

July 23, 2018

PROFESSOR JANET SMARR, Vice Chair
Department of Theatre and Dance

PROFESSOR JUDITH DOLAN
Department of Theatre and Dance

SUBJECT: Undergraduate Program Review for the Department of Theatre and Dance

Dear Professor Smarr and Professor Dolan,

The Undergraduate Council discussed the Department of Theatre and Dance's 2018 Undergraduate Program Review. The Council supports the findings and recommendations of the review committee and appreciates the thoughtful response from the Department.

Based on the review committee's report, and the Department and Dean's responses, the Council gleaned a sense of dire urgency in the need for structured leadership and direction within the Department. A number of carryover issues remain from the Department's last review in 2011, including the relationship between graduates and undergraduates in the department, lack of communication, lack of course availability, lack of faculty advising, and demands on the sole staff advisor from students and faculty. These carryover issues were compounded by issues brought up in this year's review, relating to departmental climate and variances in faculty engagement with undergraduate teaching.

UGC recommends that the Department transition to a receivership model. It is clear that the Department remains conflicted, especially with regard to teaching distribution in undergraduate courses. With numerous previous attempts by the Department's undergraduate committee to address this, and the continued resistance to change from the larger department, we feel that the Department's internal resources are not sufficient to create an undergraduate experience of sufficiently high quality. UGC believes that a Chair appointed from outside the Department would provide a neutral party to effectively implement changes and establish best practices for the Department to meet the educational needs of undergraduate students. A Chair from outside the Department could also explore methods of strengthening communication across all fronts (among students, faculty, and staff) in order to better serve the Department's undergraduate student population.

Additionally, the Council recommends that the Department establish a committee to create and document a formal administrative structure that details how decisions are made, as there is no current model for decision-making.

The Council will conduct its follow-up review of the Department in Spring 2019. At that time, our goal is to learn about the Department's progress in implementing the recommendations of the program review committee and the Undergraduate Council. The Council extends its thanks to the Department for their engagement in this process and we look forward to the continued discussion.

Sincerely,

Sam Rickless, Chair
Undergraduate Council

Attachment

(1) Undergraduate Program Review Report and Responses for Theatre and Dance

cc: F. Ackerman
C. Della Coletta
J. Eggers
R. Horwitz
C. Means
J. Moore
R. Rodriguez
M. Sidney

Department of Theatre and Dance Undergraduate Program Review

Intro:

The UCSD Theatre and Dance department has an excellent reputation based on its highly prestigious graduate MFA program and its extraordinary faculty. The review committee wants to recognize that our meetings coincided with a moment of high emotions among the undergraduate students – 35-40 of whom attended an intensely passionate meeting. (Since the meeting was so charged we followed up with an online survey to elicit more comprehensive student feedback). We know that some of the matters contributing to this climate are ones of academic freedom and budgetary constraints. However, it is also our job to discern structural issues that may have led to this climate, and we did indeed see evidence of structural problems that we strongly encourage the campus and the department leadership to address.

The department is in the throes of dealing with a very difficult set of financial circumstances, which have affected all of its operations. They are struggling with the triple-bind of the loss of the production budget that had formerly funded graduate productions, the creation of a new production staff after the separation from that of the La Jolla Playhouse, and lowered departmental budgets campus-wide. The committee recognizes that the loss of these sources of funding necessarily places a great amount of stress on all facets of departmental operation, and necessitates making sometimes very contentious decisions.

Since the last review the department has hired junior faculty who are now energized in their engagement with the undergraduate program and addressed a key concern by reinstating a department funded undergraduate production. However many other problems flagged in the last review remain unaddressed. The committee feels that a number of factors have been neglected over the years, creating frustration among students, staff and faculty who sense that the undergraduate program suffers from overall neglect. When senate faculty were asked by the committee whether they felt decisions about the undergraduate program were made last or as an afterthought the answer was “yes.” There remains a longstanding perception among students, staff, and even some faculty that disproportionate resources are directed toward the “nationally ranked” graduate program, and that the prestige of the graduate program is partially achieved at the expense of the undergraduate program. The question is not just one of resolving priorities: at UCSD graduate programs in the arts and humanities are dependent on funding generated by undergraduate enrollments so there seems to us to be an ethical imperative to ensure that the educational needs of the undergraduates are met.

The department as a whole needs to take this opportunity to talk to each other and come up with a bottom up understanding of their own commitment to undergraduate education. That said, we are very happy to emphasize that there are many favorable factors present that might make this kind of restructuring work successful at this moment: a passionate, engaged and growing cohort of undergraduate students; a broad base of campus engagement and an excellent faculty.

A. A brief description and analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the current operation of the department in general terms

The department currently has 159 majors in total; 143 in Theatre and 16 in Dance. The number of majors had been fairly consistent for the past five years, but has increased markedly for this current year, in part because of the new portfolio review option in freshman admissions. We would note however that there are two divergent trends implicit in these statistics: the number of Theatre majors has grown consistently while the number of dance majors has fallen (down from 24 five years ago). A broadly similar pattern exists for minors (although the number of theatre minors actually fell this year). The department currently has 85 Theatre minors and 46 Dance minors for a total of 131. During our discussions with faculty, one of them interestingly stated that the department also carried what she termed a “ghost cohort” of students who actively participate in the curriculum and performance culture of the department but remain as majors in other programs.

The undergraduate program offers a strong liberal arts framework for contextualizing production and the theatrical world more generally. However, the undergraduate program in theater seems heavily overshadowed by the conservatory model of the graduate MFA program, leading to profound differences in resource allocations between the two programs. The situation has also resulted in mismatched expectations from undergraduate students, who frequently noted in our meeting with them a preference for a conservatory model that it would seem extremely difficult to fund. Along these lines, the review committee was quite deeply concerned by the ways teaching and production resources are structured within the department. The review committee was not given detailed information about the distribution of financial resources directed towards production, but we strongly suspect that these are heavily weighted towards the MFA program as well, to the detriment of the undergraduate learning experience. We would suggest that the administration request information on this and discuss the full distribution of resources with the department.

The department’s administrative structure as presented in the documentation seems consistent with campus norms. As a committee we repeatedly heard, however, that there is a general feeling that decision making processes within the department are opaque and that there are not obvious formal or structural opportunities for soliciting input. This feeling was expressed on all levels: students, staff, non senate faculty and senate faculty. Communication about administrative decisions once they’re made seems to be a particular issue. There are some faculty committee structures, but it was not clear to us, and did not seem clear to those involved, precisely what their brief was nor how they answered to each other in practice. We would note here that improving communication practices within the department was a primary recommendation of the previous undergraduate program review.

The same deficiencies are apparent in how the department communicates with its students. When asked students had limited and conflicting ideas about how they might communicate their concerns with departmental administration. We heard repeated references to student "representatives" who were supposed to serve as contact points

between students and faculty, but neither faculty nor those reps themselves were able to explain their exact role or any process for consultation. In searching for documentation of the role, the committee found only a department handbook from 2013-14 on its website, which describes these positions as representatives *for* the department rather than as point people for bi-directional communication. It is, however, useful to note here that there do seem to be active and effective informal channels of communication between students and the more junior teaching faculty in particular. Adding a firmer formal structure to these would help greatly.

The review committee was very concerned by the picture presented to it from the department's administrative staff. Both who spoke to us seemed significantly overworked; in one case close to burnout. Both also communicated that they frequently felt that the faculty conducted their business with them in adversarial ways. The undergraduate coordinator, in particular, is currently tasked with a range of duties well beyond those done by people in the equivalent position in other UCSD departments. She reported hostile interactions with faculty, overwork doing scheduling for both undergraduate and graduate programs and frustration at being the single point of contact for walk-ins in the front office of the department. She is also the only person formally charged with advising undergraduate students in the department. Students reported widespread dissatisfaction with how she was performing in this role. The communication problems and lack of in-depth engagement they reported seem entirely consistent with her description of being overworked and overextended. We would also note that, when asked, neither she nor faculty could point to any formal engagement by faculty in the advising process for undergraduate students in the department (though students did report receiving useful career advice from faculty mentors). Given the number of majors and the complexity of juggling the course offerings reported this seems like it needs to be resolved. It is essential that the department move to rectify the administrative angle as soon as possible.

One of the committee's most concrete concerns was with the way in which the teaching of the undergraduate program is being managed. The department website lists a faculty that consists of eighteen ladder rank professors, nine lecturers and a large number of Unit 18 lecturers, including a larger than usual cohort with continuing status. The department's self statement refers to 30 senate faculty, which we assume reflects recent hires. While it seems that most (though not all) ladder rank faculty have some engagement with the undergraduate program, the level of said engagement seems highly variable. By divisional and campus standards the overall percentage of undergraduate teaching done by regular rank senate faculty is low, whether measured by number of classes or by number of students enrolled. Overall 27% of undergraduate classes are being taught by ladder rank faculty, 17% by lecturers and 54% by Unit 18 faculty. The divisional averages are 52% of courses being taught by ladder rank faculty, 7% by lecturers and 34% by Unit 18 faculty. What is clear is that an unusually large amount of the undergraduate teaching is being met by Unit 18 faculty. This is even more pronounced case on the upper division level, where 57% of courses, comprising 70% of upper division enrollment, are taught by Unit 18 lecturers. In comparison, these percentages for the division as a whole are 25% and 21% respectively. We understand that it is not unusual, and may even be standard, for performing arts departments to have a

disproportionate number of Unit 18 lecturers because of the need for faculty with specialized teaching experience which can be difficult to fit within the hiring profiles for senate faculty positions at an institution like UCSD. However, even taking this into account, there seems to be an imbalance here; the department's make-up is quite different from that of the other arts departments. Since it's important for undergraduates to have substantial contact with Senate faculty at all levels of their degree program, the committee urges the department to re-evaluate teaching assignments to ensure that Senate faculty, including ladder rank faculty, teach throughout the program.

In addition to the pedagogical concerns, some of the department's recent financial problems seem to have revolved around budgetary problems in meeting instructional needs. Prior to this current year, the department has consistently run sometimes significant deficits in meeting these obligations. We note that after having stabilized somewhat this deficit blew out again in 2016/17 (about 330k of a 1.4million budget) for reasons that do not seem immediately obvious in data we were provided (enrollments were basically stable, the department was down in faculty but fewer classes were taught etc). Considerably more is being spent on employing lecturers and on graduate student TAs than is coming in. We understand that meeting teaching needs is always a struggle and that currently existing campus formulae for calculating funding disadvantage arts programs where smaller class sizes are essential to the instructional mission and hence increasing enrollments can actually lead to increased costs. That said, there is clearly a problem here: the department's model of meeting its instructional commitments is not working financially. Figuring out what has been happening here is clearly beyond the scope of this report, but we would note that the continued stability of the program and any further growth depend on financial stability.

Beyond the broader structural metrics referred to in the preceding section, there also seem to be intra-departmental issues associated with the current teaching distribution practices. Within the senate faculty, there are significant differences in engagement with undergraduate teaching. It appears, for instance, that the literature/history professors are teaching three or four undergraduate classes and one graduate class while other faculty are teaching perhaps one undergraduate class only, and some seem not to teach in the undergraduate program at all (or at least not recently).

It should be emphasized that the department has recently hired three lecturer track senate faculty who are focused on undergraduate teaching. These faculty have already had a very positive impact on the delivery of the curriculum (reflected in positive comments from the undergraduate students). While the committee appreciates the department's commitment in hiring new faculty dedicated to the undergraduate program, we would hope that the department moves more broadly to prioritize undergraduate teaching. If now a significant share of undergraduate instruction by senate faculty is being done by lecturers, then there remains a structural imbalance within the department. Further, we are concerned about structural power differences which might cause problems for these faculty in genuinely moving into leadership roles around the undergraduate program. Our impression was that, currently, informal leadership of the task of reforming the undergraduate learning experience has fallen heavily to an untenured faculty member. While we realize that the responsibilities of the LPSOE position typically involve

leadership in curricular development, we wish to highlight the impossible burden that junior, untenured status places on this particular member of the department, who has little to no structural power to bring about needed changes. We could also note that this member of the faculty is a woman and one of the very few senate faculty of color, making this structural burden even more significant. Essentially, this figure risks asking for changes at the expense of her own professional stability and promotion, and she certainly has no meaningful power to make or even influence managerial decisions. We urge the department to create a clear leadership structure team of faculty – with membership from across rank level and area of expertise – who are structurally empowered to actually make decisions within the departmental governance structures.

Further, the Unit 18 faculty who are doing so much of the undergraduate teaching in the dance program seem not to be well integrated into the department. The dance faculty that we met with reported a feeling of marginalization which had been consistently increasing over the last five years. With this background they interpreted the department's sudden canceling of all of their classes for Spring 2018 as explicitly hostile. We understand that the department feels squeezed with budgetary concerns specific to the contracts of continuing Unit 18 lecturers, but even with the provisional resolution of the situation through intervention from upper administration, the structural and communication problems persist and need to be addressed.

B. Analysis of curriculum

Students seem largely happy with the courses they are taking for the major and also to be happy with the instruction they are receiving in these courses. This was reflected in what we heard from students and also in CAPEs provided. Recently hired Theatre faculty in particular have worked to address students' concerns with production and community. However students reported significant concerns about a lack of advising structure, availability of classes, and the diversity of the curriculum. We also identified some unusual supervision models in the teaching of lower division undergraduate classes and have some concerns about the recent revision of the dance curriculum.

We are disappointed to report that problems with access to class identified in the previous review persist. Many of the classes (lower and upper division) required for the major are also being taken by non majors to satisfy college general education requirements or out of general enthusiasm. Perversely, this seems to have had the effect of both restricting access for majors to required classes *and* creating a general feeling that these core classes are being "watered down" due to the presence of less engaged non-majors. We understand that the department had aggressively pursued these outside enrollments to keep their required classes for majors afloat when enrollments had dropped. Now that the number of majors is rising again, they seem to be facing a bottleneck. In response to the previous review a limited priority enrollment strategy was established: a small number of places are held on a first come first served basis. This, however, seems insufficient as there are now more majors wanting to enrol in the classes than there are reserved spaces. Further, there is also no structure of, for example, sorting majors and non majors into separate sections.

Both undergraduate students and graduate teaching assistants also reported their impression that upper division courses important to the major were being offered too infrequently for the number of majors the department now has. In some cases, classes have apparently been offered too infrequently for it to be possible for transfer students to get through their classes expeditiously. Some are offered once a year, while others are offered less frequently than that even. Given already stretched teaching resources, we understand that offering more courses, especially specialized ones with small enrollment, is perhaps not realistic. However some kind of resolution is required here, probably one that better integrates course scheduling and advising. It is possible that with more active guidance, the transfer students were heard from would be able to complete their degrees on schedule.

Students and college advising staff both reported feeling that there are too many required lower division classes for the major, and that taking them all in time to move through to the upper division classes in the way students would want to is currently difficult. In part, it would seem that the access issues triggered by the enrollment of too many non-majors is part of the problem here. Students also expressed frustration that some of these lower division offerings were too easy for those of them who come into the program with already significant practical experience. There is apparently no mechanism to pass out of classes or articulate AP credit to lower division requirements. We can assume that such complaints might increase now that the portfolio review system is recognizing student specialization in the performing arts as part of the admissions process. Most of these complaints referred to Acting 1.

The committee feels that it needs to directly address the issue of the practicum requirement, which needs to be taken twice by all majors. The previous review registered student concerns with both the requirement itself and the manner of its administration (a lottery system). Again, nothing seems to have changed. Current students are frustrated that the lottery system does not allow them to design their schedule of classes ahead of time to best suit their needs (one student described having to forgo a lead part in a production because her number came up on the practicum). Transfer students also expressed that they felt the requirement that it be taken twice was onerous for them and almost impossible within the two year timeframe for degree completion. In cross-checking, it appears that there is already an existing reduction for transfers. Students, however, are either unaware of it, or have been advised to take the class twice when they didn't absolutely need to. Transfer students also expressed frustration that equivalent experience from community college was not accepted by the department.

The committee was particularly concerned with what appear to be inconsistent structures of supervision and accountability between faculty, graduate student instructors, and undergraduate students in some of the department's course offerings. Of particular concern to the committee were Acting 1 and Public Speaking (TDGE 25). Based on statements from faculty, teaching assistants and undergraduate students we understand that these classes are led by graduate teaching assistants, while a nominal faculty "supervisor" serves as the instructor of record. Graduate assistants and students reported no meaningful classroom or other contact between the instructor of record and the students. This situation is highly irregular. Even the way these classes are listed in the

schedule of classes is irregular: because there is no central lecture, what are, effectively, sections of one course are listed as multiple courses all with the same instructor. While it may reflect department tradition and many of the stakeholders seem reasonably happy with the situation, it should be reviewed and brought more into line with standard practice in the university. A resolution could involve hiring of graduate students as associate ins (so that the person who is actually running the class is the instructor of record), or possibly by instituting and codifying a more rigorous oversight regime and some form of contact between professor and students. Lower division play analysis classes seemed to be organized around a similar model where a faculty mentor oversees graduate teaching assistants who are doing all of the contact teaching with the undergraduates. Here, however, it does seem that there are formal oversight structures in place (weekly TA meetings, curricular supervision etc). Given the broader issues, we would suggest reviewing this situation as well. As an aside, here we would also like to flag that teaching assistants explained to us that they were hired at 25% even in these cases where they were leading the classes.

The only revisions to the department's undergraduate curriculum since the last review were the recent overhauls of the dance degree programs to reduce the number of required credits and bring them into line with campus standards aimed at improving time to degree. This revision was only just completed and we hope that it works well, but wanted to express some concern about what we heard from the dance faculty in our meetings. Faculty seemed unhappy to have had to make the cuts to requirements that they had, and seemed unsure about whether the revised curriculum could really give the students what they need. We would encourage the dance area and the department generally to closely monitor the first few years of this new program. If they are unhappy with the results they should not hesitate to make changes. These could even involve arguing for the addition of requirements that they feel are essential to the teaching of their discipline. As was implied earlier, we feel more broadly that the dance area has to better figure out the integration of senate faculty and unit 18 lecturers in servicing their curriculum. There are clear tensions around aesthetic and pedagogical aims that were reflected in student feedback too.

The department's undergraduate cohort has a slightly higher percentage of underrepresented minority students than the campus at large (significantly higher in the case of Latinx students). It is true that the department has made some effort to address diversity in the current running of their undergraduate program. We want to commend them on the current hire underway in Latinx theater and on their bringing in someone through the UC President's program. Additionally, we would note that many of the upper division courses that specifically address diverse topics, when taught, have enjoyed healthy enrollments. They have, however, been infrequently taught over the past five years we are assuming, in part, because of the administrative commitments of some key faculty. What we heard from students and from faculty was that there is a real desire from these students that their education include a critical component that reflects on their circumstances in correspondence with their practice. While there are academic classes that do this, students and some faculty felt that the performance classes currently lag. The review committee agrees with this assessment based on what we heard and the materials we were provided with. In the absence of course syllabi (which we asked for but did not

receive) and production season information, it's difficult to discern quite how deeply the curriculum of the program has been diversified, but we would like to encourage the department to continue to expand along these lines. The committee would also like to note that, even with the diversity efforts underway, the department seems to be quite obviously lagging behind both peer institutions and the current state of practice within the profession, where pedagogical and curatorial practices that adopt a more reflexive stance toward social engagement have become the norm. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we see only limited evidence of this within the UCSD department.

The committee would also like to note that the department has no policy of logging syllabi for their courses and that it has been difficult for us to review any course syllabi. We understand that it might seem intrusive and unnecessary. However, given the vagaries of the instructional models described and given the limited information conveyed in catalog copy about courses, we really felt that we needed to see syllabi to get a sense of what material was being covered, how and if the aims of the curriculum were being communicated to the students on a course by course basis. We were also concerned with what we perceived as a broader lack of clear structures for assessing the effectiveness of the curriculum and for communication about curricular goals. The review charge asks the committee to "address whether academic learning objectives and assessment processes are clearly defined for each major." What we had to go on here was the catalog copy on the programs (clear, but very general) and the WASC sheets. These latter do contain detailed information, but they also seem not to be recent. They refer to an upcoming curricular revision that would come into effect in 2010/11. Further, the links to where this information is supposed to be published are broken or non-existent. These latter points may not seem so important, but the campus is going to be reviewed for accreditation again soon and this information needs to be reviewed and updated.

C. Assessment in terms of general campus policies

The primary expressed concern, perhaps, of undergraduate majors and minors was about access to facilities. Their frustration was echoed by faculty who work closely with these students. Students feel that they do not have adequate access to spaces under the control of the department and do not understand the department's policies in regulating access to these spaces. Their frustration is amplified by their impression that these spaces are frequently vacant, especially after hours. We understand that the department runs facilities that have varied oversight requirements dictated, at least in part, by campus health and safety. The posted guidelines about facilities access that we could find are vague and out of date based on what was reported to us in meetings with both faculty and students. At best, the current circumstances represent a failure on the part of the department to communicate exactly what their facilities policies are and to explain why to the students. Ideally we would hope that some kind of middle ground might be opened up, campus regulations permitting (or that if the campus regulations are onerous and nonsensical that the department might push back on them on behalf of the students).

The department's time to degree averages are worse than the campus average and are trending in the wrong direction for both freshman admits and transfer students, even for the first cohort to graduate under the reduced curriculum introduced in 2010/11. For

2015/16 the department's average for freshman admits was 4.7273 years versus a campus average of 4.2591. For transfer students the department average was 3.25 years while the campus average was 2.737. With recent upticks in enrollment and the problems of access to courses reported above, we would recommend that the department pay close attention to time to degree, preferably through a more engaged advising regime. We heard from a number of transfer students, in particular, that they felt that they were not going to be able to complete their degrees in time.

Diversity emerged as a serious point of concern in a number of registers during the review. At the most public and contentious level, there were the impassioned protests about the cutting of dance classes that cover diverse traditional practice and are taught by primarily faculty of color. We understand that the department felt these cuts were the only way out of a difficult financial situation, but we also understand that for the students and faculty concerned that it is very difficult not to understand the situation as an attack on diversity within the department, especially when combined with the existing concerns about diversity in the curriculum mentioned above. It will clearly take some time for the department to regain the trust of the students in terms of its commitment to diversity, but it is essential that it do so.

Finally, we understand that it is not useful for us as a review committee to complain about existing funding levels or ask for money on behalf of the department. We would, however, like to speak to one of the primary recommendations from the previous report which was a hopeful one suggesting that development fundraising might help alleviate many of the program's stresses and problems. The department and division have devoted considerable energy in recent years to fundraising for the department with only mixed success so far. It seems clear to us that all parties should prioritize trying to remedy issues with the undergraduate program within existing university funding models.

D. Recommendations

- The review committee strongly encourages the department to conduct a holistic review of its engagement with undergraduate education. This could take the form of a department-wide retreat, convening working groups, or producing a series of internal reports followed by full faculty discussion. In particular, we would encourage the department to think about the following questions:
 - What is the undergraduate teaching mission? What specific skill or knowledge set does the department envision training their undergraduate majors and minors to have? Where does the undergraduate teaching mission fit within larger departmental priorities? (making some kind of decision here will help with resource allocation questions)
 - Is there a way to balance the teaching and financial resources of the department such that undergraduate teaching is made a greater priority within the distribution of these resources?
 - What kind of commitment to general education will have the most impact?
 - How do general education responsibilities and service teaching integrate with the teaching of the major?

- How are you going to measure the success of your undergraduate curriculum and teaching?
 - How might the existing curriculum shift to reflect a strong commitment to diversity? Or how might it shift to better reflect the experiences and needs of the existing diverse student cohort?
- The department needs to undertake a review of how it uses its available labor in the service of the undergraduate curriculum, and of its teaching assignment policies within its senate faculty ranks.
 - The department should develop strong and clear internal committee structures to ensure transparency in decision-making about the undergraduate program. One possibility might involve designating a (tenured) faculty member as Director of Undergraduate Studies, who would lead the undergraduate committee and serve as a liaison between students, staff and the chair.
 - Develop a revised structure for undergraduate advising that involves the undergraduate co-ordinator and the undergraduate committee (or some faculty input).
 - A clearer role for student representatives should be established (i.e. which meetings they should attend etc), within the context of a broader revision of structures of how students can communicate their concerns to the department.
 - Add the undergraduate coordinator and student rep(s) to the undergraduate committee. Include a mechanism for undergraduate feedback to be accounted for in central planning to ensure that the coordinator and reps do not merely serve to disseminate information from above.
 - Act quickly to address the situation with administrative staff. It seems essential to add at least a half time person immediately (perhaps even just a work-study employee on the front desk), but also to work at re-establishing co-operative and positive working relationships with existing staff and adding supervisory guidance to ensure improved relations between administrative staff and students.
 - Monitor the newly revised dance curriculum.
 - Keep a record of course syllabi. This is not required by the campus but is standard in many departments and will help in normalizing irregular existing instructional patterns and make it easier to keep track of curricular changes.
 - In making new hires, we would recommend building on existing moves to prioritize diversity. We would also recommend aggressively looking outside of the UCSD ecosystem. The committee noted that the department has a tendency to hire graduates of its own MFA program. We counted at least eight faculty out of twenty-seven who were graduates of the program. Given that many arts departments typically avoid hiring many of their own graduates in order to ensure a breadth of experiences and approaches, finding that nearly a third of the faculty are alumni was of concern to the committee. The committee recommends that in doing searches, the department make a concerted effort to advertise the position in a wide range of external publications and sites, particularly those that would attract a diverse applicant pool.
 - If the department is going to continue opening required classes for the major to all comers, then it needs to ensure priority enrollment for majors. i.e. enroll majors

first, then minors, then others. We understand that this might require some negotiation with broader system access policies but it can be done. Alternatively, is it possible to designate a section within these classes for majors?