

**Report of the Task Force on the Future of the Humanities
at Princeton University
October 2015**

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----|
| I. | Executive Summary | 3 |
| II. | Process | 8 |
| III. | Overview: the Current Situation | 10 |
| IV-VI: <i>Ranked Principal Recommendations</i> | | |
| IV. | Princeton Humanities Institute | 16 |
| V. | Program in Film and Media Studies | 30 |
| VI. | Princeton Art Museum | 38 |
| VII-IX: <i>Other Recommendations</i> | | |
| VII. | Graduate Students | 46 |
| VIII. | Internationalization | 51 |
| IX. | General Education for AB Undergraduates | 55 |
| <u>Appendix A:</u> Gateway Initiatives | | 65 |
| <u>Appendix B:</u> Initiatives for cross-departmental collaboration in teaching and research | | 67 |
| <u>Appendix C:</u> The current remit and activities of the Council of the Humanities | | 68 |
| <u>Appendix D:</u> The President's Charge to the Task Force on the Future of the Humanities at Princeton | | 72 |

I. Executive Summary

Princeton's reputation is essentially that of being a great liberal arts university with a distinctive dedication to undergraduate education, and the rest of the country quite rightly looks to Princeton to be a leader in liberal arts education and research. We begin from the fundamental conviction that the humanities are a critical component of a liberal arts education, and we believe that our recommendations will build on the existing strengths of the humanities at Princeton in order to make the humanities even more connected, appealing, and central to teaching and research across the university.

Our Task Force's work took place against a background not only of Princeton's strategic planning process but also of national and international debate over the future and even the value of humanistic study. It is not part of our brief to engage in that debate as an end in itself, but at the outset of our report we affirm our conviction that the Humanities are as important and relevant as ever, both for their intrinsic value in understanding our diverse traditions and our current challenges and also for their role in preparing students for their lives and careers. In an increasingly interconnected and fast-changing world, our students need a grasp of what it means to understand other cultures as well as their own, and they need the critical and interdisciplinary skills that the Humanities contribute as part of a liberal arts education.

Universities have become increasingly identified in the public mind with mere vocational training, but a supple education in the arts and humanities is a good investment in the modern environment, however paradoxical that may seem to anxious parents and students. Most of our students will have had not just two or three different jobs by the time they retire, but two or three different careers, and the transferable skills of humanistic studies—flexibility, adaptability, critical analysis, clear oral and written communication—are solid preparation for that uncertain future. Numerous studies show that, on the basis of such a preparation, it is far from being financial or career suicide to major in a Humanities subject, especially if we look at the earnings of majors fifteen

years or more after graduation (see the recent survey from PayScale, for example: <http://www.payscale.com/college-salary-report-2013/majors-that-pay-you-back>). More penetratingly, the only long-term in-depth study of a large number of humanities graduates, investigating 11,000 Humanities alumni from Oxford University between 1963 and 1991, revealed that these people moved dynamically into growth areas of the economy, with only 33% of them remaining in the same sector over their lifetime (“Humanities Graduates and the British Economy: the Hidden Impact,” Oxford Humanities Division Report, Philip Kreager et al.).

The current cultural debate involves not just the future of the Humanities but of the liberal arts altogether. The issues we address in this report are part of a broader context, and at Princeton they involve not only Departments in Division I. Throughout, we consider History to be part of the Humanities, for all its being technically located inside the Division of Social Sciences: one of our Task Force members is from History, and many of those most closely involved in the Council of the Humanities have always come from History. Further, the “core” science departments show a similar profile to humanities departments in many respects. The faculty/Junior and Senior concentrator ratio in Astrophysics, Geosciences, Mathematics, and Physics, for example, is very like that in Music or the modern language departments, while Chemistry and Molecular Biology have ratios close to those of Philosophy and Comparative Literature respectively. In such questions we really are dealing with a liberal arts issue, and not just a humanities issue.

Against this background, students, parents, and the public at large need to be educated about the value and even the utility of humanistic study as part of an overall education. The Humanities departments are, as we show below (III.A), demonstrating success in winning over undergraduates who arrive here without the humanities in their plans. The Office of Career Services has valuable figures about the careers of our alumni with majors in the humanities, and the Council of the Humanities needs to work with Career Services to publicize the many varied career paths followed by our concentrators, including careers within walks of life classified by the North American Industry

Classification System (NAICS) as “Professional, Scientific, & Technical Services” (the leading category for majors from Division I), or “Finance & Insurance” and “Information” (the third and fourth categories). One of our main proposals is that AB undergraduates should be enabled to double major (IX.A); in this way, those undergraduates with a range of genuinely committed interests would be able to do full justice to their distinctive passions, strengthening the liberal arts tradition which involves the natural sciences as much as the humanities.

Above all, it is up to the members of humanities departments and programs to lead by example as they take their case to the undergraduate body. Our recommendations, which we summarize here, are designed to enable the humanists on campus to work together and also to work with their colleagues in other Divisions in order to build on their current strengths and to ensure a strong future at Princeton for the humanities and, with them, the liberal arts. We believe that a profound recasting of the humanities at Princeton is both necessary and possible, so that Princeton would guarantee even more strongly its reputation as a leader in the humanities and the liberal arts. If in ten years time Princeton has not only maintained its current standing in terms of recruitment of undergraduates, graduates and faculty but also become *the* place where ambitious and intellectually curious students want to study the humanities, then we will know that we have had success in the initiatives we propose.

Recommendations:

- The Task Force recommends the creation of a new Princeton Humanities Institute, to be housed in a reconfigured Green Hall, as the hub of a Humanities neighborhood extending across Washington Road to the Andlinger Center for the Humanities
- PHI should have proper space for teaching, film projection, large-scale meetings, and social interaction
- PHI will build on the existing resources and structure of the Council of the Humanities, eventually superseding the Council, in order to enable and direct innovative and especially interdisciplinary projects in research and teaching

- The Task Force recommends a new academic unit of Film and Media Studies to be housed within the proposed Humanities Institute, under the umbrella of the Division of Humanities. An immediate possible model for this new unit would be the Princeton Neuroscience Institute, that has an undergraduate major, a PhD program, and the power to make faculty appointments
- Film and Media Studies would have a medium-term target of 4-6 faculty lines, including History of Film, Critical Theory, Media/New Media, and Film/Video Production (this last jointly with the Program in Visual Arts)
- The new Film and Media Studies unit would work closely in tandem with the Program in Visual Arts to ensure a full coverage of interests, and the Program in Visual Arts should be enhanced in order to enable this goal: a working group from the Humanities Council and the Lewis Center should be set up to establish how this relationship should proceed
- The Task Force recommends a new, purpose-built art museum facility
- The new Art Museum should be in the center of campus, in place of or near the current building
- The Art Museum needs dedicated classroom and exhibition space, together with flexible spaces for temporary installations, performances, collaborative projects
- The Task Force recommends that the Museum should be enabled to further its already impressive record in connecting the Museum with the everyday activities of the University community as a whole
- The Task Force recommends instituting a structure for sixth-year funding for graduate students who are making demonstrable progress towards the completion of their degree, together with competitive fellowships to replace the recently discontinued Whiting Fellowships
- The Task Force recommends that the Council/Institute and departments plan to create more of the kind of teaching opportunities that graduate students need for their professional and scholarly development
- The Task Force recommends that the university actively plan to expand the opportunities for undergraduates and graduates to have Significant International Experience, including a semester study abroad program

- The Task Force recommends that the university establish clear planning frameworks and leadership structures for the organization of international initiatives
- The Task Force recommends enabling AB undergraduates to double major
- The Task Force recommends creating new interdisciplinary gateway humanities courses at the 100 and 200 level, and strengthening existing interdisciplinary offerings and certificate programs, by encouraging and rewarding interdisciplinary teaching and innovative pedagogies
- The existing interdisciplinary Humanities Sequence courses should be enhanced and used as a model for other such courses, especially to complement the existing strength in the western tradition; the Humanities Sequence should be amplified so that it will satisfy the writing requirement
- The Task Force recommends requiring language study of all Princeton AB undergraduates, whatever their proficiency
- The future of Linguistics is under active discussion in the university at the moment; the Task Force puts it on record that we strongly advocate the eventual establishment of a Department of Linguistics as the university's long-term goal
- Language teaching in the university has gaps, which is inevitable given our size. The Task Force is interested in exploring further the emerging plans from the Regional Studies Task Force for instruction in less commonly taught languages: we recommend that a working group be established as soon as the various Task Forces have all reported, to investigate priorities for which additional languages Princeton should offer, and to consider the range of options for teaching those languages
- The Arts and Humanities need to develop closer ties for joint teaching and collaboration in general, through cooperation between the administrations of the Lewis Center and the Humanities Council (and eventual Humanities Institute)

II. Process

The Task Force was constituted in the summer of 2014, with a membership comprising:

Denis Feeney (Chair), *Chair, Council of the Humanities; Giger Professor of Latin and Professor of Classics*

Göran Blix, *Associate Professor of French and Italian*

Scott Burnham, *Scheide Professor of Music History and Professor of Music*

Anne Cheng, *Professor of English and African American Studies*

Kathleen Crown, *Executive Director, Council of the Humanities (secretary)*

Rachael DeLue, *Associate Professor of Art and Archaeology*

Michael Gordin, *Rosengarten Professor of Modern and Contemporary History and Professor of History*

AnneMarie Luijendijk, *Professor of Religion*

Alexander Nehamas, *Edmund N. Carpenter II Class of 1943 Professor in the Humanities and Professor of Philosophy and Comparative Literature*

Toni Turano, *Associate Dean of the Faculty*

The Task Force had its first formal meeting, with Professor Christopher Eisgruber and Dean of the Faculty Deborah Prentice, on 1 October 2014. Individual Task Force members then interviewed all Chairs of Humanities Departments together with almost all Program Directors, along with many Chairs from other Divisions, as well as Vince Poor, the Dean of the Engineering School, and Naomi Leonard, the Director of the Council on Science and Technology; we also interviewed colleagues in the office of the Dean of the College, including then-Dean Val Smith.

As a group we met with a number of people: the Director of the Lewis Center, Michael Cadden; Director of Creative Writing, Susan Wheeler; Director of Visual Arts, Joe Scanlan; Chair of the Film Studies Committee, Jeffrey Stout; the Director of the Art Museum, James Steward; the Dean of Admissions, Janet Rapelye; Dean of the Graduate

School Sanjeev Kulkarni; and Tony Cascardi, Dean of Arts and Humanities at University of California-Berkeley. Paul LaMarche, the Vice Provost for Space Planning, took us on a tour of Green Hall, and we had a joint meeting with him and Natalie Shivers (University Architect's Office) and Hilary Parker (Strategic Planning Office). We held well attended town hall meetings with faculty and (separately) with graduate students. We are grateful to all of those who met with us for their candor and thoughtful assistance; we are particularly grateful to Sanjeev Kulkarni, Jed Marsh, Hilary Parker, Pulin Sanghvi, and Val Smith for their swift and helpful responses to our requests for information.

III. Overview: the current situation

A. Undergraduate enrollments.

It is healthy and desirable that students entering a liberal arts university should be open to competition from the various programs they encounter. 10% of undergraduates matriculate saying that they are “undecided” about their field of concentration, and once they arrive there is traffic in all directions. Of those students who do declare an interest at the time of their application for admission, almost 70% end up not majoring in their first declared interest, while almost half will declare a major that is different from all three of their initial declared academic interests.

Against this general background, the Humanities at Princeton appear successful in winning over a good number of the uncommitted. The good news is that while only 10% of matriculating students typically declare an intention to major in the humanities, between 23.4% and 18.7% over the last five years (up to 2014) have ultimately ended up concentrating in the humanities (these percentages go up to between 31.5% and 23.9% if History majors are included in the figures). This net gain in Humanities majors suggests that the Humanities at Princeton are doing a good job of winning over undergraduates once they have arrived here—though we do not mean to obscure the gradual downward trend in overall majors, from 21.9% in 2004-05 (30.9% with History) to 18.7% in 2013-14 (23.9% with History).

Once undergraduates take courses in the Humanities, they are likely to find them Very or Generally Satisfying (more than 80 percent of students across all class years). These data help to explain the doubling of numbers of those entering with an interest in humanities to those graduating with a humanities major. The Humanities appear to be attracting very high caliber students as well. Precise criteria of quality are not clearcut, and Honors allocations vary enough across the Divisions to make comparisons on these grounds

difficult. Still, Humanities students show well in election to Phi Beta Kappa, for example, and in competition for Fellowships and Scholarships.

Yet there is no room for complacency. All departments have to see the value of increasing overall numbers in their courses and reaching out to get majors. This must become a central aspect of curricular planning in all Humanities departments, and we have recommendations below to facilitate this process (IX. B-D). Some measures here are simply a matter of thinking strategically about straightforward questions: departments have to focus on easy issues such as timetabling (avoid the 11 a.m. slot for big courses, where you will be clashing with big prerequisite courses in other divisions), or labelling (we offer too many LA courses, many of which can be designed to be EC or EM instead). Departments should make an effort to have faculty involved in undergraduate advising in the residential colleges, and they need to consider carefully using their resources in ways that may not be productive: visiting faculty, for example, can be extremely valuable to a department in many ways, but departments must take into account the enrollments that such visitors are likely to attract.

This background is the context for one of our main recommendations, that of the double major. We recommend that the University offer AB students the option of a double (or “secondary”) major as soon as possible. We do not, however, make this recommendation just in order to boost humanities numbers. This step would meet a real need among many undergraduates across the university, covering a wide range of intellectual interests spanning the four divisions. In particular, we believe that as the student body continues to evolve, especially with more first generation students, it is important that the university respond by making it possible for them to explore a range of interests in real depth if they wish to do so.

B. Graduate performance.

Princeton is competing well for the pool of the best graduate students in the Humanities, and by the usual comparative benchmarks their completion rates and placement are very competitive with those of the students at our peer institutions.

According to figures supplied to us by the Graduate School, the yield from the pool of applicants to Humanities PhDs is good, at 54.1% in the last round, even if the figures do show a decline from 71.0% in 2009-10. In every year since 2009-10, Harvard is consistently the top other institution selected by those who decline (Columbia and Yale regularly appear as #2 or #3).

Graduate students in the Humanities, as in the other divisions at Princeton, compare well with a group of 27 AAU institutions in their time to degree. The median time to the PhD since the first term (a weighted average of degrees conferred in 2012-13) was 6.68 years compared to 8.32 years. Still, this means that half of our graduate students are taking more than 6.68 years to finish.

Inevitably, it is hard to get a precise idea of what happens to our Humanities PhDs once they graduate. The latest available figures for placements reported at time of Final Public Oral exam (2013-14) show 24% with tenure-track positions, 20% with other academic positions, 14% with a postdoc, 8% in a nonacademic position, 15% not placed, and 18% categorized as “miscellaneous”.

A longer-range view is provided by responses to a series of surveys of PhD and WWS Masters alumni conducted in February and March 2015: those sampled were 3-5 years, 6-9 years, and 10 to 15 years post degree. Of the 3-5 years post degree group, 70% of Humanities PhDs were employed at a US four-year college or university (of whom 8% were non-tenure track), and 15% were employed at a non-US university; of the 6-9 years group, the figures are 66% (5% non-tenure track) and 17%; of the 10 to 15 years group, the figures are 70% (24% non-tenure track) and 10%. These figures can be parsed in

various ways, but at face value they appear to show that between 80% and 85% of Princeton's Humanities PhDs are working as the professionals they aimed to become when they entered Princeton. Nonetheless, we strongly back the momentum in the humanities departments, begun above all by Professors Grafton and Gleason, to have proper mentoring and careers advising for Humanities PhDs who decide that the academic track is not for them.

C. Weaknesses

1. The present Council of the Humanities is doing an effective job in fostering teaching and research in the humanities (see Appendix C for a full account of its current activities), but it is somewhat less than the sum of its parts. We discuss how this may be put right in IV below, but the single most important need is for a new central space that would help everyone on campus who is invested in the humanities to develop a genuine sense of common cause. As we discuss in IV.B below, Green Hall is the obvious site for such a development, as part of a series of rethought spaces. Whatever happens, some Humanities units are going to be relocated sheerly on the grounds of space constraints. The university can do this in a range of ways, some of which—simply finding available space into which to fit an overflow—would involve a severe symbolic loss of status and a consequent blow to morale. We propose that the university should commit itself to providing the Humanities at Princeton with a showcase building that will demonstrate the university's commitment to a liberal arts education and to the central role of the Humanities within that mission. At a time when individual departments are being rehoused in outstanding new constructions, one of them just across the road from Green Hall, the faculty who mentor more than one in five of Princeton's students to graduation would inevitably feel keenly the symbolism of seeing such an opportunity go by in favor of a makeshift.

2. The University is alone among its peers in having such inadequate provision for the study of film and media. There is keen interest on campus for a new program, center,

institute or department in film and media studies, and the time is right to meet that interest (see V).

3. The university art museum is severely hampered in its potential by constraints of space, and the whole university community is under-served in this key area (see VI).

4. Princeton has no Department of Linguistics, and the current Program in Linguistics has been in some disarray. Nonetheless, there is high and sustained student interest. The number of those taking a Certificate in Linguistics has been in double figures since 2011-12, with numbers comparable with or superior to e.g. Dance, Visual Arts, Contemporary European Politics and Society. Total numbers enrolled in Linguistics courses have been very high for some years: 271 in 2010-11; 222 in 2011-12; 432 in 2012-13; 401 in 2013-14; and 239 in Fall Semester 2014 alone, with Spring figures still to come. Linguistics is an exceptionally exciting and important field at the moment, not least because it is the most interdisciplinary of all the fields in which the Humanities are involved: our current program has actual or potentially meaningful links with all the language departments, together with Comparative Literature, English, and Philosophy, and with Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology, Cognitive Science, Computer Science and Neuroscience. We make no specific recommendations concerning the future of Linguistics, since the university is currently actively considering its options; but a university like Princeton should not be weak in this important area, especially when undergraduate demand is so strong.

5. There are major gaps in our area studies and provision of language instruction. A university of our size cannot do everything, and the Regional Studies Task Force appears to be exploring imaginative ways of enabling Princeton students to study languages that are not regularly taught on campus. We recommend that a working group be established as soon as the various Task Forces have all reported, to investigate priorities for which languages Princeton should offer, and to consider the range of options for teaching those languages: this working group would include representatives from Division I as well as from PIIRS and the Woodrow Wilson School.

6. The Arts and Humanities need to develop closer ties at Princeton. There is a considerable amount of good collaborative work going on already, but now that the new physical home of the Lewis Center is almost ready, it is time to start planning for closer collaboration in the form of joint teaching above all, with theory, history, and practice working together. Most of us on the Task Force did not realise that Visual Arts was going to be staying in 185 Nassau Street even after the final move of the other Arts programs to the new Center; Creative Writing will remain in New South. The possibility of fragmentation of focus is still there, in other words, and the administrations of the Lewis Center and the Humanities should plan together to ensure that our students and faculty have continued and increased opportunities to benefit from joint work inside and outside the classroom and performing space.

IV-VI: *Ranked Principal Recommendations***IV. Princeton Humanities Institute: PHI/Φ**

Our principal recommendation: **that Princeton University should provide a fitting physical site to house a new Princeton Humanities Institute.**

A. Mission

The new site will showcase the university's commitment to the future of the humanities as an integral and critical element of a liberal arts education. The Institute will be a focus for everyone on campus, from undergraduate to emeritus faculty, who has a stake in the humanities. The Institute will enable broad interdisciplinary research and teaching across the university community as a whole, and it must have an effective communications staff who can let the university community and the wider world know what is happening in Princeton Humanities. PHI must have a clear governance structure, a clear reporting line for the chair/director, a representative and transparently accountable board.

The existing Council for the Humanities provides the basis for the new Institute, since the Council already has in place key elements that are indispensable for our future success—the concept of interdisciplinarity not only within Division I but reaching out across the other Divisions, including also the Art Museum and the Lewis Center; the principle of a central body with its own FTE to enable new initiatives, with established academic and administrative functions in place; the role as an umbrella organization for a diverse range of programs and committees, together with discussion groups for numerous sub-communities; experience of managing and hosting visitors and events of all kinds; direct involvement in curriculum planning and mounting of dedicated humanities and interdisciplinary courses for both undergraduates and graduates.

Currently, the Council directly administers about 16 interdisciplinary and academic programs, of which nine involve FTE and curriculum development (all of these programs host about 200 lectures, lunches, dinners, workshops, and conferences each semester: see Appendix C for details). Unlike the case with virtually all of our peers, the Council's executive committee and its chair have an academic and administrative function, advocating for interdisciplinary programs, setting budget priorities, supplementing sabbatical leaves, staffing courses, advising on program development and leadership. This experience and capacity are a key departure point for the proposed metamorphosis into an Institute. The Council would in due course *become* the Princeton Humanities Institute.

The Council for the Humanities has achieved a great deal of good for the Humanities and the university since its foundation sixty-two years ago, and the broad mission statement in its original 1953 charter remains valid today: "In all of its endeavors, the Council's goals are to encourage cooperation among departments, to foster interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship, to focus attention on problems common to all aspects of humanistic study, and to administer the Council endowment in a way that shall best enhance teaching, scholarship and faculty development in the humanities at Princeton."

Fifteen years into the twenty-first century, what we need is a renewal of that commitment in light of the enormous changes that have taken place since then. We need to create communities that will be able to adapt nimbly to the revolution caused by new media and technology, and that will dynamically facilitate the increasingly interdisciplinary work of students and faculty alike. We need a central space for all those engaged in and affected by the humanities, understood in the broadest sense. Such a centrally located organization could also play a public service role in the national conversation about the liberal arts and humanities, helping in the dissemination of current research and, for example, bringing to Princeton colleagues and students from less well-endowed institutions to take part in NEH-style summer seminars (E.3 below).

B. The Space

What the current Council lacks above all is a commanding physical presence on campus that will serve as a genuine center in space as well as a conceptual center. This is the main single reason why the Council at the moment is somewhat less than the sum of its parts. At the moment—somewhat ironically—what functions as the intellectual center for the Humanities at Princeton (if only for those housed in the Andlinger Center) is the Chancellor Green Café. The unexpected success of the café is testimony to the importance of meeting spaces, and the interactions now taking place there can be multiplied by a factor of ten if we create the right kind of physical space, if we house in that space the right units, and if we make it the home for an organization with the right kind of governance structure, resources, and academic capacities.

Allocation of resources is part of the overall strategic planning process, but we provide the basis of our thinking here, to give an idea of how we envision humanities space on campus working. In an ideal world, East Pyne would be the home for the new Institute, and for a long time we tried to retain the important central location of East Pyne as the core. But, attractive as it is, particularly by virtue of its central location, East Pyne is not suited to what we envision. It does not have an entrance which draws people into an atrium or exhibition area; it does not have accessible social areas for informal exchange immediately by the entrance area; it has too much “dead” space in the form of hyphens and nooks; it does not have the capacity for the imaginative teaching areas which we have in view.

Green Hall then looks like the only rational alternative, and if Green Hall is entirely reconstructed properly then all of the above desiderata can be satisfied—and more, as we lay out later in this section. It is easy to list the key existing academic units that would be natural partners in a reconfigured Green Hall—Classics, Hellenic Studies, Near Eastern Studies, and Religion. Green Hall could be the hub of a network reaching across to 185 Nassau Street with the James Stewart Theater; we could envisage American Studies and the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies being housed in the top floor of the adjacent

Aaron Burr Hall once PIIRS has moved to 20 Washington Road; East Pyne would continue to be the heart of European languages and cultures, with Classics moving to Green Hall; the very cramped spaces in Scheide Caldwell House and Joseph Henry House could be rationalized as part of a consolidation of humanities strength in the Andlinger Center (East Pyne and Chancellor Green, Scheide Caldwell House, Joseph Henry House). Finally, it would be convenient to have the key players in regional studies in such close proximity, with PIIRS in 20 Washington Road.

With a central Humanities Institute based in Green Hall, the heart of the Humanities at Princeton could become a vibrant place of intellectual exchange. Through its various classes, undergraduate and graduate, and its interdisciplinary Faculty Seminars and Research Clusters, PHI will bring students, faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and visitors together and increase the possibility of their interaction. It will create the opportunity to work with, and learn from, members of the Princeton community whom one might not even meet in the normal course of events.

Such interactions will occur for particular purposes on set occasions—class meetings, seminars, and cooperative research projects. Once a class or seminar session is over or once a semester- or year-long project is completed, its participants will necessarily disperse, but as undergraduates and graduate students regularly frequent the building for their courses, PHI will also become integrated into their intellectual and social lives. PHI will provide members of the Princeton community with a less formal venue for meeting and interacting with one another. Here they might continue their cooperation independently of their organized activities or where they might go without a specific purpose in mind. These less formal interactions need not be limited to the Humanities but would be available to members of the University's other divisions as well.

Centrally located, highly visible, and open to every constituency, PHI could become the intellectual and social center for much of the life of the campus. To that end, we recommend that it incorporate a spacious and pleasant café, where people would be likely to go to sit quietly, read a book or newspaper, meet a particular student or professor, or

simply engage in the informal exchange of ideas that is so crucial to a community such as Princeton. A good template for the remarkable added value of our proposed space would be the café in the E-Quad, which has become a genuine focus for our colleagues and their students in Engineering.

Such a space would be of particular significance to our graduate student community in the Humanities, who currently lack any joint space they can claim as their own, and who have responded warmly to the prospect of such a focal space. At the moment, the graduate students in the Humanities are rather fragmented, and they signalled keen interest in the development of a focal central space during our Town Hall meeting with them.

The building will need an attractive atrium as the entryway into the shared space; a café; common seating areas; appropriate teaching spaces (auditoria, seminar rooms); appropriate theater spaces for the new Film and Media Studies unit.

From this new focal center, the Institute will serve as a repository of experience and advice for fostering new initiatives, and for planning and programming in a consistent and coherent manner; at the same time, if students and faculty really made the center part of their working lives for teaching, learning and meeting, then we would see unpredictable multiplier effects coming into play as people met and interacted on a regular basis. Office hours can take place in the café and other social spaces (as they do in Chancellor Green Café now), and the intermingling of different courses, different styles of teaching, and different levels of academic engagement will generate a pedagogical environment that is truly greater than the sum of its parts.

We have to make PHI and its building the “go-to” place. PHI, so conceived and implemented, would represent the University’s commitment to the life of the mind: it would provide a place where such a life could be lived.

C. The Participants

We regard the following academic units as indispensable for the creation of this interdisciplinary humanities community, and their physical presence in the PHI building is essential. This is not necessarily an exhaustive list, but it represents the core players, in addition to the key academic units listed above, of Classics, Hellenic Studies, Near Eastern Studies, and Religion. Hellenic Studies is particularly important, as one of the most interconnected academic units on the campus, with a broad range of interests and a proven track record in managing visitors to best effect. Although this is a long list, each of these units is usually represented in physical terms by a couple of offices.

We need to negotiate with CITER and PIIRS not only the housing but also the administration of the key regional studies programs that are now predominantly staffed and run out of Humanities departments or centers: in particular, East Asian Studies, Near Eastern Studies, Hellenic Studies, Latin American Studies. These programs would ideally be member programs of both PHI and PIIRS, even if the Programs in East Asian Studies and Latin American Studies will wish to continue to be housed in their current locations (Jones Hall and Aaron Burr respectively).

Again, the Council of the Humanities is not listed here as an entity, since it will have become the Princeton Humanities Institute by the time this building is up and running.

1. Humanities Research Center. This new unit would incorporate the current core functions of the Council (endowed lectures, faculty discussion groups, faculty seminars, Old Dominion Research Professors) but reorganize and amplify them, with space and staff adequate to support the kinds of workshops, conferences, and lectures outlined in the next section.
2. Society of Fellows. The Society is the jewel in the crown of Princeton humanities. The intellectual energy generated in the Society is remarkable, showcasing active

- dialogue and collaboration across the disciplines and the generations. The Fellows are closely connected to a wide circuit, and the synergy they create can be multiplied if they are centrally housed in Princeton's showcase Humanities building. The members of the Society are deeply attached to their current home, Joseph Henry House, despite its very cramped environment, and we need to manage this transition sensitively, making the advantages of the move plain, and perhaps retaining a link to Joseph Henry House for social events and seminars.
3. Film and Media Studies. The new academic unit we recommend in V below is a natural link across virtually the whole range of what we do, and PHI is its natural home.
 4. Digital Humanities. The single most important and significant new initiative in Princeton Humanities since the Society of Fellows, Digital Humanities needs to be available and open to the community in this central location.
 5. Hellenic Studies. One of the most interconnected academic units on the campus, Hellenic Studies has extensive international experience, and can cooperate with PIIRS in particular in managing teaching and research in this area.
 6. Linguistics. However it is ultimately configured at Princeton, Linguistics is *the* interdisciplinary subject in the modern university and needs to be housed here.
 7. American Studies. (possibly in Aaron Burr) A longstanding Princeton model of creative interdisciplinary work, with a new and expansive commitment to building intellectual diversity and to making the intellectual connection between the U.S. and the world. It is also unique in sustaining deep intellectual partnerships with History and the Social Sciences.

8. Gender and Sexuality Studies (possibly in Aaron Burr) Another key interdisciplinary unit, modeling innovative interdisciplinary work on the forefront of humanistic inquiry.
9. European Cultural Studies. A highly successful example of “regional studies” within the Humanities.
10. Medieval Studies. Connected to virtually every Humanities Department, and also to History and the Institute for Advanced Study.
11. Judaic Studies. Another model interdisciplinary program.
12. Journalism. With very close ties to media studies and digital humanities, the journalism program will foster a “Public Humanities” dimension to the Institute.
13. The current interdisciplinary academic programs housed under the Council, most notably Humanistic Studies and I-HUM.

In addition:

We need to provide venues for the participation of personnel from the Art Museum and Library.

It may be that the Council of Science and Technology will wish to be housed in the Institute, or adjacent to it.

D. Research

There should be a strong and distinct research component to PHI. The “Research Center” part of PHI will focus on creating real (not just nominal) intellectual opportunities and bridges between disciplines and across schools. The primary goal is to create forums and settings for cross-disciplinary dialogue between faculty which will foreground existing

cross-disciplinary conversations, promote new and unexpected intellectual synergies, and lay the foundation for future collaborations that will enhance both faculty members' scholarship and their teaching. The successful programs for the Behrman and Old Dominion Fellows would be a starting point for an **Institute Fellows Program**, including visitors; office spaces for the Fellows will be necessary.

The Research Center has a range of options for helping to stimulate research.

1. Invite proposals for collaborative initiatives. The Research Center will solicit and review proposals from faculty collectives interested in forming a single or multiple-year cluster on specific topics. This could take the shape of a group studying a theme, which could be a simple but rich topic that generates cross-disciplinary conversations. Some examples are: "Bread," "Skin," "Light," "Scale." We can easily imagine participation from scholars in the Humanities, the Social Sciences, and even the Sciences. Faculty could propose research clusters aimed at supporting innovative critical thinking, on a topic such as "Art as Research; Research as Art;" this might be composed of faculty members who work at the intersection of criticism and practice (a film theorist who is also a film maker; a literary scholar who is also a poet; an art historian who is also a practicing painter, etc.) Another example would be a research cluster on "Critical Thought and Social Justice," and here we might see faculty working in law, literature, law, art, performance, history, the environment, and more.

2. In each case the Research Center could then sponsor Faculty Seminars based on the theme or topic, or else workshops, conferences, lectures. This should function like a fellowship: faculty need to apply, and the Institute should buy out faculty time so that they can participate actively in these events. Sometimes, these seminars can invite outside guests, utilizing especially the resources of the local community of scholars in the tristate area. Future professional collaborations as well as future team-teaching can grow out of these seminars. This will make the Institute an intellectually vibrant and exciting place to be. The Institute will provide financial, staff, and space support for the meetings of these research clusters.

3. Support and promote bold, innovative scholarship in the Humanities today that may not easily fit into current departmental structures. We celebrate interdisciplinarity at Princeton, but there are really very few places, institutionally speaking, where that kind of interdisciplinary work can be housed. New and emerging fields to be fostered could include Critical Race Theory, New Materialism, Critical Food Studies, Disability Studies, Intersectional Studies, Environmental Humanities, Urban/Medical/Legal Humanities, Global American Studies, and New Media. The cutting-edge work of the postdocs in the Society of Fellows will be supported here through workshops and reading groups.

4. PHI FTE could also provide seed money for funding interdisciplinary appointments. The Council is currently the only Humanities unit that has a synoptic view of the Humanities scene, and PHI would similarly be able to intervene strategically in order to facilitate cooperative and interdisciplinary initiatives: our numerous programs represent precisely such possibilities, and there is more we can do. This is unlike the situation confronted by PIIRS, for example, where they need to make appointments in regional studies specialities because the home departments tend not to be interested in such priorities. In the Humanities, what we see generally is a case such as Medieval Latin or Sanskrit, where a number of different units have a real interest in such a position existing but no one unit can commit -to the whole of it: PHI can detect such moments and create a coalition (e.g. including, as in the case of Sanskrit, PIIRS) by undertaking to provide a key fraction.

5. Train and support outstanding graduate students doing interdisciplinary work through sixth-year teaching and research fellowships. The existing I-HUM program could be the departure point for such initiatives.

E. PHI Service and Programming

In addition to the Research Component, PHI will become the organizational center for showcasing the most exciting current trends in the Humanities. Its programming agenda includes:

1. Public lecture series and exhibitions relating to themes above, with special focus on collaborations with the Art Museum and the Lewis Center.
2. Community outreach. We have an unusually intellectually active community here at Princeton, with many locals interested in what the university has to offer. Having an active relationship with the local community can only do us good. PHI will explore active collaborations with the town for a variety of programming ideas. A most ambitious one might be to co-sponsor a “Princeton Humanities Festival” in which we celebrate what Princeton has to offer the world in terms of its excellence and diversity in the Humanities. The Festival might include film screenings, art exhibits, readings, and more.
3. Service. We would like PHI to explore ways of assisting the cause of the Liberal Arts and the Humanities nationally. Princeton’s resources oblige us to take the initiative here. It could be possible, for example, to host NEH-style Summer Seminars for high school/community college/university teachers, ideally with NEH funding, but alone if not. These are invaluable opportunities for colleagues from less privileged institutions to take part in intense thinking about pedagogy and current intellectual issues.

PHI could play a major part in the broader mission of educating the public about the importance of a liberal arts education and the role of the humanities in the modern world. This is an active field of research and enquiry, and PHI could have an educative function as part of its mission.

F. Teaching

There are many Centers and Institutes for the Humanities across the country, and many of them have clearly been very successful. We gladly adapt from them features that will help us in our particular environment: the “Working Groups” of the University of Toronto’s Jackman Humanities Institute, for example, are a valuable model for the Institute’s research activities. But we are very conscious that we already have in place a template that will work to foster a distinctively Princetonian element that is extremely rare in other centers, namely, the core emphasis on undergraduate education as our defining excellence.

Teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level is a central mission of PHI, and we see its capacities as complementing our current excellent teaching in the Humanities. PHI builds on that foundational model to enable a structure that can adapt to the dynamism in the Humanities over the coming decades. We have already outlined the crucial ways in which the new space of PHI will serve to enhance the University’s pedagogical mission: we turn now to the provision of courses.

Courses and FTE

Although on the surface it appears that the dominant structure for Humanities teaching at Princeton is by Departments, there is in fact a good deal of interdisciplinary Humanities teaching already taking place. HUM, AMS, ECS, and other interdisciplinary programs offer a wide array of courses, and these courses are some of the most exciting and popular on campus, filling up to their maximum cap as soon as registration opens. Given the nature of Humanities education — which often involves small-group, writing-intensive teaching — one important solution to satisfy undergraduate demand is to offer more of these courses. Here, PHI is essential.

The “coin of the realm” in allocating teaching is in the form of FTEs, which the Council for the Humanities, ECS, and other groups on campus — each of which has a limited

budget of FTEs — use to “buy out” faculty from Departments so that they can offer interdisciplinary courses, which (by the nature of disciplinary expertise) are typically jointly taught by professors housed in separate Departments. This model works with our current traditions; there just needs to be a good deal more of it. PHI provides a natural focal point to organize and promote such interdisciplinary teaching through **an expanded FTE budget**. The flexibility of the FTE system allows for creative adaptation to the interests of undergraduate and graduate students, while encouraging Departments to permit faculty to experiment. PHI could make a lot of difference with even a comparatively modest increment in FTE: to develop new team-taught gateway courses, especially in interdisciplinary areas; to facilitate Humanities teaching abroad.

PHI is much more important in this whole process than simply as a bookkeeper. It will issue calls for proposals in specific areas — courses with a strong international component, for example, or Digital Humanities, Ethnic and Diversity Studies, Disability Studies, Linguistics, atelier courses to be team-taught between the humanities and the creative arts — and also evaluate proposals for collaborations in areas that we have not yet imagined (an area partially dealt with now through the invaluable David A. Gardner “Magic” Grants). PHI will also have the capacity to promote such courses for more than one iteration, encouraging faculty to invest significant time and energy into developing the courses. A greater diversity and greater stability in interdisciplinary teaching in the Humanities would enhance the pedagogical experience for students by allowing word-of-mouth to build and various cohorts to contribute to an evolving conversation.

PHI would be the logical place for the Humanities to develop teaching and research programs with an international and global dimension. Demand for international experience in the Humanities is high. A large percentage of our David A. Gardner “Magic” Grant proposals are proposing globally aware courses and international travel. The “Global Seminars” run so successfully out of PIIRS, with high humanities faculty involvement already, are a good model here. Funding for these Global Seminars is heavily oversubscribed, with about two in three applications being turned away for lack of funds; a properly funded PHI can work with PIIRS, WWS and CTR to ensure that

Princeton faculty, undergraduate and graduate students can have the access they need to this crucial aspect of living in the modern world (see further below, VIII “Internationalization”, and IX.C, on strengthening existing interdisciplinary team-taught courses).

V. Program in Film and Media Studies

A. Film and Media Studies Now

Interest in film and media has been steadily growing across the humanities at Princeton and is most readily reflected in the increased number of undergraduate and graduate courses that routinely view films (the English department alone now has close to twenty such courses). There are also at least four distinct film series on campus, as well as the non-profit group React To Film. This growth is hardly a surprise, for film is one of the most broadly accessible and engaging media in our age. Moreover, no other medium apart from language itself speaks so tellingly across the disciplinary divisions of Humanities. Nationally, over the last three decades, film and media studies have become a crucial part of humanistic studies, sharing with fields like history, literature and art history a dedication to providing students with a critical understanding of the images and image-making technologies that condition contemporary life. It is therefore no coincidence that the vast majority of film and media studies programs are either housed within humanities departments or, when they are free-standing departments, located within humanities divisions.

Despite the rapidly growing amount of film studies happening in different places and different strengths at Princeton, there is no one place for students to access information about what already exists, no single program that collates our offerings, and thus no real intellectual home for teaching and research in this area. The Program in Media and Modernity (directed by Hal Foster and Beatriz Colomina) can give only limited attention to film studies. About thirty years ago, the university created the Committee for Film Studies; the current membership of this committee represents some of the strongest interests in film on campus and also demonstrates the strength of this interest across the humanities and the performing arts: Steve Chung (East Asian Studies), Maria DiBattista (English and Comparative Literature), Su Friedrich (Lewis Center for the Arts), Thomas Levin (German), Gaetana Marrone-Puglia (French and Italian), Jerome Silbergeld (Art

and Archaeology), Michael Smith (Philosophy), and Jeffrey Stout (Religion). Many more professors could be cited from each Humanities department and program, and even more are being hired. For example, EAS recently made two appointments that consolidate and expand an already lively interest in film/media initiatives: Franz Prichard (Japanese photography, film, media theory) and Erin Huang (cinemas across the Sinophone world), who will join Steve Chung (Korean and East Asian film). And there is even a distinguished documentary film maker on campus (Purcell Carson in the Woodrow Wilson School) who is currently underutilized within the broader Humanities community.

The Committee for Film Studies has attempted to nurture and guide this ever growing level of interest at Princeton by maintaining a modest website, arranging for the annual Faber lecture (which features a scholar in cinema studies), and attempting to coordinate relevant activities of the Lewis Center and the Humanities. But the Committee has come to realize that something more than these modest efforts needs to happen, and to happen soon. To that end, they consulted with four leading film scholars last spring about the situation at Princeton and elsewhere. In a “white paper” produced this past November, the Committee made an urgent case for the establishment of a unit for Film and Media Studies at Princeton.

The Committee’s white paper characterizes the present state of film studies at Princeton as a crisis. For one, because of the conviction among faculty on campus that film and related media are essential for the study of modern history and society, video watching is continually growing within our classes, but is typically not guided by faculty with special training in film and media. Moreover, only a small handful of these classes watch celluloid film in a first-rate setting (i.e. in the James Stewart Theater). The great majority of Princeton courses that require weekly viewing of films do so through public screenings of digital videos or even through private viewings on computers and/or cell phones. This is leading to “a disturbingly low standard for Princeton’s curricular efforts in this area” as well as a series of missed opportunities for supporting rigorous and groundbreaking teaching and scholarship in the areas of film and media.

Most of our peer institutions have at least two scholars in cinema studies; we have one, who will retire at the end of the 2014-2015 academic year (P. Adams Sitney). Another major film scholar, Michael Wood, retired several years ago. The Lewis Center's Visual Arts Program has a Film Production component, but no full-time specialist in film/video production (Su Friedrich's appointment is half-time). A recent attempt to hire a major film scholar failed, largely because we did not have a department or program in place to house him. Because our peer institutions are way ahead of us on this front, we are beginning to lose talented undergraduates as well as graduate students to those programs. Every other Ivy institution has a blossoming film program, and these programs are attracting top scholars to their faculty: many comparatively small liberal arts colleges, such as Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore, have substantial and independent departments. The institutions that have set the standard for film and media studies include the University of Chicago, UC Berkeley, UCLA, NYU, Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and Brown. These programs are all different: some are stand-alone departments, some are interdepartmental programs. They are all thriving, while we remain well behind the curve. There is a growing feeling that Princeton now needs a high-end, demanding major that will attract serious students and a program that will help provide graduate students with high-level training in this area.

In sum, there is continually growing interest in film studies at Princeton, and real potential to galvanize and build on this interest, but many of our courses are currently taught by non-experts, and students are currently unable to gain rigorous training in the area of film and media from within the humanities, outside the important role played by the Program in Visual Arts in teaching production. There is a proactive group of professors committed to film studies, but they have been unable to attract major scholars in the area. These high-profile scholars are now migrating to our peer institutions, all of which have well-developed departments or programs in this area.

B. The Future of Film and Media Studies at Princeton

Because of already strong human resources and widespread student and faculty interest, Princeton has the capacity to support a substantial unit dedicated to the study of Film and Media housed within the proposed Princeton Humanities Institute. The obvious eventual goal would be for this unit to grow into a department, or else an Institute, with a graduate program. As noted above, the study of film and media is configured variously at leading peer institutions; in some cases, the unit's focus is restricted to the history of film, and in others, both film and media are included. The unit proposed for Princeton would follow the latter model and would be dedicated in general to the following two areas:

- 1) The history and theory of cinema, a term that refers to the art and culture of the moving image.

- 2) The history and theory of media, defined here to include a broad culture of images and sound. Examples would be media and technologies related to film and other iterations of the moving image such as television, video, and digital media, as well as earlier practices, such as photography, moving panoramas, and other pre-cinematic optical technologies.

As with other forms of expression studied within the humanities (such as literature, art, and music), film and media have their own history. To ensure that the study of this history at Princeton is as substantial and as rigorous as possible and to transform the currently piecemeal if dedicated engagement with film and media on campus into a model of innovative teaching and research, the provision of sufficient expertise and infrastructure is required. This would include the following:

- An independent unit such as a center or a program housed within the proposed Princeton Humanities Institute (under the umbrella of the Division of Humanities)
- Undergraduate and graduate components, including a full menu of courses as well as certificates for both undergraduates and graduate students

- 4-6 faculty lines dedicated to the unit; these lines would include History of Film, Critical Theory, Media/New Media, and Film/Video Production (it could well make sense for this last line to be jointly in Program in Visual Arts)
- A governance structure that enables the unit's autonomy, internally and with regard to other campus units
- A dedicated space that would be controlled by the unit
- The equipment and facilities necessary to sustain the unit's teaching and research program, including but not limited to: equipment that supports all relevant media (celluloid print, DVD, VHS, HD digital, analog, and so forth), state-of-the-art theaters purpose-built for film screenings including one large theater and one small theater, and seminar rooms
- A non-circulating film and media library with a librarian/information specialist
- Administrative and technical staff, including an outreach manager and tech support

The unit envisioned in this proposal would serve as a bridge between the humanities at Princeton and the Lewis Center, including the Visual Arts Program (which will remain in 185 Nassau after the construction of the Lewis Center is complete). It will be important to strengthen Visual Arts as part of this overall approach to the campus-wide lack, and to ensure that strong and meaningful institutional liaison between Visual Arts and Film and Media Studies is built into the new configuration. Cross-appointments between Visual Arts and the new unit would be an obvious way to achieve this: the working group that we recommend should explore these possibilities.

Multiple humanities constituencies across campus have expressed a desire to establish connections and undertake collaborations with the Lewis Center. But there is inadequate programming and infrastructure currently in place to facilitate such projects. A Film and Media Studies unit would provide such infrastructure and thus create substantial connective tissue among myriad individuals, programs, centers, departments, and so forth at Princeton. The study of film and media has been from its inception in the 1960s an interdisciplinary undertaking, drawing on and generated from within a range of

disciplines including art history, anthropology, sociology, musicology, literature, architecture, history, area studies, philosophy, and the history of science. A Film and Media Studies unit at Princeton would facilitate a wide range of innovative connections and collaborations across departments and programs, and would enable both faculty and students to envision and undertake truly ambitious and innovative cross-disciplinary work.

As a mass phenomenon, film and media are by nature transcultural and transnational, so a Film and Media Studies unit would also aid Princeton in further situating humanistic study within a global discourse as well as contribute substantially to Princeton's many international initiatives. A program in Film and Media Studies at Princeton would also interface in exciting ways with the evolving and wonderfully ambitious Digital Humanities Center. Finally, the history and theory of film and media cannot be properly studied without contributions from areas of expertise not traditionally associated with cinema and the moving image, including economics, public policy, ethics, and international affairs. As a commodity, a political tool or propaganda, a form of documentary, and a globally circulating medium of communication, film as an object of inquiry serves as a model historical and methodological crossroads and thus as an ideal site for the cross-disciplinary, globally-minded, and intellectually generative liberal arts education so valued by Princeton.

C. Going Forward

A Film and Media Studies unit would be a new undertaking for Princeton and would have an impact on many individuals and units on campus. Additionally, all new faculty hired in Film and Media Studies will be instrumental in building the program and shaping its short- and long-term objectives. For these reasons, it is advised that the process of hiring faculty whose logical home would be Film and Media Studies unit begin with a series of conversations with those individuals and units on campus that have a stake in such hires. This includes the search for P. Adams Sitney's replacement, which to be

maximally effective should be informed by a clearly articulated and administratively supported vision for the future of Film and Media Studies at Princeton.

If we consider the national scene, Yale's Film and Media Studies Program stands as perhaps the most apt long-term model: an interdisciplinary program located squarely within the humanities, it boasts close to a dozen full-time faculty with either dedicated appointments to the program or cross appointments with humanities departments, a well-defined undergraduate curriculum, and a PhD degree that students pursue in combination with other departments. It has, in the twelve or so years of its history, become one of the leading centers for the study of film and media, precisely because it has been able to recruit some of the leading scholars to its faculty ranks and because its scholarship is so productively linked with Yale's rich tradition in humanistic study. While Princeton's own Cinema and Media Studies field, founded on different scholarly strengths, will go in a distinct intellectual direction, it would benefit tremendously from the sort of institutional support Yale's program enjoyed during its expansion. There is every reason to imagine that we could achieve the same success as the program at Yale after a decade of wholehearted recruiting and participation from the many individuals currently on campus who are committed to this goal.

D. Impact of Film and Media Studies

Given the impact of the moving image within modern society and its relevance to myriad disciplines, it is essential that there be a well-staffed unit on campus that can help faculty, students, and others absorb and understand that impact. In turn, we believe that the establishment of a Film and Media Studies unit will itself have a deep and pervasive impact on the Humanities at Princeton. We can readily imagine a "pre-listen" and a "pre-watch" to welcome new freshmen to the university in tandem with their "pre-read", as if to signal Princeton's commitment to engaging with the ways in which our students orientate themselves in their world.

Such a unit will:

- promote visual literacy (and not just visual saturation), encouraging facility with the media that constitute the 21st-century media matrix
- create a space of convergence across the disciplines that will be hugely galvanizing and energizing
- include, in addition to the departments and programs in the Humanities and the Lewis Center, other campus units such as the Woodrow Wilson School, Computer Science and the Engineering School in general, the Princeton University Art Museum, and the School of Architecture
- inspire new research and pedagogy, curricular innovation, as well as new methodologies for studying history, poetry, music, and many other fields or forms of expression
- form a faculty seminar that can train faculty and graduate student AIs for film and media studies, thus increasing the level of competence in film studies across the Humanities and, as noted above, opening the door for new forms of research and inquiry

Film and Media Studies consists of a humanistic methodology that will illuminate, inflect, and even transform all our humanities fields. It is high time to put Princeton on the map in this area.

VI. Princeton University Art Museum

A. The Museum Today

The Princeton University Art Museum, with a collection of over 95,000 works, is one of the most important academic museums in the world. Centrally located on the campus, it is an invaluable educational resource for students and faculty, a strong connecting link between the University and the greater Princeton community, and a great destination for anyone interested in the visual arts.

The Museum's permanent collections include works dating back to the Neolithic Era and follow the evolution of the arts all the way to the most recent contemporary developments. Every continent and every form of the visual arts is represented, often by works of the highest quality beautifully displayed and easily accessible to its visitors. The Museum organizes several special exhibitions per year, and both these special exhibitions and its permanent collections are accompanied by historical and critical studies published in handsome volumes. Finally, the Museum presents a variety of educational programs, including lectures, panel discussions, social events, and concerts. Several of these events are organized by undergraduate and graduate students, with the participation of interested faculty members and Museum personnel.

All that notwithstanding, and despite its connections with the Department of Art and Archaeology, the Museum is not yet fully integrated in the life of the campus, not only in connection with the Arts and the Humanities but also with the Sciences and Engineering. But although there is ample room for progress in that regard, there is no room for its actual implementation. The Museum is in dire need of more space, not only gallery space for its collections but also, and especially, classroom space for teaching, which is as necessary as it is unavailable. In the next section, we outline its present strengths and limitations.

B. Strengths and Limitations

The chief strengths of the museum at present are its collection and its personnel. Especially strong in the Mediterranean regions, Western Europe, China, the United States, and Latin America, the collection includes material from around the world from all time periods representing a wide range of media. The origins of the collection date to the 1750s and it has developed into one of the premier academic collections in the world, providing an outstanding resource for teaching and research. The museum's staff includes twelve curators, all of whom are active scholars in their respective fields, and who serve as rigorous stewards of the collection and as liaisons between the museum and its various publics, including students, faculty, members of the larger Princeton community, and scholars from other institutions. The museum's education department, a staff of six, offers educational programming and support for students, faculty, and local residents; it also has a longstanding and vibrant outreach program for public school children in the Princeton and Trenton areas. Under the directorship of James Steward, who arrived at Princeton in 2009, the museum has launched a number of initiatives to position the Museum at the heart of the University experience, including expanding the Museum's program of exhibitions and educational activities as well as its open hours and outreach efforts. Together, the museum's team has contributed significantly to the teaching and research mission of the University. Examples of the museum's contributions to the intellectual experience of students and faculty include:

- 1) Student-faculty or student-curator collaborations on exhibitions, sometimes including co-authored exhibition catalogs.
- 2) Precept visits to museum storage and study rooms to examine works of art not on view in the galleries.
- 3) A lecture series that brings prominent scholars and artists to campus.

- 4) Hosting events such as artists' performances or panel discussions that bring together Princeton faculty from multiple departments to speak about a work of art in the collection.
- 5) Collaborative undertakings with campus and community groups, for example the year-long program "Memory and the Work of Art" (2011-2012), which brought together the University, the Museum, the Lewis Center for the Arts, Princeton's Council of the Humanities, the Princeton Public Library, the Arts Council of Princeton, the McCarter Theater, and the Princeton Symphony Orchestra, among others. "Memory and the Work of Art" included several exhibitions, a lecture series (the artist May Lin and the author Nicole Krauss were among the speakers), reading groups, performances, and concerts at a variety of on-campus and off-campus venues.
- 6) An artist-in-residency program that brings internationally acclaimed artists to campus for a series of conversations with faculty, curators, students, and the public (El Anatsui, the influential Ghanaian artist, was the artist in residence in Spring 2015).
- 7) Summer and academic-year internship programs for undergraduates and graduate students.
- 8) A student tour guide program that includes in-depth exploration of the collections with curators, workshops on education and visitor engagement, and a trip to the Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- 9) Faculty Innovation program, sponsored by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, that supports interdisciplinary study throughout the University and thoughtful use of the Museum's collections by fostering collaboration between faculty and the Museum, especially with regard to course development and teaching.
- 10) The Museum Voices Colloquium, which on a regular basis brings together University faculty, undergraduates, graduate students, and visiting scholars and curators in a visual arts think tank.

These are wonderful, illuminating programs, but many currently reach a limited constituency, one restricted in large part to entities on campus with obvious and easily facilitated connections to the Museum such as the Department of Art & Archaeology, the

Department of Classics, and the Center for Hellenic Studies. Other obvious substantial and long-term collaborations with units such as the School of Architecture, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the Woodrow Wilson School Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies have not been possible. The Museum is firmly and vigorously dedicated to outreach, and to supporting and substantially contributing to teaching and research at Princeton across the disciplines, and it is poised to make a truly substantial contribution to the arts and humanities on campus. The Museum's leadership and curatorial personnel have strongly articulated their desire to position the Museum as, in their words, "a visual and humanistic hub—a new town square, if you will—for the Princeton campus, in which students and faculty from the widest range of disciplines and experiences...can come together to explore collections of world-class significance, probing temporary exhibitions, and wide-ranging educational programs in an intimate environment." But this mission is an impossible one at present, given the severe limits of the Museum's facility.

The Museum's facility in McCormick Hall, which it shares with the Department of Art & Archaeology and Marquand Library, is the number one obstacle for the Museum as it envisions its future as an interdisciplinary teaching and research space that reaches out to and draws in students and faculty from across campus. The best and most celebrated academic museums have the capacity to affect the lives of all students, and this is because they boast sufficient physical and infrastructural space to do so. But Princeton's Museum simply cannot realize its vision as an intellectual and interdisciplinary hub in its current space. The current Museum has been cobbled together over the years through the re-purposing and addition of space; its galleries are awkwardly configured, subject to climate intrusions detrimental to works of art, and all around too small. Only 3% of the collection may be on view at any given time, which is well below the figure of 10% that the Museum Director regards as a healthy target for institutions of this kind. Further, world-class holdings are subjected to small basement galleries, and important temporary exhibitions, including the curator Kelly Baum's ground-breaking and critically acclaimed "New Jersey as Nonsite" (2013), must make do with inadequate gallery space such that their potential is drastically curtailed. There is no designated gallery space for semester-

long installations of objects for use in teaching, something that is standard at the majority of campus museums, from the Ivy League to public universities, nor is there any classroom space available for courses based on the Museum's collections. Indeed, there is no space within the entire museum that can be put to flexible use for teaching, research, and other pedagogical projects. This includes space for use in facilitating the use of the museum by faculty from many departments, i.e. space for orientation, training, object study, and so forth. What is more, the basic operations of the museum itself long ago surpassed the building's capacity. Curators and other staff occupy a patchwork of offices in all parts of the museum, which limits converse among museum personnel and thus dampens possibilities for spontaneous discourse or collaboration, among Museum staff and between staff and individuals across campus, from whom they are completely separated. Finally, interest in the Museum's collection and resources has grown exponentially under James Steward's tenure, among teaching faculty especially, yet the Museum simply cannot meet the demand because of the array of limitations described above.

Simply put, and despite the very best and wonderful efforts of its personnel, the Museum's space imposes severe limits on its operations, its intellectual impact, and its ability to innovate. This amounts to a major missed opportunity to enhance substantially the intellectual life and educational mission of the University. The Museum is at the physical center of campus. It also houses a collection that brings together into a single space an astonishing diversity of material that speaks to a host of disciplines across the humanities, social sciences, and STEM disciplines. This makes it an ideal "center" for the exchange of ideas and the stimulation of innovative thought at Princeton. As with Firestone Library, the Museum will serve not just the humanities, but will contribute to the intellectual life and vigor of the entire campus.

C. Proposal for the Future

This proposal recommends a new, purpose-built museum facility, one fit for the 21st century, to replace the current structure, with the following features:

- 1) A location at or near the center of campus, in place of or near the current building.
- 2) A plan for an interim space for the display and study of the museum's collection so as to reduce the impact of construction on ongoing teaching and research.
- 3) Classroom space, including at least one lecture hall and two seminar rooms.
- 4) Exhibition space for course-related installations.
- 5) Flexible spaces for temporary installations, performances, collaborative projects, and other non-conventional events, i.e. a lab-like space that accommodates and reflects the vibrancy and fluidity of the arts in contemporary society. This kind of space will be especially important in facilitating connections and collaborations with the Lewis Center, including the Program in Visual Arts which at present does not interface with the Museum, despite it being one of the Museum's most logical partners on campus. Such flexible, multi-purpose spaces would also assist the Museum in meeting the needs of a wide variety of disciplines, each of which engages the arts in an especial manner.
- 6) Curatorial offices in a single block easily accessible to non-museum staff, i.e. Princeton faculty and students.
- 7) Infrastructure to support a strong connection to the Humanities Council and proposed Princeton Humanities Institute, recognizing that the Museum as a historical repository and research center resides squarely within the humanistic disciplines.
- 8) Enhanced conservation department, facilities, and staff able to service the museum's collection and designed to foster collaboration with other campus entities interested in materials science, including the School of Engineering and Applied Science and the School of Architecture.
- 9) An art study center open to the public in which a greater number and density of works might be shown, i.e. in a manner not customary to regular galleries, that would provide an opportunity for curators to host focus exhibitions, some of them co-curated with students, or put on display material that is fragile or in other ways not suitable for installation in the regular galleries.
- 10) A café with ample seating and space for socializing.

D. Our Peers

The art museums at both Harvard University and Yale University have recently reopened after years-long building campaigns. Their new facilities include multiple classrooms, an education center that supports teaching and learning, research centers dedicated to long term projects (including conservation), and an art study center; there is also dedicated gallery space for short-term or precept exhibitions and educational programming. Stanford University recently opened its new building for the Anderson Collection, a premier collection of post-war American art, and has broken ground on the McMurtry Building for the Department of Art and Art History. The latter forms an architectural cluster with the Anderson Collection and Stanford's Cantor Arts Center, and was designed to serve as an interdisciplinary hub for the arts and humanities on campus, exactly the purpose that a new Museum building at Princeton would serve.

E. The Princeton Community

Nearly every individual with whom the Task Force spoke indicated a high degree of interest in the Museum and its collections and expressed desire to collaborate regularly and substantially with the Museum in their teaching and/or research. This includes nearly every department, center, or program head consulted. All parties consulted recognized the Museum as an enormously valuable intellectual resource for the campus as a whole.

It is the Task Force's recommendation that every effort be made to connect the Museum with the everyday activities of the University, in particular, with the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students, and to secure for it a central role in bringing together the various campus units that are concerned with the arts and their history. These units include, of course, the Department of Art & Archaeology but also the Program in the Visual Arts and the Lewis Center for the Arts more generally, the Committee for Film Studies (which we recommend should be expanded to include a program dedicated to

Film and Media Studies), the Program in Media and Modernity, the Program in Hellenic Studies, the Program in European Cultural Studies, and various other programs and departments in the University. The arts are also relevant to the Social Sciences: as previously noted, the Woodrow Wilson School's Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies, for example, is an obvious candidate for closer cooperation with the Museum. In Natural Science and Engineering, it would be important to encourage further teaching on the model of David Billington's classic courses, "Structures and The Urban Environment" and "Engineering in the Modern World:" Mike Littman's MAE course on "Engineering in the Modern World" and Maria Garlock's CEE course on "Structures and the Urban Environment" are positive examples of what can be done here.

A new museum facility would also assist in bringing into productive conversation disparate campus groups devoted to exploring the arts within humanistic studies, including the Museum's own student advisory council and the many ad-hoc student groups based in departments or residential colleges. All in all, the Museum could become the center of a large network of university activities connected with the arts. But, as we stated above, this goal requires the expansion of the Museum's physical plant and an active campaign to demonstrate the many uses to which its facilities can be put in the service of the University's educational mission.

VII-IX: *Other Recommendations***VII. Graduate Students**

Graduate students at the University obviously comprise a heterogeneous group, and many subsets of the whole face different challenges and opportunities in the years ahead. The Task Force for the Future of the Graduate School discusses the whole spectrum of issues in their report. The purpose of this section is to underscore those aspects of the graduate experience that have particular characteristics and resonances for graduate students in the Humanities, and to propose some actions the University might take to preserve and expand Princeton's status as a premier place for the training of the next generation of leaders in the Humanities.

Our recommendations cluster around three specific issues: the length of the academic program for graduate students in the Humanities; the significance of teaching as a component in their training; and expanding opportunities for interdisciplinarity among the various graduate programs at the University.

A. Sixth-Year Funding

As is clear from nationwide data on graduate education, as well as data generated by the Graduate School, Humanities graduate students take the longest time to complete their course of study among the four divisions of the University. The Graduate School currently (and generously) offers five full years of financial support, but there are very scarce resources for students who require more than five years to complete their course of study. (Information about those limited resources is often scattered; consolidation of that information is one of the intended functions of the Princeton Humanities Institute.) Both the reason for the longer time-to-degree and the increasingly sparse funding environment

suggest several solutions which the Task Force recommends that the University explore further.

In the view of the Task Force, the tendency of Humanities graduate students to require a sixth year to complete their course of study is a reasonable, even laudable, result of increasingly high standards of scholarship. Students in the Humanities often have to learn multiple languages once they arrive at Princeton to pursue their projects, engage in extensive archival research (at times in several countries), and master a growing body of secondary literature (which does not have the property of rapidly becoming obsolete, as scholarship in the sciences, engineering, and even the social sciences often does). All of these factors push our students to develop more ambitious projects exhibiting an increasingly high degree of professional virtuosity.

Yale University has recently recognized these features of graduate study in the Humanities by expanding their funding package for a sixth year, comprising either guaranteed teaching positions or stipends for any student making significant and demonstrable progress toward a degree. In other words, sixth year funding is not an entitlement, and each case would be vetted, to ensure that students who need this opportunity receive it. If there is a need to respond to the initiatives of our peer institutions, with whom we compete for the best students, it is also the case that opportunities for additional funding for writing-up have become scarcer in the Humanities. This year, the Whiting Fellowships — which supported some of our most capable students in their final year — have been discontinued, placing these students under greater difficulties at the very stage when they most need to focus on completing their dissertations and approaching the job market.

Therefore, to support our best students at this crucial point in their course of study, the Task Force recommends instituting both a structure for sixth-year funding, perhaps along the Yale model, and a series of competitive (potentially endowed) fellowships to replace the Whiting. These fellowships would be subject to a rigorous vetting process to enable

our best students to really shine, and could be administered by the Princeton Humanities Institute, raising the visibility of both the students and the Institute at the same time.

B. Teaching Opportunities

While many students in the sciences and engineering might go on to careers in industry or research without a teaching component, most of our students seek some form of employment within a pedagogical environment. Given Princeton's small class sizes and firm insistence on advising of Senior Theses by faculty members, our graduate students have far fewer opportunities to develop their teaching skills than their peers at competing institutions. Many of our students turn out to be excellent teachers, but their CVs cannot testify to this fact, and this can have a deleterious impact on their success on the job market. The importance of teaching is not simply professionalization (although that is important); a central ideal of the research university is that research benefits from close interaction with teaching, and vice versa — a positive feedback that our faculty experiences regularly. This intimate connection is especially true in the Humanities, in which the teaching is very hands-on and requires lengthy contact hours both in and outside of class to produce the best student outcomes.

Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the University think creatively about how to deploy the tremendous intellectual potential of these younger scholars, for their own benefit as well as for those of the undergraduates and faculty. Expansion of more large gateway lecture courses in the Humanities (IX.B below) will afford greater opportunities to precept, opportunities which have been restricted due to the proliferation of smaller seminars among the Humanities Departments. We also recommend that the University explore the creation of either Preceptorships for advanced graduate students or a series of "pre-postdocs," structured so that these advanced students are not in competition for teaching positions with their colleagues earlier in the graduate program (analogous to the Berkeley Connect program at the University of California-Berkeley). In the case of the pre-post docs, this will enable faculty to co-teach with our most talented students, enhancing faculty mentorship opportunities and injecting enthusiasm and vitality into the

pedagogical environment. (The Sophie and Edward L. Cotsen Faculty Fellowship incorporates such cooperative graduate teaching right now, and might serve as a model.)

C. Interdisciplinarity

As signaled throughout this report, interdisciplinary conversations and study are an essential part of academic research in the Humanities (as, indeed, they are in all four divisions of the University). Princeton currently offers several interdisciplinary programs directed to undergraduate students, who can earn certificates in fields ranging from Gender and Sexuality Studies and African-American Studies to area studies, languages and literatures, and the creative arts. Faculty collaboration across Departments is also very common and productive. The segment of the Princeton community which has been most constrained within the traditional organization of academic study into Departments has been the graduate students, a situation which has increasingly chafed at their intellectual ambitions.

The Task Force recommends encouraging Departments to think creatively about offering more opportunities for interdisciplinary study and collaboration, ranging from giving credit for a greater diversity of courses taken in other Departments, to offering interdisciplinary certificates (on the pattern of the undergraduate certificates) to help students develop research and teaching credentials in diverse areas. Several such programs already exist: the Center for African-American Studies, the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies, and the Program in the History of Science, among others, offer such certificates. These need not be formally established through the Graduate School, but rather administered by individual Departments and Programs.

Aside from pedagogy and credentialing, these interdisciplinary collaborations would work synergistically with the Humanities Institute: as we stressed in I.B above, the graduate body are particularly keen to see a common space at the heart of campus where they can meet and interact informally. Interdisciplinary fellows — possibly recipients of

the competitive sixth-year fellowships proposed above — could be granted space in the new Institute, bringing graduate students into the core of interdisciplinary Humanities activity on campus. Princeton has a model in place in the Social Sciences: the PIIRS Graduate Fellows, who share a large office in Aaron Burr Hull and participate in an interdisciplinary colloquium. In the process, the graduate students — often thinking ahead of the faculty — will help mark out particular interdisciplinary areas that would be important to invest in for the coming generation (as has already become clear for Film and Media Studies).

VIII. Internationalization

The Humanities have a vital role to play in the university's fulfilment of the values enshrined in its unofficial motto, which in 1996 was revised from "Princeton in the Nation's Service" to "Princeton in the Nation's Service and in the Service of All Nations." The study of other languages and cultures is central to the mission of virtually all of the Humanities. Even the study of the multicultural society and history of the United States cannot be disentangled from its international context, and the University should take seriously a commitment to experience of other cultures within the United States as part of consciousness-raising among our students, to whom a Navaho reservation or an Appalachian community are potentially as foreign as London or Singapore. The Humanities, in collaboration with other divisions, must be closely involved in the university's development of its role in internationalization.

"Princeton in the World," unveiled in October 2007 by then-President Shirley Tilghman and then-Provost Christopher Eisgruber, laid out the principles that should guide Princeton's increasing commitment to an international role, and we are very much in sympathy with the broad themes and specific recommendations of that document (<http://www.princeton.edu/reports/globalization-20071017/>). Again, we are in sympathy with the findings of the university's "Decennial Accreditation Report", with its focus on the special topic of "International Initiatives" (<http://www.princeton.edu/strategicplan/files/Self-Study-Report-Princeton-University.pdf>). We have been in touch with the Regional Studies Task Force since September 2014, and we are in accord on the main issues which have emerged so far.

The situation is fluid at the moment, and it would be premature for us to make systematic recommendations for internationalization in education and research while other groups (Regional Studies Task Force; Task Force on the Future of the Graduate School) are actively considering these issues, while the Task Force on General Education has only just begun meeting, and when the recently appointed Vice Provost for International Affairs and Operations, Anastasia Vrachnos, has only recently arrived on campus. Yet we

wish to reaffirm the commitment of the Humanities community to certain key ideas that have been in the air for some time, many of which are already clearly presented in the Decennial Accreditation Report.

1) Significant International Experience is crucial to the development of the university's overall mission. Further, SIE is clearly a transformative experience for many of our undergraduates, as shown in the statistics in "Background Data for Academic Task Forces" and as also documented by the *Accreditation Report* (p. 28).

Strikingly, a very high percentage of the students from all four years who commented on the importance of various experiences abroad (study/internship/independent research experience abroad) said that it was extremely or very important (between 56% and 65% for Juniors and Seniors, rising to 69% for Juniors commenting on study abroad: Fig. 1, using data collected in 2011, 2012, and 2013). The only other category of academic experience in the same range is the senior thesis, which 61% of Juniors and 60% of Seniors considered extremely or very important.

Again, when alumni from the classes of 2003 and 2004 were asked, from the perspective of five and ten years after graduation, "how much has each experience contributed to your professional development" in terms of "the skills, knowledge and experiences associated with each", these three forms of experience abroad were ranked as "extremely or very significant" by a higher percentage of alumni who had had one of those experiences than any other Princeton experience apart from the senior thesis and an internship in the US. Of the ten-year cohort, for example, 51% of those with experience of study abroad ranked it as extremely or very significant, compared to 50% for an internship in the US and 54% for the senior thesis (Fig. 2).

Even break trips connected to individual courses are potentially transformative for undergraduates, introducing them to more ambitious overseas opportunities, and the Princeton Humanities Institute should have the resources to fund such trips.

At the moment, students from affluent backgrounds regularly travel and vacation abroad on the basis of their families' own resources. Princeton has an obligation to make the experience of travel abroad available also to first generation students and students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, so that they have the opportunity to benefit from experiencing other cultures and perspectives at first hand.

2) Front-line Humanities faculty need to be actively engaged in planning such initiatives and in teaching courses with international content. Humanities departments and programs typically mount well over half of the university's non-language courses with international content, yet it is a cause for some concern that the percentage of those courses taught by faculty has been gradually declining from over 70% to just over 50% since 2008-2009, with lecturers and visitors taking up the slack.

3) The Princeton Humanities Institute would play a role, in particular through collaboration with the very dynamic PIIRS, in fostering international teaching and research. The University community must work together to create spaces in which participants from a range of divisions interact in international projects and initiatives involving faculty, graduate and undergraduate students—through research communities, regional studies programs, etc. The Humanities neither should nor can operate in isolation here.

4) For such cooperation to work there must be a planning framework in place. There is already a great deal of interest and activity on campus directed towards international initiatives of all kinds. At the moment, departments organize virtually all study abroad, as a reflection of the traditionally strong role of departments at Princeton (*Accreditation Report*, pp. 27-8). On the one hand, this reflection of the interest and energy of faculty and students is very heartening, and shows how interest in internationalization is coming from the ground up, from the enthusiasm of local units. On the other hand, it is desirable to have a framework in place to provide overall strategic planning, allow coordination and avoid reduplication of effort.

We therefore endorse the *Accreditation Report*'s emphasis on the importance of coordination and leadership (pp. 12-13, 15, 21-2). There needs to be a clear chain of command, presumably leading back to CITR, the only obvious existing body (*Accreditation Report*, p. 15), that can juggle the various demands and keep a line between "Princeton in the World" and "the World in Princeton". Such a framework would enable easier cooperation between PIIRS, HUM and WWS.

5) We affirm that, in an increasingly international world, language learning is crucial "as a fundamental dimension of educating culturally competent students" (*Accreditation Report*, p. 12). Accordingly, a robust language requirement must be part of the university's commitment to that goal (below, IX.E). The University should continue to explore the provision of minority languages through consortia and other forms of cooperative and online learning.

6) We support the suggestion of the *Accreditation Report* that the University should actively explore a new semester study abroad program, giving Princeton credit, "taught as a series of three four-week courses (or possibly four three-week courses for students with already sufficient language skills)" (p. 29).

7) We are in favor of calendar reform, with Fall semester examining complete by Winter Recess, not least because it would enable a "January term", which would provide a highly convenient opening for SIE without impinging on scheduled classes and activities.

8) We support the "Princeton in the World" model of a "light footprint" for Princeton courses abroad, avoiding elaborate satellite campuses, and building on our existing international connections and collaborations. There is a wide range of possibilities within the term "light footprint", and some minimal bricks and mortar may sometimes be necessary; but we do not endorse following the colony-model of some of our peers.

IX. General Education for AB Undergraduates and the Humanities

A. Double Majors

The single most effective means of increasing enrollments in humanities courses at Princeton, as well as increasing the overall number of humanities majors, would be to allow AB students to graduate in two subjects—in other words, to complete a double major. The Task Force therefore strongly recommends that the University offer AB students the option of a double (or “secondary”) major as soon as possible. We do not, however, make this recommendation just in order to boost humanities numbers. This step would meet a real need among many undergraduates in a range of disciplines, and it would enhance the cause of the liberal arts on campus in general, making it possible for students to work to a high level in more than one subject of compelling interest, so that they may adapt to a globalizing and increasingly interdisciplinary world. The double major would be beneficial for students who wish to maintain a committed devotion to the natural sciences, for example, even as they develop alternative intellectual interests.

Princeton students are clearly eager to engage in demanding academic work in multiple disciplines. They often complete several certificates, some of which require significant coursework approximating a “minor” at other schools. Some students even complete two senior theses, although the second thesis is nowhere acknowledged on their transcript. The double major will allow students with multiple areas of interest to do this work more fully and to be recognized for their accomplishments.

Most students will not pursue a double major, however, and the certificate programs will remain an attractive option. But of those who do pursue a second major, we expect that many will be in the humanities, as they are at our peer institutions. We also anticipate that the road to a double major will entail enrollment in certificate courses, so that there would be negligible impact on certificate enrollments. If anything, more students would

be drawn to these courses/paths as a part of fulfilling the requirements of the major (and departments should be encouraged to cross-list courses with interdisciplinary programs).

Despite the decline of humanities concentrators in favor of social sciences and engineering, and the undeniable forces pushing students toward “utilitarian” subjects, even as early as high school, there is strong evidence that student interest in the arts and humanities persists, particularly at Princeton (see III.A). We are certain that many Princeton students will welcome the double major and the freedom that it offers them to pursue their intense interests in the humanities, participate in a humanistic intellectual community, and learn those methodologies.

Princeton clearly attracts and admits the very best students, but the opportunity to complete a double major at Princeton may well be an added attraction in the recruitment process. Currently, with the exception of one ([Harvard](#)), all our direct peer institutions ([Chicago](#), [Columbia](#), [Penn](#), [Stanford](#), and [Yale](#)), allow their students to double major. Nationally, the past decade has seen a dramatic increase in double majors in the humanities. The Humanities Indicators at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences reports that from 2003 to 2013 the number of bachelors students in American colleges and universities completing a second major in a humanities subject almost doubled to 23,668 (an increase of 46.3%). We believe that this figure points to an interest in the humanities among students who for one reason or another choose a major in another area and that Princeton should offer its students the opportunity to accomplish this academic work. (And, of course, when implemented, humanities departments should make sure that these second majors are counted when majors are tallied.)

In our opinion, completing a double major does not conflict with completing the “Quintessentially Princeton” requirement of the senior thesis. The Task Force fully supports the requirement that every Princeton student write a senior thesis. Because researching and writing two senior theses in the final year could make this double majoring very difficult (although not impossible, as numerous students currently write two theses, an academic and a creative one), we propose that the university should find a

creative solution here, that will retain the Senior Thesis requirement without mandating a Senior Thesis for every major, and that will be as consistent as possible across the different departments and divisions. For instance, students could do a senior thesis in their “primary” majors while doing coursework in their “secondary” major, or with permission they could write theses combining their two majors. The key is to offer some flexibility with requirements and electives. Further, Junior Independent Work is an important element of preparation for the Senior Thesis, so we need to consider the implications of the double major for the Junior as well as the Senior year.

In sum, a double major will allow students to obtain the full credit for their work and will make for better, more well-rounded students who can fulfill their academic passions.

B. New Gateway Courses into the Humanities

As noted in the Introduction, the Humanities are doing a good job of drawing in undergraduates who arrive at Princeton without planning on majoring in the Humanities. But the overall trend in numbers of majors is gradually downward over the last decade, and all departments need to take active steps to attract students. In addition to the other measures we recommend, we urge the Humanities faculty to offer a more varied and more visible series of Gateway courses. These courses should be designed to welcome large numbers of students, especially students in their first two years, exposing many of them early on to the principles, perspectives, and rewards of humanistic inquiry, and effectively capturing the interest of those who may not have found that upper-level courses provide a compelling entry into these disciplines. It is likely that there is large, untapped interest in the Humanities among the undergraduate population, and that students are not finding adequate point of entry into our concentrations, certificates, and upper-level courses. We propose that departments create more appealing introductory courses to provide this entry point.

The figures suggest that one of the more urgent tasks for Humanities departments on campus is to reach out to incoming students whose interests remain undecided or who may have been underexposed in high school to humanistic inquiry. Gateway courses offering a broad point of entry into the Humanities could take a number of different forms, ranging from freshman seminars on popular topics and writing seminars with a humanistic focus to revamped introductory departmental courses and interdisciplinary sequences or “blockbuster” courses. Whatever form they take, many faculty regard such offerings as a “top priority” and see them as a “crucial” and “essential” initiative, stressing the need for “big humanities courses” capable of catering to and attracting students from across departments. Beyond serving as gateway courses for future concentrators, they would also fulfill the need—expressed by a number of faculty—for offering a general education in the humanities.

This recalibration of course offerings might well be achieved in part at the departmental level, through strictly local initiatives. But PHI could offer interdepartmental coordination, institutional encouragement, individual incentives for instructors, and financial support for course development.

Gateway Courses should ideally fulfill general education requirements, be accessible to non-humanists, attractive to first-generation students, and increase the overall number of students exposed to Humanities. They might recruit potential Humanities students (for concentrations, certificates, upper-level courses), but they might also simply incentivize non-humanists to go a bit farther. In Appendix A we give examples of how departments can reach out to undergraduates in a variety of Gateway initiatives.

C. Strengthen Existing Team-Taught Interdisciplinary Courses

Princeton already has two strong interdisciplinary gateway courses with an intense focus on the humanities, particularly literature, philosophy, and history: HUM 216-219 (Approaches to Western Culture) and HUM/EAS 233-234 (Approaches to East Asian

Culture). The Western Humanities Sequence offers first-year students an intensive, structured introduction to the liberal arts, along with close interaction with senior faculty in a wide range of humanistic disciplines. American Studies 101 is likewise a team-taught interdisciplinary course, that combines humanistic approaches with those of the social sciences.

We need to continue to build both introductory and intermediate team-taught HUM courses, together with capstone seminars, expanding the focus into non-European and non-Western fields and regions. PHI could facilitate such interdisciplinary and globally-focused courses, building on success with existing HUM courses, with a view to ensuring that some of the extremely successful courses of this kind that have been mounted in individual departments in recent years become institutionalized and provide a complement to the existing emphasis on the Western Humanities tradition.

The Task Force recommends finding inventive ways to publicize all these introductory team-taught offerings (and others to be newly developed), in effect undertaking a Humanities “public relations campaign” to make them more visible, accessible, and attractive to first-year students: these include websites, social media, faculty advising, outreach to prospective students. These initiatives have already had success in boosting the Humanities Sequence, and they can be a template for new innovative team-taught interdisciplinary course that have a more explicitly global perspective, drawing on the many other world traditions that are currently not covered by our offerings

Unfortunately, space constraints have in the past meant that Humanistic Studies 216-219 sometimes had to turn away students who are enthusiastically committed to the humanities. Even when admitted, structural considerations can make it difficult for seriously interested students to fit the year-long course into their schedules. The Council of the Humanities has already done away with selective admission and opened the course to sophomores; we are working with Admissions to publicize the course effectively to prospective students, and are working with the Dean of the College to inform first-year advisors accurately about the goals and structure of the course. Success to date is

spectacular: instead of 36 freshmen enrolled in HUM 216-219 in Fall 2014, we now have 60 in Fall 2015, the maximum that the current staffing allows us to manage.

Reconfigure the HUM writing assignments so that the year-long Sequence satisfies the University's general education requirement in writing. This would be the single most effective way to increase enrollment, as it removes the major obstacle facing students who wish to enroll in HUM or to continue into the spring: the requirement to take the separate, additional writing-intensive course during the first year. This requirement poses an obstacle for three reasons:

- The Writing Seminar often necessitates a five-course spring semester. Adding a fifth writing-intensive course to the already heavy reading and writing demands of the Sequence can be a deterrent, especially for retention into the spring. This is especially true for students taking an intensive language course (eg, FRE 102/7 or Turbo Latin) or other time-consuming courses (eg, engineers or science students).
- The Writing Seminar often forces students to choose between taking the HUM sequence and a writing-oriented Freshman Seminar in either term, as it is difficult to do both along with a Writing Seminar (and the Dean of the College explicitly advises against it).
- Finally, given the many scheduling conflicts posed by a double-credit year-long course, and by Princeton's uniquely compressed teaching day, students in HUM end up with fewer choices about which Writing Seminar to take, sometimes finding themselves assigned to writing courses that would not have been a top first choice. Recent attempts to connect the "content" of HUM and WRI were unsuccessful, with students feeling that the readings were repetitive while the writing assignments were completely disconnected.

For all these reasons, the Task Force unanimously and vigorously recommends that the HUM sequence satisfy the writing requirement. This will require HUM to incorporate additional writing modules to ensure that the goals and skills of the writing requirement

are satisfied over the course of the year. A precedent for this kind of substitution is the integrated science program, the other intensive, interdisciplinary first-year course at Princeton, which serves as the “moral equivalent” of other major University requirements.

Increase the international component of HUM courses. The HUM community continues into the sophomore year with a break trip to Greece, which has been a great success, and for the first time a break trip to Rome will take place in Fall recess of 2015; the Task Force recommends that the Humanistic Studies program incorporate additional international components, and PHI in general could help develop courses with a built-in Fall or Spring Recess international dimension.

Develop the new HUM certificate’s role as a magnet for students majoring in other divisions (eg, WWS, COS, NEU, PSY) but who want to do serious work in the humanities and want to be part of a humanities community.

The East Asian Humanities Sequence 233-234 requires a long-term investment in the course by regular faculty in the department. A new digital component introduced last year has been extremely successful. These innovations should be supported and continued (and publicized), as should the new film/media component that was recently introduced in the second semester.

We shall need institutional support for such cross-departmental collaboration in teaching, and also research. We give examples of possible collaborative initiatives in Appendix B; these recommendations overlap in part with our recommendations concerning the Princeton Humanities Institute (IV.F).

E. Language Study for all Princeton AB Students

Faculty in the Humanities are unanimous in stressing the importance of foreign language study to their fields. The ability to access artistic works, historical documents, and

scholarly research in a foreign language, as well as to engage with speakers of that language, tends to be an absolute requirement for these disciplines. The need for advanced language skills is by no means limited to humanities disciplines. However, the resources and policies currently in place are often regarded as insufficient to provide students with the solid grounding they need in foreign languages. The language requirement is seen by many as minimalistic and perfunctory, especially given the University's ambition to become more international. Many have noted in this context that there are too few languages on offer, and that some geographical areas, notably Africa, South Asia, and South-East Asia, are underrepresented. The funding available for graduate students to study language abroad over the summer is insufficient. There has been great progress in making a Significant International Experience (SIE) available to undergraduates in recent years, but the largest growth here has been in internships abroad, rather than in semester abroad programs, which have proven to be the most transformative for students. The Marsh-Jennings *Accreditation Report*, with which we agree, recommends establishing Princeton-run semester abroad programs that could encourage growth in this area. There is a risk that the internationalization of PU could occur without proper attention to the critical importance of Foreign Languages (FLs). International Content (IC) could be provided through courses and internships entirely in English, making global citizenship a low-effort endeavor that does not require the fundamental engagement with a foreign culture which occurs when mastering a foreign language.

Beyond forming global citizens and enabling SIE, IC, and humanistic research, it should be stressed that FL is valuable in its own right, since language is not just an instrument but provides a direct encounter with another culture, worldview, system of norms, and way of life; short of an actual stay abroad, FL may be the closest a student can get on campus to experiencing immersion in a foreign culture.

The Task Force recommends that all AB undergraduates, regardless of previous skill level or native proficiency, must undertake coursework at Princeton in a foreign language. We further recommend that all AB students must complete one foreign

language course beyond the introductory level courses. In effect, this means adopting for all AB undergraduates the requirements for WWS majors, which we present here:

1. take an additional course (200 or 300 level) in the language used to meet the University requirement; either a language course or a course taught in the foreign language may be used;
2. or take a course at least at the 102 level in a language other than the one used to fulfill the University foreign language requirement.

Courses used to meet this requirement may be taken at Princeton or elsewhere; all courses must be taken on a graded basis. We note that this requirement is essentially what is in place at Yale.

F. Invest in International Experience in the Humanities

Establish term-time Semester Abroad programs geared especially towards sophomores, offering 3-4 interconnected gen. ed. courses (e.g. in Economics, History, and the Arts) taught by PU faculty, as well as a foreign language course (p. 29, Marsh-Jennings report).

Continue to work closely with PIIRS to develop the Global Seminars Program, which already has strong participation from Humanities Faculty. We do not want a separate/competing track of PHI Global seminars alongside the PIIRS ones, but a planning framework in which PHI and PIIRS could work together to create a menu over a period of years.

Incorporate student international travel into humanities courses over fall and spring break as a way to “whet the appetite” for deeper engagement abroad.

We recommend certifying on the transcript that students have engaged in a significant international experience.

Appendix A: Gateway Initiatives

The Task Force recommends the following measures:

- Increase the percentage of humanities-oriented Freshman Seminars and Writing Seminars. These should be taught by tenured humanities faculty and designed to appeal broadly to engineers, scientists, creative artists, social scientists, and humanists (e.g., Baseball, Bob Dylan, Elektra, Dante). Ideally, the humanities faculty would also serve as freshman/sophomore advisors for their students.
- Encourage departments to develop interdisciplinary 100-level introductory courses (not “core” or “major” courses) designed to appeal broadly to non-humanities students and to fulfill general education requirements (e.g., “Literature and War,” EM, with a digital humanities component). The goal is not simply quantity, however, but quality. It is often the smaller size of humanities courses and the intensity of interaction with the instructor that brings students to the humanities. The added work involved in teaching large courses (often writing-intensive) may make it necessary to provide additional incentives to instructors to teach these (especially for tenured / senior faculty): through work relief, course reductions, a weighted “point system.”
- Encourage co-teaching of interdisciplinary courses at every level.
- Establish term-time Semester Abroad programs geared especially towards sophomores, offering 3-4 interconnected general education courses (e.g. in Economics, History, and the Arts) taught by Princeton faculty, as well as a foreign language course (p. 29, Marsh-Jennings *Accreditation Report*).
- Weave international perspectives and solutions into synthetic, comparative, and interdisciplinary gateway courses offered in the first two years of study.
- Develop a stronger humanities component and humanities advising in the Freshman Scholars Institute.
- Increase the number of high school students who are selected for summer humanities/journalism programs on campus. Create more opportunities to build

the perception among parents and high school students and counselors that Princeton is a place for humanistic study.

- Expand the HUM Sequence while creating additional team-taught courses to serve a broader constituency of potential humanists:

- a broadening of genres (film/media) as well as geography and culture (this is already happening with HUM/EAS sequence which has new digital and film components);

- a blockbuster HUM 101 for scientists and social scientists;

- a “global” Humanities sequence emphasizing zones of cultural contact (eg, Empire, Terrorism, Globalization, Migration, Bioethics)

Appendix B: Initiatives for cross-departmental collaboration in teaching and research

- Invest more resources and FTE in interdisciplinary programs
- Invite faculty to initiate multi-year collaborative proposals for research projects or for new “Course Clusters,” which would span divisions and involve new pedagogies, new courses, and new research (eg, Environmental Humanities; Digital Humanities; Medical Humanities; Urban Humanities)
- Encourage new pedagogies (eg, atelier-like courses that match an artist with a humanities scholar; performance components; “lab” learning in humanities; teamwork-based learning; integration of “field study”)
- Encourage more cross-listing of courses
- Sustain the Edwards Collective for the Arts and Humanities at Mathey College, which connects intellectual passions with residential experience and builds a humanities community. The Collective had 80 applicants for 15-16 (despite the unattractive building) and has been a real success in its first two years. Other residential colleges could consider similar initiatives.

Appendix C: The Current Remit and Activities of the Council of the Humanities

Princeton's Council of the Humanities undertakes most of the typical "humanities center" activities in some form:

- o **Website calendar and email newsletter** (new last year), **brochures/publicity**
- o **Endowed lectures** (Gauss, Faber, Belknap)
 - o **Grants/awards** (General funds, Magic, Stewart)
- o **Faculty seminars** (Spring 2015, "Historical Linguistics")
- o **Facilitated meetings of Humanities chairs and directors**
 - o **Visiting Faculty Fellows** (Oates, Stewart, Class of 1932, Old Dominion, Thorp)
- o **Internal Fellowships** (Behrman and Old Dominion Faculty Fellows; Undergraduate Behrman Society of Fellows)
 - o **Research Professorships** (Old Dominion Professors)
 - o **Postdoctoral Fellows** (Digital Humanities; Society of Fellows; Princeton and Slavery project; Law and Public Affairs Fellow; Stewart Postdoc in Religion; Lapidus Research Fellow, etc)
 - o **Working and Reading Groups** held in departments
 - o **Interdisciplinary Conversations** (Looking at an Object; Avant-Garde Workshop)
- o **Science/humanities Collaborations**
 - o **Team-taught Courses**
 - o **Interdisciplinary Certificates** (grad and undergrad)
 - o **Meeting spaces for lectures** (East Pyne 010), receptions (Rotunda), and seminars (Joseph Henry House)

In addition to these "center" activities, Princeton's Council has a much broader purview than its counterparts nationally: it also directly administers about 14

interdisciplinary and academic programs. Each one of the Council's program managers supports multiple programs and departmental/academic work: FTE budgets, program budgets, teaching appointments, course listings, faculty searches, certificate tracking/advising, thesis workshops, information sessions, etc. In addition, the staff manages a large and growing number of events for each of the programs. Nine of these programs involve FTE, significant programming, and curriculum development:

American Studies

Interdisciplinary PhD Program in the Humanities

European Cultural Studies

Medieval Studies

Program in the Ancient World

Renaissance Studies

Linguistics

Humanistic Studies

Journalism

Considerable energy, staff time, and resources go to supporting these nine growing programs, projecting complex FTE budgets, and supporting their directors—developing courses, advising students, recruiting faculty, advising on directorships, building certificate programs, hosting events, running searches, appointing postdocs and visiting fellows, and managing staff and budgets. Journalism and Humanistic Studies in particular require significant staff support. In addition, the Council is closely connected with the Society of Fellows, providing significant postdoctoral funding and sharing three support staff.

The Council is also the primary home for a second tier of programs that do not offer courses but do host events, committees, trips, and working groups, and require substantial administrative support, funding, and oversight:

Committee for Film Studies
Fund for Irish Studies
Canadian Studies
Italian Studies
Media and Modernity
Political Philosophy
Committee for the Study of Late Antiquity
Classical Philosophy

Finally, a third tier of programs “participates” in the Council, which supports their efforts and has strong curricular and programmatic connections with their work. But they are almost entirely independent in terms of funding and staff. The Council chair is an *ex officio* member of the executive committees and often oversees the process of recommending directors for Dean of the Faculty appointment:

East Asian Studies
 Center for Digital Humanities
Judaic Studies
Gender and Sexuality Studies
 Hellenic Studies
Latin American Studies
Near Eastern Studies
Princeton-Mellon Initiative in Architecture, Urbanism, and the Humanities
University Center for Human Values

Many regional studies programs are considered affiliates of the Council and are included in open meetings; others are not, probably because they were added more recently (eg, South Asian Studies, Center for Iran and Persian Gulf Studies).

Last year, we added the Lewis Center for the Arts as a participating member of the Council at their request. The Art Museum has expressed interest in participating as a member.

Appendix D: President's Charge to the Task Force on the Future of the Humanities

The humanities remain at the vital core of Princeton's mission, essential both to this University's commitment to scholarship that enables us to better understand the human condition and to its goal of providing students with an education that not only prepares them for satisfying vocations but also forms and deepens them as individuals and as contributors to society. At a time when technology offers dazzling new possibilities and cultures collide in ways both exciting and dangerous, the humanities provide crucial insight into what matters in life, into the character of civilization, and into the capacity—and the limits—of people's ability to understand societies different from their own. Yet, despite the urgent need for humanistic understanding in an era of rapid change and cultural disequilibrium, the humanities find themselves criticized at colleges and universities across the country because of budget cuts and calls for short-term accountability. These developments elsewhere make it all the more important that Princeton, where the place of the humanities is secure, place a leadership role in the future of the field, through both the scholarship that it generates and the students whom it educates.

To meet that challenge, the University will have to choose initiatives wisely. Over the last two decades, Princeton has invested heavily in infrastructure for the humanities, first with the renovation of East Pyne and Chancellor Green and then with the renovation of Firestone Library. Princeton has also created important new programs, including the fabulously successful Society of Fellows, the Center for African-American Studies, and the interdisciplinary doctoral program in the humanities.

With the Firestone renovation past its midpoint and scheduled to conclude in 2018, and with Green Hall projected to be used for the humanities in the future, the time has come to consider the needs, challenges, and opportunities that lie ahead. Numerous possibilities for investment have been mentioned, including media studies, a humanities center, new programs in cultural or area studies, or simply more support for existing programs or

departments. The University cannot pursue all of these possibilities, and it will be essential to prioritize goals so that Princeton's initiatives in the humanities are both successful and significant.

To that end, we would like the committee to answer the following questions:

1. What are Princeton's strengths and weaknesses in the humanities? How do Princeton's programs compare to those at peer institutions?
2. What are the most important trends, challenges, and opportunities affecting the humanities today, and how should Princeton respond to them?
3. How do the departments and programs in the humanities currently collaborate with the Lewis Center for the Arts? With the Princeton Art Museum? With the Princeton Library? With interdepartmental programs? With some of these collaborations?
4. What are the highest priority initiatives that Princeton should undertake to extend its leadership in humanities and education? To what extent does Princeton have opportunities to reallocate existing resources to supplement any new investments it might make on behalf of these initiatives?
5. How best can Princeton ensure the excellence and impact of its undergraduate and graduate teaching programs in the humanities?
6. How should Princeton define and evaluate the success of its initiatives in the humanities?