monthly. This publication takes into consideration three factors of excellence. The first is Social Mobility, in other words the recruitment of low-income students by a university - and the additional ability to see them graduate. This same ability, in other words, allows for the construction of a bridge between general education and its elite aspect.

The Washington Monthly's second and third categories of excellence are Research and Service, both tied more clearly to the "elite" end of the spectrum, to benefits reaped by Upper Division or graduate students. Nonetheless, it is precisely "elite" research that provides both the content and up-to-date relevance of courses at all levels. According to the same rationale, Service likewise contributes to the running of the university as a whole, far beyond specialized departments.

UCLA's ability to balance these three factors has begun to show signs of strain. The larger, GE- or entry-level courses cost a great deal to run, and – as we know – swathes of lecturers who teach them have been laid off, at least provisionally. That scenario will only change if the budget improves. "Unlikely" seems the probable outcome. And so ladder faculty will be asked to shoulder the burden of more GE/Lower-Division classes, which means that research will suffer. Future or potential graduate students will note the ensuing lack of prestige, grants will not be so forthcoming, and - when we include the market pressures caused by all the other schools already going online - the only trajectory seems a downwards one.

And yet, at the very time when online learning will cause many of the above problems, in can also be used to solve them. The logic here – as mentioned – is that institutions like The University of Phoenix easily win any quantitatively-driven argument, yet they lose horribly when it comes to quality. Once the number of online schools grows across the nation and becomes the norm – once the rapid declines in price have bottomed out and online education is no longer a real "alternative"- then the issue of quality will decide a great deal. UCLA can brand itself as the high end of distance education, because currently the quality of available media is risible. It is cheap, pragmatic, or crudely practical (in the most fundamental and undemanding realms). And, to boot, it is ugly.

We need, of course, to address the commonsense claim that online classes are grossly inferior to a face-to-face, on-campus experience. In the name of objectivity, it is worth taking a quick look at this year's sweeping overview of online learning by the Dept of Education, conducted precisely with this goal in mind - of comparing web-based and classroom learning experiences. The survey found that "students in online learning conditions performed better than those receiving face-to-face instruction." One of the

main reasons, of course, is that most of our GE/Lower-Division students have some experience of classes that are so big, they'd be better off watching a video performance, a close-up broadcast that is paused and (re)considered at their own pace. The bigger classes often offer no contact with the professor, in any case. Hence the number of students in the back row(s) "taking notes" on their laptops, many of whom are actually polishing their Facebook profiles. (The same students, no doubt, also wish they were at home, watching a popular BruinCast of the same information. This is an online program, in fact, that is now so popular it has caused lecture attendance to decrease!)

The classes taught by our lecturers are at particular risk, because those instructors are quite possibly going to be laid off in huge numbers. If their contracts are not renewed, overburdened ladder faculty will only be able to afford the same classes less time and attention. Once again a vicious circle downwards results. And yet, precisely because large undergraduate courses have both bigger enrolments and are vital to a student's timely graduation, we could move them to a digital summer program, thus solving several problems. Students will both accelerate their advancement and deal with core courses - on their own schedule. This can be done while they hold down summer jobs, get a better learning experience (says the Dept. of Education!), and – given the potentially limitless enrolments – resulting profits can be engendered that will actually fund lecturers during the school year.

The final pages of this document show the clear benefits to be gained in the quality of our language instruction if we take that online, too (at least partially), in the summer. In a word, all of these digital courses, being of high quality, will be used to establish UCLA's reputation as the home for high-end, cutting-edge, online learning.

SECTION THREE: The Current – Profitable – Model in Operation at UCLA's TFT

The School of Theater, Film, and Television (TFT) at UCLA currently has in operation a well-run, profitable, and top-notch system of online classes. While the efforts at TFT are not well-known, a number of informative demonstrations have been made for the university's leadership and committees by the TFT Director of Distance Education, Raoul O'Connell. The most notable of these was on March 6th, 2009, at a meeting of the UCLA Faculty Committee on Educational Technology

In exploration of a possible solution to the existing dilemmas in the Humanities, we offer here a brief sketch of the School's achievements. This year they presented 12 offerings (using 10 courses) in Sessions A and C; this was the first time that the summer scheme had offered so many classes. Over the previous five years, a small and unsupported program of 4 classes was in place, with enrolment around 100 students. Thanks to new and recent reinvestment, the outlook is even rosier. This year's collective enrolment – with virtually no advertising, save a slot in the Daily Bruin and some word-of-mouth PR work – was 769 students, the equivalent of 50 student FTE. This is a great success, by any measure.

There are several specific reasons why students love this format, over and above its mobility or flexible scheduling. UCLA summer courses delivered on campus are subject to campus and registration fees; UCLA online courses are not, so students pay the per-unit charge only. This means UC students (UCLA included) save $59, while visiting students (non-UC) save $300, and international learners save a full $700. Here we see ways in which both we and the students can benefit from the "fracturing" of formats, as mentioned above. Newspaper recently became blogs; albums became mp3s. Universities will, it seems, soon become unit-based purveyors, competing to offer students the best-quality video footage. That benchmark should be established at UCLA.

Some of the students in TFT's online courses are from the school's own majors or minors, but the vast majority are pursuing degrees in other UCLA departments, including the Humanities, Sciences, Engineering, and so on. Students from UCLA's sister-campuses constitute the next largest group, followed by international students and those from colleges and community colleges, all across the country. Professionals, retirees, and life-long learners also register. Students in these online courses are not required to report to campus or a special "testing centers" for exams. All tests, including midterms and finals, are essay-format papers or creative writing assignments, submitted via Turn It In to prevent plagiarism.

Courses taken online carry the same weight as courses taken on campus and count toward the requirements of both TFT minors. Time to degree, as noted, is therefore accelerated. This is especially true because UCLA and UC students who receive financial aid during the academic year are also eligible for financial aid during Summer Sessions. Studying in summertime is therefore fast, cheap, flexible – and open to additional support! This is a win-win situation for both learners and the campus budget.

The benefits continue: TFT's online courses do not use scheduled discussion time in an online chat-room; they are designed to give students maximum flexibility. Professors do, of course, set deadlines, but the students choose both the place and time to watch lectures or work on their assignments. Professors and TAs, it should be noted, often schedule optional Skype chat sessions, too. The date and time for such chats is posted on the "Office Hours" panel of the Class Website; notices of optional chats are emailed out in a timely fashion to all learners.

These websites are specific to the class in question; they are considered the central location from which students view all the relevant lectures, yet here, too, there is flexibility. Video podcasts of all lectures and exercises are available for download, over and above the basic video stream. The same information even comes as an MP3 file, i.e., as audio only, if so desired.

Students interact with their professors and TAs online in various ways. Both parties are active on the discussion board, as moderators and participants. This digital board provides the equivalent of class discussion, with specific questions related to the lessons being posted online. Student responses to the posts of others are required; the dangers of passive listening and non-involvement, therefore, are both avoided. As a result, the online

discussion board is an active, formal, and properly institutionalized space, both for the composition and evaluation of short essays. Each board has a special forum where the professor and TA can respond to questions about the course and its assignments.

Courses with discussion sections include a blog where instructors can post images, links, commentary, and video – all of which are designed to address issues arising during the six weeks of class. In many cases, the same blog operates as a multimedia teaching space where TAs can upload webcam video and/or offer short video presentations that introduce the material. (Importantly, professors and TAs are both given access to "Screenflow," a Mac-based application that allows for the simple screen-capture of video on the desktop, easing the workflow.)

In short, this program enables TFT to make some of its best courses available both across and beyond the UCLA campus, all in keeping with the University of California's mission of public service. Offering courses online gives students across the country and around the globe the opportunity to pursue a wealth of subjects, especially when their home institution has limited options. This digital, mobile program is in no way a "lesser version" of current offerings; quite the opposite. It furthers and betters the mission of UCLA, bridging the aforementioned gap between the quantitative and qualitative goals that threatens to cause our university significant problems in the very near future.

SECTION FOUR: The Financial Aspect of TFT's Summer Offerings

This summer, the enrolments for TFT online offerings ranged between 60 and 100 students. Working on that principle for the other divisions on campus, here is a list of courses that have had enrolments of 70 students or more – and would, therefore, potentially be suitable as summer online offerings:

Recent Summer Courses with Enrollments over 70

Anthropology

9	Culture and Society	89
124P	Human Sexual Behavior	87
33	Culture & Communication	88
156	Comparative Religion	98

Chemistry and Biology

14BL	Genetic & Organic Chem Lab	152
153A(1)	Structure Enzymes Metabolism	211
153L	BioChemical Methods	220
14C	Structure of Organic Molecules	115
14CL	Genetic & Organic Chem Lab (2)	157
14D	Organic Chem: Reactivity & Pharmacology	102
30B	Organic Chemistry	77

153A (2)	Structure Enzymes Metabolism	153
	Communication Studies	
101	Freedom of Communication	93
	Computer Science	
31	Intro to Computer Science	96
	Economics	
1 (1)	Principles of Economics	118
2 (1)	Principles of Economics	79
41	Stats-Economists	85
106F	Finance	83
137	Urban & Regional Economics	80
160 (1)	Money and Banking	102
1(2)	Principles of Economics	101
2 (2)	Principles of Economics	92
11 (2)	Microeconomic Theory	100
102	Macroeconomic Theory	143
106F	Finance	119
106V	Investments	98
151	Topics: Labor Economics	95
171	Ind Org: Theory & Tactics	80
	Engineering	
183EW	Engineering and Society	153
	Gerentology	
M119O	Psychology of Aging	88
	History	
140A	US 20th Century - 1900-1928	142
174A	Early History of India	77
13C	US & Colonial Origins - 20th Century	110
137B	British Empire Since 1783	106
140C	US Since 1960	179
157B	Indians - Colonial Mexico	79
162A	Modern Brazil	84

	International Development Studies	
100A	Economic Development & Cultural Change	102
150	Economic Development: Developing Countries	96
M100B	Political Economy of Development	124
	Life Sciences	
1	Evolution Ecology and Biodiversity	118
2	Cells Tissues Organs	128
3	Intro to Mollecular Bio	163
4	Genetics	182
1	Evolution Ecology and Biodiversity	125
2	Cells Tissues Organs	136
3	Intro to Mollecular Bio	149
4	Genetics	220
	Management	
1B	Accounting Principles	91
	Mathematics	
3C	Calculus for Life Science Students	99
32B	Calculus of Several Variables	82
33B	Differential Equations	78
	Physics and Astronomy	
6A	Physics for Life Science Majors	169
6B	Physics for Life Science Majors	123
6C	Physics for Life Science Majors	89
6B (2)	Physics for Life Science Majors	99
6C (2)	Physics for Life Science Majors	126
	Pschological Science	
3	Intro to Human Physiology	131
	Political Science	
10	International Political Theory	135
20	World Politics	142

40	Intro to American Politics	77
118	Political Violence	106
120A	Foreign Realtions – US	135
M122B	Global Environment & World Politics	135
20 (2)	World Politics	187
50	Intro to Comparative Politics	155
128A	US-Soviet Relations	85
145E	Rights of Accused	79
	Psychology	
100A	Physchological Statistics	76
100B	Research Methods in Psychology	80
133D	Social & Personality Development	102
187A	Psychology and Law	108
100A	Physchological Statistics	78
100B	Research Methods in Psychology	79
115	Behavioral Neuroscience	99
120A	Cognitive Psychology	97
127	Abnormal Psychology	84
	Public Health	
100	Principles of Epidemiology	119
100A	Intro to Biostatistics	177
	Sociology	
1 (1)	Introductory Sociology	120
1 (3)	Introductory Sociology	112
101	Development Social Theory	109
116	Social Demography	76
134	Culture and Personality	136
148	Sociology Mental Ilness	111
M176	Sociology of Mass Communication	79
1(2)	Introductory Sociology	137
102	Contemporary Social Theory	97
130	Self and Society	124
145	Social Deviant Behavior	102
M162	Sociology of Gender	134
M174	Sociology of the Family	125
	Statistics	
112	Statistical Methods	97
10	Intro- Statistical Reason	116

So what of faculty responsibilities in creating an online class? In composing a video course from scratch, it is assumed that the instructor would identify and collect the visual items him/herself, although work-study students are sometimes employed to assist this gathering/research. All images need to be high-resolution (an issue solved by any basic scanner). Lecture footage is shot in a small, in-house DIY studio at TFT with two static cameras. The lecturer sits behind a table and is able to have notes on a laptop in front of him/her. Any mistakes or nervous moments can, apparently, be edited out with remarkable effectiveness.

The basic structure of these small films designed for summer school would lead us to suggest a series of 10 x 2-hour lectures as the building block for one full course. These films can easily be updated and/or amended as time passes, if the instructor feels that his/her information needs adjustments. In TFT's current model, the instructor is not compensated for the preparation of course materials; workstudy support is paid by the school. (Course-relief/release was, in some instances, arranged in the case of instructors preparing two courses simultaneously.) The instructor receives a flat fee based on the average value of a summer ninth (or $7,000-$8,000) for this work, both for the "debut" offering and on each subsequent occasion when his/her course is listed; the course can be offered twice in one summer. All additional profits from the course could then go back to the instructor's department – to fund either grad students or our endangered lecturers.

While some sources suggest a production cost per course of $10,000, TFT estimates the expense to be approximately $8,000. This includes the camera operator, a video editor (TFT alumni), work study, and digital storage (hard drives), etc. Below is a rough budget showing how a modest, if not low enrolment of fifty students would work in terms of recouping those costs (and let us not forget that TFT's current success is build upon work that was not advertised). As is immediately clear, the initial costs of making the courses this year, in time for Summer 2010, are easily covered. The next summer – 2011 – therefore brings significantly more profit as the (pre-prepared/archived) lectures are shown for a second time.

50 students
80% UC @ $229 per unit
20% Non-UC @ $321 per unit
4 unit course
Two 25% TAs @ $1512 each
Projected 2010 Summer Session rates and deductions
(Summer 2011 fees likely to increase)

SUMMER 2010

Revenue	$49,480.00
Production Cost	-$8,000.00
Professor	-$7,000.00
Tas	-$3,024.00
Summer Sessions (Aid)	-$12,091.20
Summer Sessions (Overhead)	-$6,000.00
Total Revenue per course	$13,364.80

SUMMER 2011

Revenue	$49,480.00
Production Cost	$0.00
Professor	-$7,000.00
Tas	-$3,024.00
Summer Sessions (Aid)	-$12,091.20
Summer Sessions (Overhead)	-$6,000.00
Total Revenue per course	$21,364.80

Mr. O'Connell was asked whether these courses are evaluated by students, and he replied in the affirmative. His digital evaluations incorporate both the traditional questions from our on-campus, paper-based forms and some new questions related to learners' experience of a web-based classroom. When asked precisely what kind of queries he uses to evaluate their experience online, he was kind enough to give me the following examples:

Convenience and Appeal:
Please state your level of agreement with the following statements.

- My online class gave me great flexibility with time and scheduling
- My online class provided an academic experience in keeping with my expectations of UCLA
- My online course experience was straightforward and generally free of complications

Functionality and Effectiveness:

- Rate the overall effectiveness of your class website as a tool for delivering courses online

Repeat Appeal:

- Would you recommend a UCLA/TFT distance education course to a friend?

TFT reports that the positive or "very positive" responses to these questions numbered over 90%.

It is clear that these young scholars not only like the experience of online learning, they will come back for more. The world of higher education is moving towards a digital experience, both nationwide and across the globe - as class units begin to be sold internationally. If we do not provide these services, it seems reasonable to assume that we will simply increase our own problems – which may, in any case, already have begun.

SECTION FIVE: Some Pedagogical Proof: Online Language Acquisition

Most of what is said above refers to lecture-based courses. But what of language, since much of the summer school is driven by language-centered offerings? How can reduced physical co-presence be of any benefit to language learning? Over the last few years, a substantial body of academic literature has emerged that investigates the potential of online tools for language(s). Far from criticizing these digital tools as an excessively virtual environment, much of the research stresses the fact that online interaction, based as it is on collaboration, discussion, and debate, is a much better preparation for real-world interaction – for example corporate teamwork - than the traditional classroom.[1]

In the same spirit, many online experiences (like synchronous debate or 3D environments) are directly connected to real-life situations. They force participants to act as they would when faced with actual decision-making,[2] because online communication is a form of empirical investigation, rather than the repetition of pre-established correct answers by rote. As a result, learners both develop an advanced sense of autonomy and share important, immediately relevant information, becoming in the process part of a "learning community" and thus feeling themselves to be studying for a reason.[3] Such, in fact, is the nature of most out-of-class learning: given a choice our students always reject paper-based information in favor of media-rich alternatives.

For the same reason, our time-honored practice of lecturing to or at students is becoming obsolete. One recent article in The Chronicle of Higher Education took a theoretical leap into the future, wondering specifically about the year 2029. How will we describe teaching then?

Some teachers and students [in 2029] still use laptops or tablets, but others prefer handhelds, like phones or game consoles… Both teaching and research more closely resemble the activity of online social networks than traditional lectures, seminars, or

conferences. Courses typically emphasize collaborative research leading to immediate publication of short bursts of text. Reader feedback then powers incremental improvements and additions… The traditional unidirectional model of knowledge transmission (best represented by the now-deprecated "lecture") has been effectively discredited, although it persists through habit, inertia, and whispered doubts about the efficacy and rigidity of the new model.[4]

Many of these tools are already part and parcel of our students' normal learning environments; their absence at school is seen as a lack (and a guarantor of tedium).[5] When faculty members do make the effort to use high-end tools in the classroom, students are undoubtedly appreciative.[6] Thus we find ourselves caught between traditions of lecturing and a new age of collaborative learning.[7] We must abandon what one Second Language Acquisition (SLA) study recently termed "our pre-digital instinct and comfort zones." Indeed, if we are able to circumvent our worries and embrace the perplexing irregularity of online, collaborative learning, we can start letting students build "language awareness through observation and/or [their] experience." [8]

The benefits of collaborative work are far from anything that is "merely" virtual. Online collaborations build a tangible sense of community and shared confidence, because one of the biggest problems in learning a language is performance anxiety. [9] Language contact via the medium of a social network allows for partial privacy, which means greater experimentation and risk-taking.[10] Various studies have shown that confidence garnered in these areas is not seen by the students as false or "make-believe" in any way. Quite the opposite; as web-based socialization develops, the line for learners between virtuality and "reality" vanishes.[11] The preferred means of socialization for today's "digital native generation"[12] is already available to us all through related networks such as Facebook, MySpace, Instant Messenger, Twitter, Skype, Vkontakte, interconnected blogs, homemade video clips, podcasts, etc.[13] These forms of mobile communication build communities of SLA learners on campus, at home, on the road, and radically increase the likelihood of international, cross-cultural communication, also.[14]

In such fluid situations, the forces of cultural conflict, variation, and similarity all come into play, having been virtually absent from classrooms of the past.[15] The old, "top-down" model of learning, based upon information from an institutionalized elder, differs radically from the "bottom-up" or horizontal socialization of our students. In other words, they don't expect to be told: they expect invitations both to connect and cooperate in tasks - as on any social network.[16] Those proffered connections – made and maintained by language – will unavoidably become a place where one's values must be both promoted and defended. "Unreflective" intercultural contact is turned into so-called "developmentally available opportunities." [17]

Through quick and immediately relevant interaction, speakers realize the importance of subtle linguistic cues; they become more aware both of their vocabulary and intonation.[18] In the words of one study, what occurs is a "development of heightened attunement to the communicative preferences of one's interlocutors." Identities become less fixed as students need to "choose positions of hybridity which may augment their interpretive

capabilities - as intercultural speakers who can navigate between multiple online and offline speech communities."[19] This prepares students for everyday situations, where successful dialog requires a great deal more than good grammar or a solid vocabulary![20]

Studies have shown that these web-based, mobile approaches work because they are based upon swiftly-developing personal relationships that both matter to the students[21] and draw them into stylistically varied debates where they can no longer play the rather defeatist or silent role of "an exotic little foreigner."[22] Instead what grows is "a sense of expressivity and solidarity with one's Internet peers." Here, too, students with low self-esteem benefit, especially in situations where role-playing identities can be adopted to the benefit of self-assurance.[23]

As our evidence accrues, we naturally touch upon to the realm of online gaming, pure and simple. These tools can vivify collaborative overlap between language and goal-driven enterprise through so-called "polyfocal" situations, in which various semiotic devices are used to achieve one task.[24] Characters work together on screen in order to fulfill a task or achieve a goal, which – to be honest - is the sine qua non of almost all role-driven computer games! To know more, consequently, means to achieve more – in patterns of "intersubjective meaning."[25]

These patterns, in turn, need not exist wholly behind the screen of a static monitor: role-playing and physically mobile participation in mutual discovery is equally important in the use of cell phones.[26] Apps are available for tools like Byki that keep a constant stream of vocabulary coming to an iPhone for solo practice; cell phone communication between speakers offers just as much potential for regular "collaborative, learner-centered, constructivist and task-based learning approaches."[27] Much of the value of smartphone learning, in fact, can be explained using the "interaction" theory of modern pedagogy, according to which the comprehensible input of information that learners require comes during the negotiation of meaning with "capable" individuals[28] in "personalized learning environments."[29] What results is the "self-construction" of a student's skill-set or knowledge, effected socially at the learner's desired speed and level.[30] Following the successful use of SMS, mobile email, mobile discussion boards, and handheld messengers in SLA tasks, we can see that convenience has a direct and positive influence - both on student participation and gain. The benefits are swift, pragmatic, and directly relevant to students' lives, both inside and beyond the walls of our campus.

---

[1] Gokhale, A "Collaborative Learning Enhances Critical Thinking," *Journal of Technology Education* 7/1 (1995); Ngeow, K., "Motivation and Transfer in Language Learning," *ERIC Digest*. Available online at: http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed427318.html

[2] Stacey, E. "Collaborative Learning in an Online Environment," *Journal of Distance Education* 2 (1999)

[3] Bernard, R. et al., "Collaborative Online Distance Learning," *Distance Education* 21/2 (2000); Pilar, M. Colomar, A., and Gil Guzmán, E. "ICT-SUSTOUR and MARKETOUR: Two Second Language Acquisition Projects Through a Virtual Learning Environment," *Computers & Education*, April (2009)

[4] "The Faculty of the Future," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 30 June (2009)

[5] Windham, C., "Father Google and Mother IM," *Educause Review,* 40/5 (2005)

[6] Imus, A., et al.,"Technology: A Boom or a Bust?" *Inventio: Creative Thinking about Learning and Teaching,* 6/1 (2004); Prensky, M. "How to Teach with Technology" *BECTA's Emerging Technologies for Learning,* 2 (2007).

[7] Georgina, D.A, & Olson, M.R.,"Integration of Technology in Higher Education," *The Internet and Higher Education,* 11 (2008).

[8] Blattner, G and Fiori, M., "Facebook in the Classroom," *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, January (2009)

[9] Rovai, A.P. "Sense of Community, Perceived Cognitive Learning, and Persistence in Asynchronous Learning Networks," *Internet and Higher Education,* 5 (2002); Blattner, G and Fiori, M., "Facebook in the Classroom," *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, January (2009)

[10] "Facebook in the Classroom."

[11] Jones, R.,"The Problem of Context in Computer-Mediated Communication," *Discourse and Technology: Multimodal Discourse Analysis.* Washington: G.U. P. (2004); Miller, D., and Slater, D. *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach*. Oxford: Berg (2000); Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet*. NY: Routledge (2004).

[12] Presky, M. "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants," *On the Horizon*, 9/5 (2001)

[13] Thorne, S., and Payne, J. "Evolutionary Trajectories, Internet-Mediated Expression, and Language Education. *CALICO Journal,* 22/3, (2005); Thorne, S., and Lantolf, J. P. "A Linguistics of Communicative Activity," *Disinventing and (Re)Constituting Languages*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters (2006).

[14] Basharina, O. "An Activity Theory Perspective on Student-Reported Contradictions in International Telecollaboration," *Language Learning & Technology*, 11/2, (2007); Schneider, J., and Von der Emde, S. "Conflicts in Cyberspace: From Communication Breakdown to Intercultural Dialogue in Online Collaborations," *Internet-Mediated Intercultural Foreign Language Education*. Boston: Heinl (2006); Kramsch, C. "Thirdness: The Intercultural Stance," *Language, Culture, and Identity*, Aalborg: Aalborg University Press (1999).

[15] Thorne, S. L. "Beyond Bounded Activity Systems," *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, Los Alamitos: IEEE Press (2000); Thorne, S. L. "Artifacts and Cultures-of-Use in Intercultural Communication," *Language Learning & Technology,* 7/2 (2006); Thorne, S. "Pedagogical and Praxiological Lessons from Internet-Mediated Intercultural Foreign Language Education Research," *Internet-Mediated Intercultural Foreign Language Education*, Boston: Thomson Heinle (2003).

[16] Lankshear, C., and Knobel, M. *New Literacies*. Buckingham: OUP (2003); Emigh, W., and Herring, S."Collaborative Authoring on the Web", *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. Los Alamitos: IEEE Press (2005).

[17] Belz, J., "Linguistic Perspectives on the Development of Intercultural Competence in Telecollaboration," *Language Learning & Technology*, 7/2 (2003); Ware, P., "Missed" Communication in Online Communication," *Language Learning & Technology*, 9/2 (2005); Ware, P., and Kramsch, C. "Toward an Intercultural Stance: Teaching German and English through Telecollaboration," *Modern Language Journal*, 89/2, (2005).

[18] Agar, M. "Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation," NT: William Morrow (1994).

[19] Thorne, S. and Black, R. *Language and Literacy Development in Computer-Mediated Contexts and Communities*, Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 27 (2007); Canagarajah, S. "Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages, *College English*,68/6 (2006).

[20] Kramsch, C., and Thorne, S. "Foreign Language Learning as Global Communicative Practice," *Globalization and Language Teaching*, London: Routledge (2002).

[21] Kinginger, C., and Belz, J., "Sociocultural Perspectives on Pragmatic Development in Foreign Language Learning," *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2/4 (2005); Thorne, S. and Black, R. "Language and Literacy Development in Computer-Mediated Contexts and Communities," *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27 (2007)

[22] Hanna, B., & De Nooy, J. "A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum," *Language Learning & Technology*, 7/1 (2003)

[23] Black, R., "Digital Design: English Language Learners and Reader Reviews in Online Fanfiction," *A New Literacies Sampler*, NY: Peter Lang (2007).
[24] Jones, R.,"The Problem of Context in Computer-Mediated Communication," Discourse and Technology: Multimodal Discourse Analysis, Washington : GUP (2004).
[25] Brouwer, C., & Wagner, J. (2004). "Developmental Issues in Second Language Conversation," *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1/1, (2004)
[26] Nah, K.C., White, P. and Sussex, R.,"The Potential of Using a Mobile Phone to Access the Internet for Learning EFL listening skills within a Korean Context," *ReCALL,* 20 (2008)
[27] Nah, K. "Language Learning through Mobile Phones," *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia (2008).
[28] Long, M., (1983) "Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker Conversation and the Negotiation of Comprehensible Input. *Applied Linguistics,* 4/2 (1983)
[29] Campbell, C. and Kryszewska, H. *Learner-Based Teaching.* Oxford: OUP (1992)
[30] Warschauer, M., "Computer-Mediated Collaborative Learning," *Modern Language Journal*, 81/4 (1997)*;* Campbell, C. and Kryszewska, H. *Learner-Based Teaching.* Oxford: OUP (1992); Felix, U., "The Web as a Vehicle for Constructivist Approaches in Language Teaching. *ReCall*, 14/1 (2002)

Appendix D

DEVELOPING A RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE SYSTEM AT UCLA

Streamlining Majors, Increasing Outreach,
Generating Revenue, and Improving Quality

1. Campus Housing: The Present Scenario

UCLA's Office of Residential Life (ORL) produces a series of videos for YouTube, designed to brand the university's undergraduate living complex "on the hill." Noting with pride that 90% of our freshmen live in those various residences, these promotional films revolve around the tagline of "Right at Home, Right on Campus." The emphasis in these PR materials, as a result, falls upon the former half of that slogan. In other words, by noting that accommodation in the middle of Los Angeles can be pricey, scarce, and sometimes even unsafe, the Office of Residential Life then offers a close-knit, worry-free environment. The purpose of this document is to reverse that tagline's emphasis, and bring the campus into the students' homes – by creating a Residential College structure.

Given that UCLA is the smallest campus in the UC system - a mere two square miles - the various buildings of our undergraduate accommodations stand close together. The choices on offer consist of high-rises (Dykstra, Hedrick, Rieber, and Sproul); plazas (De Neve, Sunset Village, plus three more - as extensions of the high-rises); and suites (Hitch and Saxon). There is a very good reason why the architects of these complexes made recourse to nouns such as "village" in order to describe both the close proximity and degree of interaction between the buildings. Overseeing these interwoven structures and their residents, the ORL works hard in order "to enhance opportunities for students' academic success, their community, personal growth, and leadership development."

Looking with specific interest at that initial goal of academic success, ORL has in place the Faculty in Residence (FIR) program; each of the campus residential complexes has an affiliated faculty member or, in a few cases, two such people. The role and responsibility of each FIR is "to promote a mentoring relationship." By living and working physically within the residential complexes, these adult neighbors offer a unique opportunity for students to relate to faculty "on a more personal level than they can in the classroom." Given, in other words, ORL's overt proposal of a physical and intellectual haven from the raucous environment of surrounding neighborhoods, nonetheless the same office is implicitly aware of ways in which the 10,000+ students living on campus could cohere - to even greater pedagogical benefit.

Working conservatively towards that goal, ORL has in place so-called "Themed Communities," specifically at Delta Terrace, Dykstra Hall and Sproul Hall. In 2009-2010, the emphases in question are:

African Diaspora Studies Theme
Chican@/Latin@ Studies Theme

Green/Sustainability Theme
Health Sciences Theme
Transfer Experience Theme

The themes allow students with similar interests to live together and participate in specially designed programs that cater to their academic and social interests. Each theme is partnered both by an academic department and faculty member. Residents living in themed communities also have an opportunity to enroll in Fiat Lux seminar courses with their peers, thus enjoying the benefits of an integrated community that shares scholarly interests.

Theme residents likewise have the chance to contribute to the greater Los Angeles area through Leadership Activities and Community Service programs. Each theme community is affiliated with a number of students groups on campus, giving residents the opportunity to interact and engage in additional activities that enhance their overall experience. Students are thus part of a living and learning population that fosters their development, supports academic success, and promotes responsible citizenship. The same community creates safe environments that spark students' interests and leave a lasting impact in their experience at UCLA.

2. Campus Housing: A Future Scenario

Let us go one step further, however, in the light of the current fiscal climate. We are looking to lessen the number of majors across campus, and work instead around core offerings, thus converging countless areas of narrow specificity. If we were to extend the current residential system on UCLA from these themed communities into a *bona fide* system of residential colleges, many benefits would result, all speaking directly to the pressing issues of the moment.

Were we looking for a nearby system along these lines, i.e., a residential/educational model using campus housing, a logical candidate would be UCSC (with the so-called "communities of learning") or, perhaps, UCSD (built around a system of six colleges). Regarding that latter option, the following context is useful to consider: UCSD's colleges provide smaller "home" communities where undergraduate students get to know each other and faculty members *better* than in most large research universities. A Provost, serving both as an administrative and academic leader, heads each college. These positions could be seen as simple developments of our current Faculty in Residence.

Each UCSD college also has its own deans of Academic Advising, Student Affairs, and Residential Life, who provide a support system for students. Every UCSD faculty member, in fact, is affiliated with both a college and an academic department. Each college, in turn, is dedicated to a specific emphasis, be it Liberal Arts, Digital Humanities, Economics and Sociology, etc. This same model, if embraced at UCLA, would certainly be a commonsensical – and uncomplicated - expansion of our current themed communities. Why not arrange broader majors around these complexes, too, just as the system of houses at Harvard, for example?

In an environment such as this, one can imagine a radically interdisciplinary, broadly popular Humanities degree, by way of illustration, based in core elements of the Division, but with a subsequent concentration in a more specific field. The new Residential Colleges would oversee GE courses as interdisciplinary/Lower Division groundwork, respectful of time-honored elements of the Humanities. Envisioning such matters, one might think along the lines of the Foundation Year Program at King's College in Canada. Established more than three decades ago, it was recently voted the nation's "Best Educational Experience" among freshmen. In the college's own words, "rather than taking five distinct courses - and juggling five different assignment lists - you embark on an interdisciplinary program which eliminates traditional separations between the subjects of English, history, philosophy and sociology, allowing humanity's ideas and dilemmas to be discussed from many perspectives."

Following UCSD's model would also allow us to do that. Let's quickly sketch their structure, which successfully marries campus-wide solidarity and a sense of collegiate uniqueness. UCLA, following this same structure, would then be able to offer both the research university experience *and* a face-to-face, interdisciplinary option, orbiting around a small number of core degree fields.

UCSD's six colleges currently share some similarities, since students in every college:

- Learn to read closely, and to write and think critically
- Blend a broad liberal arts education with a "focused course of study toward life and career"
- Develop a set of social, civic, and ethical skills for "engaged citizenship in the 21st Century"
- Attend classes together with students in other colleges
- Have access to college-based academic advising to enroll in classes, plan a 4-year program of study, and "address personal challenges"
- Participate in college-based residential, social, leadership, and service activities "developed around the programmatic themes of the colleges"

As for General Education requirements:

- All students at UCSD must fulfill certain General Education requirements and the requirements of an academic major. The colleges determine General Education requirements for their students, whereas major requirements are determined by individual departments. Some colleges require students to declare one or more minor fields in addition to the major.
- General Education requirements ensure that students graduate with "advanced *writing proficiency* and breadth of knowledge across UCSD's principle disciplinary areas." (Our emphasis)

It will be argued that UCLA cannot entertain some of the intensely interactive, interdisciplinary options in place at smaller universities, or liberal arts colleges, yet the architecture of student housing on campus does, ironically, allow us that possibility. The intense, fast-track, and interactive Humanities education – upon which Oxford and Cambridge were once structured – could be set up at UCLA with minimal effort.

All that is needed is for the emphasis of ORL's slogan to be (respectfully) reversed, thus giving us "Right on Campus; Right at Home." What results is one interdisciplinary major per building, focusing activities, events, and debate to synthesize the classes taken all over campus in the new cross-divisional environment. This shift of focus, from a fractured campus to an existing, homogenous housing arrangement, would open up various options, either in terms of differential fees (students paying more for the "Collegiate Option") or differential goals (more driven students opting for a debate-intensive track, working with in-house FIR tutors).

Ours, as mentioned, is the smallest campus in the UC system in terms of square mileage, and therefore *best* suited to interdisciplinary studies on a residential model. Worldwide, in fact, the list of residential colleges and universities is by no means limited to diminutive institutions. The academic prestige afforded by this system is also considerable. Over and above the venerated collegiate systems at Oxford and Cambridge Universities, there are – of course - those equally prominent institutions based upon them here in the US, including Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, to name but three.

Going back to the starting point of this teaching configuration, it seems useful to recall how and why a college system ever emerged in Oxford. Over the course of a few centuries, approximately from 1220 onwards, the number of independent teaching bodies in the city grew too many. In addition, students lived all over town, making teaching a lot harder. In a situation not unlike our own, the administration at Oxford knew that streamlining was needed. Countless teaching opportunities around the municipality were therefore reined in, creating the colleges we know today – with fewer faculty. That same faculty, living in the colleges, was now combined with an on-site student body. As time would tell, the marriage of an intimate, interdisciplinary tutorial system and the grander, more specialized aims of upper-level research would create one of the most respected and moneyed universities in the world.

3. Conclusion

By turning our existing, close-knit, and already "themed" residential housing into a more academic environment – with the easy transfer of small numbers of eager and willing faculty into dorm-based apartments – the number of majors can start to be radically reduced. Our current offerings, over and above a broad-based, interdisciplinary "Humanities" major, let's say, could be combined with "concentrations" in French, Russian, and so forth. The colleges will act as a new, vibrant, cross-disciplinary, and socially *relevant* introduction into the liberal arts as a whole, hopefully involving classes from both North and South campuses. The Humanities will then be able to attract larger

numbers of students, who will no longer avoid the current majors that strike them as excessively narrow or, worse still, professionally pointless.

Broader-based degrees will also have greater appeal for employers and, to boot, with the new UC initiatives directed towards online classes, students will have no obstacle whatsoever in creating dramatically original, cross-disciplinary specialties on their own. As reported this week in the national press, the relevance of online offerings in higher education is growing at a dizzying rate. Our own students will soon be able to take advantage of these tools irrespective of geography; those young scholars who have fewer funds available can avoid the prohibitive expense of living on campus. In other words, although all students will automatically be members of a college, they needn't necessarily be *physically* housed within those buildings.

After all, smaller debates and discussion sections can be joined online; students need not be co-present in order to build or sway a meaningful discussion. The in-house, residential model is ideal, of course, but in another draft paper that we have already produced, advocating the use of online classes campus-wide, we show how a sense of collegiate membership can also be fostered digitally. Thus students save both money and time, whilst UCLA's profitability increases *together* with community outreach.

By creating subject- or division specific colleges on campus, for virtually no outlay and for 90% of our freshmen, a smaller, more streamlined set of degrees will be in place that can then, using the online class model at TFT, spin outward into the sidelined members of UCLA's *future* community. Students currently kept away from campus by finances or geography will also enter the fold. UCLA's Residential Colleges will become a modern gateway linking a centuries-old tradition of teaching to a changed market- and workplace. The potentially dizzying dimensions of that marketplace can be conjectured thanks to one simple advantage: UCLA is blessed with the most widely recognized university logo in the world. It would seem the time has come to engage all those people – worldwide - who *want* to be here.

Appendix E.1: UCLA DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH TEACHING WORKLOAD POLICY

A normal teaching workload for ladder faculty in the department of English consists of teaching-related activities whose credit-point value over any consecutive three-year period averages 20 teaching credits per year. Of these 20 teaching credits, at least 16 teaching credits per year must be earned through the assignment of four 4- or 5-unit lecture courses and/or seminars. The following teaching-related activities (and their point value) will be recognized in determining each faculty member's total teaching credits for the year:

4-unit lecture courses	4 teaching credits
5-unit lecture course	4 teaching credits

Since all courses in the department have significant writing components attached to their syllabi (requiring significant time of the instructor in meeting individually with students and evaluating their written work), additional points will be given to lecture courses whose enrollments exceed a normal class size of 35 students:

Class size of 36-45 students	1 extra teaching credit
Class size of 46-55 students	2 extra teaching credit
Class size of 56-65 students	3 extra teaching credits
Class size over 66 students	4 extra teaching credits

Since courses whose enrollments exceed 75 students are usually provided with TAs, class size will not be a factor in assigning teaching credit for those classes. Instead, recognition of the faculty member's additional teaching responsibilities will be based upon the number of TAs assigned to assist the faculty member in the course (since it is assumed that the faculty member will work closely with these apprentice instructors both individually and as a group):

Courses to which 1-2 TAs are assigned	1 extra teaching credit
Courses to which 3-5 TAs are assigned	2 extra teaching credits
Courses to which 6-7 TAs are assigned	3 extra teaching credits

Faculty members teaching large lecture classes who elect to meet in a weekly-scheduled discussion section with students participating in the College Honors Program will earn an additional 1 teaching credit for the course.

In order to encourage and acknowledge the faculty's involvement with students in individual tutorial relationships that involve the faculty member's meeting with a student one hour weekly through the course of a term, 0.5 teaching credit will be given for each of the following courses: 89HC, 99, 189HC, 195 (old 199I), 197, 198A-B (old 199HB-HC), 199, 375, 596, 597, 598, 599.

In addition, faculty will earn two teaching credits for each of the new one-hour seminars they teach: 19 (Fiat Lux), 89, 189, 193, etc.

Because of the close involvement of several faculty members in graduate students' dissertation research (and for which in the present enrollment process only the director of the dissertation is usually recognized in the student's enrollment record), all members of a dissertation committee will be awarded 0.5 teaching credit during the quarter in which the student passes the Part II examination and 1.5 teaching credits during the quarter the completed dissertation is filed. Members of Part I examination committees will be awarded 0.5 teaching credit since participation in this exercise requires independent consultation with the student and evaluation of written work in addition to conducting the two-hour oral examination. It will be the responsibility of those faculty who participate in the graduate instruction of students in departments other than English to report to the chairman's office details of their involvement.

Finally, in order to recognize and encourage innovation in fulfilling one's teaching responsibilities, faculty members will be awarded credit for planning and teaching courses for the first time, the number of credits being 1 teaching credit for a seminar and 2 teaching credits for new lecture courses.

Faculty members who fail to maintain an average of 20 teaching credits per year for any consecutive three-year period will be given additional course assignments in order to bring that average up to the minimum level required by the departmental teaching workload policy. In order to guarantee accuracy in departmental records, the chair's office will provide each regular faculty member during the fall quarter a tabulation of his or her teaching credits earned during the previous academic year. This will provide the faculty with an opportunity to report their teaching-related activities in other departments and programs and to designate those courses that should be considered according to departmental guidelines as "new" courses.

Appendix E.2: UCLA DEPT OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE TEACHING WORKLOAD POLICY

The faculty in the Department of Comparative Literature are committed to excellence in teaching We offer a wide range of upper division and graduate courses for our own students and for students from many other departments. The Comparative Literature Department also offers nine lower division survey and composition courses to help students satisfy UCLA requirements. Ladder faculty teach one third of these nine service courses. Formal instruction--including classroom teaching supervision of apprentice instructional personnel, and supervision of some 60 graduate and 60 undergraduate students—is one element of faculty responsibility. Research and related scholarly activities, along with service to the department, university and community, are the other. The research and instructional activities of each faculty member are inextricably intertwined, with one enriching the other. Involving students in research is an essential part of the educational process. Our workload policy reflects the interrelatedness of these activities.

The normal teaching load for Academic Senate faculty in the Department of Comparative Literature is 20 teaching credits per year, which is the equivalent of five courses. ***16 of those credits must be in four regular 4- or 5-unit courses,*** **at least two of which must be undergraduate courses; in addition, every other year at least one of the undergraduate courses must be a lower-division course.** The department has recently re-united many of our undergraduate courses to 5 units, but whether 4 or 5 units, each these counts as 4 credits toward the required total of 20 teaching credits. Undergraduate courses taught in Honors and other departments count.

The following teaching activities will be assigned credit points toward the 20 required teaching credits per year:

Lower Division courses with TAs. Since it is assumed the that faculty will work closely with their apprentice instructors, meeting with them at least one hour per week during the course and for one hour after the final examination to discuss and record final grades, the following credits will be earned according to number of TAs rather than number of students:

1-2 TAs	1 credit
3-4 TAs	2 credits
5-7 TAs	3 credits
8-10 TAs	4 credits

Teaching weekly Honors section:	1 credit
Honor's contract per student	0.5 credit
TA supervisor Fall quarter (495)	2 credits

Upper Division courses. Since all courses in Comparative Literature assign significant amounts of writing, they are highly labor intensive in terms of meeting individually with students and evaluating their writing. Additional credits, therefore, will be given to courses whose enrollment exceeds the normal 30 students:

31-39 students	1 credit
40-49 students	2 credits
50-59 students	3 credits

Teaching weekly Honors section:	1 credit
Honor's contract per student	0.5 credit

Comparative Literature 100 and 200 are required introductory courses that demand considerable extra time on the part of the instructor both in meeting individually with students and in evaluating written work. Comparative Literature 200 is a 6 unit course, which speaks for itself in terms of workload. Additional credits, therefore, will be earned by teaching these courses:

Comparative Literature 100	1 credit
Comparative Literature 200	2 credits

Combined upper division/graduate courses: Since these "C" courses require a modified syllabus for each group involved and since the preparation and meetings with those students requires more teaching effort than either grad or undergrad alone, 2 additional teaching credits will be awarded. Note: such "C" courses count as only one course toward the four regular courses which must be taught every year.

Fiat Lux courses meet one-hour weekly on a one-on-one basis. In order to encourage and acknowledge participation in these courses, 0.5 additional credit will be earned if the number of students falls below the ten required for compensation in the form of research support.

Independent Study: In order to acknowledge the considerable time spent with students in individual tutorial relationships that involve meeting with a student one hour weekly through the course of a term (or ten hours total), 0.5 teaching credit will be awarded for teaching 199 and 596. 597 and 599 can also be awarded 0.5 teaching credit if the faculty member certifies that they have met with the student for at least ten hours during any particular quarter, or if the student takes a major literature examination written by the faculty member during the quarter.

Honors Theses: In order to acknowledge the considerable work that is involved in directing án undergraduate's first major research project, the primary advisor/reader of an Honors Thesis will receive 1 credit and the secondary reader will receive 0.5 credit when the thesis is completed and approved.

Honors 89 and **189:** Faculty who teach an Honors Discussion Section as an adjunct to a large lecture course will receive 0.5 teaching credit.

PhD Committees: Several faculty members are closely involved in a student's progress through qualifying examinations and dissertation research. In order to acknowledge this important and time-consuming work, the following credits will be awarded:

PhD Committee member, ATC quarter	0.5 credit
PhD Committee Chair, ATC quarter	1 credit
PhD Committee Certifying member, Filing quarter	1 credit
PhD Committee Chair, Filing quarter	2 credits
Fields examination committee (3rd year oral)	0.5 credit

New courses: In order to recognize and encourage innovation, 1 credit will be awarded for creating courses and teaching them for the first time.

Undergraduate and Graduate Advising: We recognize the considerable importance to students' education and the considerable time required of the undergraduate and graduate Comparative Literature advisors, who in addition to day-to-day advising are responsible for planning events, devising worksheets, and presenting curricular innovations. Although we cannot count these activities as one regular course during this time of budget crisis, they will count as four credits toward the total of 20 required per year.

Faculty who fail to maintain an average of 20 teaching credits per year for any consecutive three-year period (or twelve quarters if leaves or sabbaticals occur) will be given an additional course assignment in subsequent years in order to bring that average up to the minimum level of 20 credits per year. In order to guarantee accuracy, the Chair's office will provide faculty with a worksheet on which to report Teaching Workload Credits. On this worksheet, faculty can report their teaching assignments and teaching activities in other departments as well as in Comparative Literature. Faculty are responsible for reporting courses that should be designated "new" and for calculating the credits they should receive for independent study, class size, number of TAs, and PhD committees. Teaching activities in other departments will count the same as activities in Comparative Literature