24 July 2017

TO:  Thomas DuBois, Chair, Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (Fall 2016)  
Mary Layoun, Chair, Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (Spring/Summer 2017)  
Ernesto Livorni, Incoming Chair, Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (2017-18)

FROM:  John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE:  Review of Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies programs, including:

- Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies
- Master of Arts – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, with named options in “Comparative Literature” and in “Folklore Studies”
- Doctor of Philosophy – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, with named options in “Comparative Literature” and in “Folklore Studies”
- Undergraduate Certificate in Folklore

XC:  Marty Gustafson, Assistant Dean, Graduate School  
Elaine M. Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S  
Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research  
Lisa Martin, Associate Dean, Graduate School  
Jocelyn Milner, Associate Provost and Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research  
Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities, L&S

On May 2, 2017, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered the review of academic programs overseen by the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies. Associate Dean Susan Zaeske led discussion of the department’s self-study, the review committee report, and of the corrections and comments offered about the committee report. This review of the programs was conducted for several reasons, most of which relate to the timing of prior reviews: the last “regular, ten-year” review of the Comparative Literature Department was completed in 1999, a specially convened departmental review was completed in 2002-03, and the certificate programs in Folklore have never before been reviewed. In addition, it has been four years since the department was restructured to become the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, and it is important for the college and faculty to evaluate carefully academic programs in departments that have been restructured, so we may consider program function and purpose and whether and how faculty reconfigurations serve our students.

Before summarizing the L&S Academic Planning Council’s discussion of the program review and its recommendations, I want to assure you that we understand that the review process is time-consuming as well as intellectually and emotionally challenging. Our hope is that the
process adds value to the work you and your colleagues do and provides an opportunity to think carefully about how to configure academic programs to best serve our students.

Dean Zaeske’s presentation began with the observation that Comparative Literature will be celebrating its 100th anniversary in the coming year. This celebration comes on the heels of several years of significant change, including the merger of Comparative Literature with Folklore, a number of faculty retirements, and a notable number of new faculty hires. We appreciate the effort you and your colleagues have invested in the review process, as well as the work invested for the past several years, working on the new departmental entity. We also greatly appreciate the efforts of the review committee to offer thoughtful, though challenging, recommendations about the future.

The L&S APC had a wide ranging discussion on the self-study and review committee reports. Members were particularly struck by the review committee’s observations that “almost everyone in CLFS agrees that Folklore Studies faculty have not been fully integrated into the merged department,” and that there are substantial disagreements between the faculty in areas ranging from instruction, graduate training and TA allocation, to governance. The review committee expressed concern about disagreements regarding Graduate program requirements, as well as the difficulty the faculty has had to articulate a common undergraduate program of study (within the constraints of the L&S baccalaureate degree requirements) that integrates both Comparative Literature and Folklore. More seriously, the committee offered comment on the department’s capacity to offer the nominally integrated programs for which it is responsible, with serious concern expressed about whether there are sufficient Folklore faculty to offer courses at levels to serve that array of programs (certificate, undergraduate major, graduate minor and degrees). The report suggests that program development and renovation that was anticipated at the time of merger has failed to come to fruition, and that in addition to the Folklore Program not being well integrated into the Comparative Literature program, Folklore retirements and departures have eroded the ability of CLFS to offer an integrated curriculum.

The evaluation of the committee suggests, and the L&S APC concurs, that the attempt to merge these academic areas has failed. To remediate the situation, the council has asked the department to consider reconceptualizing the merger of these programs, with the following recommended sequence of actions:

- By the end of Fall 2017, CLFS should submit a request to restructure.
- By the end of Fall 2017, CLFS should submit a request to suspend admission to CLFS program(s) during reconceptualization. Suspension of program admissions beginning in Fall 2018 will afford the faculty time to plan for the future. CLFS programs include:
  - Undergraduate major (Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science) – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies
  - Master of Arts – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, with named options in “Comparative Literature” and in “Folklore Studies”
  - Doctor of Philosophy – Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, with named options in “Comparative Literature” and in “Folklore Studies”
  - Undergraduate Certificate in Folklore
  - Doctoral Minor in Comparative Literature
Doctoral Minor in Folklore

- By end of Spring 2018, Folklore faculty (expanded to include folklorists beyond the department) should submit a proposal to relocate the existing Folklore Certificate.
- By end of Fall 2017, the Comparative Literature faculty and interested affiliates should submit a plan for engaging in efforts to reconceptualize the programs (perhaps convening a “Future of CL Task Force,” similar to the “Future of Asian Studies” task force)? Our hope is to see a broadly configured committee that will be able to engage in discussion of the future of CL as highly connected, interdisciplinary program with comparative literary (and other) study at its core.
- By end of Fall 2018, CLFS should ask to revise the CLFS program names, update program requirements (and, if necessary, discontinue the named options), and request permission to reopen admissions.

Finally, with respect to the programs as they currently exist, the APC also spent some time considering CLFS’ assessment strategy, and how this process can be used to inform discussions of student learning and program design. Members noted that while it is useful to have a sense of student satisfaction with programs and students’ perceptions of learning in them, this type of indirect assessment often is not useful to programs with very small student numbers. (And indeed, the CLFS self-study also expressed concern about how generalizable survey results may be.) APC members suggest that as the faculty in Comparative Literature and in Folklore discuss program redesign, they give serious consideration to revisiting the survey approach for assessing student learning. Also, since Comparative Literature courses serve students in other programs, it is worth considering, how to assess and improve learning at the course level, to ensure that the discipline’s contributions to other areas of study is secure and strong. Council members encourage you also to consider methods of more directly assessing student learning, and to use what is found to guide program improvement in both areas.

The L&S Academic Planning Council approved a motion to accept this review as complete, with the understanding that there is a considerable amount of work to be done and several steps to be taken to address concerns raised in the report, to protect students enrolled in CLFS programs, and to ensure that there is a future for the discipline at UW-Madison.

This report, and the department’s response to it, signals a beginning of a much longer conversation about the future of CLFS, which will involve faculty from Comparative Literature and Folklore as well as the input from colleagues from other units. I want to commend the review committee for its work and for making what were certainly difficult recommendations. This review, and the seriousness with which it was undertaken by all parties, reminds us that academic program review affords us all 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 embracing this opportunity.
March 3, 2017

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

FROM: Review Committee, Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (CLFS):

Guillermina De Ferrari (Spanish and Portuguese) Chair
Maria Lepowsky (Anthropology)
Venkat Mani (German, Nordic, Slavic)
Kirsten Wolf (German, Nordic, Slavic and GFEC Representative)

Re: Review of CLFS academic programs

CC: Elaine Klein, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
    Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities, L&S

Please find attached the academic program review of the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (CLFS). As requested, we are providing a brief report discussing the following items: 1) summary of committee activity; 2) overview of the department; 3) academic programs in Folklore (undergraduate and graduate); 4) academic programs in Comparative Literature (undergraduate and graduate); 5) culture and governance; 6) Comparative Literature in the nation vs. at UW; 7) recommendations.

1. Summary of Committee Activity:

The Committee met with Associate Deans Sue Zaeske and Elaine Klein for information about our charge. We read and considered the self-study by CLFS and the additional relevant materials provided in “Box.” We conducted one-on-one interviews with Mary Layoun, the current Chair; Tom DuBois, Chair in Fall 2016; Jordan Rosenblum, the Director of Graduate Studies; and all remaining faculty members. We also interviewed Rob Howard, former affiliate and former Chair; 1 emeritus professor; 2 academic staff members, including the Undergraduate Studies advisor; 2 affiliate faculty; and the department administrator, who was very generous and efficient in organizing these interviews. In addition, we talked to 17 students representing all academic programs housed in the department in groups of 3-4. Based on these meetings and interviews, we developed a solid understanding of the quality of the undergraduate and graduate academic programs as well as areas of concern that merit discussion as the Department looks to the future.

During our interviews, the Committee solicited information about each of the academic programs—individual as well as combined; the likely impact of course offerings in the academic training of students; and the strategies that the two programs—individually and together as a combined unit—have developed since their merger to attract, serve, and enrich the academic
experience of graduate and undergraduate students at UW-Madison. Three additional areas of interest emerged during our interviews: governance/climate; the mentoring of assistant professors; and the role of affiliates. We will discuss these issues in items 5 and 6 below.

2. Overview

UW-Madison’s Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies (CLFS) is the only department in the US (and probably worldwide) that has tried to merge these two academic disciplines. While such merger is intellectually possible and could potentially be a source of distinction, its benefits are not self-evident within the logic of current academic markets. In addition, the minimum administrative and curricular steps required to turn the two fields into one successful program were never taken. Instead, serious problems have become increasingly apparent. Almost everyone in CLFS agrees that Folklore Studies faculty has not been fully integrated into the merged department. There are substantial disagreements between the two programs concerning the teaching of students, especially the training of graduate students and TA allocation, as well as approaches to governance. The most serious structural problem is no doubt the small number of faculty identified with Folklore Studies. Four tenure-track assistant professors have been added to CLFS in the last few years, all of them via the mechanism of partner/spousal hires and all of them to the comparative literature side of the joint department. This imbalance has exacerbated existing faculty concerns on the folklore side regarding Comparative Literature colleagues plus L&S support for Folklore Studies. Overall, we found that the schism between Folklore Studies and Comparative Literature is very large and almost insurmountable in its current form. In addition to curricular and academic divisions, we found different cultures in governance. At the same time, conflicts within each program also exist. These can be addressed in ways that would not only solve but also strengthen existing programs.

Comparative Literature at UW-Madison is a longstanding, degree-granting program with tenure lines. The challenges of the merger have had the unintended consequence of distracting the Comparative Literature program from addressing its own internal problems. For a long time, Comparative Literature was an insular department organized around a narrow definition of the field. They consequently neglected some of the most interesting developments taking place on campus and elsewhere. Comparative Literature tenured faculty members have shown uneven degrees of productivity and of responsibility in advising and governance. New faculty members joined the department as a result of internal transfers, and four new assistant professors were recently hired. Currently, the program is an eclectic group of faculty members, many of whom are productive and have the capacity to steer the discipline in current and exciting directions. The academic programs in Comparative Literature are demanding and in need of revision. There are too few undergraduate majors in Comparative Literature, but the graduate program is healthier. Funding of graduate students is dramatically insufficient.

Folklore Studies is an intellectual conglomerate of scholars and teachers who have contributed immensely to the study of folklore in the Midwest, the US, and in international settings. Folklore Studies offers an undergraduate certificate and a flexible PhD program. However, the Folklore Studies program in CLFS presents three problems: it never successfully integrated; curricular and academic requirements of the Folklore PhD option, approved by the Graduate School, are internally disputed by CLFS faculty; faculty members have retired or have left in frustration.
These problems become more apparent in the graduate program, as students have difficulty fulfilling requirements in their own discipline and are rarely selected for TAships in Folklore Studies undergraduate courses. The undergraduate certificate, on the other hand, is a healthy program and has provided much needed stability to CLFS.

More than one Folklore faculty member described a mismatch of academic cultures with Comparative Literature. Issues include the relative formality or informality of procedures for working out appropriate teaching and advising. There were internal differences in their views of proper training of students, particularly graduate students, and what should be required or expected in terms of classwork and the content of preliminary examinations. Another issue was the longstanding tradition of public folklore, which some folklore faculty felt was not valued or considered as appropriate academic productivity by their Comparative Literature colleagues.

In an effort to gauge how the department currently defines its mission, the Committee raised questions to faculty members about the way the significance and relevance of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies was articulated to its potential students. Many agreed that no cohesive message was being sent out to students, partially because of the diversity of faculty research and teaching interests in Comparative Literature or Folklore Studies. A member of the “publicity committee” charged with producing a coherent message, suggests that “we are a comparative cultures department.” This may not be enough to “package” the heterogeneity of the program as is; however, it articulates the direction pursued by most Comparative Literature departments in the country. This vision may in fact be the foundation for a new and revised department.

3. Academic Programs in Folklore Studies

With the likely retirement of Professor Janet Gilmore, and the recent retirements of James Leary and Theresa Schenk, Folklore Studies is left with one budgeted faculty member at .5 FTE in CLFS. The number of Folklore-affiliated faculty has been shrinking, with several folklore-related faculty declining to renew their affiliations in the last few years. Given UW budgetary and other constraints, there is no realistic expectation of additional faculty lines in Folklore Studies in the near future. There are simply not enough faculty left at this point to sustain a graduate training program in Folklore Studies within CLFS. Sustaining the undergraduate certificate in Folklore Studies in itself is proving a considerable challenge due to the current lack of faculty to teach classes.

The Center for Upper Midwest Studies was founded by members of the former Folklore Studies Program. While it too has suffered recent retirements, the Center holds continuing grants worth about half a million dollars and employs academic staff as folklorists. The Center was not part of this program review. There seems to be little overlap at this point between the activities of the Center and the academic activities of CLFS. This is a connection that may be explored.

If folklore-related faculty affiliates were to become more active in contributing to the teaching as well as in the mentoring of undergraduate certificate students, and if a certificate curriculum were to be revised and formalized to incorporate selected classes taught by affiliates in other departments (e.g. Garlough's Gender and Performance classes in Gender and Women's Studies),
the Folklore Studies certificate could continue to make a valuable contribution to UW undergraduate education in the humanities, wherever the certificate program is housed in future.

**Undergraduate Program in Folklore Studies**

There is no major in Folklore Studies in the CLFS department. There is a small but viable undergraduate certificate program in which 15 students are currently enrolled. The gateway course, Folklore 100, enrolls dozens of students and employs TAs. Due to the shortage of active faculty, staffing the course has become challenging, and there are very few upper-division electives in CLFS. Accordingly, students routinely take courses in a wide variety of departments and programs including GNS, GWS, Anthropology, and Religious Studies.

The one undergraduate student with a Folklore Studies emphasis whom we met and interviewed seemed to be satisfied with the program and with staff and faculty advising. The undergraduate and graduate staff adviser is shared by the joint department. Formal data on job placement of folklore students after graduation was lacking, but individual faculty provided us with information dating back to the stand-alone Folklore Studies Program. The certificate program has had an impressive track record over the years, in combination with training in other majors, in placing students in relevant kinds of professional employment. Among students obtaining the certificate, 13 have gone on to folklore or related studies at graduate schools. Employment has ranged from positions with the National Park Service to museum work to founding folklore-related production companies.

**Graduate Program in Folklore Studies**

There is a PhD Option in Folklore Studies in CLFS. Applicants are admitted with the expectation that they will continue for a PhD rather than for a terminal MA. Previously, during the Folklore Studies Program era, doctoral students would receive a Special Committee Degree. The chance to offer a PhD in Folklore Studies was a primary incentive, on the folklore faculty side, for going ahead with the merger into CLFS. Stand-alone PhD Programs in Folklore are increasingly rare in North America, with Indiana University the largest and most prestigious program. Faculty members note that annual PhD production in Folklore is “tiny” and give that as a realistic reason why CLFS has not recruited new faculty in Folklore Studies.

CLFS also houses a PhD minor in Folklore Studies, one that has been utilized in recent years by doctoral students from Anthropology, GNS, and Hebrew and Semitic Studies, among other programs. PhD minors take courses for the minor distributed across multiple departments. Private conversations with PhD minors have revealed general satisfaction with the minor option despite the current lack of faculty in CLFS with a folklore emphasis.

The CLFS PhD Option in Folklore Studies faces particular challenges at this point. The recent and impending retirements of core faculty (some hired via a now-defunct Folklore Cluster) mean that there have recently been few to no courses on offer at the graduate level in a given semester and very few potential faculty advisers. If faculty are teaching Folklore 100, for example - and thereby supporting TAs in the combined CLFS - they are unavailable to offer a graduate seminar in Folklore Studies. More fundamentally, there seems to be considerable disagreement among
faculty from Comparative Literature versus Folklore Studies as to what constitutes an appropriate progression of graduate courses and even what should constitute an appropriate preliminary examination for graduates on the folklore track. One gateway graduate seminar on Translation (822) is required for all graduate students in CLFS. However, it is only offered every two or three years. Comparative Literature students mentioned having had to request that the course be offered so they would not fall behind. A folklore faculty member reports being unable to convince colleagues of the value of teaching a version of the Translation course oriented to Folklore Studies.

While the data is not broken down in the CLFS self-study, faculty report that there are currently four continuing graduate students in the Folklore Studies option. The sole dissertator is doing research in Norway and is still advised by an Emeritus faculty member (Leary). Two additional PhD students are advised by Gilmore, one of whom is expected to take a preliminary exam next year. The fourth, an internal transfer from Anthropology, is advised by DuBois. Currently on leave, she lacks the Translation course (being taught Spring 2017) and would need to substitute an Independent Study before she is permitted to take the preliminary examination in CLFS next year. A fifth graduate student with folklore interests has been advised by Christine Garlough, a faculty affiliate. Two of these graduate students have either informed us directly or, we have been told by others, that they are planning to switch to another department by next fall. At least one folklore-option applicant was offered admission this season (we have received differing reports of the number). Another promising applicant was declined admission due to lack of faculty advising.

Folklore Studies faculty are concerned by the lack of funding for graduate students. A structural issue is that CLFS TAships, mainly generated by Folklore 100, are awarded by seniority. This practice has meant that the more junior graduate students, who tend to be part of the newer Folklore PhD option, have been at a disadvantage when competing for TAships. Pedagogically too this has been a challenge for faculty instructors, who report that the Comparative Literature grads are more likely to get TAships than Folklore grads even though the former are not trained in Folklore Studies.

The graduate students we met generally valued their faculty advisers and mentors. A couple of students felt that there was not a good fit intellectually or academically and planned to depart for other programs. All were concerned with the shortage of faculty due to recent retirements. A few students complained that graduate advising can be confusing and contradictory, with the academic staff person (listed as advising both graduates and undergraduates in CLFS) telling them one thing about requirements and the faculty adviser telling them something quite different. The unavailability of the required Translation seminar at a suitable moment in their graduate careers was an issue flagged to us by both Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies graduate students.

Two faculty members report that the content of the Preliminary Examination for Folklore Option PhD students has been an unresolved and contentious issue. Fortunately, it is one that has apparently been kept away from graduate students in the program. This is a serious problem and a further sign of the current lack of integration or agreement on what constitutes appropriate graduate and professional education in the currently merged department.
The PhD in Folklore is very recent; accordingly, there is very little data. The number of students applying to the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies in 2016-17 was 26, and of these 5 have been admitted. The committee is concerned about the sustainability of the PhD with so few faculty /academic staff members.

4. Academic Programs in Comparative Literature

The current faculty in Comparative Literature is the result of several geological layers. Three senior faculty members are the remainders of the pre-merger Comparative Literature department. As is well known, the department suffered losses due to retirement and other incidents and they were not allowed to hire for a long time. Though not uniformly, these faculty members uphold a traditional view of the field with a focus on European literature, an ambitious language proficiency requirement, and the idea that all of its courses must be taught by comparatists (most programs in the country follow a system combining core faculty and affiliates with a variety of theoretical and interdisciplinary interests). Several members described some of the senior people as “checking out,” and described the Comparative Literature program as insular. Besides affiliates, who are used unevenly, additions to the faculty roster have been made by transfers from other departments. We were particularly impressed by the energy and vision of two joint-appointments. The new assistant professors have also been welcome additions to the department. They certainly have the expertise to potentially renew the program and attract new students.

Most faculty members interviewed insist on the need to rethink the program, build bridges with other units and to organize their course offering in clusters around themes that could attract students and give coherence to the program. Overall, the program has a large selection of interesting courses (although a few, like courses on yoga, seemed surprising at first sight). Two faculty members suggested the need to create a few themes or areas of strength and build courses around them, such as the environment, race, justice, science and technology, etc. This seems a smart way to use available resources on campus, connect to other faculty members, and promote itself as a distinctive product. All faculty agree on the need to fund graduate students better.

Undergraduate Program in Comparative Literature

With a requirement of 39 credits, the Comparative Literature undergraduate major is designed to train undergraduate students for a career in academia following a traditional, outdated model. Not surprisingly, the program only has 4 majors (although one major we interviewed loved the program and didn’t find it too demanding). A senior faculty member blamed the rise of corporate thinking as a reason for the lack of interest in languages and in Comparative Literature as a major field of study. Given the career goals of our students—who are burdened every year by the rising cost of higher education—it is not hard to surmise why Comparative Literature is rather unpopular. Another faculty member had a very constructive suggestion of trying to reformulate the program to cater to students for whom Comparative Literature might be a second major, not the first. The program really needs to repackage itself—focusing on disciplinary, not just linguistic diversity—in order to sustain itself and serve students well. Additional suggestions to improve the program include the creation of a gateway course to build a cohort, and a capstone course for assessment. Current assessment in the form of an exit survey is not sufficient.
Graduate Program in Comparative Literature

Graduate degree programs comprise an MA in Comparative Literature of 30 credits, seen as a part of the PhD program not a terminal degree, plus an MA exam, and a PhD in Comparative Literature for a total of 51 credits. The language requirement of two modern foreign languages and one ancient/medieval or non-Western language is equal or above the norm in other Comparative Literature departments. Some faculty members described the program to us as overly regimented, and overly Eurocentric. Two faculty members concentrate most dissertators.

Within the last 10 years, the number of applicants has dropped from 43 (2006-7) to 24 (2015-16), which is an all-time low with the exception of 2007-8, when only 19 students applied. (This was also a year in which no students were admitted.) New enrollments remain average. Within the last 10 years, 1-7 students have been admitted (5 were admitted in 2015-6). Of these, the vast majority are domestic students. Only 5 domestic targeted minority students have applied since 2010-11 (and of these 4 enrolled). The number of international students is low as well. In the last 10 years, Comparative Literature has had a total of 7 international students.

Financial aid comes in the form of teaching assistantships and whatever fellowships the Department can get from the Graduate School. Many of the graduate students serve as TAs in departments other than CLFS, and generally first-year students are not funded (unless they get a fellowship). The Department endeavors to provide four semesters of a TA-ship.

Students typically take a long time to complete their degrees. Time to degree is 8.8 years. This is largely due to the language requirements: knowledge of two modern languages (in addition to English) and reading knowledge of an ancient/medieval or non-Western language. Maybe as a result of this, quite a number of graduates do not complete their degrees within 10 years (in comparison with peer institutions).

Job placement is not a strong suit in the department. While a few students find employment within their field of study at small colleges, most of them find employment outside of academia. The graduate students who volunteered to be interviewed expressed satisfaction with the program. However, a few students and also a number of faculty members were concerned about the MA reading list, which, according to them, had not been updated in 30 years. In their opinion, it was too rigid, too focused on European literature and philosophy, too male-centered, and too insistent on the idea of a canon of literature. In addition, the Translation course (822), which is mandatory for graduates in both Comparative Literature and Folklore, is offered only every two or three years.

The committee was disturbed to learn from the graduate students that no guidance was given on dissertation topics until after the completion of the PhD prelims, and that while working on their dissertations, they were not encouraged to publish and present papers at conferences within the field. In addition, the committee learned that there was no professional seminar in order to help students prepare their CVs, teaching philosophy statements, and job applications. Students mentioned that for help in these matters, they had to approach their advisors. While the placement of PhDs has been relatively good, not all students have been able to get academic positions.
(As a point of reference. Comparative Literature PhD graduates tend to find jobs in either Comparative Literature or national language departments. An informal tally of MLA lists done in December 2016 indicates that 23 assistant professor positions were advertised in Comparative Literature, compared to 35 in Spanish, 15 in French, and 104 in English).

The CLFS Polyseminar, which has evolved and transformed itself in many ways since its introduction in 2014, is intended to bring graduate students in Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies together, but not everyone felt that it had succeeded in forging a closer relationship between the two cohorts of students or faculty.

5. Culture:

Governance:

We heard repeated complaints that the concentration of power was in very few hands, as well as the operation on the basis of consensus in Folklore Studies vs rules in Comparative Literature. Each governance style was seen as conducive to successful governance by some and as arbitrary and exclusive by others. An additional problem mentioned is that written guidelines are not always updated, and they are selectively ignored. Problems reported stalling on decisions made during meetings, decisions happening outside meetings, or, conversely, decisions that were secretly “undecided” after meetings. Agendas are not circulated ahead of meetings. The department clearly needs to revise guidelines and use them appropriately and consistently, with agendas and minutes, and predictable follow-up.

Elections have been complicated. Everyone agrees that having two chairs this academic year, one in the Fall and another one in the Spring, was problematic.

Assistant Professors:

Four new hires were added to the department (exclusively in Comparative Literature) in the last few years. The Committee found that while three the new assistant professors might not have been trained in the discipline, they conduct interdisciplinary, international, and/or transmedia comparative research and are contributing to the profile of the Comparative Literature program. In most cases, we were impressed by their teaching interests and areas of expertise, as well as by their desire to make their program work to its best potential.

During our interviews, we observed that mentoring of assistant professors has been uneven. It required activism on their part to be given tenure guidelines. It came to our attention that a tenure track faculty member has not taught a graduate seminar, nor has s/he been scheduled to teach one before coming up for tenure soon. Additional mentoring would be desirable for those faculty members that have not been trained in literature to make sure they publish in proper venues and in appropriate quantity. One Assistant Professor coming up for tenure in the near future expressed concern about the selection of outside reviewers given the disconnect between Comparative Literature tenured faculty and her/his field. Comparative Literature EC should be encouraged to enlist affiliates or even guest collaborators to participate in tenure committees in
the candidates’ fields so as to ensure that relevant outside evaluators are approached, and to help contextualize individual narratives for the A&H Divisional Committee.

6. Comparative Literature in the Nation vs Comparative Literature at UW

The wealth of any Comparative Literature department lies in its capacity to pull into two directions at once: concentration and flexibility. The concentration aspect requires the creation of core Comparative Literature courses that teach the history, theories and methods of the discipline, as well as a small selection of seminars that show how Comparative Literature is done in practice. This is essential to show that the discipline is more than a collection of national literature courses. Most programs in the country address this by requiring 3-5 courses taught by Comparative Literature core faculty. Flexibility, in turn, has been cherished by most programs for decades. This makes sense. The point of comparative studies is to make connections between literary or cultural aspects that are unlikely to be charted in any given national literary tradition. To study the uncharted in a coherent pre-existing program is impossible and, therefore, contrary to the discipline. Most programs in the country provide flexibility (and rigor) by using a robust pool of affiliates from other disciplines and linguistic traditions. The requirement of foreign languages, for instance, is compatible with both needs, the need for concentration and flexibility. Most successful programs offer the option of applying credits in a non-literary discipline in lieu of credits in a language department. Flexibility is ultimately what allows the field to adapt to new times. Most Comparative Literature programs today are hubs for interdisciplinary work.

A problem of the Comparative Literature department at UW long before its merger with Folklore was the overbearing attention to the concentration aspect of the field. This has slightly improved with the acceptance of affiliates who nevertheless remain largely marginalized. Since Comparative Literature began accepting affiliates, their names are listed on their website, but little coordination happens beyond that. The assignment of courses is exclusively done at the initiative of the affiliate. The system is extremely open-ended in that affiliates teach courses with Comparative Literature designated course numbers in a “meets with” format so that they can also use course numbers in their home departments. Affiliate-taught courses contribute to the diversity of the academic program in Comparative Literature, but often its ad-hoc quality makes this improvement merely cosmetic. Their participation in governance is also voluntary. Exam committees rarely use affiliates. Reaching out to affiliates and even to specialists not formally linked to the department would be beneficial to students, whose final dissertations will have to stand up to scrutiny in a job market that will intersect with a variety of specialists. Historically, many Comparative Literature graduates find jobs in language departments.

There are many potential benefits for Comparative Literature to work more actively with affiliates. A department with a coherent pool of actively involved faculty can be a platform for interdisciplinary work. Affiliates and students benefit from crossing departmental lines and create an intellectual community around areas of strength. Centers with no faculty lines, like the Center for Visual Cultures or the Center for the Humanities, to name a few, can take advantage of the international and interdisciplinary nature of a modern Comparative Literature department to develop academic programs that wouldn’t naturally belong in any department (an example is a slow but ongoing discussion to house a Comics Studies program in this department). Besides the historical hostility of the Comparative Literature department, the strongest deterrent for affiliates
today is the metrics, which forces every faculty member to stay put for the benefit of their tenure department. Comparative Literature could be one “sanctuary” on campus where current metrics is suspended so that the large pool of faculty members across campus can coordinate their efforts along common research interests. This will greatly enhance current academic offerings with minimum effort, and no use of additional resources.

7. Recommendations

1) Separate Folklore Studies from Comparative Literature in each and every way.

2) Recommendations for Folklore Studies:

a) House remaining Folklore Studies faculty in their current tenure home departments. Possible locations for a reconstituted Folklore Studies Program: Co-administered with Religious Studies or with GNS

Alternately, continue to offer the undergraduate certificate through a new Program to be housed elsewhere. Revise and formalize the undergraduate certificate to include courses regularly taught by Folklore faculty affiliates in other units.

b) Continuing graduate students: Move the Folklore Option PhD to the home department of the faculty adviser or do a "teach-out" via CLFS of the continuing students in the Folklore Option PhD

c) Continue the PhD minor through the new Folklore Studies Program. Actively recruit faculty affiliate to renew and become more active, especially in graduate advising and teaching. Pause admission of Folklore Option PhD students at least until above goals have been met.

d) Consider whether or not in the future there should be a Folklore Option PhD housed in GNS or elsewhere given declining numbers of Folklore PhDs produced nationwide plus shortage of suitable faculty at UW in the future Folklore Studies Program, which will be heavily dependent on affiliates to teach required and elective courses.

e) Consider whether future interested graduate students admitted via GNS or other related departments should instead receive a Special Committee PhD Degree as in the past at UW.

3) Recommendations for Comparative Literature:

At a minimum, these aspects of current programs need to be revised:

a) Undergraduate major: reduce requirements/create a certificate. Create a FIGs or use Mellon Morgridge courses to build community. Consider organizing the major around new themes. Consider adding new cultural studies majors under the Comparative Literature umbrella.
b) MA: reduce and update requirements; revise/update reading list dramatically to reflect current interests; reconsider the need of an exam.

c) PhD: consider a more flexible program; revisit Prelims to include a dissertator prospectus; reduce language requirements, and/or consider encouraging other courses in other disciplines instead of a language; create a Placement committee; create a Proseminar or use the existing Polyseminar to encourage professionalization; organize exams and dissertation committees that include one outside faculty member from the start.

We debated the convenience of dismantling Comparative Literature but the option of revising or, ideally, remodeling the department and program seemed more productive. Much is to be gained by keeping a Comparative Literature or Comparative Studies department/program at UW. The first reason is the discipline itself: it is the longest standing interdisciplinary field in the humanities, and its annual convention houses thousands of people. Ideally, UW shouldn’t lose a program with such national importance. At the same time, the program needs to redefine what Comparative Literature is in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century and how to best serve UW-Madison today. This need is not a problem in itself. Redefining Comparative Literature is in the DNA of the discipline, as mentioned in past state-of-the-discipline decennial reports as well as in the latest one, which will be published as Futures of Comparative Literature (Routledge 2017), though an earlier website version can be found here: https://stateofthediscipline.acla.org/. According to most contributors, the future of the discipline is to be the hub of interdisciplinary work in the literary humanities. Many programs in the nation reflect that in their efforts to rename departments. Some examples include: Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies, Comparative Literatures and Cultures, and Comparative Studies Department. We believe a change in this direction would allow it to house a series of well-selected and properly articulated cultural studies programs.

Regardless of whether the Comparative Literature department is revised or substantially remodeled along the lines recommended above, the changes are dramatic enough that they are perhaps better executed by an outside chair.

If the department is substantially remodeled, guidelines should be clearly established to avoid two possible outcomes:

- that all programs become absorbed by the current Comparative Literature program
- that the new rubric lacks impact by stretching the definition of cultural studies too thin

4) In all cases, assessment is insufficient and needs to be revised.

***

Thank you for the opportunity to review this department and its academic contribution to the College and University. We hope that this report and its recommendations will be useful to our
colleagues in the Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies, the College of Letters & Science, and the Graduate School.

For the Committee:

[Signature]
Dear Elaine and Sue,

Thank you for the opportunity for CLFS to respond to “factual errors” in the recent L&S Review. The CLFS Executive Committee response is attached here.

I’d like to be clear on the process we followed. As I mentioned in an earlier email and as we specify, though briefly, in opening of the attached memo, I forwarded the review report to the CLFS Executive Committee as soon as they returned from spring break. And we met last Tuesday to discuss a response both to the factual errors and to the report’s central recommendations about the future of CLFS. As the EC agreed at its meeting, all EC members, those on campus and those on leave, were asked to respond by the end of the day last Friday with any corrections of or annotations to errors of fact and with their succinct vision of the future for CLFS.

Vinay Dharwadker and I worked over the weekend to sort, filter, compile and write up the final document. We included all corrections of “errors of fact,” filtering out only those comments that were not corrections of factual errors but expressions of preferred language or opinion or reported speech. We consulted with Ernesto Livorni, CLFS’ preferential choice for incoming chair, about specific passages of the response. And I sent him the final document late yesterday for his review.

I will post the completed review to the CLFS EC folder on Box so the entire EC has a copy of the final document.

I’m happy to speak with you about any questions or comments you might have. We look forward to working together to make the future of Comparative Literature and of Folklore at U.W. Madison the strongest and best it can be. There is good reason to be hopeful about that opportunity and challenge!

Thanks again,
Mary

Mary N. Layoun,
Professor of Comparative Literature and Chair,
Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies
University of Wisconsin, Madison

---

Dear Mary,

The review committee report for the academic programs in CLFS has been submitted. Per our usual process, I’m sharing the report with you with a request for correction of factual errors that may have found their way into the report. I understand that the recommendations in this report may make it difficult to limit response to “factual errors,” though – if you have questions or concerns about that, please feel free to talk with me or with Sue about it and we’ll help you navigate that. It’s important to know that the L&S APC will be presented with the self study and all of the materials that
were submitted by CLFS about the programs, so the review committee report is read in dialogue with those materials – and the APC is generally pretty good about reading all of the documents, reading between the lines, and asking good questions about gaps or differences in information or interpretation. (Does that make sense?)

I should mention, though, that if there is a clear vision about what you and your colleagues see as the next steps you wish to take, as informed by the review, you may want to talk with Sue about that and about whether to include a brief statement about that in your response. Technically, that’s not correcting a factual error – but a short statement saying “we look forward to the APC’s counsel about the review and hope that we will be able to do XYZ” is a reasonable closing paragraph for a memo, I think. (I’ve copied Sue on this so she can weigh in.)

It would be most useful to have a response by April 11, which will allow the APC to discuss this review on April 18. Wrapping up the review this year would be good.

Thanks,
Elaine

Elaine M. Klein
Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
elaine.klein@wisc.edu | 608-265-8484

Please note that there are two “Elaine Kleins” on campus; are you sending your messages to the right one?
MEMORANDUM
April 10, 2017

TO: Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for the Arts and Humanities, College of Letters & Science; Elaine Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, College of Letters & Science

FROM: Mary Layoun, Chair, for the Executive Committee of the Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies

RE: Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies Response to the Review Committee’s Report

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies Review Committee Report of 3 March 2017 (hereafter Report) was sent to the CLFS Chair on 14 March 2017 and made available to the CLFS Executive Committee (hereafter EC). The EC met to discuss the Report, and all its members were invited to annotate any substantive errors in the Report, and to provide succinct responses to the major recommendations. EC members submitted their notes and responses to the Chair and to a second EC member for collation of their input.

The following document, then, is a collation and summary of the EC’s input. Quotation marks are used to identify key passages in the Report (by page and paragraph, and in italics), and sometime to reproduce the individual EC members’ comments. For the record, the document also distinguishes between “substantive errors” (unintended but significant errors of fact), and “other corrections” (for lesser mistakes due to data, ambiguity, or over-generalization). The Department’s overall response to the central recommendations of the Report is summarized in the conclusion. Five Appendices are included at the end.

We would like to state at the outset that the Report makes a number of significant recommendations. Some of these are excellent, constructive suggestions for improvements in the areas of student advising, student support and funding, degree requirements, program building and revision, use of faculty resources, alignment with institutional priorities, and local and national visibility. Some of the
recommendations also provide strong and compelling suggestions to re-conceptualize and realign disciplinary and inter-disciplinary commitments as well as departmental organization.

The Report has identified many practical issues that need to be addressed internally in the Department, even as we move forward with larger concerns about field, discipline, faculty productivity, job-markets, and the national and international academic environments for Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies. We plan to engage positively and productively with this range of recommendations in the coming weeks and months.

II. SUBSTANTIVE ERRORS

The Report inadvertently contains a number of errors of fact, some of which have significant consequences for the Committee’s analysis of the Department, and for the Department itself. The following notes address these substantive errors, and offer clarifications that will help to resolve the underlying issues.

A. Academic Programs in Folklore Studies

Page 3, Paragraph 5: “...the Center holds continuing grants work about half a million dollars...”

We note that recent prestigious multi-year grants totaling upwards of $1.75 million have added three new Folklore PhD academic staff whose missions require teaching and development of Folklore Studies courses.

Page 3, Paragraph 6: “...if a certificate curriculum were to be revised...to incorporate...classes taught by affiliates in other departments...”

This is already embedded in the Folklore Certificate options, if implicitly. The great majority of courses listed with a Folklore number on the Folklore Certificate Form are cross-listed courses not taught by CLFS faculty but by Folklore faculty in other departments. In addition, Folklore advisors now and in the past DO count affiliate coursework on a case by case basis, for certificates & degrees. See Appendix 1 for the Folklore Certificate Form and list of applicable courses.

B. CLFS Graduate Degrees

Page 5, Paragraph 3:

TAships in CLFS are not “mainly generated by Folklore 100.” Folklore TAships are generated by FL 100. Before and since the creation of CLFS, Folklore has had two dedicated 45% TAships (for FL 100); before and since the creation of CLFS, CL has had nine 38% TAships, 3 or 4 in the Fall, 5 or 6 in the Spring each year. Since Folklore has only one TA-assisted course (FL 100), Folklore graduate students teach for both FL and CL courses. See Appendix 2 for details.

C. The CL Undergraduate Major

Page 6: The following correctives are essential here.

(a) CL 690, a capstone proseminar required for the UG CL major is taught virtually every year and is a cornerstone of UG assessment; it is currently being team-taught by two CLFS faculty.

(b) The current UG assessment plan is on file with the campus. The plan’s submission was delayed until early 2017 due to departmental error. Please see Appendix 3.
A senior faculty member blamed the rise of corporate thinking as a reason for the lack of interest in languages and in Comparative Literature as a major field of study."

“This statement misreports the interviewee’s words and meaning. The interviewee did not say anything about ‘corporate thinking’ and certainly did not say students are uninterested in studying Comparative Literature. Rather, the interviewee said that neoliberal austerity policies pressure students to turn aside from their interests, and that all of the Humanities need to better articulate how they prepare students for life after graduation.”

D. Organizational and Governance Issues

Page 8, under “Culture” and “Governance”:

Agendas are posted to the departmental or EC folder in “Box” prior to each meeting, and all members of the DC and the EC have ample opportunity to review the agendas in advance. Currently, agendas are posted at least one week in advance of meetings.

Page 9, Paragraph 2:

“...affiliates who nevertheless remain largely marginalized.”

Since the establishment of an L&S mandated CL departmental affiliate policy in 2000, affiliates have played an active role in the Department. Two early affiliates (from 2002) were long-time members of the EC in CL: one left the university; the other, after more than ten years of affiliation with EC governance, moved 25% of his FTE to the Department. A third affiliate changed his FTE after a considerably shorter time as an affiliate with EC governance. And, more recently, another long-time affiliate requested executive governance and joined the EC.

On exams and dissertation committees, affiliates and other faculty and academic staff not formally linked to the department are a norm, not an exception; they have been serving on exams and dissertations committees since at least 2002, if not earlier.

After the creation of CLFS, the affiliate program was admittedly left to itself. Recently, however, all interested affiliates have been invited to renew their affiliation and virtually all of them have done so. If they wish for a more active role in the department, as one of our recently renewed affiliates does, they begin attending departmental meetings as a prelude to requesting governance rights.

E. Discipline, Field, and Intellectual Orientation

The review observes that courses covering yogic literature, philosophy, and related cultural expressions "seemed surprising at first sight." Yoga is central to the literary traditions of South Asia as well as to traditions, such as Sufi poetry and Buddhist literature, that are important across a wide range of cultures and that cannot be understood without recognizing the influence of yogic
thought. It is unclear why a document calling upon CLFS to take an interdisciplinary and multicultural approach should seem to question courses seeking to do exactly that.

(b) Pages 6-7: “Eurocentrism.” The criticism is simply misguided. As a corrective, please see Appendix 4, which lists the languages, literatures, and/or cultures in which selected CLFS faculty and graduate students work. And, though they’re not included in this list, one CL UG major works in Russian, another in Italian and Spanish, and a third in Chinese. This corrective applies to various references to “Eurocentrism” on these pages of the Report.

III. OTHER CORRECTIONS

The following corrections focus on smaller errors in the Report, and are listed primarily for the record. These mistakes arise from the use of erroneous data, from ambiguous statements, from interviewees’ comments that may not be reported accurately, and/or from invalid generalization.

Page 3, Paragraph 1: “. . . rarely selected for TAships in Folklore Studies undergraduate courses.”

This mis-statement can be corrected by referring to Appendix 2, which lists CLFS TAs and their teaching assignments since 2012-13.

Page 3, Paragraph 3: “. . . no cohesive message was being sent out to students, partially because of the diversity of faculty research and teaching interests.”

This is primarily an advising problem, rather than one of diversity of faculty interests.

Page 3, Paragraph 4, under “Academic Programs in Folklore Studies”:

(a) Only one Folklore Affiliate (a former CLFS Chair) has declined to renew his affiliation.

(b) Throughout this discussion in the Report, “Folklore Studies Program” should read “Folklore Program” when referring to the pre-CLFS Folklore Program.

Page 5 (top):

Rotation of courses to ensure that they are well-enrolled is not inherently a problem, so long as there is careful advising and supervision of graduate students by their advisors and by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS). The current CLFS DGS works closely with the Student Status Advisor to carefully track students’ progress to degree and satisfaction of degree requirements, as outlined in the Graduate Handbook.

Page 7, under “Graduate Program in Comparative Literature”:

(a) Paragraph 1: The M.A. remains available as a terminal degree, since particularly (though not only) international Fulbright students make use of that option.

(b) Paragraph 2: Students complete their language requirements fairly early in their graduate careers, as an examination of their transcripts could verify.

Paragraph 2, last five lines: The time to degree is high not only because graduate students receive only four semesters of a TA-ship, but also because the salaries are so low. In other departments students are granted even six or eight semesters; yet, they end up getting jobs in town, whether as tellers in banks or baristas in cafés.

(c) Paragraph 4, last sentence: Some dissertators or recent Ph.D.’s are working outside academia because they were not interested in academic positions. Personal and logistical matters often play a role in such a decision.
Page 8

(a) The CLFS Polyseminar: Offered as CL 976, this was re-instituted in 2012-13, and has included several sessions on professionalization and preparation for the academic and non-academic job market. It was transformed in 2013-14 into a forum for CLFS faculty, affiliate, and graduate student scholarly presentations as well as presentations by other faculty and students and visitors.

Page 11:

In 2015-16, CLFS finalized a graduate assessment plan of considerable complexity; the UG assessment plan is more recent and only for the CL UG major. These materials were probably not available to the Review Committee. They are attached here as Appendix 5.

IV. RESPONSES TO MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

We look forward to working with South Hall and the L&S APC over the coming weeks and months to accomplish some of the excellent goals recommended by the Review Committee. However, there are two crucial recommendations that we feel must be addressed immediately. Many of the Committee’s more specific suggestions for improvement flow directly from these two ideas.

1. Separation of Folklore Studies and Comparative Literature. At this point in time, the CLFS EC as a whole does not have a unified vision of the future with the requisite clarity, but in the coming months we would like to discuss among ourselves the very strong recommendation of the Review Committee to separate the two programs.

   Earlier this semester and well before the Review, we had contacted the Office of Quality Improvement to facilitate conversations this semester—among graduate students, among faculty and staff, and among all of us together—about the future of CLFS and the challenges of that future. It wouldn’t be a radical shift to now organize those conversations around this decisive recommendation of the Review Committee.

   At present, at least one EC member emphatically endorses that recommendation: ‘I agree with the Review-of-CLFS Committee’s Recommendations, on p. 11, points 1 & 2 of the report, to separate Folklore Studies from Comparative Literature, as soon as possible, and to begin exploring the proposed Recommendations under point 2 to find reasonable solutions expeditiously.”

   But another colleague is puzzled by it: “To separate Folklore Studies from Comparative Literature in each and every way’ seems an unexpected recommendation after all these years.”

2. Chair of CLFS. The recent departmental election of Professor Ernesto Livorni as CLFS Chair for the coming year is a response avant la lettre to the Review Committee’s recommendation for an outside chair. Professor Livorni is a strong “compromise” in light of the Report: he has fifteen years’ experience as a CL/CLFS affiliate with executive governance, but still has 75% of his tenure home in the Department of French and Italian. He both is and isn’t “external,” and would be in an excellent position to implement several of the Review Committee’s recommendations designed to move the Department forward in a productive way.

   We appreciate the time and effort that the Review Committee and the College has devoted to the review of the Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies, and we look forward to working with the APC on their constructive recommendations.
V. APPENDICES

Appendix #1: Folklore Certificate Form

A certificate in Folklore Studies requires a minimum of 15 credits distributed as follows:

1. Introductory core
   - Folklore 100
   - Introduction to Folklore

2. Genres
   - Folklore 250
   - Introduction to American Folklore

3. Geographic Areas
   - Folklore 211
   - Global Language Issues

4. Theories & Methods
   - Folklore 220
   - The Folk Tale

   - Folklore 359
   - Studies in Folklore and Ethnic Genres in Performance

   - Folklore 369
   - Myth

   - Folklore 451
   - The Supernatural in the Modern World

   - Folklore 539
   - The Folklore of Festivals and Celebrations

   - Folklore 555
   - Comparative World Dances
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 102</td>
<td>Introduction to Comparative Ethnic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 210</td>
<td>The African Storyteller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 270</td>
<td>The Hero and Trickster in African Oral Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 279</td>
<td>Introduction to Turkish Folk Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 320</td>
<td>Folklore 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 329</td>
<td>Folklore 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 345</td>
<td>Folklore 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 347</td>
<td>In Translation: The Scandinavian Tale &amp; Ballad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 348</td>
<td>Javanese Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 357</td>
<td>Indian Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 401</td>
<td>Musical Cultures of the World: Africa, Middle East, Iran, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 402</td>
<td>Folklore 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 404</td>
<td>Folklore 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 406</td>
<td>Folklore 411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 407</td>
<td>Structures of African Oral Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 431</td>
<td>Folklore 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Folklore</td>
<td>Jewish Studies: Holocaust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Women</td>
<td>Folklore 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian-American Folklore</td>
<td>Seminarian, Yesterday and Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic and East European Folklore</td>
<td>Russian Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk 446</td>
<td>Celtic-Scandinavian Cultural Interrelations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UW-Madison Folklore Programs, 559 Ingalls Hall, 1155 Observatory Dr., Madison, Wisconsin 53706
3. Examining folklore in relation to a cultural area (at least one)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folklore 455</th>
<th>Folklore 517</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Javanese Performance Repertory</td>
<td>The Irish Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 518</td>
<td>Folklore 535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scottish Tradition</td>
<td>American Folk and Vernacular Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 540</td>
<td>Folklore 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Culture &amp; Identity in the Upper Midwest</td>
<td>Prison Narratives of the African Diaspora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 630</td>
<td>Folklore 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar on American Folklore</td>
<td>Topics in Ethnographic Textiles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Examining the issues, theories, or methods of folklore studies (at least one)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folklore 344</th>
<th>Folklore 339</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological Approaches to Folklore</td>
<td>Studies in Folklore and Ethnic Genres in Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 410</td>
<td>Folklore 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore Studies in Historical Perspective</td>
<td>Gender and Expressive Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 471</td>
<td>Folklore 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Tradition and the Written Word</td>
<td>Field Methods and the Public Presentation of Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 491</td>
<td>Folklore 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum in Public Folklore</td>
<td>Folklore Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 512</td>
<td>Folklore 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Culture Analysis</td>
<td>Proseminar in Ethnomusicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 520</td>
<td>Folklore 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Representations in Wisconsin</td>
<td>Digitally Documenting Everyday Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 530</td>
<td>Folklore 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics in Folklore</td>
<td>Folklore in a Digital Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore 639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field School: Ethnography of Wisconsin Festivals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Undergraduate Major in Comparative Literature
Department of Comparative Literature & Folklore Studies
College of Letters & Science

Faculty Director Contact/Title: CLFS Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUGS)
Contact Information: 608 262 3059

CL Student Learning Goals:
1. Literary fluency in a language other than English
2. Comparative understanding of a selected range of literary and cultural texts
3. Critical intellectual familiarity with concepts and theories of the literary and of the comparative
4. Ability to engage in the comparative analysis of literary and cultural texts
5. Critical reading, thinking, writing, and speaking skills to express and communicate the above.

CL UG major requirements:
6 credits 201, 202, 203, 205 introductory courses
6 credits 310, 371, 475 literary criticism and theory
9 credits 310, 371, 475 literary/cultural coursework in a single language other than English
3 credits 690 capstone seminar
15 credits elective courses in CLFS

---

1 For Honors in the CL Major, 6 of these remaining 15 credits must be the two semester Senior Honors Thesis.

If you have questions, please contact regina.lowery@wisc.edu. (v. 08-23-15)
## Plan for Assessing Each Student Learning Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Planning</th>
<th>Learning Goal #1</th>
<th>Learning Goal #2</th>
<th>Learning Goal #3</th>
<th>Learning Goal #4</th>
<th>Learning Goal #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method for assessing learning (at least one direct method required)</td>
<td>9 cr. of literary/cultural coursework in a single language other than English; ability to use that knowledge in CL courses</td>
<td>Required course work in 200 level courses</td>
<td>CL 310, 371, 475 (literary criticism and theory)</td>
<td>Elective CL coursework for the major</td>
<td>CL 690 (capstone seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable for assessment activity (at least one activity each year; all goals reviewed in a 3-year cycle)</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Every other spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUGS) will provide assessment reminders and updates to all faculty and academic staff teaching CL courses, keep track of the assessment timeline, and remind the faculty teaching key courses to collect student work for assessment.

The DUGS and the Chair will compile and initially analyze all student learning assessment data.

That initial analysis and the data itself will be forwarded to members of the Curriculum Committee (which includes the Director of Undergraduate Studies) for evaluation and further dissemination.

At the September meeting of the Curriculum Committee (CC), assessment results compiled by the CC Chair and the DUGS will be reviewed and the CC will produce an initial summary. That summary will be circulated to the CL faculty and discussed at the subsequent fall departmental meeting.

---

2 Literary fluency in a language other than English  
3 Comparative understanding of a selected range of literary and cultural texts  
4 Critical intellectual familiarity with concepts and theories of the literary and of the comparative  
5 Ability to engage in the comparative analysis of literary and cultural texts  
6 Critical reading, thinking, writing, and speaking skills to express and communicate the above.
Undergraduate Degree Program Curriculum Mapping Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Map</th>
<th>Program-level learning goals and the courses that contribute to each learning goal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Goal #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #1</td>
<td>CL 20X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #2</td>
<td>CL 20X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #3</td>
<td>CL 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #4</td>
<td>CL 371 or 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #5</td>
<td>CL 371 or 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #6</td>
<td>CL elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #7</td>
<td>CL elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #8</td>
<td>Lit/culture*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #9</td>
<td>Lit/culture*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #10</td>
<td>Lit/culture*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #11</td>
<td>CL elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #12</td>
<td>CL elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #13</td>
<td>CL 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience #1</td>
<td>MTW* essay competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 “9 credits of coursework in literature [or culture] in a single foreign language”
8 For the Honors in the CL major, these last two elective courses are CL 691 and 692, the two semesters of the Senior Honors Thesis.
9 The Maria Tai Wolff Award competition is conducted every spring for the best essay by an UG Comparative Literature student.

If you have questions, please contact regina.lowery@wisc.edu. (v. 08-23-15)
Appendix #4. Partial Range of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures in the Department

Select Faculty Skills

1. Dharwadker: Hindi, Marathi, Urdu, Punjabi (various periods), literary Sanskrit, English
2. Gilmore: German, Spanish, Latin, French, Russian, Italian, Middle English, Old English, American English dialect, and “African-American creoles”
3. Layoun: modern & classical Greek and modern & classical Japanese, Arabic, French
4. Livanos: Spanish, Italian, Russian, Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Modern Greek, Latin.
5. Livorni: Romance languages, French, Spanish, Italian
6. Neyrat: French, English, German
7. Rosenblum: Hebrew (ancient and modern), Aramaic, Greek (ancient), Latin, Syriac, German, French, Spanish
8. Statkiewicz: French, German, Russian, Polish, Ukrainian, Czech, Slovak, Italian, ancient Greek and Latin.
9. Wells: Spanish and Portuguese

Select Graduate Student Skills

10. Chiuminatto: Latin, Ancient Greek, Old English, Middle High German, Middle English, French, German, Russian
11. Grelson: Russian, English, German, and Ancient Greek
12. Halls: Portuguese, Spanish, French, Hebrew
13. Koemets: Russian, and German
14. Ly: Vietnamese, French, and classical Chinese
15. Maity: Bangla (Bengali); Hindi; Japanese; Sanskrit
16. Massnick: German, French, Latin, Old Saxon
17. McMahon: Hebrew (Classical and Medieval), Aramaic (Old, Imperial, Jewish Palestinian, and Targumic), Phoenician and other Canaanite Dialects, Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Classical and Koine Greek, reading knowledge of German and Yiddish
18. Pulczinski: Armenian (Classical and Eastern), Spanish, Arabic, French
19. Ruiz-Rivera: Spanish, French, Portuguese, German
20. Sartbay: Kyrgyz, Russian
21. Steiner: Norwegian, Somali, and German
22. Treviño-Murphy: Spanish, French, Arabic, and American Sign Language
23. Tybon: French, Spanish, Arabic
24. Woods: Spanish, Portuguese, German, Russian
ASSESSMENT PLAN CLFS MA

Please email your program’s Assessment Plan Template and Curriculum Map Worksheet to regina.lowery@wisc.edu by July 1, 2016.

Identifying Information
School/College: Letters and Science
Graduate Degree/Major Program Name: Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies
Graduate Degree Level (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., DMA, etc.): MA
Faculty Director Contact/Title: Jordan Rosenblum
Primary Contact Information: <jrosenblum@wisc.edu>

Approved Student Learning Goals (4/4/15)
found on the Inside Assessment website (https://provost.wisc.edu/inside-assessment/).

Knowledge and Skills Learning Goals
LG1. Articulates, critiques, or elaborates the theories, research methods, and approaches to inquiry and schools of practice in comparative humanities.

LG2. Identifies sources and assembles evidence pertaining to questions or challenges in comparative humanities.

LG3. Demonstrates understanding of comparative humanities in a historical, social, or global context.

LG 4. Selects and/or utilizes the most appropriate methodologies and practices.

LG 5. Evaluates or synthesizes information to questions or challenges in comparative humanities.

LG 6. Communicates clearly in ways appropriate to comparative humanities.

Professional Conduct Learning Goals
LG 7. Recognizes and applies principles of ethical and professional conduct.

Code for relative significance of measures in relation to learning goals.
- Not addressed in this instrument
M addressed to some degree in this instrument
H centrally addressed in this instrument
### Direct Measures of Student Achievement of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>LG 1</th>
<th>LG 2</th>
<th>LG 3</th>
<th>LG 4</th>
<th>LG 5</th>
<th>LG 6</th>
<th>LG 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Writing Sample/Second-Yr product comparison</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Student paper review 702</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Student paper review 771/510</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instr. A. Compare student writing sample submitted on application to graduate program with Second Year Exam or Thesis in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

Instr. B. Student paper review 702 in terms of achievement of LG1-7

Instr. C. Student paper review 771/510 in terms of achievement of LG 1-7
### Indirect Measures of Student and Curricular Achievement of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr. D</th>
<th>Syllabus content review CLFS 702</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr. E</th>
<th>Syllabus content review CLFS 771/510</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr. F</th>
<th>Student evaluation questions specific to LGs asked in CLFS 702</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr. G</th>
<th>Student evaluation questions specific to LGs asked in CLFS 771/510</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr. H</th>
<th>Exit survey review</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr. I</th>
<th>Survey of graduates five years after graduation</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instr. D.** Syllabus content review 702. Syllabi from all iterations of 702 since last evaluation examined for service to LG 1-7

**Instr. E** Syllabus content review 771/510 Syllabi from all iterations since last evaluation examined for service to LG 1-7

**Instr. F** Student evaluation questions 702 review: students in the program in 702 are given supplemental evaluation questions related to LG 1-7 at end of course. Examination of each iteration of 702 since last evaluation.

**Instr. G** Student evaluation questions 771/510 review: students in the program in 771/510 are given supplemental evaluation questions related to LG 1-7 at end of course. Examination of each iteration of courses since last evaluation.

**Instr. H** Exit survey on graduation. Graduating students who leave the program with an MA are given survey asking their views on the curriculum’s achievement of LG 1-7. Surveys reviewed since last evaluation.

**Instr. I** Survey five years after graduation. Students who left the program after the MA and have graduated five years prior are surveyed regarding their retrospective views of the curriculum’s achievement of LG 1-7. Surveys reviewed since last evaluation.
## Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Courses and Events</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
<th>Instr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLFS 702</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B, D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Exam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization course (CL 771 or FL 510)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C, E, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Year Exam or Thesis</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Instruments addressing entire curriculum: H, I

### Timeline for evaluations.

The Assessment plan calls for evaluation of courses and learning over the course of four years, allowing for at least two iterations of pertinent courses from one evaluation to the next. Evaluation reports will also compare results from the report five years earlier.

**Year 1.** Instr. A, Student learning as indicated in Second-Year essay or MA thesis, particularly as compared with writing sample submitted by students when applying to the graduate program.

**Year 2.** Instr. B, D, F: Student learning and curricular effectiveness related to 702, generally offered every second year.

**Year 3.** Instr. C, E, G: Student learning and curricular effectiveness of 771/510, generally each offered every second year.

**Year 4.** Instr. H, I: Student learning and curricular effectiveness as indicated in survey analysis of graduating students immediately upon graduation and five years post graduation. Surveys administered to only terminal MA students.
ASSESSMENT PLAN CLFS PhD

Please email your program’s Assessment Plan Template and Curriculum Map Worksheet to regina.lowery@wisc.edu by July 1, 2016.

Identifying Information
School/College: Letters and Science
Graduate Degree/Major Program Name: Comparative Literature and Folklore Studies
Graduate Degree Level (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., DMA, etc.): Ph.D.
Faculty Director Contact/Title: Jordan Rosenblum
Primary Contact Information: <jrosenblum@wisc.edu>

Approved Student Learning Goals
found on the Inside Assessment website (https://provost.wisc.edu/inside-assessment/).

LG 1. Articulates research problems, potentials and limits with respect to theory, knowledge and practice in comparative humanities.

LG 2. Formulates ideas, concepts, designs, and/or techniques beyond the current boundaries of knowledge in comparative humanities.

LG 3. Creates research, scholarship, or performance that makes a substantive contribution.

LG 4. Demonstrates breadth within their learning experiences.

LG 5. Advances contributions in comparative humanities to society.

LG 6. Communicates complex ideas in a clear and understandable manner.

LG 7. Fosters ethical and professional conduct.

Code for relative significance of measures in relation to learning goals.

- Not addressed in this instrument

M addressed to some degree in this instrument

H centrally addressed in this instrument
## Direct Measures of Student Achievement of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LG 1</th>
<th>LG 2</th>
<th>LG 3</th>
<th>LG 4</th>
<th>LG 5</th>
<th>LG 6</th>
<th>LG 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instr. A</td>
<td>Writing Sample/PhD Prelim product comparison</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. B</td>
<td>Second Yr product/dissertation comparison</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. C</td>
<td>Student paper review 822</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. D</td>
<td>Student paper review required elective in literary periods or ethnographic methods</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instr. A.** Compare student writing sample submitted on application to graduate program with PhD prelim examination answers in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

**Instr. B.** Compare Second Year Exam or Thesis with Dissertation in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

**Instr. C.** Student paper review 822 in terms of achievement of LG 1-7

**Instr. D.** Student paper review of elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods in terms of achievement of LG 1-7
### Indirect Measures of Student and Curricular Achievement of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. E</strong> Syllabus content review CLFS 822</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. F</strong> Syllabus content review CLFS required elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. G</strong> Student evaluation questions specific to LGs asked in CLFS 822</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. H</strong> Student evaluation questions specific to LGs asked in CLFS required elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. I</strong> Exit survey review</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. J</strong> Survey of graduates five years after graduation</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instr. E** Syllabus content review 822 Syllabi from all iterations of 822 since last evaluation examined for service to LG 1-7 (generally taught every second year)

**Instr. F** Syllabus content review required elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods. Syllabi from all iterations of these courses since last evaluation examined for service to LG 1-7 (courses offered regularly)

**Instr. G** Student evaluation questions 822 review: students in the program in 822 are given supplemental evaluation questions related to LG 1-7 at end of course. Examination of each iteration of 822 since last evaluation. (generally taught every second year)

**Instr. H** Student evaluation questions required electives review: students in the program in required elective courses in literary periods or ethnographic methods are given supplemental evaluation questions related to LG 1-7 at end of course. Examination of each iteration of courses offered since last evaluation. (courses offered regularly)
Instr. I Exit survey on graduation. Graduating students given survey asking their views on the curriculum's achievement of LG 1-7. Surveys reviewed since last evaluation.

Instr. J Survey five years after graduation. Students who have graduated five years prior are surveyed regarding their retrospective views of the curriculum's achievement of LG 1-7. Surveys reviewed since last evaluation.
Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Courses and Events</th>
<th>LG1</th>
<th>LG2</th>
<th>LG3</th>
<th>LG4</th>
<th>LG5</th>
<th>LG6</th>
<th>LG7</th>
<th>Instr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLFS 822</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>C, E, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Prelim</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required elective course in literary periods or ethnographic methods</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>D, F, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD. Dissertation</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments pertaining to all aspects of the student experience: I, J

Timeline for evaluations.

The Assessment plan calls for evaluation of courses and learning over the course of five years, allowing for at least two iterations of pertinent courses from one evaluation to the next. Evaluation reports will also compare results from the report five years earlier.

Year 1. Instr. C, E, G: Student learning and curricular effectiveness as reflected by measures of 822, generally offered every second year.


Year 3. Instr. A. Student learning and curricular effectiveness as reflected by PhD preliminary examination in comparison with product from second-year MA exam.

Year 4. B Student learning and curricular effectiveness as reflected in PhD dissertations produced since last evaluation.

Year 5. Instr. I, J. Survey analysis of graduating students immediately upon graduation and
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Select a UW-Madison Program. Dashboard will populate the retention/completion rates for the UW-Madison program (top graph) and the retention/completion rates for comparable peer programs at other AAU institutions (bottom graph).

Select UW-Madison Program
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UW-Madison Retention/Completion Rates (Comparative Literature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
<th>25.0%</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
<th>25.0%</th>
<th>42.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Entrance Cohort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Association of American Universities Peer Program Retention/Completion Rates (Comparative Literature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>94.2%</th>
<th>94.9%</th>
<th>88.0%</th>
<th>16.0%</th>
<th>26.7%</th>
<th>18.6%</th>
<th>23.2%</th>
<th>27.4%</th>
<th>20.0%</th>
<th>25.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Entrance Cohort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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