

**Committee on Education Policy
Undergraduate Program Review**

**Department of Communication
University of California San Diego
April 15-16, 2010**

Introduction

The Committee on Education Policy (CEP) appointed an Undergraduate (UG) Review Committee for the Department of Communication, which met on April 15 and 16, 2010. We were briefed with review material in advance, including a letter dated June 22, 2009 from the Chair of CEP to the Chair of Communication informing the Department of the content and context of the review, a self-assessment of the UG Program by Professors Hartouni and Hallin of the Department (dated December, 2009), and a variety of supporting materials. These included Departmental resource profiles, funding summaries, scheduling and enrollment data, teaching statistics, faculty and student demographics, degree completion times, college enrollment information, undergraduate experience surveys, etc. In addition, we received a copy of the previous review (from 2003), the Department's response and the one-year follow-up report.

On April 16, the Review Committee met with the Chair and Directors of UG advising, permanent faculty, the MSO and UG advising staff member, lecturers and teaching assistants, UG students and three College Deans of Academic Advising. The following day, the Review Committee met again with the Chair and one Director of UG advising for an initial debriefing. This was followed by the exit interview which also included the Associate Vice-Chancellor (UG Education), the Divisional Dean, Associate Chancellor (Academic Affairs) and a representative of the Academic Senate Office.

The Department of Communication

The field of communication, in general, is an interdisciplinary one, frequently combining perspectives, theories, and methods from a variety of the human sciences. This is evident across the leading programs in the country, such as USC, Penn, and UMass. The Communication Department at UCSD rightly holds a position of high esteem within such national groupings, as well as internationally.

The Department is in many ways a heterodox department, even in the context of an unusual discipline, in that it has largely eschewed (a) the vocational orientations of journalism school, film school, public relations, marketing, and the communication of public-interest messages, (b) quantitative methods of media-effects research and mass communication more generally, and (c) rhetoric, forensics, and debating emphases of speech communication.

Instead, the department has followed a unique blend of qualitative social method, textual analysis, cognitive science, media history, cultural studies, political economy, performance, production, and public policy. This is done across the qualitative social sciences, the humanities, and the arts. Teaching, production, and research are designed to articulate together. Courses seek to blend skills and approaches that are more often taught separately: method, theory, history, and production.

As part of its self-reflexive ethos, the Department engages in regular self-scrutiny and revision of its offerings, in accordance with changes in: the faculty it loses and hires, the fields it draws upon, and dramatic shifts in the technologies that it both studies and uses for teaching and research.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Department

The UCSD Communication Dept is an interdisciplinary program, with faculty from many disciplines. This heterogeneity has posed significant challenges for the integration of the faculty and courses. Newer faculty, hired from many disciplines and sub-fields, frequently study media and related topics in other parts of the world, using methods and

topics that are comparative and global. The strengths of this approach are clear: continuity through decades of successful work, adaptability due both to faculty changes and the openness of the senior professoriate to new and different approaches, dynamism in the ongoing interdisciplinary dialogs that ensue, and responsiveness to a shifting external environment of student aptitude and interest.

On the other side of the coin, some weaknesses exist. For example, the heterodox nature of the Department means that outsiders (and some insiders) remain somewhat uncertain and unclear about its boundaries and emphases. Moreover, use of the name 'communication' and the boons and burdens of history and understanding that this term carries, imply certain things—quite reasonably—to parents, students, and administrators that are at variance from what is actually done at UCSD. Finally, the Department may need to consider its mission not only in terms of its own sense of sovereignty and legitimacy, but also in the light of the name under which it chooses to travel, and the desires routinely and forcefully expressed by its students, as disclosed in the comments made in the College Advising Deans' survey.

Unlike many other communication departments that emphasize vocational skills development, the UC San Diego department has developed a decidedly theoretical and critical approach to the field of communication. The Department has established a well-deserved reputation in the US for its distinctive approach. We see this as a major departmental strength. The Advisory Committee noted a number of general points regarding the Department. Foremost, we got the impression of a dedicated department that presents a united front, with UG teaching at the forefront of its mission. Communication within the department (between faculty, lectures, TA and students) seemed good.

However, students entering the program are not always aware of the theoretical and analytic orientation of the Department. Many students expect a more practical orientation, one that will prepare them for broadcasting, journalism, public relations,

media production, etc. While the Department takes considerable effort to educate students—on their website, at admit day, and at orientations, apparently even more attention needs to be made to inform students of the special orientation of this Department.

The manner in which the department distributes temporary and permanent faculty to course offerings is distinctive and laudatory. Unlike many departments on campus that allocate temporary faculty to introductory courses, Communication assigns senior permanent faculty to introductory and capstone courses. Temporary faculty—including ABD students and temporary lecturers—teach specialty courses at the upper-division level. This policy is commendable, because it exposes students to senior scholars who are notables in their fields, and have considerable experience teaching. This policy is also advantageous because it enables advanced graduate students and temporary faculty to teach courses in their areas of expertise, rather than being asked to teach courses that cover the broad spectrum of the field—a skill that does not often come easily to beginning instructors.

However, we worry that this distribution of resources cannot be sustained, especially in light of the budget crisis, the solution to which is predicated on the reduction of resources. We noted that information contained in the Department's Overview of the UG Program, the total number of classes taught (2009-10) was 98 divided between 48 faculty and 50 temporary lecturers. These figures prompted two remarks: (1) is the current model of such a weighting sustainable in light of on-going and possible future financial constraints, and (2) if the stated number of FTEs is 23.2 for 2009/2010, then the average UG course load for each faculty member is apparently close to 2. On this latter point, we were reassured by follow-up correspondence with the chair that other factors were at play – namely, teaching relief for junior faculty, relief and reward for large classes, sabbaticals, teaching at other departments, faculty buy-outs, etc. – and indeed the average faculty teaching load was indeed closer to 3 UG and 1 graduate-level class. On the former issue, we were left to wring our hands, along with the department, in hoping for the best but planning for the worst (such as 10-15% cuts).

The Department caters to a large and growing number of UG students. Enrollments for this academic year are over 1,800, with almost half declaring Communication as their Major. The Department suffers from a severe understaffing in undergraduate advising. One of the two departmental undergraduate advisors recently retired, and there is no provision for replacing this person. Thus, one person is advising close to 900 Majors. This is an untenable situation that will wear down even the extremely capable advisor. Provisions must be made to hire a full-time replacement at the same (or higher level) than the person who recently retired.

The Curriculum

The field of Communication taught by the Department is divided into four main areas of inquiry: Communication and Culture (COCU), Communication and the Person (COHI), Communication as a Social Force (COSF), and Media Practice (COMT). Undergraduate students are guided through the Major by having to take two lower-division prerequisites: Introduction to Communication (COGN 20) and Methods of Media (COGN 21). If students want to pursue work in media production, they must take COGN 22, which is a lab counterpart of COGN 21. Following completion of these classes, majors must complete the following upper-division prerequisites: COSF 100, COCU 100 and COHI 100. Only after completion of these sets of prerequisites can majors take upper-division electives which appeal to their interests. A total of 9 are required, at least one of which must fall under the three major curricular areas (COHI, COCU and COSF). One media methods course (COMT) is required to fulfill the media production requirement. A senior seminar (COGN 150) is required to complete the program.

On the first day of our review, the Review Committee was given a copy of a document from the UG Curriculum Committee entitled 'Curricular Reform Based on Faculty and Graduate Student Survey Data.' The Faculty had received a copy one day before we received our copy. The document set about discussing curricular priorities for the Department with a proposed overhaul of the UG curriculum both in scope and

organization. For example, there was discussion about organizing new core courses (the role of the present 100 series) to be relevant to all courses on offer: this would then lead to ‘concentrations’ in five possible areas. In part, the new curriculum document was formulated to address some of the perceived shortcoming of the present curriculum. For our present review, it is important to note that we addressed the current curriculum—its successes and its weaknesses.

Strengths/weaknesses of the Curriculum

The small number of students we interviewed was generally supportive of the aims of the present curriculum set-up of having introductory (prerequisite) classes which formed a common background for the student body, prior to more specialization with upper-division electives. They lauded the theoretical, inquiry-driven approach of the present curriculum as opposed to other, more vocation-based, degrees. However, practical concerns were voiced, particularly regarding a perception of ‘bottlenecks’ and ‘unfairness’ in the present curriculum. Both these points were echoed by faculty.

We examined the issue of ‘bottlenecks’ in the curriculum. The consensus on ‘bottlenecks’ is that they owe their existence to the requirements of having to take the pre-requisites before embarking on the upper-division electives. This could be an acute problem for transfer students, given the lack of articulation between community college offerings and the Department’s curriculum. The present solution to alleviate this issue was to offer the prerequisite classes more often: 5 times a year for COGN 20, with twice-yearly offerings of most of the other required courses.

However, based on the department’s record for advancing students to the degree, there does not seem (to us) to be bottlenecks. The Department’s time-to-degree average is better than the campus average. Whereas the campus average in 2007-2008 for Freshmen was 12.9 quarters, the Communication Department average for this same period of time was 11.8 quarters. A similar pattern exists for transfer students. Thus, a major rationale given by faculty for modifying the existing curriculum was not obvious to us.

The review committee also took up a perceived injustice on the part of some students who felt that their progress through the program was hindered by the current approach of first having to complete a rigid set of prerequisites. This was leading to students petitioning to waive prerequisite requirements for some classes—which seemed to be granted on an ad-hoc basis by the Department—causing resentment by those students who had satisfied prior requirements. This may be a legitimate cause of concern and one which the Department needs to address.

Let us state upfront that we were pleased that the faculty decided to share the draft of a new proposed curriculum with us. In light of the prior discussion, it may well be that an intellectual reason needs to come to the fore if there are going to be wholesale changes to curriculum. The discussion document emphasized the need for new media forms and developments to be incorporated in all course offerings. This was viewed as a laudable aim by the Review Committee, but the reform document was short on specifics, particularly in light of financial constraints imposed by the current budget crisis and the likelihood of fewer future resources, perhaps coupled with a decrease in the number of courses which would be available to students. In this respect, a decrease in the number of upper division classes required to graduate would seem a sensible option, and one which is presently under consideration.

One of the unique features of the present curriculum was that the large prerequisite classes were taught by permanent faculty. As mentioned previously, this is viewed by the Review Committee as an extremely positive feature. However, one of the aims of the classes—to give a broad introduction to the subject area—was somewhat diminished by the rotation policy, using different instructors who appear to place different emphasis on the subject matter. Students commented that the core seemed to be defined more by the instructor as opposed to the subject matter. If this is the case, why call the subject a core?

One aspect of the current curriculum which generated animated student discussion was smaller classes which increased professor-student interaction. Seminars, 198/199 classes,

practicum classes were seen in a very positive light. Visiting lectures and alumni involvement were viewed in a similar light. The Department needs to be receptive to these desires.

Relationship to Campus/University

We heard from Faculty, Staff, Teaching Assistants, Lecturers, and undergraduates alike that the Department is going through turmoil over changes to the communication environment on the campus: specifically, academic speech and prose in the English language. We were told that many international students take classes in groups, with one proficient English-speaker writing papers and take-home exams on behalf of others. It was said that the TOEFL system is not working, nor are local strategies.

We heard that students become very frustrated with their lack of understanding (and consequent progress with coursework); take large lecture courses where there are take-home exams that can be worked on collaboratively; panic in upper-level classes where there are in-class exams; beg faculty to let them pass; and seek classes where they won't have to write or speak in class. This is clearly an unsatisfactory situation, for the Department and the wider university.

Moreover, Teaching Assistants spend many hours teaching students what a paper is and how to write one. We perceive these problems as a function of shifts in the wider political economy of student recruitment across the University of California system. As the system seeks more and more out-of-state tuition funding, this leads to the doubly enriching inevitability of money, culture, and learning styles from beyond the system's usual catchment area—but also generates new difficulties.

This is largely being perceived as a problem of demand: that these students are underprepared linguistically for academic study in an English-dominant Research-One school. But we see it also as a question of supply: that the University has failed to allocate resources both to assist students in English expression and to re-train faculty in a new learning environment. Countries that have moved from an endogenous to a mixed

demand of undergraduate students in the past have experienced similar problems. These are not just about the adequacy of the TOEFL system, or writing programs, or the greedy eyes of the Global North and its academic administrators: they are about a wholesale shift in pedagogy. The issue lies deeper than just with non-native speakers of English, we heard from some faculty that they perceive US-based speakers of English (as a first language) are also in need of serious assistance in essay writing.

We are aware that the colleges offer writing classes, sometimes locked into more topic-oriented settings, with offerings covering several quarters in a row. These instructors are mostly ladder-ranked faculty. Robert Horwitz from the Department is the co-director of one of these programs, but others from the department seem absent. We heard that the Department of Literature prevents students taking classes until they have passed these college courses. Communication does not require this of students, and transfer students are waived the requirement to take college writing courses. A possible solution would be to restrict upper division classes until college-writing requirements have been satisfied. We stress, however, that this is a campus-wide, indeed system-wide issue, that must be addressed with resources allocated that are commensurate with the changes in income expected from the new group of student stakeholders. These resources should include more robust support for new students, but also re-training for faculty in the new norms of their trade.

Recommendations

In addition to general recommendations encapsulated within the above remarks, we would like to draw attention to the following specific points:

1. The Department needs to help non-native English speakers (plus some native speakers) get the most out of their time in the Communication Department. One possibility would be to consider adopting the writing model employed by the Department of Literature.
2. Communication between the Department and community colleges is recommended concerning the possibility of pre-empting required pre-requisites. Transfer students are a vital (and expanding) part of the student body and, as such,

- would benefit from any preparation prior to admission to facilitate a smooth transition.
3. Department should consider lessening the variation in instruction when compulsory courses are required and taught by different instructors. The Department needs to discuss the concept of core classes.
 4. The Department needs to adopt a coherent policy on pre-requisites and waivers and implement this policy consistently and fairly.
 5. The undergraduate advising load is untenable. The Department could consider redirecting some of its temporary faculty funds to hiring additional advising staff.
 6. The Department should approach the campus administration about the need to relax the rules on the number of courses that ABDs can teach.

Respectively submitted,

Tobias Miller (UC Riverside)

Bud Mehan (UCSD, Dept. Sociology)

David Hilton (UCSD, Scripps Inst. Oceanography) Chair.

Department Response to the Committee on Education Policy Undergraduate Program Review

The Department of Communication found the Committee on Education Policy Undergraduate Program Review especially useful, given that we have devoted considerable time and attention over the course of the last several years to assessing how we might overhaul our undergraduate curriculum. The department's efforts have now culminated in a proposal for curricular restructuring which we intend to submit to CEP at the beginning of Fall quarter (2011). Because this proposal anticipates and will substantively address many of the suggestions and recommendations offered in last year's program review, we will speak only briefly in this document to the half dozen or so issues about which the review committee expressed particular concern.

(1). The CEP Review noted a two-fold problem that undergraduates experience typically in their first year as majors: on one hand, many students enter the communication major expecting and/or seeking vocational rather than scholarly training in areas popularly associated with the field (for example, broadcasting, film making, journalism, public relations, public speaking, cross-cultural dispute resolution, advertising, marketing, and party planning). On the other hand, the orientation that new students *do* receive to the department's distinctive, which is to say, more theoretical and critical approach to media, appears to vary from year-to-year depending on who is teaching the major's entry level required course (COGN 20).

We are keenly aware that our new majors are sometimes confused by the nature of our course offerings and that their exposure to the department's distinct course of study in compulsory core classes may vary. With the new curriculum we will be proposing we are especially mindful of both problems. As with our current curriculum, the entry-level course proposed *in the new curriculum* will seek specifically to: (1) provide students with a general introduction to a range of communication practices filtered through the distinct theoretical/critical approach(es) of our curriculum and; (2) prepare them for (imagining) a broad range of employment opportunities in the private, government and non-profit sectors.

Moreover, once students have successfully completed the major's entry-level course, they will proceed on to three required 100 level gateway courses in which the critical/theoretical orientation of the field and department is more finely developed. *In the new curriculum*, these 100 level gateway courses have been redesigned to meet a more deliberate pedagogical focus on distinct histories, theories, methods and practices within the interdisciplinary field of critical communication. We believe that this newly redesigned set of required courses will provide students with a tighter, more coherent overview of the scholarly field. And, to sustain this coherence and ensure curricular continuity, given that it is unrealistic to expect the same permanent faculty to teach these core courses year after year (or beyond a three year period), we will be devising a template that elaborates the specific areas of focus for each core course. Having such templates and a more focalized core course curriculum will allow permanent faculty to be more easily rotated in and out of these required classes and will also provide some flexibility in using lecturers (as the CEP Review suggested might be necessary under present economic pressures).

(2). On another front, although speaking still to problems undergraduates experience in plotting their course of study through the major, Reviewers highlighted students' complaints about the department's sometimes confusing, unpredictable, and unevenly enforced system of course prerequisites. Many students (but especially our growing number of transfers) felt this system lacked a coherent rationale and, as configured, worked only to impede their progress through the major. We agree with the Review and with our students that there has been a problem: as our course offerings and student numbers have expanded and as areas of scholarly interest and expertise have shifted with the addition and separation of faculty, the logic of the prerequisite system put in place three decades ago has definitely been tested.

We have sought to address this problem in devising a new curricular structure which aims to maximize flexibility and student access to courses. In the current system, the curriculum is organized along four tracks—Culture, Social Force, Human Information Processing, and

Production. In order to enroll in upper division courses in a particular area, students have been required to first complete a general, entry level course (COGN 20) and a particular track's gateway course (either COCU 100, COSF100, or COHIP100. Production carries its own set of prerequisites). Students who failed to take the gateway 100 for a particular track in the quarter it was offered then had to matriculate during summer session or wait a full year to complete the area's required course and have access to its upper division offerings. To deal with this perceived structural impediment to their progress, students have devised often quite ingenious work-arounds. But faculty have also in effect been dismantling the prerequisite system, appearing, at least to students, to indiscriminately be granting access to some (often many) while withholding it to others.

With the new curricular structure, we have jettisoned the four distinct tracks as an organizing matrix for upper division classes. Although we will continue to require three 100 level courses, to matriculate at the upper division level—to take *any* of the upper division classes—students with standing will need to have completed only two of the three 100-level core courses (and it can be any two of the three). Moreover, for those students who have taken the entry level core course, but haven't yet completed their 100 level courses or do not have upper-division standing, we have added a range of intermediate courses that have only the completion of the introductory core course as a requirement.

According to our models, with this reorganization of the curriculum, all students (4 year and transfer alike) will be able to move with relative ease through the major and have access to the courses they need, as they need them. In addition, and in order to further facilitate time-to-degree, we have also accepted the CEP Review's recommendation to lower the number of required courses for the major: instead of 15 courses, undergraduates will now be required to complete 13 courses (12 of which will be intermediate/ upper-division).

(3). The Review endorsed the department's efforts to incorporate production broadly across the entire curriculum, but noted that we would likely find it difficult to sustain and effectively

build this component of our curriculum given the paucity of university resources in this time of economic austerity. We acknowledge this challenge and remain committed to securing additional resources and outside funding sources for production equipment and smaller classes. That said, we would also like to stress that we include in the category “production” a cornucopia of practices from writing and performance to audiovisual media making—practices, in other words that are not necessarily resource intensive. Moreover, we are finding that greater numbers of our students come to us already digitally literate with access to online open source tools; and this increased, baseline literacy has allowed us to incorporate basic production assignments even in our largest courses.

(4). A growing impediment to undergraduate success in the major is English proficiency among our international students and writing proficiency across our majors. The CEP Review framed this issue as a larger, campus wide problem with which the department must nevertheless find ways to contend. We agree with the Review’s framing and, accordingly, are encouraged by the Council of Provosts efforts toward creating a campus-wide writing center that might assist our students in meeting the demands of our classes. Still, we are cognizant that the problems posed by undergraduate reading and writing proficiency will persist in the coming years even with a campus-wide center and are strategizing accordingly. For example, we have had many faculty discussions about whether to develop and offer our own, in-house writing-intensive courses (as we once did); and we may yet develop such courses. Pursuing this approach will clearly entail a reallocation of instructional resources. How we might accomplish such a reallocation we have yet to determine especially in view of the increases we are already experiencing in our average class sizes with the cutbacks.

As an alternative to devising our own writing-intensive courses, Reviewers encouraged us to consider adopting the Department of Literature’s policy of requiring students to pass college writing requirements before matriculating in the major. Although we greeted this suggestion with interest, a closer look at Literature’s policy led us to conclude that it would not be feasible to implement given the size of our major and the administrative oversight it would require.

Moreover, following Literature's policy would place an additional, undue burden on our transfer students, which, contra the CEP Review, must meet college writing requirements before graduating. [Reviewers were under the mistaken impression that Communication waives the writing requirement for transfer students. This is incorrect.]

(5) . Finally, there were a number of issues raised by the CEP Review over how the Department's undergraduate program was administered and here we will just list the issues:

- Reviewers noted that the undergraduate program was severely understaffed with one, permanent undergraduate advisor overseeing 900+ majors and some 1800 enrollments per year. We fully agree that we need additional, permanent staff support for undergraduate advising and the department is taking steps to ensure that the advising staff will be expanded.
- Also, reviewers recommended that we work with campus administrators to relax the rules on the number of courses that ABD's can teach. This issue has been referred to the Department's graduate committee for consideration and action.
- The Review encouraged the department to pursue articulation agreements with community colleges to preempt prerequisites. However, given our unique curriculum, the need to convey this curriculum to new students, and the changes we've made in prerequisites to facilitate movement into upper division courses, we do not believe we can create preemption agreements at this time. That said, we have been in contact with community colleges to better facilitate the transfer of students into our program.
- Last, the Review suggested that given the department's unique interdisciplinary approach to the field of communication, we consider changing our name. Suffice to say, we have similarly entertained this possibility and, at least for the moment, rejected it. Many in the department have cultivated strong connections to the communication field as currently configured; and we believe, in any event, that the name continues to best encapsulate the diverse range of approaches and expertise of our faculty.

October 14, 2011

PROFESSORS DAN HALLIN, Chair
Department of Communication

SUBJECT: Academic Senate Undergraduate Program Review for the Department of Communication

Dear Professor Hallin,

The Undergraduate Council, and previously the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), is charged with conducting periodic reviews of undergraduate programs on campus. In Spring 2010, a CEP review subcommittee conducted a site visit of the undergraduate program in the Department of Communication. The subcommittee issued a report with a set of draft recommendations for the program. The Undergraduate Council considered this report and the Department's response at its October 7 meeting.

First, the Council would like to recognize the Department's thoughtful analysis of the subcommittee's recommendations. In addition, we are heartened to see that the response has included a thorough review of the undergraduate curriculum. The proposal to restructure the Department's undergraduate curriculum reflects a substantial endeavor, and the Council commends the Departments for its willingness to dedicate this amount of effort to the curriculum.

The subcommittee had six primary recommendations:

Subcommittee Recommendation #1: The Department needs to help non-native English speakers.

The Council recognizes that addressing the needs of non-native English speakers is the responsibility of individual programs and the campus. We do, however, encourage departments to take steps to strengthen the writing skills of its majors. The Department referenced possibly offering an upper division course on writing for Communication courses. This is an excellent idea, and while we recognize that resources may make it difficult for the Department to offer this course, we encourage further thought on this proposal. We note that the College Writing Center is expected to be operational by Spring 2012, and may serve as a further resource to Communication students.

Subcommittee Recommendation #2: Communication between the Department and community colleges is recommended.

The Council believes that some of the concern for transfer students and facilitating their progress toward degree will be addressed by the revised curricular structure.

Subcommittee Recommendation #3: Department should consider lessening the variation in instruction when compulsory courses are required and taught by different instructors.

The Council is in full agreement with this recommendation. We recommend that the Department submit course templates at the time that the course approval requests are submitted for the new core courses.

Subcommittee Recommendation #4: The Department needs to adopt a coherent policy on pre-requisites and waivers and implement this policy consistently and fairly.

The Council believes that the revised curricular structure will address this concern.

Subcommittee Recommendation #5: The undergraduate advising load is untenable.

The Council agrees with this recommendation, though it recognizes that advising staff is overtaxed in all areas of the campus.

Subcommittee Recommendation #6: The Department should approach the campus administration about the need to relax the rules on the number of courses that ABDs can teach.

The Council is aware that the Department requested a waiver to the Associate In policy, which was denied by the CEP. We recommend that the Department consider submitting requests for exceptions, as appropriate, on a case by case basis.

This memo concludes the initial review of the Department of Communication's undergraduate program. We expect that from this point forward, the Department will develop and implement strategies to address the recommendations above. As the proposed revisions to the curriculum include a Fall 2012 start date, the Council has opted to postpone the one year follow up to Fall 2013. This will allow us to better determine the efficacy of the new curriculum in addressing the Undergraduate Council's recommendations.

In conclusion, we wish to reiterate that both the review subcommittee and the Undergraduate Council were impressed with the Department's ability to deliver a sophisticated major highly based on theory to a large number of undergraduate majors. The Council is further encouraged by the Department's willingness to organize a huge revision to its undergraduate curriculum. We are hopeful that this level of dedication will mean continued excellence in the undergraduate program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Partho Ghosh', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Partho Ghosh, Chair
Undergraduate Council

cc: J. Elman
D. Hamann
D. Hilton
B. Sawrey
S. Subramani
J. Sobel