6 February 2017

TO: Mary Trotter, Professor and Director, Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies Program

FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE: Completion of L&S Portion of Review of Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies programs, including:

- Master of Arts – Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies
- Doctor of Philosophy – Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies

CC: Russ Castronovo, Professor and Chair, English
Marty Gustafson, Assistant Dean, Graduate School
Elaine M. Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, APIR
Jocelyn Milner, Associate Provost and Director, APIR
Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities, L&S

On December 20, 2016, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered the materials submitted concerning the mandated academic program review of the graduate programs in Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies (previously known as the MA and PhD in Theatre and Drama). Associate Dean Susan Zaeske led discussion of the self-study, the review committee report, and the errata document. Council members were impressed by this two-year review, finding many things to praise about the program, and most importantly, noted the hard work of managing a program through a challenging transition, especially one that involves faculty from across multiple departments and schools/colleges. The review committee report offered a remarkable amount of detailed advice, which I’m sure you and your colleagues will consider as you face the future; we highlight below a few matters in particular.

A key issue identified in the external review committee report is the need to cultivate leadership for the program in the future, both in terms of the steering committee and the director. At present there are five core faculty members in the program, with at least one retirement to occur in the next three years and one member unable to participate in program governance due to serving as chair of a department. The external review committee recommends increasing the size of the steering committee to cultivate more faculty participation beyond core members. At the same
time, it suggests clarifying or perhaps dropping the distinction between core and affiliate ITS program members. Cultivating involvement by more faculty members is important for developing a succession plan for the directorship of the program as the same individual cannot be expected to serve in that capacity term after term.

The report praised current efforts to build community, identity, and a sense of belonging for this long-existing program that has a new administrative structure. It also suggested a number of steps that might be taken to clarify the new structure to external and internal audiences. For example, the review committee suggested attending to the ITS program’s online presence on the University Webpage as well as the ability to find its courses online, some issues that may be resolved somewhat in the new digital environment. The review committee also suggested that it would be helpful for graduate students to have a space of their own, which would create a sense of community and facilitate the exchange of ideas among students, faculty, and staff. The report provides a number of additional ideas about improving communication and a sense of identity among graduate students.

Yet another suggestion of the review committee was that the ITS Program develop a Ph.D. minor and also an undergraduate certificate. The L&S APC discussed these suggestions and agreed that there is wisdom in developing programs that attract enrollments, but before doing so there must be sufficient resources available to do so. These resources include the time of faculty and staff to carefully develop the program proposals, the ability to regularly provide the courses in the curriculum, appropriate advising, and so forth.

Learning goals for the master’s and doctoral programs have been articulated, curriculum maps and assessment strategies are on file in the Inside Assessment site, and we anticipate that the program will comply with the required submission of a report reflecting implementation of those plans by November 1, 2017. Planned assessment strategies – e.g., faculty evaluation of theses and proposals, using a standard rubric reflecting the articulated learning outcomes – seem appropriate for graduate-level program evaluation, and aggregating outcomes from individual students should offer some insight into the effectiveness of requirements, advising and mentoring, and other aspects of the program that affect student learning. These plans are, however, still in early stages: by the time the next review is conducted, the council hopes to see that assessment activities are regularly conducted, the findings considered by the faculty, and action is taken to foster improvement.

The L&S Academic Planning Council readily approved a motion to accept this report as complete; however, members also recognized that ITS is still in a period of necessary and important rebuilding work. They therefore asked that the College and council conduct the next review in five years, by which time members hope see a stronger community, continued strengthening of faculty affiliate relationships, and increased quality of students and placements.

Academic program review affords us an opportunity to identify strengths as well as areas needing improvement: it is a process that keeps a great university great. Please accept my thanks for seriously and thoughtfully embracing this opportunity.
November 28, 2016

To:
John Karl Scholz, Dean, College of Letters & Science

From:
Monika Chavez, German, Nordic, and Slavic (committee chair)
Jeff Smith, Communication Arts
Patricia Rosenmeyer, Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies (GFEC Representative)

CC:
Russ Castronovo, Chair, Department of English
Mary Gustafson, Assistant Dean, Graduate School
Elaine M. Klein, Associate Dean of Academic Planning, College of Letters and Science
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Jocelyn Milner, Associate Provost and Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Mary Trotter, Director, Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies
Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for Advancement, Arts & Humanities, College of Letters and Science

This review was implemented to (a) satisfy the requirement for programs to be reviewed at 10-year intervals (in this case, the former doctoral program in Theatre & Drama); and (b) to assess the Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies program (ITS) in its second year after its separation (completed by Fall 2015) from the former (incarnation of the) Department of Theatre & Drama and its reconstitution as a ‘program by committee’ that is housed in the Department of English. The review was conducted by a committee that consisted of Professor Patricia Rosenmeyer (Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies), who also served as the GFEC representative on the committee; Professor Jeff Smith (Communication Arts); and Professor Monika Chavez (committee chair; German, Nordic, and Slavic; Second Language Acquisition). The committee received a charge from Dean John Karl Scholz on July 21, 2016 and on August 31, 2016 met with Associate Deans Elaine M. Klein and Susan Zaeske to discuss the task ahead.

The program

So as to better understand the procedures that were selected for the review process, it may be useful to first introduce the current structure of Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies (ITS), a ‘program by committee.’ The program, fundamentally, is a reconstitution of the former doctoral program in Theatre & Drama (informally also referred to as ‘Theatre Research’), which used to be part of the Department of Theatre & Drama. The doctoral program in Theatre & Drama (now, ITS) in the last 10 years has lost two faculty members (Barbara
Clayton; Robert Skloot) and one academic staff member (Kristin Hunt) and now is constituted of five ‘core’ faculty members (a term that will be explained below). The (now separated) Department of Theatre & Drama has moved to the School of Education while ITS has remained in the College of Letters and Science and has been housed administratively in the Department of English. The program offers both MA and PhD degrees. The program’s faculty, in its current terminology, is divided into five ‘core’ and between 15-20 (depending on faculty’s recent, pending, and anticipated relationships to the university and the program) ‘affiliate’ members. The program is supported by a .50 FTE, Brenda Weiss, who used to be the graduate program administrator for the former Department of Theatre & Drama. Brenda Weiss’s total appointment is 1.0 FTE as she is also tasked with timetabling for the Department of English.

The ‘core’ faculty include Professor Aparna Dharwadker, Associate Professor Michael Peterson, Professor Mike Vanden Heuvel, Professor Manon van de Water, and Associate Professor Mary Trotter, who directs the program. Of the five ‘core’ faculty members, (only) two (Professors Dharwadker and Trotter) hold appointments in the housing department, English, which is also their tenure home at 100% even as 50% of their teaching effort has been dedicated to ITS. Similarly, the three other ITS ‘core’ faculty members also have 50% of their teaching effort dedicated to ITS even as they hold their full-time appointments in other departments, i.e., Associate Professor Michael Peterson in the (new) Department of Theatre & Drama; Professor Mike Vanden Heuvel in the Department of Classics and Near Eastern Studies; and Professor Manon van de Water in the Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic. Since ITS is an academic program rather than an academic department none of the ITS faculty hold a percentage appointment in ITS. Members of the ‘core’ (and also of the ‘affiliate’) faculty are dispersed physically as well as in terms of tenure homes. ‘Core’ faculty members regularly teach theatre-themed courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels, none of which have an ITS-specific subject listing and some of which are offered with an English and/or Theatre & Drama (TD) and/or other subject listing, such as ‘Slavic.’ For example, an undergraduate course that is regularly taught by ITS ‘core’ faculty and that most frequently offers graduate students in ITS the opportunity to serve as teaching assistants (TAs), is English/TD 120, Introduction to Theatre & Dramatic Literature. Similarly, another course that is taught by an ITS ‘core’ faculty member (Manon van de Water) and provides TA positions for graduate students in ITS is TD/Slavic/C&I 360.

‘Affiliate’ members include faculty members from diverse departments, including (the current) Theatre & Drama, Art, Art History, Music, Dance, Gender and Women’s Studies, English, and the foreign (including classical) languages.

According to the self-study that was submitted on January 1, 2016, one semester into the implementation of the new program (p.3), ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty differ in the regularity with which they offer ITS-relevant courses; their ability to advise dissertations and theses; and their service on the program’s Executive Committee. The same self-study also described the program’s governance structure and the Executive Committee’s responsibilities as follows ‘[…] governed by a faculty-elected Program Chair and an executive committee. The executive committee is currently made up of members of the core faculty. The executive committee’s responsibilities include new student recruitment, course scheduling, budgetary
decisions and contributing to assessments of student progress.' However, the current practice is for a Steering Committee to govern the program and for that Steering Committee to be composed of two ‘core’ faculty members (the program’s Director, Professor Trotter, and Associate Professor Michael Peterson) and two ‘affiliate’ faculty members (Associate Professor Paola Hernandez, Spanish and Portuguese and Professor Christine Garlough, Gender and Women’s Studies).

As of 2015, the program had 25 graduate students, most of whom were PhD-bound. According to a self-study report submitted to the College of Letters and Science on January 1, 2016, between May 2005 and May 2015 (the program’s last academic semester as the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama), the program – specifically its current five ‘core’ faculty members – guided 40 students to the PhD degree and had another 11 students working toward degree completion, many of whom have since finished. In other words, on average, each ITS faculty member has guided or is guiding one doctoral student to graduation each year. Of these graduates, at least 23 have been placed into tenure-track positions; at least 5 occupy academic staff or adjunct positions; and two are in leadership positions in higher education. Evidently, ITS and its predecessor, the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama, have historically been highly productive and well respected members of the academic community in theatre studies. According to the self-study document, the National Research Council Ranking of 2010, placed ITS (then, the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama) at rank 4 among the top eight programs in the nation.

In summary, ITS is a graduate program that has been structurally reconstituted but has been built on traditions of academic excellence and on a strong national reputation. With the goodwill and tangible commitment (especially in copious amounts of time) of its ‘core’ faculty (particularly its Program Director, Mary Trotter) as well as its ‘affiliate’ faculty (especially the two colleagues - Paola Hernandez and Christine Garlough - who serve on the program’s Steering Committee); the program administrator, Brenda Weiss; the graduate students who, we learned, are enthusiastically committed to the success of the program; the housing Department of English; relatively recent UW-Madison hires, such as Senior Lecturer Jen Plants (English); and administrators in the College of Letters and Science, ITS has been able to create the fundamental structures of a program that can succeed into the future, that is, continue in – and, possibly, improve on - its hard-earned reputation as major contributor in its field as well as on campus. Moreover, Assistant Professor David Ronis, the new Director of the University Opera, also has indicated his support for ITS (currently and practically, by hiring an ITS student as a dramaturg in a production), with the intent to expand and strengthen relations between ITS and the University Opera.

However, despite the fundamentally sound (and potentially stellar) outlook for ITS as a program, there is no denying that it faces serious challenges, particularly those that relate to its intellectual, fiscal, and physical dispersal; the loss of resources (for example, as they concern access to endowment funds and some of the

---

1 According to a response to an inquiry by the committee from ITS Program Director Mary Trotter, 38 students have completed their degrees over the last ten years; however, since the self-study document listed dissertation titles, dissertators, and advisors, the discrepancy of two students is likely to be attributed to the cut-off day (i.e., whether to include graduates from May 2005).
long-standing arrangements for practice opportunities for ITS students) brought on by its separation from the Department of Theatre & Drama; and more generally, the tension between – on the one hand - the potential that is inherent to many superb interdisciplinary programs, namely that for growth in the breadth and depth of its intellectual endeavors and its service to the university community, and, on the other, factual limitations in terms of resources (for which interdisciplinary programs largely depend on the graciousness of other departments and programs) and, one may argue (based on conversations conducted as part of this review as well as personal experiences with administrative matters), a lack of incentivization of sharing that has been brought on by campus-wide fiscal policies.

The review process

The committee approached the review process with particular attention to (a) the challenges experienced by a program that was new and, at the same time, indebted to a long-standing reputation of excellence; (b) the potential for communication difficulties among the dispersed stakeholders in the program; and (c) the program’s need and desire for strengthening or establishing relationships across campus that will support its missions for years to come. We therefore aimed to gain as many perspectives as possible, in part with a view to eventually being able to offer concrete suggestions that the program could consider as it strives to secure its place as a leader in the field.

As a preview, everyone that was personally invited to speak with us did so generously and with a great deal of enthusiasm and trust in that the review would be more than just a formal exercise. It was clear that ITS is a community of diverse yet similarly highly engaged stakeholders. The program’s Director, Mary Trotter, was particularly helpful. She met with the committee twice in person and, in addition, answered thoroughly in writing follow-up questions from the committee (so that the total written document amounted to 18 pages) and helped the committee compile a roster in which we had compiled comparative (relative to ITS’s identity as the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama; the Department of Theatre & Drama, also in its former incarnation as an MFA program; and the PhD Program in Second Language Acquisition, which is also an interdisciplinary program) data about the program’s structure; graduate recruitment, support & placement; faculty appointments; and degree requirements. Professor Trotter also answered numerous email inquiries from review committee members quickly, thoroughly, and clearly.

The committee also received support from (a) Academic Planner Kelley Haslam (Graduate School), who provided the committee with documents pertaining to the graduate program, such as the Program Profile and Exit Surveys of ITS as well as comparable conglomerate data for the Graduate School as a whole and all Humanities programs taken together, and met with the committee on September 21, 2016 to answer questions about the data shown in these documents; she also followed up with additional information via email; (b) the other four ‘core’ faculty members, with each of whom we met individually (three in person, one
via Skype); (c) several graduate students in ITS, some of whom we met with individually and others with whom we met in a group; (d) several ‘affiliate’ faculty members (including the two colleagues, Christine Garlough and Paola Hernandez, who serve on the ITS Steering Committee), whom we each met in individual meetings; (e) the incoming chair of the Department of English, Russ Castronovo; (f) David Ronis, Director of the University Opera, with both of whom we had separate in-person meetings; and (g) program administrator Brenda Weiss. We had also arranged to meet with Senior Lecturer Jen Plants (English) but because of a scheduling mistake by committee chair Monika Chavez, the initial meeting did not take place and scheduling conflicts prevented us from finding an alternative date. The meetings took place between Thursday, September 22 and Friday, October 7, 2016 and lasted between half an hour and two hours. We also offered an open session on Wednesday, October 5 at 2 o’clock in the afternoon but nobody other than committee members attended.

In addition, Associate Dean Elain Klein and Ashley Doebereiner provided the committee with guidelines for the review; self-study documents submitted by ITS on January 1, 2016 (after one semester as a new program); current and past ITS assessment plans; and documents that pertained to the creation of ITS as an academic program. The committee also held several in-person meetings and communicated via email to decide on procedure and to prepare this report. Associate Deans Elaine Klein and Susan Zaeske met with the committee on November 17, 2016 to answer some of the questions about administrative matters that had arisen during the investigative phase.

It should be noted here – and will be revisited later in the report – that in the review process we encountered several instances of mismatches in information between different sources. They concerned, for example, (a) the current governance structure: The self-study document (submitted on January 1, 2016) describes an Executive Committee composed of all ‘core’ faculty and led by a Program Director whereas, in fact, the program is now governed by a Director and a Steering Committee composed of two ‘core’ and two ‘affiliate’ faculty members; (b) the program website: For example, profiles of faculty (both ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’) including their departmental affiliation do not appear to be up-to-date; (c) descriptions of program requirements: The Graduate School website and the Graduate Student Handbook (the version that we had access to) describe somewhat different requirements, e.g. the Handbook calls for 69 credits (or 23 courses) toward PhD; the Graduate School’s description of the program stipulate 51 credits; similar discrepancies were found for the descriptions of requirements for the MA degree; and (d) the tabulation of degree completions: While the self-study documented (not just reported) 40 PhD degrees completed between 2005-2015 (and 11 more as heading toward completion), a report that we received from the (very helpful) Program Director, Mary Trotter, reported 38 completed PhDs, perhaps because of a divergence in accounting methods, such as including or excluding graduates of May 2005.

The committee notes these discrepancies not as a criticism but rather as a grounds for arguing that, at least on a limited-time basis, the program would benefit greatly from greater administrative support. Although the program is not an independent department (and has no – or only a negligible - budget of its
own) and is relatively small in terms of 'core' faculty - two circumstances that one could take to indicate lesser need for administrative support - it is undergoing a process of re/constitution and, as will be explained in greater detail below, is constituted of a community that essentially is in diaspora, i.e., a community that needs to establish itself as such via a concerted effort rather than the more typical organic means that arise from the benefits of a shared space, time together, and accountability to/within the same hierarchical structures. The committee further believes that ITS has mastered the initial phase of transition and re/constitution and has gained some early insights into how the program can work going forward. ITS is, in our opinion, ready to move beyond crisis management to concerted planning and we hope that our report can give direction just as hopefully available additional (even if on a temporary basis) administrative resources would constitute an investment in the sustainability and, potentially, growth of ITS as a program with a long tradition of excellence and a new shape.

Findings and recommendations

We will summarize our findings by themes, which are: (a) dispersal & community; (b) the use of electronic media to promote & sustain community and the visibility of the program; (c) the governance structure of the program; (d) the situation of graduate students specifically; and (e) outlook. Each theme will be followed by a set of recommendations. These themes are not truly discrete and therefore, some of the same observations will recur just as some recommendations will resemble or be premised on each other. We have composed these recommendations under the assumption that ITS colleagues and campus administrators will examine them for feasibility (and, hopefully, identify resources that increase their feasibility); and prioritize and/or modify them according to the program's needs and available resources.

(a) Dispersal & community

Since issues of dispersal and community emerged as central in the course of our review activities, we will discuss them first and address several of its most prominent aspects. Since most issues of dispersal, as discussed here, intersect with each other closely, we will offer a list of collated recommendations at the conclusion of this section.

a.1. Overview

We count among immediate stakeholders in ITS its 'core' and 'affiliate' faculty; its graduate students; its graduate administrator (Brenda Weiss); and its administrative home, the Department of English; and as extended stakeholders, academic campus departments, units, or programs that do or could benefit from the intellectual endeavors (including course offerings) of ITS; campus entities that are dedicated to performance that may benefit from or add to the expertise of faculty and graduate students in ITS (examples may include
the University Theatre; the University Opera but also – and we recognize the precarious nature of the historic relationship – the new Department of Theatre & Drama, some of whose faculty still are listed among ITS affiliates); potential employers of ITS graduates; the field of Theatre Studies (loosely defined) as a whole; the local community of the City of Madison; and ultimately, in keeping with the Wisconsin Idea, the State of Wisconsin.

To preview the gist of the report, ITS brings to the table a tremendous amount of faculty expertise in key and nationally unique, (e.g., the Theatre for Youth) areas of research and practice; a respectably sized group of highly engaged graduate students; a dedicated graduate administrator; a recognized tradition of excellence in the field; and a housing department (English) that is, by all indications, very supportive (such as emerged in conversations with the chair of the department, Russ Castronovo, as well as the two ITS ‘core’ faculty that hold appointments in English). Although less explicit than other assets, the work of ITS – in both its graduate and, continued from its being part of the former Department of Theatre & Drama, its undergraduate course offerings, could serve a segment of the campus community that takes an interest in ‘performance’ in the broader, theoretical sense. At the same time, there are notable challenges to the full unfolding of the potential of ITS. In essence, these challenges are attributable to the related issues of (various types of) dispersal and change (which, in this instance, may have been perceived as a diminution of resources and, as a consequence of dispersed tenure homes, a loss of identity). That is, although many interdisciplinary programs face issues brought on by dispersal, ITS has not always been a dispersed program. In this, its early, phase of re/constitution, ITS needs to determine procedures that address this dispersal, specifically (a) whether some types of dispersal (as noted below) and/or their respective degrees can me ameliorated; (b) how to deal with types/degrees of dispersal that are unlikely to change going forward; and (c) whether/which new opportunities for collaboration and/or reconstitution present themselves at this moment and going forward.

Issues of dispersal permeate nearly all of our observations and recommendations. We therefore acknowledge that the dedication of specific section of this report to the matter of dispersal serves as a frame and is not, in fact, truly limited to this section.

a.2. The Department of English as the academic home of the program and the tenure home of two (out of five) current ‘core’ faculty members

In very simplistic but nevertheless descriptively relevant terms, ITS ‘core’ faculty is split between tenure homes in the Department of English Professor Aparna Dharwadker and Associate Professor Mary Trotter) and tenure homes in (three) other departments (Associate Professor Michael Peterson, Professor Mike Vanden Heuvel, and Professor Manon van de Water). Although this distribution already hints at the fundamental issue of dispersal, another dimension of the diaspora becomes evident when one considers that this same distribution also amounts to a split between two faculty having appointments in the department that houses ITS (English) and the remaining three having appointments in departments that have no inherent
relationship with ITS (Classics and Near Eastern Studies; German, Nordic, and Slavic; Theatre & Drama).

As per conversations with ITS ‘core’ faculty members (both, those housed inside and those housed outside of English); the incoming chair of English (Russ Castronovo); Brenda Weiss (who serves both as graduate program coordinator for ITS and as timetable person for English); and a number of ITS graduate students, the relationship between ITS and English is perceived as being to the benefit of both parties. Specifically, ITS sees itself as an asset in teaching a high-enrollment undergraduate course (English/TD 120), which generates credits for the Department of English and, at the same time, provides employment opportunities for graduate students in ITS as TAs. Both ITS ‘core’ faculty (and perhaps less, so ITS graduate students) and the Department of English, which – according to Professor Castronovo – has traditionally taken a ‘big tent’ approach and gladly accommodates multiple language-centered disciplines, discern shared intellectual ground, which all parties appear ready to explore further. In addition, the Department of English has hired an academic staff member, Senior Lecturer Jen Plants, specifically with the view to support the mission of ITS.

Despite the overall very promising collaboration between English and ITS, there appeared to be some instances of mismatched perspectives or miscommunication. The graduate students that we spoke to seemed somewhat confused about their responsibilities toward and the privileges that they might derive from the Department of English. For example, they were not certain whether they might be able to use common social spaces (it seemed that the answer would be, yes) or draw on departmental funds set aside for graduate students of English (it appeared that the answer would be, no). ITS graduate students also were uncertain about their academic (and, to an extent, social) identities. They found themselves in new academic and physical spaces without being able to make out the boundaries (or even, the ability to determine whether there were boundaries). For instance, ITS students were not certain whether students in English recognized them as members of – alternatively - an affiliated, an integrated, or an essentially unrelated community. Moreover, graduate students in ITS told us that they gain access to designated physical spaces (such as desks or mail-boxes) via appointments-for-work (such as TAships) but not via fellowships. They were wondering whether the Department of English could provide students who do not have work-for-pay appointments with mail-boxes and, if possible some minimal (but perhaps secure) storage spaces (such as for coats, bags, and laptops).

Similarly, the fact that two – but not all – of the ITS ‘core’ faculty have their tenure home in English, seemed to give rise to predictable but not quite fortunate dynamics in that (a) the physical proximity between two but not all ITS faculty members facilitates interactions between these two colleagues but not among the full group, which – as can be expected – limits impromptu exchanges of ideas or resolutions of unexpected problems that involve all five ITS ‘core’ faculty; and (b) the question of split tenure homes, which also coincides with a split between tenure homes that are in the housing department, English (true for two ITS members), and tenure homes that are in other departments (as is true for the remaining three ‘core’ faculty and many of the ‘affiliate’ faculty, including the two ‘affiliate’ faculty who serve on the Steering Committee; see report sections further down) complicate several matters, specifically, as they pertain to (b.1.)
departmental service, including program leadership as Program Director and/or service on the Steering Committee; (b.2.) the planning/anticipation of sabbatical leaves; (b.3.) course scheduling and rotation; and (b.4.) long-term planning, such as is needed to manage hiring and retirements. For (b.1), some concerns were expressed about possible inequities between faculty members housed in English and those not housed in English; more specifically, about whether/how service to ITS may be recognized as service to a given faculty member’s home department; in this context, ‘service’ also comprises program leadership, such as serving as Program Director and/or on the Steering Committee. Matters (b.2.), (b.3.), and (b.4) require a degree of coordination that is easier (and more likely) within departmental boundaries but, in practical terms, these issues need to be addressed in concert by all (not just two ‘core’) ITS faculty members and their (multiple) department chairs & colleagues.

ITS graduate program administrator Brenda Weiss holds a 1.0 FTE that is split 50/50 between English and ITS. She shares her office with two colleagues in English so that ITS does not have its own office space. As a result, there is no physical delineation between Ms. Weiss’s duties in ITS and English – which certainly can be advantageous – but which also means that meetings between her and the ITS Program Director, ITS faculty, or ITS students (some of whom might require confidential information) cannot remain separate or ITS-program-internal (or, if needed, private).

In summary, ITS is an intellectual community that exists in physical, administrative, and, to an extent, governance (the housing department serves as tenure & budgetary home for some but all ITS faculty members) and social diaspora. In terms of socio-cognitive theories of intellectual development founded on notions of community, the current state of affairs is problematic in that experts (the faculty; the graduate program administrator) can form an action-oriented group only with difficulty. The group of experts, moreover, is limited in its ability to introduce novices (graduate students) to community practices, which include professional (academic as well as performance-practice) activities. The group’s ability to act together to bring in new members or to bring in more closely affiliated (but not (yet) ‘core’) members is also impeded.

We would like to emphasize that community formation needs to happen at both a synchronic (establishing connections among contemporary stakeholders) as well as a diachronic (establishing connections among stakeholders past, present, and future; linking to traditions and setting visions for the future). Clearly, for an interdisciplinary & dispersed program, community formation & maintenance on the synchronic level already pose special challenges; in the particular case of ITS, however, there is the added experience of rupture (and disruption) as it was formed out of a process of separation. The ability to link to traditions and develop credible and engaging visions of the future is therefore as important as it is difficult to achieve.

### a.3. Linguistic diaspora: English and the foreign languages

The UW-Madison is a national leader in research in and the teaching of languages other than English. Indeed, one of the five ITS ‘core’ faculty members, Manon van de Water, has her tenure home in a foreign language department (German, Nordic, and Slavic) as does one of the two ‘affiliate’ faculty members who serve on the
Steering Committee (Paola Hernandez in Spanish & Portuguese). A good portion of ‘affiliate’ faculty (depending on how one counts, approximately one third), too, are housed in a foreign language department. Foreign language departments (including those in the classical languages) include in their mission the teaching and research of various literary forms, including genres that directly pertain to the mission of ITS. Foreign language departments, often as part of their (graduate and undergraduate) course offerings also research, produce, and perform plays – alas, in the foreign language that constitutes their core mission. That is, foreign language departments harbor prominent potential resources in terms of course offerings, mentorship, and – if, explored further – practice opportunities for graduate students in ITS, on the premise that a lack of (foreign) language knowledge does not bar ITS students from accessing these resources. As ITS constitutes its new (now separate from Theatre & Drama) identity, it may find that the research and practice of theatre in (or about) languages other than English can add new and distinctive dimensions.

**Recommendations:**

(1a) In the committee’s conversations with graduate students, we perceived a loss of identity in graduate students, specifically, a sense of confusion about their identity vis-à-vis the Department of English and about the precise nature of their own academic community (and, it seemed, a lack of understanding of what the word ‘interdisciplinarity’ signals, i.e., a degree of confusion about the discipline/s itself/themselves). We would recommend that ITS faculty (both ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’) address together with graduate students possible (and within, ideal and attainable) definitions of the discipline or the ‘interdiscipline’ that emerges from the multiple disciplines that support the intellectual endeavor that is ITS. We anticipate that such conversations would be exploratory and would facilitate the emergence of answers rather than concern the transmission of pre-determined answers from faculty to graduate students. The format in which these conversations happen should reflect the emergent nature of the disciplinary definitions to be established. In that sense, a conference (or workshop) format – perhaps in the form of a graduate student conference – might be appropriate. In may also be useful to include in these conversations participants from outside ITS. These ‘outside’ participants could comprise non-ITS members (faculty and graduate students) of the housing department of English; representatives of departments that house ITS ‘core’ (and perhaps those that house ‘affiliate’) faculty; graduate students from other interdisciplinary fields on campus (such as Gender and Women’s Studies; or Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies; or the PhD Program in Second Language Acquisition); and representatives (especially, graduate students) from peer programs at other institutions. As members of the ITS community grapple with their specific notions of ‘interdisciplinarity’ at a concrete example (the definition of their own program), all participating parties will be able contribute to (and thereby deal with and learn from) a debate about interdisciplinarity as well as inter-departmental collaboration in a nationwide academic climate that make such endeavors difficult and necessary at the same time. In other words, such a conference could accomplish multiple purposes: (a) It could help ITS tease out ideational
and practical dimensions of its identity; (b) it would raise the visibility of the program on campus and beyond and perhaps help build connections into the future; and (c) it could serve as a professionalization experience that is relevant for all participants but perhaps particularly enriching for its graduate students.

(1b) There also seemed to be a (perhaps, mis)perception among graduate students – to paraphrase one of them – that ‘the new ITS structure may be good for faculty but its advantages to graduate students are less apparent.’ It would seem useful to not only concentrate on building a communal identity among graduate students but also between ITS graduate students and ITS faculty. The current Program Director, Mary Trotter, is very actively engaged in community-building efforts and has implemented a weekly electronic newsletter in which community members at large are informed about happenings in the program. Whereas the use of electronic media – especially in a community that to-date lacks common physical space – is certainly of great relevance, the profuse use of such media also diminishes their significance, especially to recipients and particularly when ‘sender’ and ‘recipient’ roles are so clearly delineated (i.e., there is no real interactive dimension). The Program Director has also attempted to implement a series of colloquia, which were/are to address a range of professionalization and academic matters. As per reports from graduate students and the Program Director, this series has not yet come to full fruition. Of particular note to ITS students were, (a) a lack of student input into the specific content of these colloquia; and (b) faculty participation being limited to a small subset of the ITS faculty (perhaps because many of them were on leave).

In summary, it appears that future activities toward community building should (a) strengthen the sense of belonging and establish goals that are shared between faculty and students; (b) account for students’ perspectives and needs more explicitly; (c) expand beyond electronic media; (d) should not be driven solely by the Program Director and a small subset of faculty; and (e) should include interactive dimensions of exchange rather than only/mostly a unidirectional transmission of information.

Specific measures may include:

- ITS faculty (the Steering Committee) may consider the formation of sub-committees that are dedicated toward specific purposes, such as professionalization activities; academic interest groups; contact with alumni/ae or with professionals in the community (see also suggestions regarding the governance structure); and as appropriate, to include students on these committees so that students may participate in the determination of content of colloquia (or similar events) as well as take on well planned (rather than impromptu) roles in their organization and presentation. Similarly, it may be useful to include graduate students (or their representative/s) in designated and appropriate segments of faculty meetings.
• ITS may consider establishing routes of communication (such as blogs or Wikis; or social media; see also recommendations with regard to the ITS presence on-line) in which more and more diverse stakeholders can take on the role of ‘contributor’ rather than just ‘recipient’.

• One single person – even an extremely active and well-intended person – cannot carry a community forward, both for definitional reasons of what ‘community’ means and for reasons of sustainability and continuity. In other words, the Program Director alone cannot be responsible for shaping a community. Graduate students cannot carry the major burden of organizing community activities, either. In other words, ITS needs to devise ways in which a larger group of faculty – possibly not just ‘core’ but also ‘affiliate’ faculty – can take on leadership roles in community organizing. In addition to the formation of sub-committees (each dedicated to different specific purposes), ITS faculty may also consider hosting, on a rotating but regular (perhaps bi-weekly or monthly) basis – with one or two faculty leading the event – opportunities for students and faculty to interact socially (such as in a coffee or lunch-hour event) while also addressing specific professional, academic, or career-related matters. Topics could be determined in advance with input from faculty and students and a calendar could be prepared, with faculty signing up to host one or two events per semester. If appropriate, students from other programs (with related interests) could also be invited to join (and, perhaps reciprocate by inviting ITS students and faculty to some of their own events). If ‘affiliate’ ITS faculty could be enlisted for such an endeavor, with a total of 20-25 faculty, depending on the frequency of meetings, each faculty would be responsible for no more than 1 event per academic year. Faculty could use this opportunity, too, to talk about courses that they will be offered in the near and intermediate future; explain about their research (including methods); and perhaps connect with students who plan to submit proposals to conferences that they (the faculty) plan to attend or, in a similar vein, provide some chaperoning functions when ITS students (especially novice attendees) travel to the same conference.

(2) A communal identity is difficult to form or maintain when there is no physical space in which to give it expression. The committee realizes the serious shortage of space on campus. Nevertheless, an important step forward could be taken by ITS if an area could be identified in which ITS graduate students (and faculty) might give physical expression to their identities (such as by displaying ‘evidence of community’ that ranges from meeting agenda to recent publications by faculty and graduate students); make their presence known (such as via designated mailboxes); and come together (even if only at designated or reserved times).

To drive forward recommendation (2), these steps may be considered:

• Clarifications with regard to the use and allocation of physical space in the Department of English
Preliminary conversations with the chair of English, Russ Castronovo, indicated the possibility of (at least) assigning mail-boxes (and thereby, physical addresses at which to receive professional mail) to ITS students who do not hold work-for-pay positions (and benefit from facilities made available via these appointments). While such a step would constitute a significant improvement for some of the ITS students, it would not address the desire for shared space and/or a space in which to meet (even at pre-determined and limited times), that would be an important improvement over the current situation.

- The lack of shared (or, seen from another perspective, delineated) physical space also extends to the situation of graduate coordinator Brenda Weiss. The committee understands the advantages that follow from Ms. Weiss’s proximity to her colleagues with whom she shares work for the English department. However, if a shared/designated ITS space could be identified in which Ms. Weiss might hold, for example, designated ‘office hours’ for ITS faculty and students, we believe it would help members of the ITS community to a significant degree.

(3) Just as ITS needs to deepen its sense of communal identity, it would also be useful for ITS to broaden the synchronic and diachronic contexts in which ‘community’ can manifest. This is especially true for graduate students who, different from faculty, have no other ‘home’ but ITS, and which, in turn, for many of them lacks a physical and, by extension, distinct social and sometimes even distinct intellectual, dimensions. The ITS graduate students, it appears, already have taken measures of their own (such as weekly social meetings) to foster group cohesion. Nevertheless, ITS graduate students may benefit from a more explicit support structure in their current efforts as well in yet-to-be-made attempts to establish their ITS identity on and beyond campus.

Specific measures to broaden the **synchronic** context of the ITS community – in addition to the possible graduate student conference and the regular social-cum-professional meetings that also involve ‘affiliate’ faculty, as suggested above – could include:

- A meeting between all ITS faculty (not just ITS faculty housed in English) and (perhaps a particularly relevant subgroup of) faculty in (the rest of) English could be convened, with the objective to identify some overlap in research interests; to identify course offerings of mutual interest; and to discuss shared interests between the different groups of graduate students, with a view to planning opportunities for graduate students to connect.

- Similar meetings could be convened between ITS faculty (‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty) with their respective department chairs (including the chair of English) to determine whether/how specific needs of ITS can be met and what contributions ITS can/could make to the respective departments.
ITS-relevant courses in foreign language departments may be a resource that has not been as fully utilized as it could be. Similarly, some of the graduate students in the foreign language departments may wish to develop their research interests in ITS more definitively. While foreign language departments may welcome the boost in enrollments as well as in intellectual outlook that ITS graduate students could provide, many foreign language departments will also feel obliged to continue in their long-standing practice of offering (certain) graduate courses in the target (foreign) language. In short, the cultivation of closer relationships between ITS and foreign language departments seems mutually desirable but at the same time, is limited when potential ITS students do not possess the necessary proficiency in the target language.

Several solutions might be explored: (a) In its advertising and recruitment of new graduate students, ITS may work in concert with foreign language faculty & departments and consider several routes: (a.1.) explore the possibility of joint degrees (which might also help with avoiding excessive demand on limited ITS faculty time for mentoring and advising doctoral students); (a.2.) allot an ITS recruitment contingent to applicants with proficiency in specific foreign languages; or (a.3.) consider the implementation of a PhD Minor in ITS, which students in the foreign languages may wish to pursue, thereby bringing their expertise (and possibly, that of their faculty advisors) into the ITS community; (b) come to an agreement with foreign language departments that certain ITS-relevant courses be offered in English, perhaps in alternation with the course being offered in the foreign language; or (c) devise a meets-with scheme in which the foreign-language version of the course would be accompanied by an English-language version/credit. For this scheme to function, there would need to be a designated ITS-prefixed subject listing. In another part of this report, we will recommend the exploration of an ITS-specific subject listing.

Specific measures to broaden the diachronic context of the ITS community could include:

- More explicit efforts to connect with and highlight the accomplishments of the program’s alumni/ae/alumnae could (a) increase the fund-raising potential of ITS (which would require more intense administrative support, at least temporarily, until proper channels have been established); (b) provide networking opportunities for current students; and (c) outline for current ITS students possible professional trajectories. In addition to involving alumni/ae in social media or forms of communication, such as newsletters, they may also be invited to participate in colloquia or the more informal (coffee or lunch-hour) meetings suggested above. Alumni/ae could participate in person; via Skype; other forms of on-line communication, such as blogging or chatting; or even ‘webinars/web panel discussions.’ Perhaps some alumni/ae would even be willing to take on an advanced ITS student as a mentee. In a similar vein, alumni/ae may be featured more prominently
on the program’s website (perhaps also in the form of video clips in which they talk about their experiences at Madison) and thereby serve not only current students but also speak to potential students and aid in recruiting.

- ITS students should also be connected more explicitly with professionals in the community and beyond, for several purposes: (a) For students to make contact with professionals who could employ them with a view to the satisfaction of practice-related degree requirements; (b) for students to develop a more concrete and practice-oriented understanding of their own professional interests and strengths and to broaden their understanding of possible career trajectories; (c) to raise the visibility of the program vis-à-vis practitioners (outside of academia); and (d) to enable the program to contribute to the local community and the state.

Such connections could be established in several ways: (a) Invite professionals to campus to participate in the context of their specific qualifications in a colloquium, graduate student conference, or social-cum-professional meeting; (b) advertise specific services that ITS students may render, such as via a database that lists students’ specific qualifications and is accessible to potential employers or via personal visits; and/or (c) collaborate with programs that have the necessary financial resources and may be interested in inviting professionals whose expertise is relevant to both them and ITS.

(b) The use of electronic media to promote & sustain community and the visibility of the program

Given the dispersed nature of the program (community); its relatively recent reconstitution as a program; and a degree of uncertainty about the program among its stakeholders, effective use of electronic media plays an essential role. However, we noted four specific issues with regard to the electronic presence of ITS: (1) Online information that was out of date or out of line with same-topic information that appeared elsewhere; (2) the web-presence (visibility) of the program; (3) the program name as a search term (and as a concept) as well as the lack of an ITS-specific subject listing; and (4) the underuse of electronic media to build and maintain community and share information among stakeholders.

The fact that on-line information presented by the program is out of date and/or incongruous when several outlets (program website; graduate school website/s; handbooks) are involved, has been discussed earlier in this document (in the description of the review process).

Apart from the fact that the ITS website contains information that is out of date, the ITS webpage is also not very easy to find online. This low degree of ‘findability’ likely affects both current UW students who are looking for information (such as classes that may be taken toward degree) and prospective students who look for a potential PhD program in Theatre and Performance Studies (loosely defined). A link to the ITS website can be found on the Letters & Science page for the College’s departments and programs, but there is no comparable link on the University’s Academics tab.
Electronic course searches, too, are problematic. The lack of a designated ITS-specific subject listing, the overlap in subject matter with other academic units (most notably, the current Department of Theatre & Drama); the broad spectrum of courses offered by the housing Department of English; and perhaps not entirely self-evident cross-listings (such as English/TD 120 or TD/Slavic/C&I 360) all complicate matters. For example, in a recent exploration of the course search function, when we input ‘theatre’ as a keyword, about twenty courses from the Department of Theatre & Drama were the first things that came up. By the same token, when we input ‘English’ as a keyword, the first three courses that turned up were ITS courses. Since it is likely that the algorithm that directs the search also depends on the frequency with which search terms are used, having adequate descriptors is even more important.

The program name – that starts with an ‘I’ for ‘Interdisciplinary’ Theatre Studies – is prone to misdirecting searches that focus on key words, such as ‘Theatre’ (or ‘Drama’ or ‘Performance’). Perhaps more substantially, interviews suggested that there was some uncertainty amongst program faculty and students about what ‘interdisciplinary’ actually means. Although faculty frequently discussed it as a rubric for crossing disciplinary boundaries, students saw the term as referring to the blending of theory and practice. Furthermore, some committee members saw the term ‘interdisciplinary’ as a synonym for ‘interdepartmental.’

Recommendations:

Before we specify steps that might be taken toward the remediation of these issues, we would like to note that the execution of some of these steps (a) will require at least a temporary increase in administrative support that goes toward the program (e.g., toward the implementation of ITS-specific subject listings; improvement of the web presence; establishing accounts and templates in social media); (b) potentially, a small but permanent shifting in administrative resources (such as in the appointment percentages of ITS/English of program administrator Brenda Weiss) to a degree that is yet to be determined; and (c) collaboration between all ITS-interested departments and programs (such as to ascertain the most effective use of an ITS-specific subject listing, e.g., for cross-listings or meets-with arrangements), including, ideally, the current Department of Theatre & Drama. The maintenance of any innovations in the use of electronic resources cannot rest on the shoulders of the Program Director alone and may benefit from the leadership of a designated faculty sub-committee (see recommendations regarding the governance structure) and the involvement of graduate students as well as of UW resources yet to be identified.

(1) The Director and Steering Committee should work with the UW’s webmaster to make sure a link to the program’s website is added to the university’s tab for Academics, which lists departments and programs.
(2) A concerted effort should be made at searching various websites with regard to the accuracy and congruency of the dissemination of ITS-specific information.

(3) The ITS website should be updated and expanded/revised. For example, true to the academic mission of ITS, media besides the printed word should be utilized to showcase the accomplishments of ITS faculty, students, and alumni/ae. A more detailed and descriptive account of themes that that occupy the work of ITS faculty, students, and alumni/ae would also be useful (for example, the current list of alumni/ae in alphabetical order and by the names of their current employers is not really informative and also not quite inspiring).

(4) ITS should consider the implementation of electronic platforms (Box folders; KBs; etc.) that facilitate the sharing of work & ideas across physical divisions and with some degree of continuity.

(5) ITS may wish to consider improvements to the continuity and transparency in advising & mentoring of graduate students by creating an on-line student data base with uniform documents that can be accessed by all authorized faculty, such as to monitor the following student-related activities: advising agreements; the completion of course work toward degree work; the completion of non-course work degree requirements, such as obligatory practicums; the setting & completion of program milestones; and research accomplishments, such as presentations at conferences and publications.

(6) The newsletter (or a similar publication) may be expanded (though, in that expanded format be reduced to an annual publication) to include – in content and audience - alumni/ae and others interested in the program.

(7) ITS may consider targeted use of social media, such as a program Facebook site or twitter account to promote the program and communicate with stakeholders. The overarching goal would be for ITS to use media in a manner that does not relegate the majority of stakeholders to ‘recipient’ status but instead promotes greater participatory roles for all.

(8) Both graduate students and their advisors would benefit from having a clearer overview (and have that overview sooner) of courses that they may count toward degree as well as, if possible, information about practice experiences. The latter might be accomplished if relevant stakeholders could advertise available positions at the ITS website or link already existing advertisements to the ITS website. The former might be achieved via the next recommendation (#9).
ITS would greatly benefit from program-specific subject listings for its classes. Multiple advantages can be expected: (a) A designated subject listing would make it much easier for students to find courses offered by the program. (b) It would be easier for the program to explain degree requirements, as captured in the types, number, and sequence of courses that need to be taken. (c) As explained earlier in the context of ITS-relevant courses offered in foreign language departments, an ITS-specific subject listing would facilitate meets-with or cross-listings between courses (or of course sections), i.e., those taught in the foreign language and those taught in English. (d) It would be easier to distinguish between courses that count toward the ITS major and any non-ITS PhD minors that ITS students would like to feature in their degree work. Indeed, an ITS-specific subject listing would help graduates profile their expertise on their Curricula Vitae. Conversely, should ITS implement a PhD Minor in ITS, an ITS-specific subject listing would help prospective ITS minors document their sub-specialization and also draw a clearer distinction in course work between ITS majors and minors. (5) If ITS courses were explicitly labeled, it may be easier for ITS to plan and monitor, together with the home departments of the ITS faculty members who teach these courses, the rotation of ITS-required and/or ITS-relevant courses and to add new courses into the rotation.

ITS should explore the prospect of changing the program’s name. The committee is keenly aware that the program’s current title was the product of much careful deliberation and negotiation. Moreover, we also acknowledge that the program may be reluctant to change the name after expending considerable effort to reestablish its identity, both on campus and within the preeminent professional organizations for theatre and performance studies. That being said, changing the program’s name to something that begins with ‘theatre’ would likely place webpage tabs and links in places where prospective students are more likely to look for it. Pertinent discussions may also yield new and useful insights into how the program delineates itself from and affiliates itself with the multiple academic traditions that are currently invoked in the inclusion of ‘interdisciplinarity’ in its name.

(c) Governance of the program

As noted earlier, the governance structure of ITS is not quite clear and likely not yet firmly established (which is understandable and, with a view to the need for flexibility in the early stages of ITS’s re/constitution, not necessarily a disadvantage). In the draft of the Provost’s letter of transmittal (from 2014), the College and ITS worked together to develop a small and efficient governing structure. According to this document, the governing structure was to consist of: (a) A Program Director; (b) a Steering Committee (made up of four elected members of the core and affiliate faculty); and (c) a/the Director of the Theatre for Youth Program. However, according to the self-study document (submitted on January 1, 2016; p. 3), ‘The ITS Program is
governed by a faculty-elected Program Chair and an executive committee. The executive committee is currently made up of members of the core faculty.'

In fact, in conversations with the Program Director Mary Trotter, with ‘core’ faculty, and with some ‘affiliate’ faculty members, it emerged that the current governance structure rests on a model that combines features of the 2014 and the 2016 documents referenced above: A four-person committee (two ‘core’ faculty, including the Program Director; two ‘affiliate’ faculty members) currently governs the program but, according to a communication from the Program Director, the Director of the Theatre for Youth Program does not have a permanent seat on the Steering Committee (and does not, in fact, serve on the Steering Committee now). The Steering Committee is tasked with all the duties typically assigned to department executive committees. It is charged with oversight of program curriculum, with decisions about the program’s limited budget (such as monies that it receives for recruiting graduate students), with student assessment and student grievances, and with the vetting and selection of applicants for admission to the program. Yet the Steering Committee is somewhat small relative to the overall size (in faculty and graduate students) of the program.

It appears that the formative process of the governance structure has responded to the practical limitations that have presented themselves. ITS faculty have obligations, including often extensive administrative duties, to their housing departments and/or take leaves, such as sabbaticals. Another common theme throughout the committee’s review of ITS was a general sense that too much administrative responsibility falls to the Program Director. The Director is not only tasked with leading the Steering Committee, its ongoing colloquia for graduate students, its email communications with stakeholders, but also advises all first-year graduate students and chairs committees (or, constitutes in herself a ‘committee’) that concern various duties, such as maintaining the program’s web presence; obtaining grants for graduate students (such as the Graduate School Block grant); establishing & maintaining ties with alumni/ae; reaching out to persons and entities that can provide practice experiences to ITS students; communicate with ‘affiliate’ faculty and their home departments; interact with the Department of English, the Graduate School, and the College of Letters and Science on behalf of the program; and by and large, oversee graduate student recruitment (although the Director of the Theatre for Youth plays an active role in recruiting & vetting applicants with an interest in that particular area).

Furthermore, the relatively small number of core faculty has created certain challenges when it comes to planning curriculum and in performing student assessments. Since requests for leave are made and approved within faculty members’ home departments, the management of sabbatical rotations is outside of ITS’s control and prone to the specific needs and whims of other units. Yet, even in the best of circumstances, where only one core member is on leave at any given time, ITS operates most years with the expectation that its roster of ‘core’ faculty members will be reduced to less than five, who then – as a small group - need to carry on their shoulders the teaching of ITS courses as well as the administration of the program. As per self-study document (and as also explained above), only ‘core’ faculty appear to be entrusted with the advising of dissertations and only papers written in the courses taught by the ‘core’ faculty can be used toward the Prelim A exam portfolio. The relatively small number of ‘core’ faculty has had a knock-on effect for students
enrolled in the PhD program. Some doctoral candidates, for example, reported difficulties in preparing their PhD Prelim A exam portfolio, simply due to the dearth of courses offered by ‘core’ faculty that, in turn, resulted from sabbatical schedules that were made outside of ITS. Students were able to comply with the program’s requirements for Prelim A exams, but they nonetheless felt that the choices they had to make regarding which papers to submit for the Theatre History, Dramatic Literature, and Theatre and Performance Theory components of the exam were severely circumscribed.

**Recommendations:**

The small size of the Steering Committee relative to the tasks that it – and among them, especially the Program Director - needs to accomplish, raises issues of continuity (such as in instances of sabbatical leaves); sustainability (will there be enough faculty willing & available to carry out these tasks in the future); and effectiveness (can the Steering Committee accomplish all tasks that are necessary for an effective administration of the program).

We recommend that:

1. the ITS Steering Committee should revisit the issue of what the responsibilities and privileges are reserved for ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty members, respectively. The Steering Committee should weigh the pros and cons of maintaining the current distinction, particularly as to whether it is the best way to incentivize the allocation of teaching effort to the program. As the program reexamines the expectations that is has of ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty, it may also consider (a) how to make it possible for ‘core’ faculty to assume, over time, greater and smaller duties, as their other obligations allow (for example, service on the Steering Committee may rotate); and (b) how to make service on the Steering Committee less onerous for individual members by dividing the labor over more people and into sub-committees (see Recommendation #2, just below).

Although some ITS faculty expressed a desire to eliminate the ‘core’/‘affiliate’ distinction altogether, that step may not do justice to the differential ability of ITS-interested faculty to serve the program. It seems more sensible to pursue the elimination of the ‘core’/‘affiliate’ distinction as a long-term, rather than short-term, goal. It may be more feasible to draw upon the pool of current ‘affiliate’ faculty to expand the size of the ‘core’ faculty. Adding an additional two or three people to the roster of ‘core’ faculty would help to (a) regularize the curriculum; (b) alleviate the challenges that students face in preparing their Prelim A exams; and (c) offer students a broader range of possible dissertation advisors even as individual ‘core’ faculty may perceive a lessened burden in terms of such advising responsibilities. The expansion of ‘core’ faculty would also add a safeguard in the event that someone was to retire or leave. Grass roots faculty energy and interest, rather than
standard budgetary requests to fill gaps and replace losses, will be vital to the program’s future sustainability.

(1) the number of Steering Committee members be expanded to (approximately) ten, i.e., the Director and (approximately) nine elected members of the ‘core’ or ‘affiliate’ faculty, including, possibly, ITS academic staff. This structure would enable the Steering Committee to form separate subcommittees charged with some of the tasks that currently fall to the Program Director. For example, one subcommittee might coordinate the program curriculum, another could reach out to alumni/ae and/or monitor the program’s web presence, and a third could perform initial vetting and contact of prospective admissions to the program. A slightly larger Steering Committee would (a) alleviate some of the burden that currently falls on the Director, which would contribute to the sustainability of the governance structure; (b) identify and mentor likely candidates for future leadership roles; (c) require broader buy-in from all faculty involved in ITS and, at the same time, help gauge the level of commitment that current (and future) ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ members can bring to the program – and ultimately guide a re-determination of the meaning and, potentially, feasibility of the division into ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty; (d) help the program achieve more or better, even as individual members need to contribute less; and (e) build a greater sense of community through the sharing of information, responsibilities, and achievements.

(2) a graduate student representative (elected by the graduate students) participate (perhaps as a non-voting member) in appropriate portions of Steering Committee meetings so as to present to faculty and, conversely, take back to the graduate students, concerns that are relevant to ITS graduate students. Graduate student representatives may also serve on appropriate sub-committees. The involvement of graduate students would enhance a sense of community between faculty and graduate students in a dispersed program; and would also help graduate students develop the ‘service’ dimension of their professionalization experiences in the program.

(3) the (new) Steering Committee, in consultation with all ITS faculty & graduate students and in observance of Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPPs) should draft a document that formalizes the governance structure of ITS. Given the discrepancies that exist between same-theme documents (such as the 2014 and 2016 documents that provide different descriptions of the program’s governance), it would be good to have the program’s governance clearly stated in a form that can be accessed by current and prospective ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty and can be used as a basis of communication with ITS faculty members’ housing departments, the Graduate School, and the College of Letters and Science.

(d) The situation of graduate students
We will first describe, in outline, (1) the overview of course of study for ITS graduate students; (2) the feedback that we received from past graduate students via the Graduate School Exit Survey and from current graduate students via personal interview; (3) feedback about aspects of the graduate program that we received from faculty and that had not been mentioned elsewhere in the report; and (4) data that capture the fundamentals of the graduate program.

d.1. Overview of course of study for ITS graduate students

Below is a chronological sketch of students’ progress to MA/PhD:

1. Proseminar
   a. Proseminar in Theater Research (required) = ENGL 850 is taught every fall semester

2. Sequence of courses
   a. One of two courses in the graduate theater history sequence = ENGL/TD 731 & 732 is taught every year
   b. A seminar in theater and performance research is taught every semester
   c. The remainder of courses are selected from dramatic literature, theater history, theater/performance theory courses

3. Transition from MA to PhD:
   a. Students are required to apply to proceed to PhD from M.A. in their last semester of the M.A. program. The student sends a letter (email) to the Director, who consults with the Steering Committee. In the last 10 years, all applicants have succeeded in the transition to PhD
   b. PhD Minor requirement: students must complete a Minor from another program (e.g. GWS, English), or a distributed minor developed in consultation with their dissertation advisor

4. Prelim Exams: A & B

5. Dissertation Stage
   a. Students choose a dissertation advisor at the end of their 3rd semester of the PhD program

6. Learning Goals for PhD

   • Demonstrate understanding of the theory, history, and practice of drama and theatre as collaborative cultural forms across historical periods.
   • Master the methods and materials of theatre and performance research and writing in order to produce original scholarly projects that range in complexity from term papers to dissertations.
   • Develop methods for theatre and performance practice and theory in order to test the reciprocal relations between research and practice through reflective participation in the production process.
   • Identify and distinguish among the diverse global locations of theatre and the intercultural contact among
theatre traditions, especially as these multiply in the modern and contemporary periods.

d.2. Feedback from ITS graduate students via the Graduate School Exit Survey (9 respondents) and personal interviews by the committee

The graduate student body has clearly suffered with the split of ITS and T&D, and while they had noted the tensions prior to the reorganization, they remain unclear about the advantages of the current situation. In the Exit Surveys, ratings were lower than campus and divisional averages in quality of graduate curriculum, quality of graduate teaching, assistance in finding employment, sense of respect from faculty, and intellectual climate in program. Most reported a less than positive experience in the program and the university, and would not necessarily recommend others to attend. However, this was a small set of respondents (9) and the cumulative experiences that they referenced pre-date the split of ITS and T&D, with students included in the survey having entered between 2004-5 and 2010-11. In other words, respondents likely cued into the tensions that plagued the former doctoral program in Theatre & Drama, the predecessor of ITS. Nevertheless, it is possible that some of the concerns mentioned in the Graduate School Exit Survey carried over into the reconstituted ITS.

Students noted a variety of issues that have been either effected or exacerbated by the split (source: Interviews), particularly with regard to the following (please note that we are reporting on students’ comments, not our own opinion).

(1) Coursework: Students commented on the unpredictability of course offerings because of dependence on other departments for course offerings and the allocation of sabbaticals. They also complained about the difficulty of finding and identifying degree-appropriate courses because of the lack of an ITS marker (subject listing).

(2) Advising: Overall, students felt they were expected to take the initiative in obtaining feedback and guidance, rather than feeling fully supported intellectually. They perceived a lack of clarity about roles of ‘core’ vs. ‘affiliate’ faculty, especially their availability for courses, prelim papers, and dissertation advising. Dissertators in particular noted communication issues when faculty are overworked, unavailable, or away on sabbatical. They would prefer more advice in selecting a dissertation topic, directing research, and getting timely and/or helpful feedback for revisions. They also expressed an interest in receiving mentoring when they prepare for conferences and publications and on-site networking support at conferences when accompanied by faculty. Given that courses do not rotate across ‘core’ faculty and that a notable portion of the ‘core’ faculty (i.e., potential advisors) can be absent during a given semester, graduate students found it difficult to
encounter the full array of specializations by the time they are supposed to choose an advisor, i.e., by the end of the 3rd semester.

(3) Professionalization: Several students were concerned that the R-1 oriented faculty that constituted their teachers and mentors were not fully aware of the demands of non-R-1 faculty positions, specifically the need for faculty at non-R1 institution to teach a broad spectrum of courses (several of which are offered in the current Department of Theatre & Drama). Students would appreciate the opportunity to TA for a broader array of courses and also, practicums (see the next point. There was also a strong desire for individualized (not just in the form of generic colloquia) professionalization activities, including assistance with the preparation of job portfolios that acknowledge a broader spectrum of potential careers. Student also expressed a desire for an orientation to the faculty, courses, degree requirements, and the community at large upon arrival.

(4) Practicum Requirements: Students told the committee that it that after the separation between ITS and Theatre & Drama, they have found it more difficult to find required practicum opportunities, as they are not well supported in identifying relevant opportunities by the program or campus in general (students need to be involved in 3 production experiences during their program, through e.g., in the University Theater, in the Frederic March Play Circle, in the University Opera, or in plays put on as part of courses offered in foreign language departments).

(5) Community: Students desired a larger incoming cohort with a view to community building and long-term professional impact of the program even as they understood that limited resources may require so-called ‘right-sizing’ of the program. Overall, the students expressed a strong desire for a greater sense of community within ITS, especially in terms of broader and more intense faculty involvement. They wished for a designated space where students and faculty could mingle, network, and socialize informally. They also, in principle, supported the idea of colloquia but would like to see them better sustained and oriented toward students’ objectives, especially, as outlets in which they (as well as faculty and invited speakers) could share their research, including in advance of conference presentation or on-campus visits as part of a job search.

(6) TA Opportunities: For graduate students, TA appointments are part of their professionalization experience (see Point #3, above). They are grateful for the opportunity to earn a small salary, health insurance, and tuition remission via teaching the two courses that seem best geared toward supporting ITS students (i.e., English 120: Introduction to Theater and Drama, ca. 350 undergrads enrolled, employs 7 ITS students as TAs; TD/Slavic/C&I 360 typically offers 3 TA positions). However, students explained that serving as TA for these two courses alone does not help build the teaching portfolio that they believe is required for success in a very competitive job market.
Job Placement: Students realize that the academic job market in their field is limited although some said they had not been made aware just how dire the situation appears to be when they first applied to the program. In addition to these general worries that apply to many academic fields, students were specifically concerned about the impact that the split of ITS and T&D had on the resources available to them (course offerings; mentorship; work experience); the reputation of the program; and the professional identity that they would attain (several students expressed the belief that in their future careers they likely would need to draw on skills taught in ITS as well as T&D). They were also confused about the label 'interdisciplinary' in the title ITS and some feared that their own lack of understanding might be shared by potential employers who would then fail to identify ITS students as qualified. This worry was compounded by the lack of ITS-specific subject listings, which yielded transcripts full of non-ITS-marked courses.

Despite their concerns, students also expressed a strong sense of gratitude toward the faculty, who – students realized – (a) are struggling not only with the typical multiplicity of demands of a faculty career but (b) who also have worked hard for the program to transition into the present ITS and, (c) who, as a result of the split, need to accommodate competing demands from ITS and their (new) home departments. All the students indicated satisfaction with the availability and clarity of the written set of expectations about requirements and satisfactory progress (source: Exit Survey). Students also recognized the benefit of the program in Theater in Education/ Theater for Youth program, as UW-Madison is one of only 3 such programs nationwide. In addition, students reported a very positive sense of collegiality among peers. Indeed, perhaps realizing the constraints under which the faculty have been laboring, students have been working hard themselves to create a coherent community within ITS (source: Interviews). The Student organization (TDGSO) organizes weekly social meetings and puts on a graduate conference annually.

d.3. Feedback from faculty as it concerns graduate students

Faculty noted some of the same issues that were also identified by students. They mentioned needing to divide their already tightly-budgeted time between ITS and their home department; insufficient funding for student recruitment as well as for students in the program. Some faculty – particularly those housed in departments with endowments, where they realized the stark differential in resources between ITS and other programs – regretted ITS’s comparative lack of ability to provide, fellowships, and summer and research (including travel) support. Faculty also noted a drop in applications that started in 2011. It is unclear whether this drop reflects a national trend (especially in the Humanities) and/or is linked to a variety of situation-specific factors (such as the failed expectation of the establishment of a College of the Arts; or the then-impending process of re/constitution). In light of the current job market and the program’s resources, all ITS
faculty were in favor of a lower target admissions although preferences ranged between two and four new students per year.

d.4. Data that capture fundamentals of the graduate program

In reviewing ITS-relevant data we examined four aspects of the graduate program: (1) Demographics; (2) funding; (3) time to degree; and (4) the range of career outcomes.

(1) Demographics:

In terms of diversity, while ITS has a good record of admitting Domestic Targeted Minorities, very few enroll. From 2006/07-2015/16, there were 16 Applicants, 7 Admits and 2 Enrollments of Domestic Targeted Minorities. Most current ITS students are US citizens, although the program receives a number of international applications annually. ITS has a low but steady international enrollment number. From 2006 to 2015, ITS’s gender balance has held steady at ca. 60-65% female and 35-40% male. The most recent data (for 2015/16) show 22 Applicants (15 Domestic Non-Targeted, 7 International); 10 Admits (8 DNT, 2 I); and 4 New Enrollments (4 DNT, 0 I).

(2) Funding:

Most funding is through TAships, in ENGL/TD 120 (usually 7 spots) and TD/SLAV/C&I 362 (usually 3 slots); other TAships are occasionally available in English, Comm Arts, ILS, the DesignLab, and other programs. The percentage of Full-Time PhD Students with 1st 4 years funded by University is 74%; the percentage of Full-Time M.A. Students with 1st 2 years funded by University is 35%.

(3) Time to degree:

The 10-Year Doctoral Completion Rate for a cohort of 21 is ca. 6.3 years; 86% completed the PhD vs. 71% of all AAUs.

(4) The range of career outcomes:
It is unusual for ITS students with PhDs to achieve a tenure-track appointment immediately out of graduate school. In the last 10 years, 38\(^2\) scholars have graduated from the program. Of these: 23 are in tenure-track positions; 5 are in academic staff or adjunct position; 2 are in higher education administrative positions; 1 is in state-level educational administration; 1 is teaching theatre in a primary school; 2 are working in/with professional and/or community arts organizations; and 4 are working in other fields.

**Recommendations:**

We believe that the recommendations for community building; revision to the program’s governance structure; and better/more intense use of electronic media will address many of the issues raised by graduate students (and by faculty about the situation of graduate students). As a matter of fact, many of the recommendations that we presented in these sections were strongly influenced by what we heard about the concerns of (as reported by graduate students in interviews and as shown in the Graduate School documents that we referenced) and about (as reported to us by ‘core’ and ‘affiliate’ faculty in interviews) graduate students in ITS. As ITS weighs the implementation of these recommendations, we ask that it pay special attention to the desire of graduate students for greater guidance in their professionalization, especially with regard to (a) mentoring in research activities (writing a dissertation; presenting at conferences; preparing and a professional dossier, among other issues); (b) allowing for the possibility to tailor the academic and practice components of the program to specific student career objectives; (c) better communication with regard to the full array of employment opportunities after graduation; (d) greater involvement of students in shaping & maintaining the program (including in aspects of governance); (e) the conveyance of a realistic assessment of the resources that ITS can offer – under the best possible circumstances – to its students; and (f) the setting of program requirements & goals as well as admission criteria & targets that match the program’s abilities to provide well for each of its stakeholders (students, faculty, and administrators).

**Recommendations:**

**(e) Outlook**

In this section, we address some of the possibilities that ITS may consider beyond the immediate scope of this report. We recognize that each of these suggestions (we do not consider them true recommendations) has a different type of impact on different stakeholder groups and may not be welcome by all. It is for ITS, together with its current stakeholders, to decide whether/how to move forward.

---

\(^2\) Again, please note the discrepancy between two reportings of graduates in the last ten years, i.e. 38 and 40, respectively. It appears that the difference can be attributing to whether graduates of May 2005 are included in the count.
e.1. A comprehensive community-identifying/-building exercise

One of the faculty members that we spoke with suggested a retreat for ITS; we were inspired by the idea but, based on other conversations, are concerned that a retreat at this point in the program’s constitution may put stressors on this emerging community that it is (not yet) equipped to meet. We were wondering, however, whether a meeting of interested parties (including, possibly, select representatives from the Department of Theatre & Drama – especially those who are still listed as ITS ‘affiliates’) around a specific (and rather neutral) topic might serve a conduit to the determination of (1) who would be willing and able to be part of the endeavor that is ITS; (b) what roles individual members are willing and able to play in the program; and (c) how these individual roles could be constituted into a coherent plan of action. We thought that at a meeting on the topic of graduate student professionalization opportunities (via course work; practice experiences, teaching assistantships, and mentoring on the broader scale) might be suitable. It would further help ITS to appear not only as a receiver but also a provider of services and ideas (see also, (e.2.).

e.2. The establishment of a PhD Minor in ITS

Mentioned by several of the ITS faculty members that we talked to, the PhD Minor in ITS does not seem to be a new idea of ours. Indeed, a PhD Minor in ITS could address several of the concerns presented in this report. It could help broaden the connections of ITS across campus; permit a closer collaboration between ITS and ITS-relevant programs that out of practical considerations cannot share ITS’ objectives fully (e.g., foreign language departments); provide a larger cohort of similarly-interested students to students in ITS without imposing on ITS the need to take on cohorts that are larger than what ITS can manage comfortably; and, in some instances, may enable ITS graduate students to participate in events, etc. that are organized by the home departments of ITS PhD Minor students. We do recognize that the introduction of a PhD Minor would impose an additional burden on ITS faculty and, possibly, the graduate program administrator, as requirements will need to be designed and their observance monitored; the new minor will need to be advertised; advising will need to be offered to new students as well as students who are interested in the program; and communication with the home departments of the new PhD Minor students as well as with various university agencies will need to be initiated and maintained.

e.3. A certificate program for undergraduates

Although ITS grants degrees only to graduate students, its curriculum also serves a substantial number of undergraduate students. Given the unpredictably of ITS’s course offerings from semester to semester and from year to year, the program is likely to see a certain amount of volatility in its undergraduate enrollment totals. This could pose some challenges as the College moves toward a system that emphasizes teaching
metrics. Because ITS quite wisely seeks to keep its incoming graduate cohorts small, the program could find itself disadvantaged in measures focused on the total number of credit hours taught. We understand the concern about the proliferation of certificates across the UW campus. Nevertheless, we also believe that there is a potential untapped market for ITS courses, both within the College and in some of the professional schools. Moreover, ITS’s Steering Committee might also develop strategic plans focused on increasing undergraduate enrollments. Such plans would enhance the program’s teaching metrics (and, quite bluntly, its standing or collateral within the Department of English) and might broaden opportunities for teaching assistantships and other professionalization activities for ITS students.

e.4. A meeting to dissect and discuss this report and determine a concrete agenda for action

Just like the idea of the PhD Minor in ITS, the idea of a meeting to dissect and discuss this report and determine a concrete agenda for action is really not ours. It was presented to us by Program Director Mary Trotter as already in the planning stages. We only wanted to express our strong support for this proposal and we hope that this report will be a useful basis for the discussion of ITS members. We would also like to recommend that graduate students as well as the graduate program administrator be included in these deliberations as much as is feasible.
December 15, 2016

Elaine M. Klein  
Associate Dean for Academic Planning, College of Letters and Science  
307 E South Hall  
Bascom Mall  
UW-Madison  
Madison, WI 53706

RE: Errata in ITS Review Committee Report

Dear Elaine,

Thank you for forwarding the ITS Review Committee Report to me earlier this month. The ITS Steering Committee and faculty are already discussing the committee’s extremely thorough and thoughtful work. I do list in the document, however, some corrections and clarifications around (inevitable) errors of fact discovered in the report.

We are grateful for the review committee’s hard work, and look forward to the APC’s response to the report as well.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Trotter  
Director, Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies Program  
Associate Professor, English and Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies  
Affiliate Faculty, Celtic Studies and CES  
Immediate Past President, American Conference for Irish Studies
Corrections and Clarifications to the ITS Reviewers’ Report
Submitted by Mary Trotter, ITS Director, on behalf of the ITS Program
December 15, 2016

Pages 1-2
Reviewers’ Report
“The doctoral program in Theatre & Drama (now, ITS) in the last 10 years has lost two faculty members (Barbara Clayton; Robert Skloot) and one academic staff member (Kristin Hunt) and now is constituted of five ‘core’ faculty members (a term that will be explained below).”

Correction/Clarification
The doctoral program has lost one faculty member (Robert Skloot) and two academic staff members (Barbara Clayton and Kristin Hunt)

Page 2
Reviewers’ Report
“Similarly, the three other ITS ‘core’ faculty members also have 50% of their teaching effort dedicated to ITS even as they hold their full-time appointments in other departments, i.e., Associate Professor Michael Peterson in the (new) Department of Theatre & Drama; Professor Mike Vanden Heuvel in the Department of Classics and Near Eastern Studies; and Professor Manon van de Water in the Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic.”

Correction/Clarification
Since in the fall of 2016, Michael Peterson’s tenure home moved to the Art Department. He is now an Associate Professor of Art with a .50 FTE teaching effort dedicated to ITS. At the time of the writing of the self-study, Peterson was still in the Department of Theatre and Drama

Page 2
Reviewers’ Report
“Similarly, another course that is taught by an ITS ‘core’ faculty member (Manon van de Water) and provides TA positions for graduate students in ITS is TD/Slavic/C&I 360.”

Correction/Clarification
The course in question is not TD/Slavic/C&I 360 but TD/Slavic/C&I 362.

Pages 2-3
Reviewers’ Report
“The same self-study also described the program’s governance structure and the Executive Committee’s responsibilities as follows ‘[…] governed by a faculty-elected Program Chair and an executive committee. The executive committee is currently made up of members of the core faculty. The executive committee’s responsibilities include new student recruitment, course scheduling, budgetary decisions and contributing to assessments of student progress.’ However, the current practice is for a Steering Committee to govern the program and for that
Steering Committee to be composed of two ‘core’ faculty members (the program’s Director, Professor Trotter, and Associate Professor Michael Peterson) and two ‘affiliate’ faculty members (Associate Professor Paola Hernandez, Spanish and Portuguese and Professor Christine Garlough, Gender and Women’s Studies).”

Correction/Clarification
I regret that the self-study did not make more clear our plans for our governing structure. The program shifted to the Steering Committee structure outlined in our request to relocate and rename the program from 2014. When we wrote the self-study in 2015 we were still transitioning into a program fully independent administratively of Theatre and Drama (ITS and Theatre and Drama shared budgetary administrations until June 30th, 2015), and we continued with a version of the model of governance we employed as part of Theatre and Drama, relying exclusively on core faculty to govern the program. In our self-study we signaled the plan to move into a structure similar to that outlined in our 2014 proposal, writing, “we plan to include the option for the executive committee to be made up of selected core and affiliate faculty when the program becomes more established” on page 3 of the self-study. The study should have been more clear by using the new term “steering committee” instead of “executive committee.”

Page 3
Reviewers’ Report
“However, the current practice is for a Steering Committee to govern the program and for that Steering Committee to be composed of two ‘core’ faculty members (the program’s Director, Professor Trotter, and Associate Professor Michael Peterson) and two ‘affiliate’ faculty members (Associate Professor Paola Hernandez, Spanish and Portuguese and Professor Christine Garlough, Gender and Women’s Studies).”

Correction/Clarification
The current steering committee members were elected by ballot by all faculty and affiliates serving in the program in spring semester of 2016. We plan to have members of the steering committee serve three-year appointments, with faculty rotating on and off the committee. This plan may change if we choose to have a significantly larger steering committee. We are grateful to affiliate faculty Professors Paola Hernandez and Christine Garlough for volunteering their efforts toward moving ITS forward. Both Hernandez and Garlough bring superb insights into teaching and research of theatre and performance studies, and their time is in high demand in their own departments and in the profession.

Hernandez and Garlough’s efforts are not only essential due to their intellectual contribution to the program, but also due to the fact that their involvement allows core faculty the opportunity to pursue research or serve L&S and UW in other ways. Core faculty member Manon van de Water requested not to serve on the Steering Committee for the next three years while she continues to serve as ITS’s Director of the Theatre for Youth Program and takes on the Chairship of the newly formed German/Nordic/Scandinavian Department. Core faculty member Mike Vanden Heuvel is on sabbatical after stepping down as Chair of the Integrated Liberal Studies
Program. And core faculty member Aparna Dharwadker received a spring semester 2017 fellowship from the Institute for Research in the Humanities and will be unavailable for service that semester. This situation left only two core faculty members available to serve on the steering committee. Thus, to continue with core faculty governance was not only counter to our proposed governance structure but logistically untenable.

Page 3
Correction/Clarification
Christine Garlough is Associate Professor of Gender and Women’s Studies

Page 3
Reviewers’ Report
“According to a self-study report submitted to the College of Letters and Science on January 1, 2016, between May 2005 and May 2015 (the program’s last academic semester as the doctoral program in Theatre & Drama), the program – specifically its current five ‘core’ faculty members – guided 40 students to the PhD degree and had another 11 students working toward degree completion, many of whom have since finished.”

Correction/Clarification
The committee is correct that the I (Trotter) provided them a breakdown of 38 rather than 40 graduates in the last ten years as part of a lengthy document the reviewers requested covering a large range of topics. In my haste to get the requested information to the committee as quickly as possible I overlooked two of our forty graduates between 2005 and 2015. Allow me to offer the correct numbers here:

- PhD alumni from 2005-2015 currently work in the following positions.
  - Tenure-track/tenured higher education 23
  - Non-tenure track higher education 5
  - Primary/secondary education 2
  - Higher education administration 2
  - State-level educational administration 1
  - Arts/creative activity 3
  - Positions outside education or arts 4

I sent the review committee members this data in response to their concern that our graduates do not usually move into academic positions immediately after graduation. This data reflects our high levels of placement in a highly competitive field, where very few students move immediately from graduation into an academic position.
Reviewers’ Report

“The Graduate School’s description of the program states that the ‘minimum course requirement’ for the PhD is 51 credits but the program handbook stipulates that students need 69 credits to graduate.”

Correction/Clarification

The minimum course requirement number in the graduate school description is the minimum number of courses beyond transfer credits. The handbook stipulates the total number of courses required for completing the program, including transfer credits. Students who matriculate into the PhD program with an MA may transfer up to 18 credits, then take 51 credits of coursework at UW, totaling 69 credits.

Reviewers’ Report

“[The ITS Program] is essentially in a diaspora i.e., a community that needs to establish itself as such via a concerted effort rather than the more typical organic means that arise from the benefits of a shared space, time together, and accountability to/within the same hierarchical structures.”

Correction/Clarification

While we appreciate the reviewers’ observation that having faculty and curriculum dispersed across several departments requires a concerted effort to a higher degree than a program within a single department, we believe that the use of the term diaspora is problematic. Diaspora implies that the theatre and performance MA and PhD on campus is in a state of exile and displacement. However, our relocation to English (our very hospitable new administrative home) has in fact allowed us to stay in our “ancestral home” of the College of Letters and Science, while the Theatre and Drama Department decided to move from the College of Letters and Science to the School of Education. Also, the MA and PhD relied on affiliate faculty across campus to support its mission while still in Theatre and Drama. In other words, we appreciate and acknowledge the reviewers’ astute and well considered observations of the very real difficulties of a program with faculty distributed across departments, but we made this change to the program in order to maintain core program values and practices, best cultivated by maintaining our home in L&S.

All ITS students now have access to mailboxes from the English Department

Reviewers’ Report:

“the housing department serves as tenure & budgetary home for some but all ITS faculty members”

Correction/Clarification
This sentence should read, “some but not all ITS faculty members”

**Pages 18-19**

Reviewers’ Report

“According to the (2014 program proposal) document, the governing structure [of ITS] was to consist of: (a) A Program Director; (b) a Steering Committee (made up of four elected members of the core and affiliate faculty); and (c) a/the Director of the Theatre for Youth Program. However, according to the self-study document…(2015)...The ITS Program is governed by a faculty-elected Program Chair and the executive committee. The executive committee is currently made up of members of core faculty”

Correction/Clarification
Please see note regarding pages 2-3

**Page 19**

Reviewers’ Report

The Director of the Theatre for Youth Program does not have a permanent seat on the steering committee (and does not, in fact, serve on the steering committee now).

Correction/Clarification

The Director of the Theatre for Youth Program took on the position of Chair of the newly formed German/Nordic/Slavic Studies Department this fall, and currently serves on the executive board of an international TFY organization that requires a significant amount of trouble. Thus, she has asked not to be included on the Steering Committee while she serves as GNS Chair.

**Page 19**

Reviewers’ Report

“Only ‘core’ faculty appear to be entrusted with the advising of dissertations and only papers written in the courses by the ‘core’ faculty can be used toward the Prelim A exam portfolio.”

Correction/Clarification

Papers written in courses taught by ITS affiliate faculty may indeed be used in Prelim A exams. The report is correct that, at this time, only core faculty sit on Prelim A exam defenses.

**Page 24**

Reviewers’ Report

“Student[sic?] also expressed a desire for an orientation to the faculty, courses, degree requirements and the community at large upon arrival.”

Correction/Clarification

While this expression was one or more students’ opinion, we are concerned that student/s did not think they received an orientation. During welcome week, all new students participate in a one-hour new student orientation which covers faculty, courses and degree requirements as
outlined in the program handbook, followed by individual course advising from the program director. They also are invited to an all-program meeting and social during welcome week or the first week of classes. We hope that, with the help of our newly elected student representative to the ITS Steering Committee, we can redress this issue.

Page 24-25
Reviewers’ Report
“RE: student concerns that Theatre and Drama courses, production experiences and TA positions are no longer available to them since ITS’s relocation and renaming.”

Correction/Clarification
ITS students have the same number of opportunities to take Theatre and Drama courses and participate in University Theatre productions as they did before the split. Indeed, ITS students have continued to work as actors and dramaturgs for University Theatre productions and have taken Theatre and Drama courses every semester since ITS’s relocation in Fall of 2015. As for TA positions, ITS students were not offered TA positions in acting or design by the Theatre and Drama department before the split, so there has not actually been a loss of teaching opportunities with ITS’s relocation in English. Indeed, our students continue to teach TA positions in Integrated Liberal Studies and Communication Arts, and several ITS students are enjoying working in the writing center or teaching composition in the English Department this year. This clarification does not dismiss, however, the students’ desire for more curricular, practice and teaching opportunities. Rather, we wish to correct the assumption that curricular teaching and production opportunities were lost with the renaming and relocation of the program. We will clarify this matter with our students while also striving to create more opportunities for them.
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