

**REPORT OF THE
PROVOST'S WORKING GROUP ON ARTS AND DISCIPLINES
May 2010**

Contents

- Introduction
- Arts at Chicago
- Finding: Arts Practice and Scholarship
- Analysis: Obstacles to Integration
- Models
- Recommendation: The Chicago Art Lab
- Appendix I: Mellon Exhibition participants
- Appendix II: Curricula in the Arts

Introduction

In 2008, the Provost constituted the Arts and Disciplines Working Group to investigate the state of the arts on the University of Chicago campus, specifically as they relate to the core mission of this institution: research and teaching. The definition of “arts” was broad, encompassing not just creation and performance but curatorship and production. In addition, the Provost asked the Group to recommend ways **better to integrate the arts and traditional or “disciplinary” scholarship**: to reach out beyond the core arts practice programs to involve scholars across the University in the Reva and David Logan Center and in the arts generally.

The working group was convened by Deputy Provost for the Arts Larry Norman (Romance Language and Literature, Theater and Performance Studies), who served *ex officio*. Richard Neer (Art History) was named chair. The other members were: Bill Brown (English); James Chandler (English, Franke Institute for the Humanities); Darby English (Art History); Martha Feldman (Music); Tom Gunning (Cinema and Media Studies); Miriam Hansen (English, Cinema and Media Studies); Laura Letinsky (Visual Arts); David Levin (German, Cinema and Media Studies, Master of Arts Program in the Humanities, Theater and Performance Studies); W.J.T. Mitchell (English and Art History); Robert Pippin (Philosophy, John U. Neff Committee on Social Thought). Theaster Gates (Director, Arts Program Development) participated *ex officio*.

In fulfillment of the Provost's mandate, the Group met through the latter part of 2008 and the first half of 2009. Though the group recognized the important work of the 2001 “Future of the Arts Report” and the 2007 “Arts Clarity” statement, members agreed that an up-to-date and more broadly-cast campus-wide survey of faculty involvement in the arts was required. The Group felt it particularly important to hear from people outside the core arts practice programs (DoVA, Theater, Music, Creative Writing). Absent such information, the Group agreed that informed evaluations and recommendations would be impossible.

To that end, the Working Group conducted an exhaustive series of interviews with faculty and staff across the Divisions, the Booth School, the Law School, the Graham School, the Library, the professional arts groups (Smart Museum, Court Theatre, Renaissance Society, etc.), the Press, the Oriental Institute, the Office of Community Affairs, and so on. The goal of these interviews—each lasting 45-90 minutes—was to map ongoing arts activity on campus and to poll the ambitions, hopes and anxieties of our community. Less systematically, the Group reviewed arts initiatives at peer institutions, notably Harvard.

Arts at Chicago

As a preliminary to the Working Group's findings, a brief inventory of the arts programs at the University of Chicago is both useful and appropriate. Entities active in creation, performance and exhibition fall into four broad (and sometimes overlapping) categories:

- Curricular Programs
- Interdisciplinary Research Centers and Committees
- Presenting Organizations
- Co-Curricular and Student-Run Programs.

Curricular Programs

The University houses six degree-granting programs that incorporate the practice of the arts in their curricula: Art History, Creative Writing, Cinema and Media Studies (CMS), Music, Theater and Performance Studies (TAPS) and Visual Arts (DoVA). All of these programs offer the BA degree; some offer an MFA (DoVA) or a special option within the Humanities Division's Master of Arts program (Creative Writing, CMS and, soon, TAPS); three offer the Ph.D. (Art History, CMS, Music). Their curricula are correspondingly diverse. Some take arts practice as the primary focus of coursework (Creative Writing, TAPS, DoVA); others incorporate practice to varying degrees across multiple curricula (Music) or include it as an increasingly popular and important option (Art History, CMS). All make critical reflection on the practice of the arts an integral part of their programs.

In addition to these units, the John U. Neff Committee on Social Thought (Ph.D. only) has a longstanding tradition of appointing distinguished artists to its faculty, from poets like T.S. Eliot, Mark Strand and Adam Zagajewski to novelists like Nobel laureates Saul Bellow and John Coetzee to the pianist Charles Rosen. The presence of these scholar-artists on our campus represents one important precedent for collaborative work between the Arts and Disciplines at Chicago.

Activities of these various units take many forms. For example, since performance is critical to scholarly and creative work in the Department of Music (and to the University at large), the department sponsors a wide array of performance activities, including twelve University ensembles; programs in piano, chamber music, and voice; four professional resident ensembles; and a variety of concerts and concert series. DoVA likewise hosts annual exhibitions of student work as well as organizing the DoVA Temporary (see below); Creative Writing hosts readings of student work. TAPS, in addition to helping support student-run productions at University Theatre (see below), hosts resident artists and ensembles. Art History collaborates with the Smart Museum and the Art Institute of

Chicago in numerous ways, including faculty- and student-curated exhibitions, paid internships and course offerings by curators from the two institutions via an endowment from the Rhoades Foundation.

Finally, the General Education requirement in the College includes a series of specially designed courses in “Art, Music, and Drama,” from which all undergraduates are required to take 1-2 quarters. All six arts units participate intensively in this branch of the Core, offering students a diverse range of educational experience. In addition, the Humanities Core includes the 3-quarter sequence on Media Aesthetics, which typically features faculty drawn from the arts programs.

Appendix II, prepared by David Levin, provides a more detailed description of teaching in three of these units and a recommendation for further study.

Interdisciplinary Research Centers and Committees

A significant number of interdisciplinary research centers and committees considers the arts to be integral to their programs. The Center for Race, Politics, and Culture has an annual one-quarter residency for a visiting artist, and other units (including the Center for the Arts of East Asia, the Center for Gender Studies, the Center for Jewish Studies, the Center for Latin American Studies and the Franke Institute for the Humanities) have invited creative and performing artists or collaborated with exhibition programs. The same is true of a number of graduate interdisciplinary workshops (e.g. Contemporary Art, Interdisciplinary Approaches to Modern France, Mass Culture, New Media, Theatre and Performance Studies, etc.). Further afield, interdisciplinary journals such as *Critical Inquiry* and *Opera Quarterly* have created discussions between artists and theoreticians in print, on campus and online. Last but not least, the Open Practice Committee—a collaborative venture between Art History, DoVA and the Smart Museum—aggregates and promotes public arts-related programming across the University.

Presenting Organizations

The “DoVA Temporary” gallery, the Oriental Institute, the Renaissance Society, the Smart Museum of Art and the Special Collections Research Center are all venues for exhibitions that range from ancient sculpture to contemporary art and print illustrations; the Logan Center will add a new exhibition space to campus. Much of the programming at these venues is collaborative, involving scholars from around the University. In Music, the University of Chicago Presents (UCP) organizes a range of performance series not only on campus but also in collaboration with the Harris Theater and the Museum of Contemporary Art. UCP also curates ArtSpeaks, assists a faculty member in Music Composition in curating Contempo (a new music collective established in 1964 that now includes the Grammy-winning ensembles-in-residence Pacifica Quartet and eighth blackbird), and mounts the concerts of another ensemble-in-residence, the Saint Paul Chamber Orchestra. The Court Theatre is the University’s nationally renowned professional theatre; it envisions establishing a Center for Classic Theatre. The Film Studies Center programs screenings and events with visiting artists and scholars; CMS also works closely with DOC Films (see below). In addition, both Rockefeller Chapel and International House have wide-ranging public arts programming.

Co-Curricular and Student-Run Programs

A 2008 survey found that almost half of the College's 4,500 students (as well as a broad array of graduate and professional school students) participates in over 75 student arts organizations. Many of our academic and presenting arts programs have developed over time from such student activity. Though these organizations are too numerous to catalogue here, we note, as examples vital to the interdisciplinary ambition of this report, such groups as DOC Films, the longest continuously running student film society in the country, which serves as one of the major film presenters in the city; University Theatre, which produces over thirty productions annually; and a wide array of student music programs (including the University Orchestra, the Motet Choir, the Middle East Music Ensemble, the Jazz X-tet, and so on), which are comprised of graduate and undergraduate students as well as faculty, members of the University community, and residents of Hyde Park.

To conclude this brief overview, the Working Group firmly believes that the trans-disciplinary mission we envision for the arts can only be achieved **within a framework of disciplinary excellence**. In order to foster the sort of vital exchange that marks work in the arts at Chicago, it is imperative that the University maintain and extend its commitment to recognizing the **arts as an integral part of the research mission and curriculum of the University and its culture of inquiry**. To that end, it must **simultaneously support the University's arts entities and encourage work that engages substantively with the arts from within scholarly disciplines**. It is not enough to support individual units or even the arts per se (though such support is indispensable). If the arts are to thrive at this University, it is equally important to foster collaboration between artists and scholars at every level, as well as work by individuals that crosses established boundaries between the Arts and Disciplines—regardless of departmental or programmatic affiliation.

Much of the Working Group's time was spent determining the extent of, and demand for, such work around the University. It is to the results of this investigation that we now turn.

Finding: Arts Practice and Scholarship

From our interviews the Group learned that **support for the arts is broad across the University**. We found several examples of faculty and staff working to integrate scholarly research and arts practice. Notable in this regard is the Music Department, already perhaps the most internally integrated of any department on campus. In 2008, in tandem with University of Chicago Presents, the Music Department hosted a series of performances and scholarly events devoted to the works of the French composer Olivier Messiaen—culminating in a major conference. In 2009, it hosted a major conference devoted to musical text and performance, bringing together musicologists, practicing musicians, scholars of theater and dance (many people met more than one description). This event had a pedagogical corollary in the form of an ongoing Workshop in improvisation. The impact of both events has been immediate and international.

But Music was not unique. In Art History and DoVA, 2009's *Our Literal Speed* combined performance art and academic lecturing, garnering international attention. In TAPS, a three year Presidential Fellowship in the Arts awarded to the troupe 500 Clown has had a catalyzing effect, transforming the practice of physical theater both on campus and around the city. Via the John U. Neff Committee on Social Thought, major writers like Nobel laureate John Coetzee and poet Adam Zagajewski have played an integral part in the professional and pedagogical life of the University. Among the impressive number and range of activities in Creative Writing, Kestnbaum writer-in-residence George Saunders participated in an enormously successful fiction-writing workshop, presented a reading to a packed house in Stuart Hall, and participated in a panel discussion about his work.

Activity was not confined to these standing arts-related programs. From a former dean of the Business School who employs jazz in his teaching, to an historian who suggested that research into transnational arts communities ought to supplant Area Studies, to a professor of philosophy working on musical improvisation in collaboration with an avant-garde trombonist, we encountered a diverse and vibrant community of scholars and artists working together.

Chicago students are in the forefront of these developments—often, it must be said, to a greater degree than faculty. Having come of age in a digitized world, many undergraduates and graduates are accustomed to experiment with modes of expression and communication that are distinct from traditional forms of academic production (e.g. the printed essay or the lab report). Such innovation occurs daily in every division and every school, as students manufacture videos and post them online, produce websites and blogs, mix and relay audio files. In short, many Chicago students are already arts practitioners, albeit informally. It would be in the University's interest to tap this energy, and to relate it more systematically to academic and scholarly pursuits.

The overall lesson was clear: the University of Chicago is blessed with a reserve of goodwill toward the arts—and, as one might expect, with a faculty and a student body committed to innovation. This support extends across multiple divisions, schools and institutions. Although opinion on campus is by no means unanimous, at no point did any interlocutor express the slightest reserve at the University's decision to expand arts on campus.

Yet many interlocutors, including those with institutional affiliation to arts practice programs, voiced **a sense of embattlement, even demoralization.** Despite notable successes, the general tone of the interviews was of enthusiasm mingled with frustration at a real or perceived lack of institutional support. Several interlocutors from arts programs described a sense of marginalization and even demeaning treatment (supported with concrete examples). Others, conversely, voiced or otherwise demonstrated unwillingness to adapt to the basic pedagogical demands of an academic institution. Given the breadth of enthusiasm for the arts on campus, and the University's unprecedented investment in arts infrastructure, this testimony seemed particularly significant.

Even scholars who voiced a strong commitment to arts practice tended to treat it as a small but treasured component of their total research and teaching. Significantly, on no occasion did anyone with budgetary authority in a discipline-based unit indicate willingness to

increase arts spending *at the expense* of ongoing scholarly programs. As a practical matter, arts were effectively secondary to traditional scholarship. Just so, we learned that academic departments (outside of the Music composition track and DoVA) seem rarely to make arts practice a top priority in new faculty appointments, even when those departments incorporate arts practice in their curricula. At present the six arts units and the Committee on Social Thought have a combined 13.5 tenured or tenure-track faculty with appointments in arts practice, at least 2 of whom are not full-time.¹ Of this total, 5.5 are in a single department (DoVA). In short, **faculty support for the arts does not always translate into commitment of resources—especially when such a commitment is effectively in competition with “core” academic programming.**

This situation is not universal. More than a few scholars have gone out of their way to commit time and resources on behalf of arts practice. Professor Elizabeth Helsinger's agreement to chair DoVA is an inspiring example, as is Professor Janice Knight's leadership in the Creative Writing program, while Theater and Performance Studies enjoys participation from faculty in a wide array of scholarly disciplines. On the whole, however, such arrangements of priorities are hardly commonplace; they attract comment and praise in part because they are exceptional.

The programming of the Logan Center bears out this assessment. The Working Group explored ways to expand faculty involvement in the Logan Center beyond the four core participants (CMS, DoVA, Music and TAPS), especially in terms of faculty research and graduate teaching. But we had significant difficulty identifying substantive, long-term proposals. This difficulty does not seem to reflect merely superficial or transitory conditions (e.g. the composition of the Group or the selection of interviewees). On the contrary, the Center for Disciplinary Innovation (CDI) at the Franke Institute reports a similar situation. The CDI funds team-taught, interdepartmental seminars—a form of collaboration very much in keeping with the mandate of the Arts and Disciplines Working Group. In three years of activity, however, the CDI has received only one proposal for a collaboration between arts practitioners and scholars (a course by Arnold Davidson of Philosophy with a visiting musician from Columbia, to be offered in Fall 2010).

¹ Creative Writing (4): Knight, Reddy, Scappettone, Slouka. DoVA (5.5): Bruguera, Jackson (half in DoVA, half in Art History), Letinsky, Salavon, Schutter, Sullivan. Music composition (3): Kotoka, Ptaszynska, Ran. Social Thought (1): Zagajewski. Music performance and Theater and Performance Studies are taught by lecturers or by faculty with primary appointments in other fields. Arts practice in CMS is taught by a Senior Lecturer; in Art History, by a combination of a Lecturer and visiting faculty. Lecturers also perform significant teaching in Creative Writing and DoVA. It should be noted that Professor Knight, director of Creative Writing, did not join the University faculty as a teacher of Creative Writing, but generously undertook to run the program when her participation was deemed necessary. Professor Elizabeth Helsinger (English and Art History) has for the last two years played somewhat analogous role in DoVA.

Not many years ago, in 2001, the Future of the Arts Report described a University culture in which the arts suffered chronic neglect. The Working Group found evidence of substantial progress, but much work remains to be done. If the project of integrating Arts and Disciplines is less controversial than it might have seemed nearly a decade ago, still to a surprising extent the arts remain ancillary to many established research agendas. As a result, there is often **a disparity between principled support for the arts on the one hand, and programming initiatives and budgetary allocations on the other.** This disparity has concrete effects on both intellectual life and faculty morale; it represents a serious challenge to the University as it moves forward with arts-related initiatives.

Analysis: Obstacles to Integration

How to account for this gap? As we have seen, a lack of resources is at best a partial explanation. Apathy and inertia, while present in every large institution, also seem inconsistent with stated enthusiasm for collaboration. The causes, we suggest, lie deeper, in institutional structures and in academic culture itself.

Here the makeup of the Logan Center may provide a clue. Although the Center's impact will be widespread, at present its activities involve a relatively narrow range of faculty, particularly as regards research and doctoral-level instruction. We have already outlined the numbers and distribution of arts faculty around the University. The Center's primary users are CMS, DoVA, Music and TAPS. Only two of these programs (CMS and Music) grant the Ph.D., of which only one (Music) includes tenure lines for arts practice (in composition, not performance). To be sure, the activities of the Logan Center are by no means coterminous with the arts at Chicago, and numbers alone do not tell the whole story. Yet the demographics may help to explain the Working Group's difficulty in identifying substantive programming proposals for the Logan Center. Faculty research and teaching play a leading role in setting institutional priorities at this University—and rightly so. Insofar as the Logan Center currently involves a relatively restricted range of faculty (however dedicated and energetic), and insofar as it operates primarily at the collegiate level rather than encompassing the entire span of pedagogy at this University, it risks limiting its own impact; one result being that programming proposals are unlikely to be forthcoming in significant numbers. The conclusion is readily apparent: **if it is to make best use of the Logan Center, the University must involve both a greater number and a broader range of scholars in the arts.** Experience suggests that such involvement will not occur spontaneously.

More profoundly, however, our present dilemma merely reflects the status quo of academic culture. Virtually by definition, scholarly disciplines do not have artistic practice at their cores. Even in the Humanities and the “soft” Social Sciences, most scholars advance their careers by producing results of a fairly traditional cast—e.g., books and articles—and not by collaborating on arts projects. Tellingly, the Humanities Division's Policy Committee has no established criteria for evaluating faculty work in the arts; the question is urgent, not least because it is difficult to envision what such criteria might be. Artists, conversely, can have their own professional commitments, their own definitions of success,

which—beyond the matter of tenure—are often distinct from those of the professoriate. An academic position is the summa of professional accomplishment for many scholars; not so for many practicing artists. Both groups tend to commit their resources accordingly. These remarks are not intended as criticisms, either of scholars or of artists. We wish simply to offer a realistic assessment of the challenge at hand: **entrenched disciplinary norms, modes of evaluation, and demands on time are major obstacles both to faculty involvement in the arts, and to arts participation in academic culture.**

These challenges should not obscure the real successes of the University's arts programs. Many of our faculty and staff have worked wonders. For example, the dedicated work of the lecturers, senior lecturers and, faculty (the latter having primary appointments in other departments) who work on behalf of TAPS is nothing short of inspiring. From the students' perspective, TAPS and University Theater involve easily the largest number of students of any arts practice program, whether in the form of coursework or voluntary participation in mounting productions (not to mention attendance at performances), even as they manage a robust program of internships at professional theaters around Chicago. But if our extant programs have done well, still **it will remain a challenge for the University to achieve future success commensurate with its investment in the Logan Center.** In short, the Logan Center is not an end but a beginning.

There is a palpable hunger on campus for new modes and media of inquiry, new ways of integrating arts practice with traditional scholarship; but too often, this hunger goes unsatisfied. This situation, we have suggested, is likely a function of established institutional and professional priorities. Yet it leaves the arts effectively marginal—which, in turn, may account for a sense of embattlement amongst many arts practitioners even as the University invests unprecedented sums in arts infrastructure. The Arts Initiative offers a significant opportunity to identify, test and implement new ways of addressing that hunger.

The result is a situation of some urgency. The University has committed over \$110M to the construction of a building to house arts programming. In order for this undertaking to realize its potential, it is necessary to make artistic practice more integral to University life beyond the ambit of arts practice programs. Only if collaboration with the arts becomes a high priority for *a broad range* of Chicago scholars will the University get a maximal return on its substantial investment. **To that end, we urge the University to encourage the emergence of scholarly research paradigms, and modes of pedagogy, in which the arts play a substantive role.**

Models

How to thread the needle—to encourage extant research paradigms to incorporate arts practice, without sacrificing their traditional rigor? The Working Group was unanimous in its belief that a “top-down” approach would not work. Changes of the sort we need cannot be mandated from above. We emphatically do not need an “Arts Czar” or a single body making funding decisions across the University. Rather, **the University needs structures that will provide incentives for grassroots, “bottom-up” initiatives.**

To use a good Chicago phrase, we need to *nudge* scholars in the direction of an integration of arts practice and scholarship.

The Group did not find viable models for such programs on other campuses. Some peers, like Yale and Stanford, have large, well endowed arts programs—in Yale's case, a School for the Arts—and hence operate on an entirely different footing from the University of Chicago. A better analogy seemed to be Harvard; there, in late 2008, a blue ribbon committee produced a document that addressed these very issues. This document was widely reported in the national media. Yet Group members were struck by a disparity between the fanfare surrounding the Harvard document and the modesty of its proposal: in effect, the Harvard Arts Initiative recommended the inclusion of arts practice courses in Harvard's Core curriculum. Since the University of Chicago already includes arts practice courses in the Common Core, Harvard's initiative provided encouragement but no useful exemplars.

Closer to home, models for the integration of arts and traditional areas of academic research have in recent years proliferated on the University of Chicago campus. The ArtSpeaks program, initiated in 2004, brings high profile practitioners to the University for short (two-to-three day) residencies that place them in dialogue with faculty and students from a wide range of disciplines outside our arts programs. In the past year, for example, Kennedy Center honoree Leon Fleisher engaged in a faculty workshop with members of our Neurobiology department, Macarthur Fellow Kara Walker with scholars from History, Pulitzer prizewinner Tony Kushner with Jewish Studies, and film-maker Atom Egoyan with CMS and TAPS. Other examples include the interdisciplinary lectures, exhibitions, and screenings organized by the University's Open Practice Committee (comprised of members of DoVA, Art History, and the Smart Museum), as well as the work of University of Chicago Presents, which integrates faculty research projects into its public arts programming, notably in 2008's Messiaen Festival and an upcoming two-year program on The Soviet Experience. The recently constituted graduate workshop in Theater and Performance Studies has brought together graduate students faculty and artists in a wide-ranging discussion that encompasses traditional academic research as well as innovative collaboration amongst artists and scholars.

As successful as these programs have been, however, one in particular has developed the infrastructure to realize *long-term* projects involving both the arts and the core work of non-arts faculty and graduate students: **the highly regarded Mellon exhibition program at the Smart Museum.** In this program—endowed by the Mellon Foundation after a successful five-year trial—scholars from around the University collaborate with Museum staff and the University Press to mount exhibitions and to publish catalogues. Although many of the scholars have come from Art History, a significant proportion have not; the Mellon program has proven to have broad appeal, extending from the Humanities into SSD and beyond. Typically the exhibition is preceded by a seminar, taught by the scholar in question in collaboration with museum staff; student projects in this seminar frequently issue in essays for the exhibition catalogue. To date, seventeen scholars in six departments and two Divisions have organized exhibitions (see Appendix I). Anne Leonard, Curator and Mellon Program Coordinator at the Smart Museum and Lecturer in the Department of Art History, has taken a leading role in this initiative.

The Mellon Foundation's decision to endow the Smart program after a trial period is an index of its success. Moreover, the model has already been replicated. Similar projects have been undertaken in the Special Collections branch of the University Library, and the Court Theater is looking into a parallel initiative involving stage productions.

The exhibition format may seem to limit the Mellon program's utility as a model. But it is possible to extract some general lessons from the program's success. The following characteristics are salient:

- **Collaboration** between museum staff and University faculty is integral to every project.
- A relatively **short term** from conception to completion, in effect acknowledging scholars' standing commitments to their "home" disciplines.
- A strong **pedagogical component** (student participation in mounting the exhibition and writing catalogue copy).
- A strong **public component** (the exhibition itself).
- A **publication** issued under the imprimatur of the University Press.

These five points, we suggest, provide a recipe for building a strong program that encourages collaboration between arts and scholarship. The challenge is to translate it into the new context of a University-wide arts initiative.

Recommendation: The Chicago Art Lab

In order to catalyze fruitful collaboration between scholars and arts practitioners, we recommend a program incorporating the salient features of the Mellon exhibition formula: **a program of short-term projects at the intersection of scholarship and arts practice, involving students, and issuing in both a publication and a public program (exhibition, performance, etc.).**

More specifically, we envision a program, tentatively dubbed the Chicago Art Lab, with the following characteristics:

- In a departure from the Mellon prototype, we recommend that this program take the form of **residential fellowships of one to three quarters duration**. Such sustained focus is integral to the stated goal of moving collaboration between the arts and scholarship to the center of professional life at the University. Faculty from within the University would receive relief from teaching analogous to that currently provided to fellows of the Franke Institute for the Humanities. However, a relatively flexible term for fellowships is necessary to accommodate the schedules of visitors, especially visiting artists.

- **Fellowships could come in two types: collaborative and solo.** In the Mellon program, every exhibition resulted from a collaboration between a curator from the Smart Museum and a University faculty member. For the Art Lab, we envision a broader and more flexible arrangement. Ideal pairings might be a neuroscientist and a video game

designer, a pianist and a musicologist, a cinematographer and an historian of film, a jazz musician and a philosopher, a political scientist and an architect. No route of inquiry ought, in principle, to be ruled out, and participation from beyond the traditional Humanities, and from beyond the realm of High Culture, ought to be welcome. Nor is there, in principle, any reason to limit collaborations to only two fellows; the door should be left open to future consideration of larger projects.

Solo fellowships would target individuals whose work already combines elements of arts practice and discipline-based scholarship. We draw inspiration from recent work by Matthew Jackson (Art History and DoVA) on the intersection of performance art and scholarship, or the recently-departed Roger Moseley (Music) on musicology and instrumental improvisation, or Working Group member David Levin on dramaturgy and opera studies. But participation from outside academia might also be appropriate, e.g. by individuals working in New Media in the corporate sector.

Both types of fellowship are necessary for a successful program. Collaborative projects are inclusive, with the potential to draw in people who work within a well established discipline or sector of the creative community. But by pairing self-identified Artists and Scholars, they also risk institutionalizing boundaries instead of overcoming them. Solo fellowships, conversely, have the potential to foster innovative work that does not fit easily into any pre-existing category, supporting individuals who are not simply Artists or Scholars, but both—or neither. But solo fellowships have their own risks, most obviously of isolation and accountability. The two types are complementary.

- In order to create the greatest impact, we recommend that this program involve **visiting artists and scholars** as well as members of our University faculty. We particularly recommend the involvement of arts practitioners from Chicago itself, the better to connect Hyde Park with the city's burgeoning cultural life. Initially it could be mandated that only one member of each collaborative fellowship could be from outside the University. If the program proved successful, the possibility of bringing in pairs of outside scholars/artists could be considered. Our goal should be to make Chicago a "destination," like the National Humanities Center or the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton.

This provision, we recognize, adds significantly to the cost of such a program. Yet we believe it to be crucial. The advantages are threefold: first, bringing in outside voices will help to shift entrenched attitudes while providing an atmosphere of dynamism and excitement; second, there can be no better way to publicize the University's arts initiative than to bring in witnesses and participants; third, it provides a bridge between the University and the city.

- Each project should have a **pedagogical component**. It is crucial that Fellows be able to conduct their research and arts practice, but also that there be some formal mechanism for students to benefit from their presence. In order to encourage work closely related to faculty research, and to encourage innovative ways of incorporating artistic work into intellectual life, we recommend that this component take the form of a quarter-long course, ideally with a graduate-level component included. Participation would have to be strictly limited, and the coursework would span only one quarter of the two- to three-quarters duration of the fellowship.

- The Fellowship would culminate in a **public lecture, performance or exhibition**, as appropriate. This provision seems crucial as a means to publicize the program, to maximize its benefit to the community at large, and to assess its success. The Logan Center would seem a natural venue for such programming.
- An **online publication program** would fill the role occupied by exhibition catalogues in the Mellon program: as a permanent record of the collaboration and a venue for student participation. In addition, publications play an important role in academic careers, and thereby provide an incentive for faculty participation. It would be necessary for University to provide resources to facilitate this publication. There seems to be no need, however, for a printed book, costly to produce and limited of access; on the contrary, a virtual publication seems more in keeping with the forward-looking nature of this initiative. Yet collaboration with the University Press would be highly desirable. As digital publishing becomes an increasingly important component of the Press's enterprise, Art Lab projects might provide ideal opportunities for experimentation with new modes of publication across media and disciplines—an example of a potential “ripple effect” that the Art Lab might have in the University.

Costs

Of course, such a program would not be inexpensive. When fully operational, it would require faculty leadership, a staff, office space and access to studio facilities where appropriate. Additional costs would vary dramatically depending upon the number of fellowships and, more specifically, the number of extramural Fellows per annum. The approximate cost to bring an internationally known scholar or artist to campus for a single quarter, including accommodation and stipend, is roughly \$50K. Adding administrative expenses, project costs, course relief for the University of Chicago faculty member involved, and public programming and online publication, we estimate that each extramural Fellow would cost approximately \$100K. We stress that each fellowship could be a naming opportunity in fundraising.

Intramural fellows would be considerably less expensive. The chief cost would be to the home departments of faculty and, by extension, to the Divisions and the College, in the form of teaching relief. In order to encourage participation from within the University, we recommend that any such relief for intramural Fellows *not be counted* against their accrued leave time under the new faculty leave program.

A program such as this one requires a critical mass of participants to be effective. But the professional schedules of arts practitioners rarely adhere to the academic calendar. Therefore, flexibility in the administration of fellowships is necessary. We recommend that the number of fellowships per annum not be set in advance. Instead, the Center should award fellowships from a fixed budget. A fully functioning program might, for example, include two to three pairs of fellows in residence for one quarter each, thus involving about eight (8) outside fellows each year, paired with eight (8) University faculty, lecturers, or artistic leaders (curators, theater directors or dramaturgs, etc.). If the year's program featured some longer term fellows (2–3 quarters), the number of fellowships awarded would be reduced accordingly. In order to ensure an effective start to the program, we

recommend that in its first year a minimum of one pair of fellows be in residence for each quarter.

Pedagogy and Programming

The fellowship program would be at the heart of the Arts and Disciplines projects. Yet in order to broaden the impact, we recommend two separate funding resources be established under the aegis of the Art Lab in order to stimulate innovative forms of interaction.

- *Public colloquia, seminars, events, and projects* arising from the work of our faculty, students, and professional arts programs (Smart Museum, Court Theater, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago Presents, Renaissance Society, etc.). These may also involve collaborations with other city, national, and international cultural institutions (Art Institute, Chicago Opera Theatre, etcetera).
- *Curricular innovation grants* (both graduate and undergraduate) at the crossroads of artistic practice and scholarship. These courses might involve co-taught courses pairing University scholars and practitioners along the lines of the Center for Disciplinary Innovation. But they might equally encourage individual scholars to experiment with new modes of teaching, or new types of courses. Of particular interest is curricular innovation outside the ambit of our current arts programs, e.g. in the sciences or professional schools.

In sum, our **finding** is that the University of Chicago has not yet met its potential for scholarly engagement with the arts. Such engagement is often incompatible with established professional and intellectual priorities on both sides of the equation. The construction of the Logan Center makes this situation untenable. Our **recommendation**, accordingly, is that the University incentivize faculty-driven proposals for research and teaching that span the gap between the arts and scholarship. We recommend that this incentivization take the form of a new Center for Arts and Disciplines, or Art Lab, centered on a residential fellowship program but also including resources for curricular innovation and public programming.

A program purpose-built to foster collaboration between artists and scholars would be unique in this country, perhaps the world. The United States is home to many residential fellowship programs for distinguished scholars, and also to many programs for artists and writers. Some academic fellowship programs (e.g. the J. Paul Getty Research Institute) occasionally make awards to artists. But there exists, to our knowledge, **no residential fellowship program anywhere in the United States specifically designed to encourage collaboration between artists and scholars across all disciplines—still less with a pedagogical component.** The closest analogue is perhaps the American Academy in Rome which, however, runs parallel programs for artists and scholars, in which collaboration is serendipitous. The Chicago Art Lab would represent **a bold new experiment**, fully in keeping with our University's ethos. In short order it would, if executed properly and with sufficient institutional support, help to put us "on the map."

In the longer term, however, the stated goal of this center is to provide incentives for faculty to integrate arts practice into their research, and for practicing artists to fully engage in the intellectual life of the university. Such integration would represent a significant change in our intellectual and professional culture—a prospect both exciting and daunting, but one to which the University has already substantially committed itself.

Appendix I: Mellon Exhibition Participants

Faculty involved with Mellon Exhibitions at the Smart Museum of Art, by department, 1995–2010. Information provided by Anne Leonard, Curator and Mellon Program Coordinator at the Smart Museum and Lecturer in Art History.

Art History

Ingrid Rowland (*The Place of the Antique in Early Modern Europe*, 1999)

Linda Seidel (*Pious Journeys*, 2000)

Reinhold Heller (*Confronting Identities in German Art*, 2002)

Rebecca Zorach (*Paper Museums*, 2005)

Joel Snyder (*One/Many*, 2006)

Richard Neer (*GRAPHIKÉ*, 2006)

Martha Ward (*Looking and Listening in Nineteenth-Century France*, 2007)

Classics

Ian Moyer (*Sacred Fragments*, 2002)

Sarah Nooter (*The Tragic Muse*, 2011)

English Language and Literature

Elizabeth Helsinger (*The "Writing" of Modern Life*, 2008)

Germanic Studies

Sander Gilman (*Weimar Bodies*, 1998)

Romance Languages and Literatures

Philippe Desan (*Literary Objects: Flaubert*, 1995)

Larry Norman (*The Theatrical Baroque*, 2001)

Elissa Weaver (*A Well-Fashioned Image*, 2001)

Frederick de Armas (*The Painted Text*, 2003)

Thomas Pavel (*The Tragic Muse*, 2011)

John U. Neff Committee on Social Thought

Glenn Most (*GRAPHIKÉ*, 2006; *The Tragic Muse*, 2011)

Appendix II: Curricula in the Arts

Although a wholesale review of the curricular situation of the arts lies beyond the immediate purview of this report, it became clear during the course of our deliberations that any consideration of the relationship of the arts to the disciplines requires a consideration—and perhaps a *reconsideration*—of the place of the arts in our disciplinary curricula. Not surprisingly, the importance of the arts in the work of our faculty and students is reflected in the importance of the arts in our classrooms. And yet, that importance is not so easily charted. Our first recommendation, then, is for a more extensive and focused review of the curricular place of the arts with an eye to the curricular *future* of the arts. This recommendation emerges from the group's consensus that creative work is intellectual work—a consensus that is, increasingly, reflected in divisional course offerings and hiring decisions. The implications of this consensus need to be thought through carefully, not just on the curricular level, but also when it comes to issues of faculty hiring, retention, and promotion. We leave it to a future report to undertake such a study.

In the meantime, it is important to note that a number of units have come up with innovative and exciting ways to incorporate creative work into their graduate and undergraduate curricula. Thus, to cite three important but by no means exceptional examples: The undergraduate major in CMS includes the option of a creative BA project accompanied by a written thesis situating the project in historical, aesthetic, and critical contexts (the same, we should note, is possible within the purview of MAPH at the M.A. level and Music at the B.A. level). Both undergraduates and graduate students take film and video production courses with Judy Hoffman whose appointment, like Catherine Sullivan's, is in both DoVA and CMS; CMS graduate students serve as course assistants for these production courses. Judy Hoffman also teaches courses on the history and theory of the documentary (as well as Chicago film history), and both Judy and Catherine have begun working with PhD students on field exams. Further, a number of CMS students are active in the student organization Fire Escape, which is dedicated to student film and video production on campus; and the Film Studies Center brings filmmakers and video artists to campus on a regular basis to participate in discussions and workshops with PhD students and undergraduate majors.

In DoVA, the curriculum is no less innovative, but it is innovative in different ways. Thus, while other units have found interesting ways to incorporate creativity into their curricula, DoVA curricula have found innovative ways to supplement creativity with inter- and transdisciplinary forms of engagement. Thus, to cite a notable example, Professor David Schutter's paintings, firmly rooted within a conventional idiom, are centrally informed by his work in aesthetics, art history, and literature. Beyond simply deriving energies from these other fields, Schutter's paintings query the conceptual and institutional borders that locate these fields at some remove from the work of painting. To cite a similar example from the undergraduate curriculum, DoVA's lower division courses challenge students from across the university to sharpen their awareness of the relationships between visual and other forms of knowledge via projects that investigate scale, contrast, rhythm, and value—terms that are recast both literally and metaphorically. And while the number of visual art majors may be modest, it is worth noting that a substantial number of students

minor in visual arts, understanding their work within DoVA as a means to strengthen their ability to work in fields ranging from anthropology to pre-med to computation. In a similar vein, DoVA's graduate students are required to pursue studies outside of DoVA as a means of grounding, extending, and complicating their visual practices.

In Theater and Performance Studies, our undergraduates are receiving extensive and comparative training in a variety of performance idioms as they refine their skills in more (institutionally) familiar forms of critique and analysis. Even in Music, where critical and scholarly practices have always been closely integrated with performance and composition, much the same story could be told. For example, graduate students working on Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern musics made a plea to engage in practical study of these repertorial traditions, including the public performance of neglected early music repertoires that students are researching in their doctoral studies. That in turn led to the establishment of the Newberry Consort as a departmental ensemble-in-residence (in 2005), to lead workshops, sight-readings, and various experiments in performance practices, which in turn resulted in the creation of the Early Music Ensemble. The decision to hire the ensembles-in-residence Pacifica Quartet (beginning in 1998) and eighth blackbird (beginning in 2000) was prompted principally by critical needs among Composition graduate students to work intimately with performers, although it is important to note that those ensembles have also immensely enriched core classes with their visits and improved the work of orchestral and chamber music ensembles for which they lead sectionals.

The Working Group sensed a tremendous opportunity lurking in the emergence of these new curricular directions, that is, in the fact that at Chicago, creative work is increasingly engaging in dialogue with criticism and vice versa. We suspect that this conjunction (and concurrently, the creation of the Logan Center) offers an extraordinary opportunity to develop a prototypically "Chicago" form of combining theory and practice, extending to artistic creation not only a commitment to excellence but also the spirit of experimentation and contestation that marks intellectual work at the University.

It is clear that such an initiative will require a great deal of institutional imagination and no small amount of resources. But the quality and energy that has characterized recent curricular developments in Music, DoVA, TAPS, and CMS, among others, suggest that such a model is not just viable, but has enormous potential for students and faculty, and for the broader importance of the arts across the disciplines.