

www.graduatestudentabuse.org

Welcome to www.graduatestudentabuse.org. This is a website that has been set up in response to the events that have transpired over time in the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, specifically the way in which the faculty of that department has interacted throughout the years with its graduate students. This website focuses primarily on two things:

1. The series of three reviews of this department that occurred from 1999-2000 to 2004-2005, the events that led up to these reviews, and the attempts to deny and cover up the abuse of graduate students that was partially uncovered by these reviews and which had gone on for years in this department;
2. An analysis of these events and conclusions drawn from that analysis regarding the nature of the relationship between the University Administration and the University's tenured professoriate, and the role this relationship and the conventions on which it rests, e.g. academic tenure, play in the treatment of graduate students.

This report is divided into eight sections, and includes general background information (both with regard to academe as a whole and to UCLA and its Slavic Department in particular), an explication of specific events, and original source documentation such as the first Eight-Year Review report on the UCLA Slavic Department, email communications, letters, etc. The latter half of this report provides an analysis of these events, places them into a larger and different interpretive context, and concludes with a series of suggestions to bring about change.

These eight sections can be read as either HTML files or PDF files. Section IV, which provides original source documentation, is subdivided into ten sections, IV-A through IV-J. In addition, the complete report is also available as a single PDF file for those who would prefer to download it in its entirety. There is also a section for suggested links, including a link to an open blog for this website.

Section	Title	Web	PDF
I	<i>Introduction:</i> What is This Report About and Why is It Necessary?	I	I
II	Contextualization of the Problem	II	II

III	Explanation of the Documents	III	III
IV-A	Eight-Year Review Report on the UCLA Slavic Department	IV-A	IV-A
IV-B	Annotated Copy of the Eight-Year Review Report	IV-B	IV-B
IV-C	Letter from Faculty Head of the Internal Review Team	IV-C	IV-C
IV-D	Initial Report from Internal Review Team's Graduate Student Representative	IV-D	IV-D
IV-E	Email Communications from Internal Review Team's Graduate Student Representative	IV-E	IV-E
IV-F	Email from Internal Review Team's Graduate Student Representative Concerning Distribution of Eight-Year Review	IV-F	IV-F
IV-G	UCLA Slavic Dept. Response to Eight-Year Review Report	IV-G	IV-G
IV-H	UCLA Slavic Dept. Graduate Student Handbook	IV-H	IV-H
IV-I	Departmental Internal Report	IV-I	IV-I
IV-J	Resolution Passed by the Graduate Students Association	IV-J	IV-J
V	Michael Heim and the Consequences of His Actions	V	V
VI	System "Breakdowns"; Actions of Individuals/Entities	VI	VI
VII	<i>Conclusions:</i> What the Documents Tell Us about the System and Academe	VII	VII
VIII	Anticipated Reactions and Final Recommendations	VIII	VIII
I-VIII	[Download the complete report as a single PDF file]		I-VIII
Download Acrobat http://www.adobe.com/support/downloads/main.html#Readers			

Links

Related Links	URL
Blog for www. graduatestudentabuse.org	http://www.abuseofgraduatestudents.blogspot.com/
UCLA Website	www.ucla.edu
University of California (UC) Website	http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/
Contact Info for UC Regents	http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/contact.html
Office of the UC President	http://www.ucop.edu/welcome1.html
California State University (CSU), Chico Website	http://www.csuchico.edu/
CSU Website	http://www.calstate.edu/
Contact Info for CSU Board of Trustees	http://www.calstate.edu/PA/info/trustees.shtml
CSU Chancellor	http://www.calstate.edu/executive/
California State Community College System	http://www.cccco.edu/
California State Community College System Chancellor's Information	http://www.cccco.edu/executive/chancellor/chancellor.htm
California State Community College System Board of Governors	http://www.cccco.edu/executive/bog/bog.htm
California State Assembly Website	www.assembly.ca.gov http://www.cccco.edu/
California State Senate Website	www.senate.ca.gov

Find Your Nine-Digit Zip Code	http://zip4.usps.com/zip4/welcome.jsp
Find Your Elected Officials for Your Locale	http://www.vote-smart.org/
California Dept. of Education	http://www.cde.ca.gov/
California Secretary of Education	http://www.ose.ca.gov/

I. Introduction: What is This Report About and Why is It Necessary?

What is This?

This is a report, narrowly speaking, on the abuse of graduate students at the UCLA Slavic Department and the subsequent attempts to cover up that abuse, and in a larger context, on the system in place that allowed such abuse to take place. Thus, the report has two different, albeit related, aims. The first is to highlight some of the abuses that have gone on in one specific academic department, in this instance the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA. For many years now, there have been rumors and whispers throughout the Slavic academic community concerning the state of graduate student welfare in the UCLA Slavic Department. The most recent Eight-Year Review of the Department, held in 2000, highlighted a great number of irregularities and abuses and caught the faculty in lie after lie as they tried to deny the all too obvious truth of what was really happening in their department to the students placed in their charge. Much of what is in this report deals with this issue, as it was the Eight-Year Review report that set in motion the entire series of events that led to the near meltdown of the Department itself.

The second, and probably more interesting thing that this report addresses is the larger context in which the abuse of UCLA Slavic Department graduate students transpired, how the system in place supposedly to root out wrongdoing on the part of faculty actually discourages dissent, and how far that system will go to make sure that the details of abuse at the hands of professors does not become common knowledge. For years, horror stories have abounded as to how bad graduate school can be, but rarely is there anything written on just exactly *why* such a system can exist. There is, of course, no shortage of articles and essays written that concentrate specifically on one or two aspects of the system, but in order to understand why it exists as it does, one must examine the phenomenon in a way that is both more detailed while at the same time being more comprehensive, i.e. both more accurately and from a wider perspective. Any such examination must provide detailed evidence in favor of its take on what the core reasons are that can (and often do) combine to make graduate school such a living hell. That so many students should suffer so grievously in graduate school should itself cause eyebrows to raise. After all, most of those who are in graduate school probably did well as undergraduates, so the usual assumption would be that most of them should also do well in graduate school, but as

anyone who has ever been through the graduate school grind knows all too well, this is not always the case. As it turns out, the example of the UCLA Slavic Department illustrates well just exactly why the system is so impervious to change, and indeed, how most people, including those whose tax dollars support higher education, often aren't even aware that there is anything wrong.

The problem with an exposé such as this, however, is that for it to do the job that it wants to do, it must be extremely detailed. There are a number of reasons for this, but the main reason is directly related to one of the misconceptions about academe that allows such abusive behavior towards graduate students to occur: when the public at large is asked to make a judgement on the academic systems that it supports with its tax dollars, more often than not it is the case that very few average citizens have any real idea of just what exactly it is that a college or university does. There is a vague and general understanding that higher education is about teaching, but the details are usually lost on most of those outside of academe. Because of that, whenever there is a conflict between students and professors in which the public is asked to believe one side or the other, the default assumption is often that the faculty is right, or at least more right than wrong. Faculty will usually trot out one or two facts, chosen selectively for the purpose of buttressing their argument, the students might or might not try to trump these arguments, and then the public, still grotesquely underinformed as to what is happening in academe anyway, is asked to come up with some sort of opinion. As long as the abusing faculty, or those in the academic administration who represent their interests, can throw out just enough counter-information to at least effect a draw in the mind of the public at large, then the system forces the public to ask the question "Who are you going to believe? Whiney graduate students who think the world should be served to them on a silver platter or respected academics who appreciate the need for these students to learn the value of hard work and inflexible standards of excellence?" Unless one is able to trump, at every turn and in every instance, the arguments of the faculty in favor of the existing system, one will have a difficult time convincing the public at large as to the inadequacies of the system. The down side, of course, is that because the devil is indeed in the details—and the details are many—this adds many extra pages to this report, thus making it that much less amenable to a quick perusal, but the thinking here was better an accurate document that will actually bring about some change than a smaller document designed to be read by a larger audience.

The report itself is divided into eight different sections. Whether or not you as a prospective reader would want to plough through all eight sections depends very much on where your interests lie. If you are interested merely in the abuses that were happening in the UCLA Slavic Department and how the Eight-Year Review of that department brought some of those abuses to the fore, then you could skip directly to either the Eight-Year Review report itself (reproduced in its entirety as [Section IV-A](#) except for one page that was not released to students), or you could go to [Section IV-B](#), an annotated version of that same report that was offered to the

Graduate Council of the UCLA Academic Senate in response to a request by the Graduate Council that UCLA Slavic Department graduate students comment on the report. If you are interested in the larger question of how a department with such an alarming degree of graduate student abuse can exist within a university system, then it might be advisable to at least start with [Section II](#), which provides background both for academe in general and for the nature of the relationship between the university administration and the tenured professoriate, and also provides a detailed account of what happened during the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department.

An in-depth reading of all the sections is not necessary to get an idea of what is going on at UCLA and probably at other UC campuses and other similar institutions as well. And indeed, some of the sections are placed here only for reference. For example, [Section IV-H](#) is simply the Graduate Student Handbook, thirty plus pages prepared by the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department in an attempt to show the Academic Senate and the Dean of Humanities that this department is indeed capable of managing its own affairs and need not be placed into receivership. The whole point of this particular section being included in the report was to show how vapid and meaningless this handbook really was, so there is no real need to read through it in detail unless one wanted to be absolutely sure of the assertion made in this report that it contained nothing that would support the UCLA Slavic Department's claim that this handbook was an integral part of their strategy to reform themselves. Similarly, if you are interested more in how the system itself broke down—or, as the report suggests, worked very well while only appearing to break down—then you might want to concentrate your attention on [Section VI](#)

If, however, you as a reader of this document are looking for more than simply an idea of what was happening in the UCLA Slavic Department and why what did happen was allowed to happen, then you might want to go through the chapters in order. The report itself was written to be seen as an organic whole and works best that way. Some issues, once explicated, are often referred to once again later in the report along with a shorter explanation because of the interrelated nature of the various academic processes that came into play in the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department. Thus, the report does have what is hoped to be a comfortable (as opposed to numbing) degree of redundancy to it. Still, if you are thinking of coming to UCLA (or any of the UC campuses, for that matter) for graduate school, if you are in a position where you offer advice regarding graduate school choices, or if you are considering making a financial donation to UCLA and have concerns regarding the extent to which you can trust the academic institution that would be the recipient of your donation, then you might want to consider reading through the entire report.

Contents of the Report

The eight sections of this report begin with what you are reading now, the Introduction, which also contains an explanation as to why it was necessary to go public in this manner. The rest of the report breaks down as follows:

- **[Section II](#)** begins by providing some initial context and insight into the academic world in terms of the relationship between tenured faculty and the academic administration that purportedly oversees their work, as well as into concepts such as professional courtesy between tenured academics and the nature of their relationships with each other, especially when it comes to matters of investigation and discipline. It then goes on to examine, step by step, the case of the 2000 Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department, from the beginning of the process (actually, even before the beginning, as it also provides some background on the history of this department) up to the present. This section of the report is very detailed and devotes a considerable amount of attention to the mechanics of the review process, and thus might not be seen as "gripping" reading. This fact notwithstanding, such attention to detail was seen as necessary in order to establish the facts of the Eight-Year Review and how this review played out in the case of the UCLA Slavic Department.

- **[Section III](#)** and Section IV have to do with some of the documentation associated with the 2000 Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department and the events connected to it. Section III is merely an explanation of the documents and communications listed in Section IV. Section IV breaks down as follows:

- **[Section IV-A](#)** is a copy of the Eight-Year Review report as issued to the students of the UCLA Slavic Department. Also included is an email sent to these same students by the Chair of the Department, Michael Heim, in which he attempts to counter some of the charges contained in the report, as well as a "revisionist" letter from two members of the external review team (i.e. those members of the review team who are not UCLA faculty members but rather faculty members from other universities brought in specifically to provide "objectivity" to the process, or so the thinking went.). In this letter the two external reviewers, at the request of the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, attempt to counter some of the more serious charges made by the internal review team (i.e. those members of the review team who are UCLA faculty members).

- **[Section IV-B](#)** is more or less an annotated copy of the Eight-Year Review report that was produced by some linguistic students of the UCLA Slavic Department in response to requests by the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate for input from Slavic Department graduate students. Graduate student commentary is interspersed throughout the report itself, much in the same way that one would reply to different parts of an email by inserting individual responses directly after the relevant original text. The

responses here are given in blue font to make it easier to distinguish between them and the original text. This section also includes an introductory note to the Academic Senate and a concluding list of suggestions.

- [Section IV-C](#) is a copy of a letter from the head of the internal review team to the graduate students of the UCLA Slavic Department in which he urges them to cooperate with the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department in discussing the results of the Eight-Year Review. This letter was sent in spite of repeated requests from Slavic Department graduate students themselves and from their representatives not to be put in a position where they would have to either agree to speak with UCLA Slavic Department faculty members about the report or else openly refuse to do so, thereby putting them under a cloud of suspicion as having "cooperated" with the reviewers who brought about such a damning picture of the UCLA Slavic Department.
- [Section IV-D](#) is a communication to the head of the internal review committee from the sole member of internal committee who was not a UCLA faculty member but a UCLA graduate student (a doctoral student in English Literature). Following the communication itself, he passes on his initial report on the conditions he found within the UCLA Slavic Department to the head of the internal review committee.
- [Section IV-E](#) is a series of emails from this same graduate student representative on the internal review committee to various officials within UCLA frantically asking them to back off their call to UCLA Slavic Department graduate students to speak with the UCLA Slavic Department faculty about the results of the Eight-Year Review. Especially noteworthy is the increasingly frantic and frustrated tone of each successive email, so much so that by the last one, this graduate student representative is questioning his own judgment in having encouraged UCLA Slavic Department graduate students to cooperate in the review.
- [Section IV-F](#) is a communication from this same graduate student representative on the internal review committee to an administrative official in the Academic Senate office asking that copies of the Eight-Year Review report be made available to graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department.
- [Section IV-G](#) is a response produced by the UCLA Slavic Department in October of 2000 after it had a summer to get over the shock that the Department had been exposed so thoroughly in the Eight-Year Review report.
- [Section IV-H](#) is a handbook produced by the UCLA Slavic Department for incoming

students, a handbook produced in response to the results of the Eight-Year Review and which, according to the UCLA Slavic Department, would go a long way toward solving the problems that had been plaguing the Department and its graduate students.

- [Section IV-I](#) is an Internal Report produced by the UCLA Slavic Department in 2001 designed to show further reform and progress on its part in righting the ship that was rocked so badly by the Eight-Year Review report.
- [Section IV-J](#) is a copy of the resolution passed by the UCLA Graduate Student Council as a result of what happened during the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department.

- [Section V](#) describes the fallout from the decision by the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, Michael Heim, to fight the order from the Dean of the Humanities that prohibited Slavic Department faculty from speaking with graduate students of the UCLA Slavic Department concerning the review itself. Michael did indeed win this battle against the UCLA Academic Administration, this in spite of repeated promises of protection given to these same students by the UCLA Academic Administration, promises that were also explicitly written into the Eight-Year Review report itself. This was the single most important moment in the review process, for once these promises of protection turned out to be a house of cards, the tide started to turn against graduate students. Because of its importance, it is given its own section in this report.

- [Section VI](#) addresses the question of why a review system that was, in theory anyway, designed to protect graduate students and highlight abuses within departments wound up failing these graduate students so badly, time and time again, at every level. It explains the role played by some of the main characters and entities involved in this review process and it provides a listing of how various processes in the system "broke down" and failed these students. It concludes by offering a new perspective as to what these processes were in fact really designed to do.

- [Section VII](#) takes the facts and documents presented in the previous six sections and uses them to draw some conclusions about the system of higher education as it exists at UCLA and in academe in general. Specifically, it speaks to the opacity of the system and its desire to keep its inner workings from being known by the public who support it. It also speaks to the question of how to quantify success in academe and to the impact of the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department on former and present graduate students in that department. How the University views concepts such as honor and integrity, as well as the two-track system in place in academe in this regard (one for tenured academics and one for everyone else) are also addressed here. How this system, as flawed as it appears, is nonetheless able to perpetuate itself, is also discussed, with specific attention given to the decentralized nature of the typical university, the

practice of buying the silence of those who have been aggrieved, the reality of an individual trying to stand up to an institution, the question of how one quantifies prestige, and to what is termed here the [Moosa-ization](#) of the university, i.e. the inability/unwillingness of a typical University administration to try to enforce discipline on its own tenured faculty.

- [Section VIII](#) attempts to do two things. The first is to predict some of the possible reactions to this report might elicit from various people and entities associated with the UCLA Slavic Department and with the events connected to the Eight-Year Review report listed here. The second is a list of recommendations as to how things can and should be changed in order to preclude this sort of abusive behavior and institutional cover-up in the future, with specific recommendations for various entities, e.g. the University of California Regents, the California State Legislature, law enforcement, unions, taxpayers, and so on. It concludes with an appeal to graduate students, past and present, to use their considerable power and knowledge to bring pressure to bear on the system in order to initiate change.

Why Was It Necessary To Go Public In This Way?

The immediate question that comes to mind when a report such as this is made public is why such public exposure is necessary. Why, if students had grievances against either their department or the University itself, could they not have availed themselves of the channels of communication and avenues of redress already in place? This is, after all, one of the stated purposes of any administrative superstructure, be it inside academia or in government or in business. This question takes on even greater significance when the issue involves graduate students training for jobs in academia itself. As is clear to anyone who has ever worked in academia, in most fields (and without question in the field of Slavic) jobs are hard to come by. In such a competitive environment, where literally hundreds of students apply for a single position, the slightest taint to a given applicant's profile can lead to his/her application being consigned to the reject pile. Equally clear to anyone who has ever been associated with academia is the fact that academia loathes open conflict and does not look at all kindly upon those seen as prone to stir up trouble and controversy. The label of "rabble-rouser", be it justified or not, is one that sticks to applicants and negatively impacts their employment potential for years to come.

These facts are very well known to all graduate students who have gone through or been associated with the UCLA Slavic Department. They understand how the system works in this respect, and because of this, they understand very well the dangers involved in going public. Why do this, then? Why put oneself at risk in an attempt to force change in the system through public exposure when there already exist avenues to express grievances within the academic institution itself? The answer to this question, an answer that one will see as one reads through this report, is that graduate students have already availed themselves of those options. Time and

again graduate students tried to exercise these options, and explored other, less public options as well. On countless occasions graduate students attempted to work within the existing system in an effort to be protected and have past wrongs righted. But as this report shows all too clearly, those attempts were all for naught. In other words, every option provided by the system itself for seeking redress was tried, and every time it was tried, it was, at one level or another, thwarted. Sure, some cosmetic reform was allowed, but no real change was instituted, no one who abused students or covered up that abuse was ever terminated, no student who ever suffered at the hands of this faculty was ever compensated. In effect, students were simply given no choice: they could either accept the results of the cover up of the abuse or they could go public.

Hence the necessity to compile this report and post it publicly.

- [<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

Section 1 | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

II. Contextualization of the Problem

In order to understand the problems that were associated with the UCLA Slavic Department and the issues connected to the Eight-Year Review of this department that was conducted in 2000, one must understand the various contexts within which these problems and these issues have arisen. This section will concentrate on the role of tenured faculty and how these faculty relate to the academic administration that is supposedly located just above them on the academic hierarchy. This role and this relationship will be examined first from the point of view of academia as a whole, and then as they were seen within both UCLA as an institution and the Slavic Department as an entity within that institution.

A. Within the History of Academia

Like the unions that exist for the technical, custodial, administrative, and maintenance staffs, the professors have a *de facto* union in what is usually termed an Academic Senate. (At UCLA, the Academic Senate is comprised of all the tenured members of the faculty.) Unlike these other unions, however, the Academic Senate has a disproportionately large amount of power. In many of the major colleges and universities throughout the country, the tenured professoriate, through organizations like the Academic Senate, often play a dual role: on the one hand, the Academic Senate at UCLA sets University policy (including policy on matters of professional conduct, and, in effect, many of the rules for running the University), while on the other hand, it serves to represent the interests of the tenured faculty. While it is true that individual campuses, at least at UC, are subordinated to the Board of Regents, these regents in reality rarely concern themselves with day-to-day proceedings, and even more rarely, except in the most egregious cases, with matters of discipline involving tenured faculty.

Thus, the end effect is a "union-like" entity that also sets (or has a disproportionately large influence on) university policy. Imagine if the custodial union for the university also ran the university. The conflict of interest would be obvious. And yet, this is the situation as it exists now for tenured professors at most institutions of higher learning, and certainly for those at UCLA and the other UC campuses.

The result of this situation is an academic administration which, at its highest levels, is comprised solely of tenured professors. Does this have an effect on the enforcement of rules and

regulations that govern and define standards of conduct and professional behavior for University employees? There is nothing to suggest that this is so with regard to non-tenured employees, most of whom are subject to the same behavioral and disciplinary sanctions, including termination, as is seen in government or other large workforces.

The same cannot be said, however, of those members of the university who have tenure. The institution of tenure, cherished and fiercely defended by the faculty, also plays a major role in the university's stance toward disciplining and dismissing faculty members. As originally conceived, tenure was meant to protect professors from political pressure with regard to the content of their teaching and their publications, within obvious limits. (For example a professor of Russian cannot walk into a class and start teaching chemistry). What tenure was never intended to do, however, was to provide *carte blanche* to faculty so that they might engage in abuse or unprofessional behavior with impunity. And yet, even the staunchest defenders of tenure will admit that this does indeed happen. In fact, it happens with varying degrees of frequency, in some departments much more so than in others.

Even if one were to leave aside the issue of tenure, however, one is still confronted with the fact that, of all the employee groups at the university, only the tenured professoriate is in a position to, in effect, police itself when it comes to issues of abuse and unprofessional behavior. It is true that there exists a level in the university hierarchy which is nominally above that of the tenured faculty (for example, in the University of California system there is a president for the entire UC system as well as a Board of Regents, which is above both the University President and the individual Academic Senates on the individual campuses) but this level is rarely, if ever, called upon to deal with issues of faculty abuse and unprofessional behavior. It is the individual campus administrations and the Academic Senates of the individual campuses that serve as the *de facto* final arbiter in matters such as this.

The results of this situation, one in which the faculty finds itself serving as its own supervisor and as the director of its own oversight and review procedures, are predictable. It has long been known throughout academia that tenured academics have always tended to tread lightly when it comes to meting out discipline to their tenured colleagues. There are a number of reasons for this:

1. There exists within academia, as is the case within many of the professional vocations, a strong sense of professional courtesy. Just as it is often difficult to find a physician who would be willing to testify against a fellow physician, so too are tenured academics loath to speak out openly against their fellow academics.

2. The hesitancy that many academics feel when assigned to what they feel to be the distasteful task of disciplining one of their own is augmented by the knowledge that, whatever

their findings, there are very real limits to the disciplinary action that can be meted out to tenured faculty, regardless of how harsh the recommendations made against them. A common attitude can be summed up as follows: what's the point of doing an extensive investigation into the alleged misdeeds of a colleague when there is very little chance that he/she will be subjected to any real punishment, much less be subject to dismissal? All this does is stir up bad feelings that will have to be circumvented in any future action with that particular colleague or colleagues.

3. What might be the strongest deterrent to strict enforcement of disciplinary and professional ethics codes by academics with regard to their fellow academics is the fact that, in the eyes of many tenured professors, to discipline one member of their collective for abuse or unprofessional behavior could lead to others of their class also being challenged and reprimanded/dismissed for such behavior. Even those members of the tenured professoriate who are not abusive towards their students and who do maintain a high standard of professionalism with regard to their conduct and demeanor--and let there be no doubt, there are many in academia who do fit this description--but even they can be at times hesitant in insisting that their colleagues who have crossed the line be disciplined or dismissed. Many of these academics who honor their pledge to maintain this high standard of professionalism nevertheless often have to work with colleagues who fail to honor this pledge. Sometimes this contact is at a moderate level, for example simply being in the same department, sometimes it is at a higher level, such as working on the same committee, and at times it is extremely intimate, including working together on the same projects, the same research, and the same publications. Given the nature of these contacts, and given the fact that, because of tenure, there is next to no chance that an offending colleague will ever be dismissed, regardless of how heinous the behavior, it is understandable--lamentable, but understandable--that many of the academics who do maintain high standards of professionalism feel that there is little point in pressuring their colleagues to do the same.

Reinforcing this feeling are faculty codes of conduct and codified "standards of professionalism" which, while on the surface dedicated to upholding these principles, actually end up discouraging investigations in instances where such codes and standards are violated. For example, these codes will often specify that if there is misconduct, then the "professional" way to address such conduct, especially conduct on the part of one's tenured colleagues, is to be found *exclusively* in whatever system the academic administration has set up to handle instances such as this. In other words, at no time are a department's problems ever to be aired publicly. To do so would be considered an egregious violation of collegial trust and, by extension, of "professionalism", selectively defined.

In this respect, what happens at the higher levels of academia is little different than what happens at the higher levels of business or government. Those who occupy the higher levels in these and many other bureaucratic structures tend to make rules--and, more importantly, to interpret rules--in such a way as to allow greater flexibility for themselves than is allowed for

those at lower levels. A significant part of this process of "rule interpretation" can be seen in what are commonly known as "rules of professional conduct", rules which, ostensibly, are there for the protection of all, but which in fact often serve to bring academics in line and to make sure that, whatever they do, they are not to put fellow academics in difficult situations, nor are they to point out or highlight the flaws and/or misdeeds of individual members of the tenured professoriate. If there are problems, then these problems are to be addressed internally and are to be brought to resolution in as unobtrusive and private a manner as is possible. The emphasis is always to be on gentle correction, and only in the most severe of cases is the question of punishment or dismissal even considered, much less imposed. In other words, the sort of disciplinary options available and *regularly imposed* at other levels of the academic employee hierarchy, that is to say among the technical, custodial, administrative, and maintenance staffs, are only nominally available, and only in the rarest of instances imposed, for the tenured faculty.

The tenured professoriate will, of course, deny that the above description is an accurate representation of the disciplinary constraints under which they operate. They will take pains to point out the various and sundry disciplinary options available to the university administration and their own abhorrence of unprofessional and abusive behavior. They will further point out that, for tenured professors, and especially for the sort of respected academics who represent high powered research institutions such as UCLA and the other UC campuses, the fact of being singled out, the very fact of being upbraided, however secretly, by their fellow faculty members is, in a way, the worst punishment to which they could be subjected, far more severe than simply being demoted or losing their job altogether.

While there may in fact be some truth to this latter assertion, it is more likely the case that the tenured professoriate trots out this sort of explanation ("Look, why even bother demoting this person, or firing him? Clearly he has suffered enough.") with the hope of deflecting the public's demand (assuming, of course, that news of the academic's misdeeds would even reach the public) that the academic or academics in question be held accountable for his/their actions. The fact is, statistics do not in the least bear out the claim that tenured professors are disciplined at the same rate or with the same level of severity as is seen with other groups of university employees. In the entire history of the University of California system (not just UCLA, but the entire ten-member campus) only a handful tenured professors have ever been fired. How many have had to suffer the "shame" of being privately upbraided by their colleagues, one cannot say (more about this later), but however excruciating this shame, the fact that those who have been forced to undergo it did so while being paid their full salaries, and without worry that their jobs would be at risk, no doubt helped to soften the blow.

B. Within the Slavic Department at UCLA

While every university and university system is different, for those which have academic tenure--which would include almost all public institutions and a great majority of the private ones--the above-mentioned scenarios are fairly typical. They may differ in specifics, but in general, the sacrosanct status of professors, and the abhorrence with which tenured academics look upon the task of disciplining their tenured brethren is common to most such institutions. This abhorrence notwithstanding, UCLA, as a public institution financially supported by and nominally beholden to the public at large, is obliged to have in place some sort of system by which it evaluates the performance of its tenured faculty and through which, in theory anyway, it can bring about the dismissal of tenured professors who abuse their authority or who fail to conduct themselves in accordance with university regulations (or, in extreme cases, in accordance with state and federal law).

At UCLA this system is essentially two pronged: at the individual level, all tenured faculty undergo peer-review for promotion from associate professor to full professor, and for so called "step increases" within the associate professor and full professor levels. At the program level, the normal review process runs in eight-year cycles. The eight-year review process begins with a departmental self-evaluation, with graduate students encouraged to fill out what are supposed to be confidential and anonymous questionnaires that cover various aspects of the department being reviewed.

The departmental self-evaluation and the graduate student questionnaires are then forwarded higher up along the chain to an internal review committee consisting of two to three (sometimes more) UCLA professors and one UCLA graduate student (none of whom are from the department being reviewed) and usually at least two external reviewers from comparable academic institutions throughout the country. An important point to note, especially when seen in the light of the 1999-2000 Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department, is that *it is the department being reviewed* which provides the university the initial list of academics from which the final two external reviewers will be chosen. Thus, the department under review has enormous influence on the selection of the outside (non-UCLA) reviewers who will be investigating the department itself.

The on-site investigation itself usually involves meetings with the faculty, with associated staff, with various deans and other members of the UCLA academic hierarchy. In addition, there is an opportunity for graduate students to sign up for individual 15-minute sessions with the investigating committee as a whole. One should note that while these sessions are indeed private, there is no anonymity guaranteed to the students participating in these sessions. They are attended by the investigating committee, whose members, in theory anyway, are dedicated to maintaining the confidentiality of the discussion, but the fact that this or that student actually took the initiative to go in and speak with the investigating committee is on the record for all to see.

In the case of review of the UCLA Slavic Department, this set-up was extremely problematic, for at least five reasons:

1. It was unclear from the outset whether or not the questionnaires that graduate students filled out, which also included a section for them to address individual problems not covered by the questionnaire, would be accessible by the Slavic Department faculty. In a department as small as the Slavic Department, it would not be difficult to determine who had written what, especially if specific issues were involved.
2. None of the students who had substantial complaints dared to go in and make these complaints directly to the committee for fear of being identified as having gone in and "aired the Department's dirty laundry", so to speak. Those who did go in spoke in generalities and stuck to issues that were, for the most part, far from the main issues of abuse that were rocking the Department at that time. Given the fact that no one was sure if the questionnaires afforded confidentiality, the ability to communicate directly with the committee took on that much more importance.
3. The bulk of the problems concerning abuse of graduate students was concentrated on the linguistics side of the Department, although it often affected students in the literature side as well. Of the two outside members brought in to be a part of the investigating committee, one was a former member of the UCLA Slavic Department, a linguist who had close ties to members of the Department. When students in the Slavic Department found this out, they immediately raised concerns with the UCLA Administration. Although this individual had, at this stage of the investigation anyway, done nothing to cause students to question his impartiality, the gravity of the situation and the knowledge of the backlash that would be unleashed against those who were suspected of having spoken against the Department made many of the students feel that speaking confidentially to this particular investigator would be a less than judicious choice.
4. The 15-minute blocks that were allotted to each graduate student would not have been nearly enough time to address the problems that were facing graduate students in this department.
5. These 15-minute interviews were held in a room located squarely in the main Slavic Department office. While one is not always able to hear through the door what is being said, sometimes when discussions become heated conversation does escape this room, even when the door is securely closed.

In response to these concerns raised by the graduate students, they were given the option of meeting with individual members of the investigating committee (as opposed to having to meet with every member) at a secure location outside of the Slavic Department.

This, then, was the system that UCLA had in place to investigate its Slavic Department. The longer one looks at the system, the clearer the picture that emerges, and that is a picture of a university that wants to have some sort of system in place that can be pointed to as an example of oversight, and which may in fact deal with superficial abuses of power, but which is also designed to keep such oversight as superficial as possible. Keep in mind that these reviews of any given department only occur once every eight years. Thus, the investigative committee is asked to gauge a department's performance for this period based on the results of a graduate student survey and a week's worth of investigation. Perhaps this would be sufficient were the department in question a perfect department, but it is woefully, woefully inadequate for a department that has even a moderate degree of problems, much less problems of the scope seen in the UCLA Slavic Department. The only way a system such as this one could even come close to shedding light on such departmental abuse would be if the students themselves not only cooperated, but actually pushed the system, demanding that it live up to what it claimed to be, a true review process. Given the potential repercussions to any students imprudent enough to do so, only rarely do they make this demand of a lax oversight system such as this one.

In light of UCLA's lackadaisical attitude toward the review process, it should come as no surprise that individual departments at UCLA would adopt a similarly indifferent view towards it, for clearly this sort of attitude is in their interest in that it provides the departments a maximum amount of autonomy. While such autonomy is a good and welcomed thing with regard to their scholarship (again, within reasons: mathematics professors should not be devoting all their publishing time to Victorian Literature), it is very questionable whether or not it is a good thing with regard to how UCLA oversees and, when needed, disciplines its own faculty. One would think that the fact that these departmental reviews occur only once every eight years, and that they are, in large part, so very superficial, *and* that these reviews are, to a large degree, guided by the department itself, would provide enough assurance for the department under review, specifically for that department's tenured faculty, that they would not have to be overly worried about any single review.

This, however, was not the case with the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. The Slavic Department, more so than a great many other departments at UCLA, has always fiercely guarded its independence and has never been shy in raising the battle cry of academic freedom should any of its perceived freedoms and rights come under threat. The very idea that the Department should be reviewed at all, given its past standing in the field of Slavic, strikes many of its faculty as slightly insulting. The notion of "academic freedom" is flexibly interpreted by these same faculty, such that it encompasses not just what they publish and what they teach, but almost every conceivable aspect of how the Department itself is run, certainly to include the manner and tone with which the faculty interacts with its graduate students. The idea

that outsiders (and by that is meant anyone outside the UCLA Slavic Department, including UCLA faculty from other departments and other UCLA administrators) should have any say whatsoever in how the Department acts in matters such as these is not a popular one among many of the faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department. And yet, the Eight-Year Review is mandated, it is a part of the above-mentioned system of oversight that public universities must have in place, if for no other reason than to be able to claim that they do indeed exercise some degree of control over what goes on within individual departments, and to be able to refute the claim that faculty are "free agents" unfettered by any rules of conduct or professionalism.

The UCLA Slavic Department, however, was not in the least anxious to undergo the Eight-Year Review scheduled for 1999-2000. The reasons for this were not restricted solely to the feeling of indignation, mentioned above, that they should be subject to any sort of oversight at all. The situation in the Slavic Department had been, for a number of reasons, growing increasingly tense throughout the decade of the 90's. The eventual report itself details a small yet illuminating fraction of some of these reasons, so they will not be highlighted here. Suffice it to say that when the time had rolled around for the 1999-2000 Eight-Year Review, there was reason enough for the faculty to worry what the response would be from a graduate student body that was, in many respects, highly disaffected and disillusioned, a graduate student body that saw students suffering both from fear and from extreme anger at the causes of that fear. So concerned were some of the faculty with the potential ramifications of any such review that they attempted to put it off, calling on a little known and rarely used codicil in the review procedure which allows, under only the most exceptional of circumstances, the review to be put off for a couple of years. At some point in the discussion someone must have suggested polling the graduate students to see what they thought of this idea.

This is not quite as innocuous or as simple as it may sound. While those in attendance at a graduate student meeting called to discuss this issue almost to a person felt that there was a need to alert the University to the abuse that was happening within the Slavic Department, there was also fear of the consequences of voting not to postpone the Eight-Year Review, and fear of what would happen as a result of the Eight-Year Review. A graduate student, when he/she finally finishes, depends greatly on the reputation of the department from which he/she has graduated for initial job offers. While in other departments it might have been possible to address the issues of abuse in a constructive way, most of the graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department knew very well that there was every chance that this would not be the case here, with the result being a possible loss in prestige for the Slavic Department and a subsequent lessening of their chances to obtain a position. In spite of this fact, the vote among graduate students was overwhelming, with approximately 90% voting not to postpone the Eight-Year Review, the faculty's clear desire that it be postponed notwithstanding. (The exact record of the vote, if there was one, was not available for the preparation of this work, but it might even have been the case that the vote was 100%, or perhaps 90+ % in favor, with no dissenting votes, just one or two abstentions.)

In retrospect, this vote might have had no practical effect, since postponing eight-year reviews is done only in very exceptional circumstances, but from the point of view of seeing where graduate students were at this particular time and how they were thinking, this vote was instructive. It was particularly impressive to see the literature students acting in support of the linguistic students. While the abuses that went on within the UCLA Slavic Department emanated primarily from the linguistic faculty, the effects also spilled over onto the literature section, and there was in fact a history of literature students leaving the programs because of abuses by linguistic faculty, so it is not as if the literature students were not incurring considerable risk by taking a stand in solidarity with their fellow graduate students in linguistics. As it turned out, the attempt by the faculty to put off the review was probably doomed from the outset anyway, but the vote and the solidarity shown by literature students toward their fellow students in linguistics was and is instructive as to the depth of feeling that permeated that department's body of graduate students.

If this fear seems somehow exaggerated to people on the outside, it is important to remember the context in which this whole review was taking place. Not only was the faculty for the most part against this review (or, if not a majority against it, certainly quite apprehensive as to what would result from it), but the instructions that graduate students received regarding the filling out of the initial forms and questionnaires that signify the beginning of this process were also unclear and at some points contradictory. In order to ensure that students would speak up and be candid in their description of their experiences within the UCLA Slavic Department, there needed to be a promise of both absolute confidentiality and absolute opaqueness regarding the instances of individual participation, i.e. no one should be able to look at the final report or at descriptions of the Eight-Year Review process and be able to deduce who had said what to whom. From the outset, however, there were flaws in the system.

As was described above, the section on the questionnaire that allowed students to add additional comments in long hand was a source of concern for a number of reasons. Handwriting, obviously, gives people away, but so do descriptions that reveal specific instances of abuse, especially in a department as small as the UCLA Slavic Department. Thus, going beyond answering a simple multiple-choice questionnaire to writing out specific examples could have very real consequences were these examples ever to be seen by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty. Given the attitude of fear and mistrust that already permeated the UCLA Slavic Department, the fact that there was at the very outset of the Eight-Year Review process already ambiguity with regard to the crucial question of whether faculty would be able to read graduate student written responses that were part of the original questionnaire only served to make students that much more wary about committing to a system which in the past had not only failed to uncover abuse, but had in fact served to cover it up.

IV. How the Slavic Dept. Review Was Actually Conducted

It was immediately brought to the attention of the investigating committee that students had fears about talking with the committee, both because they didn't want to be seen in the middle of the Slavic Department office going in to talk to the committee, and because of the presence of a former UCLA Slavic Department faculty member (a linguist, no less) on the committee. From this point on, there were in essence two reviews going on: the sort of formal review that happens regularly every eight years, with regularly scheduled meetings with faculty, deans, etc., and a second review, with students meeting with the investigating committee at a site far removed from the physical environs of the Slavic Department.

The review process thus took on a schizophrenic character, with the formal review process looking outwardly much like the previous Eight-Year Review process and much like the usual review processes that are conducted at UCLA, while in point of fact, much of the real investigation was taking place away from the Slavic Department, with students, at their request, meeting members of the internal committee at an unannounced location. As was discussed above, many of the students, especially the linguists, refused to meet with the external committee because of the presence on it of the former UCLA Slavic Department faculty member, who was himself a linguist. It became clear as the process proceeded that the faculty itself soon became aware of the severity of the situation. Some of the more candid faculty members made mention, in guarded terms, that they were aware that the UCLA Slavic Department was under a harsh microscope.

This was a justifiable fear on the part of the faculty. The fact that the students were so afraid of retaliation that they had asked for a neutral meeting site was not the only indication that something in the UCLA Slavic Department was very much amiss. In order to gain a broader picture of what had been happening in this department, the internal committee, at the urging of the active graduate students, began to contact former graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department. The nature of the charges being leveled against the faculty in this department was such that independent corroboration was deemed essential.

Factual Errors Statement

When the investigation of the UCLA Slavic Department was for all intents and purposes completed, two separate reports were issued: one by the internal committee, the committee consisting entirely of UCLA faculty and one UCLA graduate student, and one by the external committee, consisting of just two people, the two outside reviewers, one of whom was the linguist who was a former faculty member in the UCLA Slavic Department. A rough draft of both of these reports was then sent to the Chair of the Department for what is termed a "Factual Errors Statement". The purpose of a "Factual Errors Statement" was just exactly what it sounds

like, to go over the report for accuracy of basic facts (number of faculty, fields of expertise of the faculty, things of that sort). In other words, it is purely there to allow simple mistakes to be corrected. It is not intended to be a forum through which the conclusions drawn by the internal and external committees can be discussed and disputed.

It appears as though Michael Heim, the then-Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, misunderstood the nature of the "Factual Errors Statement" section on two points: first, he apparently believed it to be a low-level communication between himself and the Academic Senate, when in fact it was destined to become a part of the official report. Secondly, he either did not realize that the sole purpose of the "Factual Errors Statement" is merely to ensure that the basic facts listed in the report are correct (and not to dispute the conclusions of the report itself), or else he realized this, but thought that he could use it as a forum to rebut some of the very harsh conclusions reached in the reports themselves. Because the Chair was, apparently, unaware that his comments would become part of the public record, he was unusually candid in his assessment of the problems facing the UCLA Slavic Department and in his assessment of some of the problem faculty involved.

When the Chair first learned that his response would in fact become part of the report, a report that is itself a part of the public record, he was quite distressed. He was heard to have said time and time again that he simply could not believe that they would actually put his candid comments on public record, thus enabling the colleagues about whom he spoke to see what exactly it was that he had said about them. It was one of those rarest of moments in which the façade of the UCLA Slavic Department fell, if but briefly, exposing not only the reality of what was going on in the Department, but also the thoughts of the faculty themselves, both as regards their colleagues in the Department and the Department's graduate students.

Essentially what the Chair attempted to do in this "Factual Errors Statement" was not correct small statements of fact, but to rebut the very harsh report of the internal committee (the review committee made up of faculty only from UCLA, along with one UCLA graduate student). In this attempted rebuttal, the Chair continued with the same patterns of denial and evasion that had characterized his participation (or lack thereof) in the initial investigations. So egregious was this continued pattern of prevarication and sophistry that the internal committee felt compelled to answer in a point-by-point response, detailing some of the instances in which the Chair's response deviated from the truth, a response which confirmed *officially* and *on the record* the fact that the Chair had been less than honest in his interaction with the internal committee, and had in fact attempted to cover up and deny the systematic abuse that permeated the UCLA Slavic Department. The Chair's initial "Factual Errors Statement", the internal committee's response to this statement, and student commentary on this statement, are available in this report. The content of these documents speaks for itself, so it will not be belabored here.

Initial Reaction of UCLA Slavic Department Faculty

When the report finally came out, the reaction of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty was mixed. The Chair and those who had perpetrated this fraud--or at least who had *attempted* to do so--were understandably upset. The Chair had at least had some forewarning of what lay ahead, while many of the other faculty members were still in a state of denial. For so long this faculty had done what it wanted when it wanted, and had been unchallenged in its treatment of its graduate students, that it was at first almost impossible for the reality of the situation to sink in. The next step in the response cycle varied by individual faculty member. Some of the younger faculty, especially the non-tenure track faculty, felt that the Department had been warned, had but failed to take advantage of the opportunity to come clean, admit the abuse, and right the ship, however painful and embarrassing that admission of wrongdoing would have been. Another set of faculty simply were not in town at that point. A third group, representing the traditional core of the faculty, soon got over its shock and moved quickly to fury and anger. One emeritus came storming in and accused one student of trying to destroy the Department that this emeritus had worked so hard to build. Others of this group began questioning students about the Eight-Year Review.

The problem with this is self-evident. These students were promised protection by the UCLA Administration for their frank and candid participation in the process. Examples of that encouragement are as follows:

[From an administrator in Graduate Information Services] "I am very concerned about your reluctance to comment on your program. I strongly suggest that you make every effort to convey your perceptions to the review teams during the programmatic review next year. If you do (*sic*-should read: "do not") make any effort to do this, people cannot fairly evaluate your program."

Before the process even began, some students had gone to the Dean of the Humanities to complain about what was happening in the UCLA Slavic Department and were encouraged to be as open as possible, and were again promised protection from reaction to the report by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty. The following is culled from a message sent to a Slavic Department graduate student concerning fears about participating in the review:

"I have been assured [by the Chair of the Slavic Department and the Associate Dean of Graduate Division] that input from graduate students will be solicited and reviewed in a manner that protects the confidentiality of those who provide it...I can't emphasize enough the importance of offering your frank assessment of the program, and of encouraging your fellow students to do so. Former students should be urged to contribute as well. As I mentioned when we met, this input has been taken very seriously in reviews of other departments. Those students, too, were no doubt concerned about repercussions, but to my knowledge that has not occurred."

The report itself emphasized the need for such protection, and (as it turns out, ineffectually)

threatened faculty with dire consequences for trying to retaliate or threaten students for their participation in the review process. Thus, there were multiple instances of the UCLA Administration, in its various incarnations, encouraging student participation and promising protection from harassment and retaliation.

To have the Chair and other faculty asking graduate students about this review was problematic for any number of reasons. In a department as small as the UCLA Slavic Department anonymity can be quickly lost simply by the process of elimination. For example, out of a graduate student body of twenty five to thirty, if five or ten students, when cornered by faculty, deny involvement in the review process (and given the level of fear and intimidation that existed in the UCLA Slavic Department, this is not in the least beyond the realm of the possible, or even the probable), this then further narrows the field of possible "culprits", i.e. of students who might have talked to the investigating committee.

In addition, those students who choose not to participate in discussions with faculty also then run the risk of coming under a cloud of suspicion as students who refused to abide by the understood code of silence regarding discussions of the UCLA Slavic Department's dirty laundry with those perceived as "outsiders". Students could, in effect, be damned if they did and damned if they didn't. And those who did acquiesce to faculty requests to discuss the review would also experience what is termed a "Captive Audience" situation, one in which a subordinate finds himself or herself face to face with a faculty member who determines grades, who writes recommendations, who sits on committees, and who approves--or disapproves--dissertations. The potential for intimidation in such a situation is enormous, and again, especially so in the atmosphere of fear and intimidation that defined the UCLA Slavic Department.

Attempts to Keep Faculty from Interrogating Graduate Students

When the original report came out, it contained strong wording concerning the possibility that faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department might attempt to retaliate against the graduate students in the report who agreed to speak with the internal committee. The wording is as follows:

"It goes without saying that the willingness of numerous students to speak with the review team (but not to be quoted) was critical in arriving at the decision to take the above actions. Let it, therefore, be clearly understood that the slightest indication of retaliation by faculty against students will be aggressively investigated by the Graduate Council to determine whether charges should be filed with the appropriate Senate Committee for violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct, not only for recent but also for any past offences."

Given the fact that the internal committee felt so strongly about this issue, and that the internal committee had made it clear to graduate students that this was their feeling, graduate students

were of the opinion that they could appeal to the internal committee if they felt threatened. And this is precisely what some of the students did, appealing to both the faculty head of the internal committee, and also to the graduate student representative on the internal committee.

The faculty head of the internal committee was initially reluctant to ask the Dean of the Humanities to intervene in this matter, i.e. to prohibit the faculty from discussing the results of the Eight-Year Review with the graduate students, at least until he had the opportunity to investigate further. Upon such further investigation, however, the faculty head of the internal review committee did in fact agree with students that faculty should not be communicating with students directly about the Eight-Year Review, for all the reasons listed above. The graduate student representative for the Slavic Department students offered in lieu of such direct communication to serve as a medium for those students who wanted to communicate with the faculty, but who did not want to be identified, and also for faculty who wanted to convey their thoughts to the Slavic Department graduate students.

In response to this request by the internal review committee that the faculty be kept from discussing the results of the Eight-Year Review with the graduate students, the Dean of the Humanities came up with a partial solution, one which stated that only the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department should be in contact with students about the results of the Eight-Year Review, and that other faculty should refrain from engaging students on this topic. Although the Dean of the Humanities might have thought she was proposing a reasoned compromise, in fact that was not the opinion of the graduate students in question. Even if the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department had been honest and aboveboard throughout the review process, the fact is that he is a colleague of faculty members who for years had abused graduate students and who had instituted and for years nurtured an atmosphere of fear and intimidation among graduate students. Even if this chair had acted honorably during the Eight-Year Review process, it would still have been inappropriate for him to interact directly with graduate students concerning the Eight-Year Review, for these reasons and all the reasons listed above. There is no information that he wanted to have or disperse that could not have been done through the graduate student representative for the Slavic Department.

As the facts clearly show, however, the Chair of the Slavic Department was not honest and aboveboard during the review, and he did not act honorably during this process. Far from it. The internal review committee found numerous instances of the Chair failing to be honest and aboveboard. The following excerpt from the report makes clear the lack of forthrightness with which Michael Heim approached his duty to work with, and be honest with, the review committee:

"It was certainly the desire of the review team to work with the Chair of the department. For this reason the chair of the review team brought up, very directly but in general terms,

the issue of student dissatisfaction at a presite visit meeting with the Chair of the department. When the Chair of the department said that, aside from funding problems, there was no student dissatisfaction to speak of, the chair of the review team asked the question again to be sure he had heard correctly. Similar questions were asked of the Chair and of other faculty during the site visit. Especially in the beginning, the response was a disavowal of any such problems. At one point an external reviewer was moved to exclaim to a faculty member, "...you are in denial!" *The pattern that emerged was consistent denial or minimization of the problem-until confronted with overwhelming evidence.*"

The Dean of the Humanities knew at this point the extent to which the Chair had failed to be honest and aboveboard with the investigating committee. If the internal committee, which had the power to recommend sanctions against the Slavic Department, found that it could not trust the Chair of the Slavic Department, then why would the Dean of the Humanities think that this individual would warrant the trust of graduate students who had, under promises of protection from the UCLA Administration, spoken openly and at length about abuse within the UCLA Slavic Department? The "compromise" offered by the Dean of the Humanities was unacceptable and ominous: if the Chair's behavior was going to be overlooked even as the investigation is reaching a crucial point, the question had to be asked, what was the Dean of the Humanities' commitment to seeing that the process was conducted fairly and in a way designed to protect those graduate students who had responded to the UCLA Administration's request that they participate fully in this inquiry?

Graduate students immediately pointed this out to the faculty head of the internal committee. The graduate student representative in the UCLA Slavic Department again repeated her willingness to act as a medium between faculty and staff. The graduate student representative on the internal committee also voiced his concern. The response from the faculty head of the internal committee was one of concern, but also a feeling that the Dean of the Humanities should not be pressured on this point, at least not at this time. This was one of the few moments where some graduate students failed to see eye to eye with the faculty head of the internal committee, who did make the assurance, however, that if circumstances were to change, i.e. if it appeared as there might be problems with the Chair regarding this issue, he would immediately appeal this decision by the Dean of the Humanities to the "highest levels" of the University, understood by graduate students to mean the Chancellor's Office.

Two things immediately made clear the need for the internal committee to do just exactly that. The first was the reaction of the other faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department to the prohibition on speaking with graduate students about the specifics of the Eight-Year Review. Graduate students were informed that not only were some of the faculty not amenable to such a prohibition, they were furious that it had been imposed upon them from above. There was an immediate

threat by these faculty to challenge this prohibition legally as an infringement upon their First Amendment rights of free speech and as a violation of their academic freedom.

Heim's "Response to the Response" to the Factual Error's Statement

The second thing was a mass email sent out by the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department to all the graduate students. Apparently frustrated that his attempt to defend the Department via the "Factual Errors Statement" was trumped, point-by-point, by the internal committee, the Chair appears to have wanted to continue this argument privately with the graduate students themselves. At this point, given what was already on paper (and also given what graduate students in this department already knew) one has to wonder whom the Chair thought he was going to convince with this attempt. In any case, the Chair proceeded to again argue his case. The details of what he said and graduate student response to these details are appended in a latter section, so they will not be belabored here. Briefly, however, the Chair continued to defend his conduct and that of the faculty. Shockingly, he continued his attack on the one student (identified only as XX in the report) who had the courage to tell her story in such a way as to make her identifiable to the Department as a whole. In his attempt to smear her and to question her abilities, Michael Heim went so far as to release, without her permission, some of this student's undergraduate grades, thus violating a host of federal and state laws, to say nothing of UC regulations. Throughout this "rebuttal to the rebuttal" of the "Factual Errors Statement", the Chair continued his pattern of false and misleading claims. (Again, the specifics are seen in the annotated version of the report.)

The single most egregious, and disquieting, aspect of this mass email to students was when the Chair attempted to explain the question he posed in response to the internal report, namely "Who are 'the students' here?" In his attempt to characterize this question as one of a number of rhetorical questions, he makes the following statement: "I am not asking which students came forth: I do not need to ask who the offended students are because I know who they are." The effects of such a statement, sent directly to each and every one of the graduate students in a department which is being reviewed, can be nothing less than chilling, especially so for graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department. Michael Heim is saying that, in effect, he knows very well who was affected, and thus there is no longer any need to maintain a distance between him and the students.

Student Response to the Threat of Lawsuit Made by Slavic Department Faculty and to Michael Heim's Refusal to Recuse Himself from Questioning Slavic Department Graduate Students

Graduate students immediately reacted to this mass email. They pointed out to Internal Committee that, because the Chair had emailed his view of the situation to graduate students,

including those not in the area (i.e. those on vacation or on summer abroad study programs), those graduate students not actually in Los Angeles at that time were in effect getting only one side of the story, while at the same time being asked to comment on the entire situation. In other words, these students were not able to physically go into the UCLA Slavic Department office and look at the report, an option available (in theory, anyway) to graduate students still on campus at that time. The demand was made that *all* graduate students receive a copy of the entire report. If that meant emailing a copy of the report to grad students not currently in the local Los Angeles area, then so be it. This situation put the Academic Senate (which controls the dissemination of the report) in an awkward situation. Normally the Academic Senate prefers to keep a tight rein on the report itself, which is why there is usually only one or two copies available for student perusal, and even at that it is only available by going into the department in question and asking for it. And yet Michael Heim had already sent out his response to this report by email. Fairness demanded that the report itself also be sent out via email to all students, just as Michael Heim's rebuttal of the report was sent out by email, lest those students not on site receive only one side of the issue. And yet this request was ultimately rejected by the Academic Senate, presumably because the university was loath to have an Eight-Year Review report as damning as this one floating about in cyber-space. Instead, paper copies were mailed out to all students who were local with the promise that copies would be Federal Expressed overseas or elsewhere in the country to any UCLA Slavic Department graduate students who wanted a copy. (This, of course, would require the student to identify himself/herself as having this interest, something that did not have to happen in order to receive Michael Heim's response to the report by email.)

This failure by the Academic Senate to be evenhanded in its distribution of the report was disturbing enough, but nowhere near as disturbing as was the content of Michael Heim's mass email and the reaction of some of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, i.e. their threat to bring suit against the UCLA Administration for violating their First Amendment rights. Earlier, in response to concerns from UCLA Slavic Department graduate students that Michael Heim had not been prohibited by the Dean of the Humanities from discussing the results of the Eight-Year Review, the faculty head of the internal committee was concerned, but also said that if circumstances were to change, i.e. if it appeared as there might be problems with the Chair regarding this issue, he would immediately appeal this decision to the "highest levels" of the university.

When Heim's email arrived, a copy of it was immediately delivered to the faculty head of the internal committee along with a frantic request that he honor his promise to go to the highest levels of the university to keep Heim (and now the other faculty as well) from talking to UCLA Slavic Department graduate students about the Eight-Year Review. In spite of the numerous protests by graduate students involved in the Slavic Department's Eight-Year Review, no conclusion was ever reached in the matter involving Heim and the other faculty. That is to say, the status quo, that being Heim's refusal not to agree to refrain from talking directly to graduate

students about the Eight-Year Review, never changed. Graduate students were told by the Internal Review Team that appeals had been sent to officials from the College of Letters and Science and on up to officials at "the highest levels" of the university, again a euphemism they understood to mean the Chancellor's office. In spite of this, graduate students never heard of an official change in Heim's position, and there was no further directive coming from the university at any level prohibiting Heim from interrogating students about the Eight-Year Review. Likewise, there was never any indication from the University that it would challenge those faculty members who threatened legal action when they were asked not to interact with graduate students in the Slavic Department with regard to the Eight-Year Review. This sent a message that could not have been any clearer: in spite of what the Academic Senate or the College of Letters and Sciences had promised about protecting graduate students who participate in the Eight-Year Review, the university administration was not going to confront these faculty any further, regardless of what effect this had on the graduate students who had been promised protection in return for their cooperation with the investigation.

Single Most Crucial Point in the Review:

Once the University had promised, explicitly, to protect cooperating graduate students, only to prove itself unable and/or unwilling to prevent faculty members from asking students about the review, the true nature of the power structure at the UCLA became clear to all concerned, and especially to the graduate students who had believed the University's many promises of protection. While the process of investigation into the Slavic Department continued after this point, the credibility of any promise made to graduate students concerning protection evaporated with these incidents (faculty members threatening the university with legal action/Heim's refusal to leave off questioning graduate students about the review.) What also evaporates, as an extension of this, is the ability to question graduate students in an open and candid manner: not only can graduate students never again trust the promises of the university administration with regard to issues such as protection and lack of retaliation at the hands of faculty, but from this point onward, student responses themselves have to be seen as potentially compromised. *Why would any student, in response to an inquiry concerning the department and faculty on which he/she is so dependent, give a frank and detailed response in light of what has happened? To do so would be tantamount to professional suicide.*

Next Steps: Evaluating Options

At this point, the only alternative students were given was to respond to the Eight-Year Review report. The Graduate Council of the Academic Senate had requested a response to the report from Slavic Department graduate students, and since it seemed that the UCLA Administration had either given up or refused to order Heim and other faculty members from talking to graduate

students, the only alternative would be to raise this issue with the Academic Senate itself, via its Graduate Council. This was done both individually and in groups. The response attached here to the Eight-Year Review is of the latter and represents the view of more than one Slavic Department student, but others wrote individual responses.

The recommendation made by the internal committee was two-fold:

1. That the graduate admissions to the Slavic Department be suspended
2. That the Department be put into receivership

The first of these steps could only be authorized by the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate (the body which authorized and oversees all eight-year reviews), while the second, ordering the UCLA Slavic Department into receivership, could only be done by the Dean of the Humanities. The Chair of the Slavic Department, even after he had been exposed as one who misled, covered up, and fed false information to the internal committee, made clear from the beginning his intention to fight against the implementation of these two suggestions. As a part of this campaign he enlisted the assistance of the two members of the external committee, David Bethea of the University of Wisconsin, and Alan Timberlake of UC Berkeley, himself a former member of the UCLA Slavic Department. The Chair persuaded these two members to write an addendum to their original report, one that in effect softened both their own initial external committee report and also countered the findings of the internal committee.

During this time the Chair continued to ask students about the report, and continued to assert his right to do so. It was at this time that the Chair and some of the faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department began a long-term strategy to isolate the offending linguistic faculty and to make a show of change in the Department. Senior faculty members were approached and the idea was floated of closing down the linguistic component of the program altogether. A strategy was begun to differentiate literature from linguistics, presumably on the grounds that, since the offending linguistic faculty members could not be terminated because of their tenured status, the next best thing would be to make clear to the university administration that the real problem lay with the linguistic faculty, and not with the literature faculty. Above all, the "denial-of-the-obvious" strategy, which had blown up so devastatingly in the Department's face during the review itself, was continued.

The Bethea/Timberlake Addendum

The addendum to the original report by the two members of the external committee, David Bethea of Wisconsin and Alan Timberlake of Berkeley, was a part of this "lie and deny" strategy. It too is appended to this report, along with an annotated copy which comments in detail on the accuracy of this addendum. Only a brief overview of this addendum will be given here.

When the scope, detail, and severity of the internal committee's report finally became clear to the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, the "lie and deny" strategy kicked into full gear. It may seem counterintuitive to non-academic readers of this tract (i.e. to those not involved in academe at the university level) that the Chair would do this, especially given the fact that his credibility had just been decimated by an investigating committee comprised of his own academic colleagues at UCLA, but one needs to keep in mind the environment at UCLA. The only people really capable of disputing Michael Heim or any of the faculty were graduate students themselves. The relationship that exists between faculty and graduate students in a department such as the UCLA Slavic Department is one in which intimidation and the always-present-if-not-always-subtle threat of retaliation at all time lies ominously just beneath the surface. The resulting fear on the part of the graduate students allows the faculty much leeway in what it reports as the truth: in many instances, only graduate students can refute what is being said, and no graduate student who has any hope at all of graduating (much less of getting the all important mentorship and recommendations after graduation) would dare to contradict faculty. Russian literature tells us of a similar relationship between Russian plantation owners and their serfs, where the most intimate and damning of topics were often discussed in the presence of these serfs, mainly because these serfs had no legal standing in law or society, and that the word of a serf against his master carried no weight in this particular power paradigm. Graduate students are not serfs, but the same principle applies: since it would be dangerous and self-harming to call attention to any faculty member's "flexible" interpretation of the truth, the faculty often become used to the fact that they can take liberties with the truth, so much so that it becomes second nature.

This results in a sort of laxness when it comes to reporting the truth, an understood "built in" margin of error/exaggeration. This may explain the implementation by the UCLA Slavic Department of the "lie and deny" strategy, even in the face of such a massive and embarrassing trumping of this strategy previously. It appears that this same strategy also played prominently in the addendum penned by Bethea/Timberlake. They begin by acknowledging that what prompted their letter was their fear that the continued existence UCLA Slavic Department as an academic department was itself at stake. They then claim the following:

- that they heard the same evidence as the internal committee (not in the least true, since many graduate students, because of the presence of Alan Timberlake, a former UCLA Slavic Department professor--and a linguist no less--, refused to talk to the internal committee);
- they wrote against the internal committee's finding that the UCLA Slavic Department treated graduate students like "chattel" and "damaged goods" (there is no way that the external committee could know one way or the other whether or not this was true, since they didn't have the same broad-based student input that the internal committee had);
- They shamefully try to twist the situation in the UCLA Slavic Department around such that it

is not the UCLA Slavic Department faculty that is guilty of abuse, but rather, just the opposite is said to be true: it is the poor faculty which is being treated unfairly, not unlike those who suffered injustices in the Soviet Union;

— Bethea/Timberlake go on to question the trustworthiness of the internal committee, implying that it accepted the students' version of events sight unseen (this is completely untrue; everything told to by graduate students to the internal committee was repeatedly questioned, and the committee itself did independent verifications of what was said);

— Quite to the contrary, it is Bethea/Timberlake who unquestioningly accept information, but they do it from the faculty: they accept without question the Slavic Department Chair's characterization of XX (the one student who was courageous enough to go public with her story), and then go on to repeat it as if it were fact as they join the Chair in his campaign to smear her further; they also accept as fact the ludicrous figures fed to them by the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department with regard to the number of the Department's graduate students who obtain tenure track positions;

— Bethea/Timberlake mischaracterize the training received as "excellent" (*some* of it is excellent; some is good, some is mediocre, some is terrible, and *much* of it, especially in linguistics, is simply outdated)

— Bethea/Timberlake mischaracterize their own review as "extremely rigorous". (It may have been that from their point of view, but they did not even come close to the truth of that department, albeit for reasons that are not entirely their fault, since many students refused to talk with them because of Timberlake's presence on the committee.)

— Bethea/Timberlake at times out-and-out repudiate their previous report, taking a department that they once characterized as having "an alarming level of anxiety, bordering on demoralization" and then turning around in this addendum and claiming that they "do not find it dysfunctional". Have they adopted here the "lie and deny" strategy of the UCLA Slavic Department itself? Did they automatically default to that manifestation of "Truth" that is built upon the aforementioned "understood" and "built in" margin of error/exaggeration, a margin which none of the graduate student "serfs" has heretofore pointed out? Or do they simply lack cognitive dissonance?

— Most amazingly, even after having seen the internal report, after having read how Michael Heim went out of his way to *deny* the truth, went out of his way to *cover up* abuse, went out of his way to defend at all costs the reputation of the UCLA Slavic Department, even up to and including smearing the reputation of former students--even after all this, Bethea/Timberlake *still* continue to characterize Michael Heim in the most positive of lights, claiming that "especially under the current chair--the department has come to a mature understand of the nature of its problems as a collective..." etc. etc. If someone who had acted in the way Michael Heim had acted was considered by Bethea/Timberlake to be an optimal person to chair the Department, then one could only ask whom they would consider to be an inappropriate person to chair the Department?

In summary, the Bethea/Timberlake addendum was nothing more than an attempt to downplay the severity of the problems that exist within the UCLA Slavic Department, an attempt in which they were quite willing to ignore inconsistencies, accept unquestioningly what was told to them, accuse the investigators of Stalinist tactics of repression against the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department, join this faculty in its attempts to smear students who did speak up, and on and on and on. It is a disgraceful and embarrassing example of the solidarity that exists among tenured faculty, and of the extent to which they will go to protect their own regardless of how repugnant or abuse the behavior of these colleagues.

Responding to the Report

This, then, was the atmosphere that confronted graduate students who had complied with the request of the UCLA Administration to cooperate fully with the investigators of the UCLA Department, and who had been promised anonymity and protection from retaliation on the part of the faculty. They had seen this promise dismissed completely by the UCLA Administration, this after numerous requests from graduate students themselves, from the graduate student representative from the Slavic Department, repeated requests from the graduate student representative on the internal committee, and from the faculty head of the internal committee itself (who would later reverse himself). These same students were now being asked to comment directly to the Academic Senate (more precisely, to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate) on the report itself. As was noted above when it became clear that the UCLA Administration was going to refuse to take steps to keep Michael Heim and the rest of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty from questioning students about the content of the report, the handwriting was very clearly on the wall: as graduate students in that department at that university, there could be no expectation--none--of protection from avenging faculty or from further interrogation or even of anonymity, since such interrogation could, in a small department such as the UCLA Slavic Department, very quickly narrow the field of who talked and who did not.

And yet, even in spite of this fact, even in spite of the betrayal of these students by the UCLA Administration, many still responded to the report, still offered feedback to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate. Whether or not they were as open and aboveboard in their commentary as they might have once been, one cannot say. Clearly some were, as can be seen by the documents appended here in this report. Some felt that this was the absolute last chance to convince the UCLA Administration to do something about the UCLA Slavic Department. At the end of the 1999-2000 academic year the Graduate Council had acted immediately upon the suggestion of the internal committee and suspended admissions to this department, but the Dean of the Humanities had yet to act on the suggestion that the Department be put into receivership.

This was new ground for everyone concerned, but very few of the students doubted that the receivership would happen, especially given the extent to which the corruption and abuse and lying in the UCLA Slavic Department had been exposed by the report. The feeling among many UCLA graduate students was that, regardless of broken promises, once all the information got to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate, once this body of UCLA faculty members were confronted not only with the numerous lies told on behalf of the UCLA Slavic Department both by its chair and by the supposedly objective "outside" reviewers brought in to evaluate it, and once the Graduate Council was informed that this disinformation campaign had even grown to include cover up activity, threats to students' well-being brought about by the abrogation of promises made by the UCLA Administration, the public smearing of an ex-student, and actual illegal activity in the form of releasing to non-authorized persons grades from the undergraduate transcript of that same individual--that at this point, the Graduate Council could not help but step in, continue the ban on the admission of new graduate students, and urge the UCLA Administration to fully implement the suggestions of the internal committee, i.e. receivership.

In order for this to happen, however, the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate had to know the specifics of the incidents that occurred within the UCLA Slavic Department and the incidents that characterized this most unusual of eight-year reviews. It was the belief of some graduate students that without the presentation of overwhelming evidence of wrongdoing on the part of the UCLA Slavic Department, and without overwhelming evidence of how the entire review system is skewed in favor of the faculty, the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate might find a way to wiggle out of its obligations, might find a way to soften the steps suggested by the internal review committee. Past experience both within the UCLA Slavic Department and in this particular Eight-Year Review (e.g. the Bethea/Timberlake addendum) has shown that if given the chance, faculty members investigating fellow faculty members will, to varying degrees, tend to give the benefit of the doubt to their colleagues, usually for the reasons discussed at the beginning of this tract (e.g. professional courtesy, inability/unwillingness of the institution to bring about real punishment, etc.). Because of this, it was decided that in the student response appended here, there could be no wiggle room, no possible way for the UCLA Administration to misinterpret or conveniently overlook the actions of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty. It was for this reason that the response to the Eight-Year Review, and to Michael Heim's emails and to the Bethea/Timberlake addendum, had to be as detailed as possible, almost a point-by-point commentary on what was being claimed. The thinking was that no matter how outlandish and fantastic the protestations of innocence that would be made by the UCLA Slavic Department, the evidence countering those claims would be so overwhelming, and so damning, that the UCLA Administration, in the persons of the Dean of the Humanities and the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate, would have no alternative but to follow through with the suggestions of the internal review committee by putting the UCLA Slavic Department into receivership and by continuing the ban on graduate admissions.

Departmental Strategy vis-à-vis the Graduate Council and the Dean of the Humanities

At the beginning of the Fall Quarter of the 2000-2001 academic year, the Chair of the Slavic Department, Michael Heim, did what he said he was going to do all along, and that was go to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate and ask that the ban on graduate student admissions be immediately lifted. Graduate students were understandably of two minds on this issue. On the one hand, the handwriting seemed to be very much on the wall. Everything pointed to the fact that the UCLA Administration was going to do everything it could to hush up this horribly embarrassing review and, if possible, effect whatever change was deemed necessary through gradual reform and not confront the UCLA Slavic Department directly. It may well be that the legal challenge that some of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty had threatened might have put the Administration in its place and let it know where ultimate authority resided in the University. Both Heim and the rest of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty had openly and with impunity defied the attempts to keep them from talking to graduate students about the Eight-Year Review. Given this fact, some graduate students asked the question, what's the point of fighting this thing any further? Clearly the UCLA Administration has shown its intention to preserve the UCLA Slavic Department and its faculty at all costs, so why continue this fight? The impulse to give up was also fueled by the knowledge that continuing the fight, while perhaps morally noble, could easily harm the very students who were waging this battle, since any dent to the UCLA Slavic Department's reputation would also have negative residual effects on the graduate students themselves, who depend in part on that reputation to get jobs.

And yet, there was also the feeling that given the egregious and repeated nature of both the abuses within the UCLA Slavic Department and of the attempts to cover up and minimize this abuse, this would be one time where the UCLA Administration simply could not ignore the recommendations of the internal committee. While there was never a poll conducted among graduate students regarding the lifting of the ban on graduate student admissions to the Department as a whole, there were discussions about whether or not the ban should be lifted for just specific sections of the Department, i.e. whether or not the ban should be lifted to allow the admission of just literature graduate students or (much less likely, since the problems in this department stemmed primarily from the linguistic section) or of just linguistic students. Most of the graduate students in literature felt that it might be all right to allow the admission of literature graduate students. This would help to soften the blow to the Department's reputation and it would keep any more young and enthusiastic first year graduate students in Slavic linguistics from being exposed to the linguistic faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department with all that would connote for their graduate student experience. The linguistic graduate students were, understandably, much more divided. On the one hand, they were to a much greater degree the direct recipients of the abuse that had characterized the UCLA Slavic Department's treatment of its graduate students and were thus very much aware of the need to put an end to this treatment.

In addition, there were some among this group that were so incensed at the way the system seemed to conspire in favor of the faculty, so outraged by the fact that outside faculty such as Bethea/Timberlake were willing to jump so readily onto the bandwagon and try to, in effect, disavow some of what they had written in their original external review report, that these students were willing to do whatever it took, including risking their own careers and risking potential legal action against them that they were more than willing to do whatever it took to make sure that the truth was revealed and that this sort of cover up (regardless of at whatever level it was taking place) would succeed. (The fear of having legal action being threatened against students by the UCLA Slavic Department is not, by the way, one that is without foundation or precedent. Such threats have been seen even for smaller incidents, far less important to the reputation of the UCLA Slavic Department than the results of the Eight-Year Review.)

On the other hand, there were linguistic students who felt that, since the UCLA Administration had, at this point, indicated by its failure to bring Michael Heim and the rest of the faculty in line, at least with regard to the issue of not contacting graduate students concerning the results of the Eight-Year Review, that we might as well accept this defeat as a partial victory (at least some of the abuses were brought to light) and go on from here. And some of the graduate students, frankly, were in fact intimidated by what the faculty might do in response to continued pressure from the graduate students to bring to light the abuses within the UCLA Slavic Department. The fact that students now knew that they had no real protection from the faculty, and that the promises of protection from interrogation at the hands of the faculty were in reality empty promises, no doubt contributed to this atmosphere of intimidation and hesitation on the part of some of these graduate students. In the end, when polled by the graduate student representative for the Slavic Department whether or not the Department should be allowed to open admissions to graduate students again in their respective disciplines (on the condition that reforms be undertaken in the Department and that outside supervision be present), about half of the Slavic linguistic graduate students agreed. The others said no, with a small number abstaining. (There was also a small number who were technically graduate students but who were out of residence, i. e. advanced to candidacy and working elsewhere.) It should be noted that literature students voted in favor of allowing the Department to admit new students, but *only* literature students. (In effect, for the purposes of this vote, the students were divided into literature and linguistic sections, with each group voting on whether or not graduate students should be admitted specifically in that subfield, i.e. literature students voting on whether the Department should be allowed to accept graduate students *only* in literature, while linguistics students voted on whether or not linguistics students should be admitted.)

When the time came for Michael Heim to address the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate, he did exactly what he said he was going to do, he asked the Graduate Council to remove the ban on graduate student admissions, claiming there had been "significant reform" of the Slavic Department during the summer. Anyone who knows the UCLA Slavic Department, even if only

superficially, knows that this is nonsense. The very idea of reforming a department like the UCLA Slavic Department, one which for decades existed using threats of abuse and abuse itself, in just a single summer is outright laughable. The fact is that this department, if it was reformable at all, would be so only after years of oversight and probably only after the termination of some of its faculty, an option made almost impossible because of the institution and rules of tenure, at least as this institution and as these rules exist now. This is not to say that the UCLA Slavic Department didn't make pretenses of reform, and in some cases, there really were some small reforms. Apparently Michael Heim's strategy, and that of the UCLA Slavic Department, was to "make show". In other words, to introduce a number of quantitatively impressive "reforms" to which the Slavic Department Chair could point to when making his case for lifting the ban on graduate student admissions and for keeping the UCLA Slavic Department out of receivership.

In order to understand the nature of the reforms and the pseudo-reforms that came about as a result of the Eight-Year Review report, one must first understand both exactly what the Eight-Year Review found during its investigation into the UCLA Slavic Department and the nature and scope of the abuses that characterized this department. The Eight-Year Review is attached to this document, both in its original form and in annotated copy, but a summary of those aspects of the report necessary to evaluate the above mentioned reforms and pseudo-reforms will be presented here. In addition, some of the abuses in the UCLA Slavic Department which were not presented in the report itself (for reasons of preserving anonymity, or simply for reasons of keeping the report to manageable dimensions) will also be presented here. It is against the backdrop of these factors that the analysis of these reforms and pseudo-reforms will be made.

Excerpts from the Review and Individual Instances of Abuse and Subsequent Cover Up Documented Therein or Connected with the Review Report

- Setting the tone for the report: "This level of graduate program dysfunction is unprecedented in the collective experience of this review team."
- *Every* student who spoke feared retribution
- Physical displays of anger by the faculty
- Students being intimidated into taking courses they neither wanted nor needed
- Course evaluation forms which are anonymous in name only

- Fear of retaliation in comprehensive exams or in getting dissertation signatures
- Shouted and barbed insults aimed at students
- Students threatened with a loss of funding
- Students threatened with disciplinary action for disagreeing with faculty
- Systematic disrespect for graduate students
- Spiritual blight in the Department in the eyes of the students
- Overadmitting students and then allowing attrition to select those students who finally get degrees
- Talent being shunted or destroyed altogether
- Incomplete or non-existent reading lists
- The faculty avoids voting on issues that might go against the strongest personalities in the Department
- Excerpt from the review: "Again and again the review team heard of mistreated students who received only soothing words from the Chair and from other members of the faculty. In one instance the Chair actually did approach the faculty member involved to suggest outside mediation. When (predictably) the faculty member objected, the matter was dropped. Thus, a situation with its origins in a small minority has become the responsibility of the entire department because of the inaction and complacency of the faculty (with one exception)."
- The very Chair of the Slavic Department himself claiming not to understand the picture of the UCLA Slavic Department drawn by the internal committee
- The Chair of the Slavic Department was untruthful in his statement that XX was the only student lost as a result of a conflict with a faculty member
- The Chair of the Slavic Department was untruthful in his statement that the UCLA Slavic Department does not discard students as damaged goods

- The Chair of the Slavic Department was untruthful in his statement that the internal committee taking everything that was told to them by the students at face value
- The Chair of the Slavic Department was untruthful in his statement that the UCLA Slavic Department faculty was looking forward to the Eight-Year Review
- The Chair of the Slavic Department was untruthful in his statement that the UCLA Slavic Department could handle its own affairs and thus did not need to be put into receivership
- The Chair of the Slavic Department was untruthful in his statement that he had "no idea" of the Review Team's probable conclusions
- The Chair of the Slavic Department was untruthful in his statement that retaliation had never occurred in the UCLA Slavic Department
- The Chair of the Slavic Department was untruthful in his statement that student suffering had been blown out of proportion
- The Chair of Slavic Department, in seeking to smear the one student who did speak openly with the internal committee (designated "XX" in the report), openly mischaracterized this student's ability in Russian, and misrepresented the nature of the coursework taken by her here at UCLA
- As a part of this smear campaign, the Chair of the Slavic Department violated UC regulations and state and federal law by releasing, via email, grades from XX's undergraduate transcripts to grad students and others

Instances of Abuse Not Covered Specifically in the Report (*Not a Comprehensive List*)

- Minimal, and at times non-existent, concern with student welfare
- Violations of ethical and professional codes of conduct by faculty, some of whom are almost certainly psychologically disturbed
- Campaign to keep regulations, requirements, and official obligations as vague and as ill defined as possible in order to allow the faculty the greatest possible interpretation of said rules, regulations and obligations.

- A faculty that rules by canard and by decree as opposed to adhering to the rules and regulations set down by the University, ignoring rules that were not to their liking and establishing new rules on the spot
- A department with no organization, with no firm policies, no coordination of policy, and no will to organize itself
- Irrational and contradictory behavior towards graduate students (and often towards other faculty as well)
- Failure by the rational and semi-rational faculty to check the behavior of the irrational faculty
- Institutionalization of graduate student abuse
- The previous Eight-Year Review process had been a farce:
 1. Graduate students had been coached on what to say and what not to say to the investigating teams
 2. Thus, the investigating teams failed to highlight the abuse going on in the Department

3. Even worse, by failing to highlight the abuse, the eventual report that came out of the review provided a cover of sort for the Department, an inaccurate report of a good department

- Failure to prepare students in the fundamentals of the field, especially in linguistics
- Giving out misleading information to potential students in an attempt to recruit them into the UCLA Slavic Department. Included in this on-going campaign of deception were misrepresentations, half-truths, and out and out falsehoods, especially with regard to the funding that was said to be available to graduate students.
- Students were routinely told that if they made satisfactory progress (the criteria for which were never defined) then sufficient funding would be available for the duration of their on-campus training. This was not true.
- Students had no right to expect funding, but they had every right to expect the truth about the funding situation, a truth that was consistently downplayed or denied outright

during the recruitment process.

- A grading process by the faculty that was at best wildly subjective, at worse deliberately manipulated according to the personal whims of individual professors and not according to objective criteria designed to test the student's mastery of the material presented.
- The at time almost nonexistent relationship between grades earned and success on comprehensive exams.
- Students being forced to take classes they neither wanted nor needed simply to provide students for a class that a particular professor wanted to teach.
- Students being punished for dropping out of classes that they didn't need
- Students who had no idea what to expect on comprehensive exams, no idea of what to focus on, no idea of what the faculty considered important, especially in linguistics
- Uneven and often inconsistent standards for what was expected of students in terms of their ability in Russian
- Different standards and different levels of difficulties for different students on what are supposedly the same level of exams, e.g. one student having a markedly more difficult and challenging M.A. exam than another. While Ph.D. exams are expected to be more individualized, this was not true of M.A. exams, and yet there were wildly different standards of success for different students.
- Exams being used to punish students who failed to toe the line
- Using individual homework assignments to punish students who had fallen out of favor
- The problems of nepotism within the UCLA Slavic Department
- Faculty acting as a carburetor of sorts, regulating the field by discarding graduate students at their whim, as opposed to by the abilities, or lack thereof, of the individual graduate students
- Students not being mentored through the dissertation process, but rather being left to flounder by a faculty so uninformed on recent scholarship in the field that said faculty is incapable of helping students in this situation move on with their work

- Faculty actually threatening unspecified retaliation against other faculty, *even in the presence of graduate students* (note the above-mentioned "serf" phenomenon), for perceived offenses such as breaking the "unity" of the Department, and for watching out for graduate students' best interests, even when those interests are at odds with those of the abusive faculty members
- The faculty's inevitable characterization of any attempt to regulate its behavior from the outside as a "violation of academic freedom" and as an "insult to the dignity of the University" (actual quotes from various faculty members)
- The faculty actually *discouraging* graduate students from publishing and from delivering papers at conferences, other than at the tightly controlled California Colloquium ("You're at conferences in order to *listen* to talks, not to give them.")
- Graduate students being coached on how to respond to inquiries from the Eight-Year Review committee
- Faculty members staying in the classroom while supposedly confidential course evaluation forms are being filled out

These then are *some* of the abuses, which characterized the UCLA Slavic Department's treatment of its graduate students. Once again it must be emphasized that this list is not even remotely comprehensive, and it may not even be representative of some of the worst abuses that occurred. Others will inevitably come to light as investigation of this department proceeds, but what the above lists do provide is the sort of background necessary to understand the nature of the claims made by the UCLA Slavic Department in late summer and early fall of 2000 to have turned itself around and become capable of directing its own future and that of its present and future graduate students.

Response of the UCLA Slavic Department Faculty to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate

The response to Graduate Council by the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department was consistent with what one would have expected from a department which had for years denied there were any problems at all. When confronted with the truth time and again by the internal review committee, however, the strategy of the Slavic Department then switched. The decision was made to try to minimize the impact of the report and to make it seem that the abuses reported by the review committee had been blown out of proportion. Central and essential to this effort, however, was

the goal of once again gaining control over its own graduate students, the same students who (in part) had been empowered by the promises of the UCLA Administration, promises of anonymity and of protection from retribution and from being interviewed and questioned by the faculty concerning the Eight-Year Review. Once it became clear that these promises were empty, that the faculty (any of the faculty, not just the Chair, which would have been bad enough) could corner any of these students and ask them about the review, this control over the graduate students began to flow back toward the faculty. Students knew then, if they hadn't known earlier, that indeed, no matter what happened, the UCLA Administration was going to stand squarely in the corner of the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department.

Once this criterion was met, once control had once again begun to be reestablished, the Slavic Department could begin this process of minimalization. Since the review process is itself so compartmentalized, this attempt might not be as far-fetched as it sounds: the UCLA Administration goes to great lengths to see to it that the reports from the Eight-Year Review are not circulated, this despite the fact that what is reported there is all technically on the public record and thus retrievable through the Freedom of Information Act. Even at this late date, even with all that had been revealed about the abuses that had occurred in the UCLA Slavic Department and the attempts by the faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department to deny and cover-up these abuses, there was still hope among the Slavic Department faculty that the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate could be led to believe that not only was substantive reform possible, but that it had already occurred.

The response by the UCLA Slavic Department to the Eight-Year Review is appended below, so what will be seen here will be a brief overview. The attempt at minimalization, at balancing out all of the bad with some of the good, begins with the very first sentence: "We are gratified by the praise for the Department's stature and the accomplishments of both the graduate and undergraduate programs, but we have also taken the harsh criticisms to heart." Apparently the first thing that struck the UCLA Slavic Department about the Eight-Year Review was not the long list of repeated and documented abuse and charges of cover-up associated with that abuse, but rather an enormous sense of gratification at the praise heaped upon the UCLA Slavic Department in the Eight-Year Review for its "stature and accomplishments". The Eight-Year Review is appended here in its entirety (except for once page of the faculty self-review that was not released), so readers can judge for themselves whether this sense of gratification on the part of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty is merited. The more jaded interpretation of this opening line to the Academic Senate's Graduate Council would be something along the following lines: "We as the UCLA Slavic Department have for years done what has been asked of us by the University. We have assembled a world-class faculty, we have published, we have hosted and attended conferences, we have established what was a well-regarded graduate program. We have done all this, and this is not something that should be overlooked by our colleagues on the

Graduate Council. Sure, there has been some unfortunate abuse of students, but that goes along with the system. Who among us hasn't seen this or something like it in our own departments? Keep this in mind, and keep in mind the old saying, "There but for the grace of G-d go I."

The response goes on to detail the division of the Department into so-called "caucuses", one for literature and one for linguistics. In this can be seen the beginnings of the idea that was germinating at the time among literature faculty, the idea to do away with the linguistic side of the program, an idea actually broached by some of the literature faculty to senior linguistic faculty. Also able to be seen is the continuation of the policy of simply refusing to confront those troublesome linguistic faculty identified in the report as "the strongest personalities in the department". Rather than actually confront them, the new idea was simply to isolate them in a linguistic "caucus", and thus insulate the literature faculty from the madness which regularly emanated forth from some of their linguistic colleagues.

In order to continue with this strategy of minimalization, the UCLA Slavic Department was going to have to show something, some evidence that not only had substantial reform been undertaken, but that it had actually been implemented, and had become so well entrenched that this department, a department which for years had abused its graduate students and then routinely lied about such abuse, was now, *in the course of just a few months*, completely turned around. One would think that being able to project a positive image of such a department would be a near impossible task, and in most cases it would be, assuming that those elements of the UCLA Administration which were tasked with overseeing the Slavic Department, namely the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate and the Dean of the Humanities, were not already predisposed in favor the UCLA Slavic Department.

The arguments advanced by the Slavic Department in favor of lifting sanctions can only be seen as unreal and bizarre, as least in so far as they could be seen as a justification for lifting the sanctions. To quote from the second paragraph: "Let us begin by treating the issue the internal report revolves around, that is, what it terms the unhealthy environment among the graduate students and its relation to faculty conduct. Although we understand that an unhealthy environment cannot be legislated out of existence, we feel we have taken the necessary decisive actions to restore that environment to health." How might they have accomplished this Herculean feat in a mere matter of months? To a large extent, through (so goes the claim) the production of a "handbook" for graduate students, one which "will go a long way to lifting what they have perceived as the veil of secrecy surrounding a number of departmental procedures" and "will contain detailed explanations of all current policies, including the ones recently passed in connection with the review." In reality, this "handbook" (seen in [Section IV-H](#) of this report) was nothing more than an attempt to appease the demand for change with a quantitatively impressive but qualitatively vacuous document that, far from "lifting...the veil of secrecy surrounding a

number of departmental procedures", only served to further obscure the real causes for student alienation. The vast majority of this "handbook" merely told students what they already knew: where to sign up for email addresses, calendar of deadlines, important phone numbers, building maintenance, information on the Reading Room and the Russian Room, a list of faculty and staff, housing information, and that type of program information that is typically available in a college catalog, faculty committees, and so forth. Of the 34 pages of the initial "student handbook", only one addresses faculty misconduct, and all it does is to quote official University policy in this regard.

In short, this student handbook does nothing--nothing--to alleviate the deep-rooted problems that have characterized the UCLA Slavic Department for years. The only purpose for a work such as this is to provide a cover of sorts, to provide something to which the UCLA Slavic Department faculty can point in order to claim that they have taken steps to address the many problems that are found in the Department. The handbook is appended below, and can be seen there in its entirety. A quick glance through it makes glaringly clear the intent behind such a handbook, one which simply repackages information easily available elsewhere and which contributes nothing to the resolution of the Department's problems. Given the fact that the intent of this "student handbook" is so transparent, the question then becomes, why would the UCLA Slavic Department offer up such a weak and flimsy document to the university body (Graduate Council of the Academic Senate) and the university official (Dean of the Humanities) who will eventually decide the fate of the Department with regard to the questions of receivership and the lifting of the ban on graduate student admission? The only plausible answer goes back to what was discussed at the beginning of this work, the nature of the relationship between tenured professors, and especially between those tenured professors who are tasked with the unpleasant duty of overseeing their fellow tenured colleagues. The faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department understood very well that they had to offer up something, anything that would, at least superficially, appear to be a step in the direction of clearing up the confusion and darkness that has enveloped the Department for so long. They also understood that the tenured faculty who would be judging their efforts (the Graduate Council and the Dean of the Humanities) would not be pressing them on the flimsy nature of this "student handbook". The important thing was that there be something that could be presented, and something to which could be referred should a worst-case scenario occur and inquiries be made from *outside* of the university system regarding the UCLA Slavic Department.

The claims of the Slavic Department to have turned itself around reach their most surreal, however, when addressing the issue of abuse. Given the fact that abuse of graduate students was the central (although not only) issue of the Eight-Year Review, this section will be excerpted here:

"Of the new policies the one most directly relevant to the issue of faculty conduct is the establishment of a formal grievance procedure in cases involving a potential violation of the

Faculty Code of Conduct. Given its central importance let us cite it in toto: *Students believing they have a grievance involving a faculty member are advised to attempt to resolve the matter with the faculty member in question. If the grievance remains unresolved or if students feel hesitant about approaching the faculty member, they may bring the matter to the attention of the chair and request the chair's mediation. At any point students may avail themselves of the campus Ombuds Office. Other courts of resort include the Graduate Division and the Office of the Dean of the Humanities. In cases of grievances involving a potential violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct (see UCLA Faculty Handbook [www.apo.ucla.edulapoweb/facultyhandbook/9 htm49]) students may consult with a member of the Academic Senate Grievance and Discipline Procedures Committee (3125 Murphy Hall, 310•825.3891) for help in deciding on an appropriate course of action. For further details see UCLA General Catalogue, Appendix A, Charges of Violation"*

Again, on the surface, this looks fine: the establishment of a formal grievance procedure. But what does this "formal grievance procedure" say and do? When we break it down it lists the following options (in the order in which each option is to be exercised) whenever a student feels he/she has been the victim of abuse:

1. *Resolve the matter with the faculty in question.* For the type of abuse that has gone on in this particular department, the very idea of resolving the problem with the faculty member in question flies in the face of reality. The response to such challenges is always instantaneous and scathing. Even assuming--and this would be a great assumption--that the graduate student could continue in the graduate program after challenging the faculty member, what he/she would certainly have to look forward to is increased difficulty in getting funding, and, more importantly, the loss of whatever mentoring and recommendations one could possibly hope to attain from the faculty member whose conduct was challenged. There have been several instances where students simply changed their concentration from linguistics to literature after having made the mistake of challenging a linguistics faculty member. In addition, one would also have to deal with the influence of these faculty after graduation, influence that extends throughout the United States and into foreign countries as well. It is difficult enough to get a job in the field of Slavic, it is that much more so when your home campus faculty not only would not support you, but would let it be known, subtly but clearly, that you should not be hired.

2. *Bring the matter to the chair and request the chair's mediation.* This is sheer lunacy. This department, the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, actually expects graduate students to go freely to the Chair with problems concerning faculty abuse? This after the chair at the time of the review, Michael Heim, continually lied and covered up and denied the abuses that were taking place? The same chair who himself admits that he cannot recognize the picture of the UCLA Slavic Department drawn by the review committee? The same chair who tried to smear the one student brave enough to allow her story to be told publicly, and who

encouraged Bethea/Timberlake to join in that smear campaign? The same chair who broke the state and federal law by releasing grades from the undergraduate transcript of this same student? The same chair who said that the report overstated the degree of student suffering, and who said that there were no real problems to speak of, and who said that the UCLA Slavic Department could handle its own affairs, and who claimed that retaliation never occurred in this department, who claimed that the internal review committee took everything that the graduate students said at face value? The same chair who refused urgent and repeated requests from students and administrators alike to cease his questioning of graduate students about the Eight-Year Review?

Is *this* the chair to whom graduate students are supposed to go? It is stunning that this department, or any department that had been so thoroughly exposed as abusive, would have the chutzpah even to think such a thing, much less suggest it formally as a way of countering abuse perpetrated by faculty.

3. Four other potential mediators are mentioned. The problem is, these are not so much mediators as they are facilitators, institutions that simply route people through the complaint process:

a. *the campus Ombuds Office*

The Ombuds Office will contact the various people concerned, but its powers are extremely limited;

b. *the Graduate Division*

The Graduate Division is the institution that conducts the Eight-Year Review. That process has already been tried and shown to be severely deficient;

c. *the Office of the Dean of the Humanities*

A number of students went directly to the Dean of the Humanities prior to the 1999-2000 review of the UCLA Slavic Department. They were told that the best way to handle this problem is through the above-mentioned severely deficient Eight-Year Review process;

d. *Academic Senate Grievance and Discipline Procedures Committee:*

This point is addressed in detail in the response to the Eight-Year Review appended here, but just to touch briefly on this and why it is not much of an option: according to the Dean of the Humanities at the time of the review, whatever action is taken against the professor in question is done so in secret; not even the students who bring up the complaint are allowed to know what that action is. Not only can one not know the severity (or lack thereof) with which the offending faculty member has been punished, it's not even possible to know if he/she was punished at all. This is particularly problematic in that it removes the embarrassment and shame of public censure as a tool for keeping faculty in line and discouraging them from practicing

the sort of abuse that was characteristic of the UCLA Slavic Department.

Thus, past experience would tell us that none of these four options are much of an option at all, at least not if one hopes to bring about effective action in restraining the offending faculty members.

The sort of "made for display" nature of "the new policies the one most directly relevant to the issue of faculty conduct is the establishment of a formal grievance procedure" is best seen in the fact that these policies are not in the least bit "new". These options, weak as they are, have *always* been available to graduate students, even when the storm was blowing its worst in the UCLA Slavic Department. It is precisely because they were so weak that they were rarely if ever used. It was only when things got so bad that there seemed to be no alternatives for large numbers of students other than to quit the program altogether that graduate students availed themselves of options such as going to the Dean of the Humanities and the Academic Senate, the results of which action will soon be discussed here. The main point, however, is that the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, in proclaiming this "new policy" and the "establishment of a formal grievance procedure", has in fact done nothing of the sort. They merely repackaged the old, insufficient system and presented it as new. Granted, this works well for those looking in from without, but for those who are familiar with the Department, this was nothing more than yet another Potemkin village built to impress onlookers with the new sense of concern this faculty suddenly developed for its students.

This is the sort of "reform" that has been on-going in the UCLA Slavic Department. One last final example of such "reform" will be examined here, one supposedly dedicated to making clear the opacity of the funding process. In an internal report of the UCLA Slavic Department dated November of 2001 (entire text is appended below) the Slavic Department faculty address the funding procedure, declaring that henceforth there would be a student-self assessment involved, and that the criteria would include level of academic performance, timely progress to the degree, and support history (i.e. how much support an individual student has had in the past compared to that provided his peers). This is much the same approach that the faculty used when adopting the "new" procedures for dealing with faculty abuse of students and the "establishment" of a "formal grievance procedure". There is nothing new in all of this. It is simply a repackaging of the old criteria. It is not as if the criteria themselves are bad. They are not now bad, nor were they bad then. It is simply that the criteria themselves were so loosely adhered to that they couldn't even be said to have been guidelines. Let's take them one at a time:

- 1. Student-self assessment:** Nothing new here. This simply harks back to the time when graduate students had to include a statement of purpose when requesting departmental support. The particulars might be slightly different, but the principles are the same.
- 2. Level of academic performance:** On the face of it, this seems reasonable. The problem is how one judges the levels of academic performance. The Eight-Year Review report

speaks of students being threatened with lower grades simply for disagreeing with instructors. It speaks of criteria so poorly defined that students don't know what they should be studying. How does this putatively "new" system do anything to address those issues? The answer is that it does nothing to address them.

3. Timely progress to the degree: Again, *prima facie*, this seems reasonable. But it can only be seen as reasonable if the responsibility for moving through the program, and, more importantly, the ability to move through the program, rests with the student. There is a reason that UCLA graduate students in Slavic, especially in linguistics, have such abnormally long time to degree averages. When students do not know what to expect, they naturally tend to slow down, to try to concentrate their efforts on finding out what is expected in classes, on homeworks, on papers, in comprehensive exams, and in dissertations. The less sure the individual student regarding what is expected of him/her, the more cautious he/she will become.

What is also true is that the amount of support offered to students figures in directly to the time to degree. Since this support is often based on the above-mentioned "Level of Academic Performance", the failure of this system to work often has ripple effects on students who are trying to make progress on their degree. Inaccurate systems of student evaluation and ranking lead to lower or nonexistent funding, and this in turn leads to longer than normal times to degree.

4. Support history: The idea behind using support history, i.e. the amount of support a single student has had over time, as a criterion for further funding is yet again, *prima facie*, a normal one, with the idea being that students who have had great amounts of funding shouldn't be ranked higher than students who haven't had that much funding. If this were actually the practice of the UCLA Slavic Department, then this would be fine, but in fact this is not the practice. Students used to be given vague promises of funding ("If you do well, we will fund you", without any further definition of "doing well") but that soon gave way as funding dried up. The next line used by the Department was that it would endeavor to provide four years worth of funding for its graduate students. The problem is, some students got nowhere near four years of funding while others were funded for five, six, seven years and beyond. There are examples of favored students being allowed to teach classes as TAs that had only one or two students in them, simply to keep that funding available to the students in question. There are other examples of students who had nowhere close to four years of funding yet were listed as having had this funding anyway.

So while it would in theory make sense to include support history in any decision concerning funding, it makes no sense to collect information on the support history of each student and then ignore it and fund whomever you want to fund. That is what the UCLA Slavic Department has done in the past, and there is nothing in this "reformed" funding procedure that would prohibit them from doing it again. The point to such a "reform", then, is simply to be able to claim that reform has occurred, be that true or not. Of course,

such reforms would never survive a true investigation into the Department, nor would they fool any supervisory entity determined not to be fooled. If the UCLA Slavic Department knew one thing, however, it was the environment in which it was operating. It knew that the University Administration wanted, at all costs, to keep a real investigation from happening, the to prevent the conducting of a "fact-finding mission or to determine the guilt or innocence of particular individuals". (The quote is taken from the internal reviewers when they themselves were describing what their investigation was *not*.)

Before moving on to the actions of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate and of the Dean of the Humanities in this matter, it is instructive to look at one final excerpt from the "Response by the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures to the Eight Year Review". At the end of this document, the faculty make the following point: "We therefore request that the Graduate Council reinstate the Department's right to admit graduate students into its program, effective immediately. It may seem questionable whether changes made over the eight months that have passed since the site visit can resolve problems that developed over a period of eight years. Should the Graduate Council have any doubts about the current ability of the Department to create an atmosphere productive of intellectual stimulation and growth, we invite you to ask the opinions of our students, including those interviewed during and after the site visit." Above, it was noted that the *single most crucial point in the review* was when the University Administration failed (or simply gave up) in its attempts to keep the Chair of the Slavic Department and the faculty of the Slavic Department from talking to students about the Eight-Year Review. The consequences of that failure can be seen here in the quote above, in which the UCLA Slavic Department practically dares the UCLA Administration to continue questioning students. And why should it not have adopted such a confident air? The Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department and some of its faculty not only successfully asserted their "right" to talk with students about the Eight-Year Review wherever and whenever they choose, they also made clear to graduate students the limits of the "protection" that was supposedly made available to them by the UCLA Administration in return for their cooperation in the Eight-Year Review.

This is not to say that there was not some level of reform in the UCLA Slavic Department. After so devastating an Eight-Year Review report, it would have been impossible for there not to have been some reform. The question is whether such reform is sufficient to keep such abuse from recurring and whether such reform will redress the damages done to current and former students. On both counts, what the Department tried to pass off as reform fails. It is also possible that there were some students who were not intimidated by talking to the faculty, at least not to Michael Heim, who had a reputation as a faculty member on whose shoulder students could cry after having gone through abuse at the hands

of the faculty. It was never a question of Michael Heim himself being an abusive faculty member. Michael Heim will be discussed at length later on in this report, but while he had weaknesses as a teacher and a mentor, he also had strengths. There are students in the Department who like and respect Michael Heim. But the point is not whether or not Michael Heim himself was abusive. The point is what Michael Heim did when he was put in a position where he had to choose between the good of his colleagues and the good of the graduate students. To repeat what was already stated above, when asked again and again to refrain from questioning graduate students about the Eight-Year Review, he refused, again and again, to do so. At that point not only was the trust of the graduate students betrayed, but it also compromised the veracity of whatever they say thereafter. No doubt there were some students who would have said that some things had gotten better. There were also students who would have said that what was going on here was nothing more than a cover up. This latter group of students, however, had been around too long not to see the handwriting on the wall. They had already cooperated fully with the investigation instituted by the UCLA Administration, in return for which they were promised protection from retaliation and protection from interrogation. That promise had already been broken, in spite of repeated pleas bordering on begging for the UCLA Administration to protect them. There was no way those students were going to have anything more to do with this system, one which had already so egregiously betrayed their trust. It is because of this that the UCLA Slavic Department could so confidently invite the University Administration to come in and interview the graduate students. Those who had no complaints would add credence to the faculty's claim of real reform. And those who did have real complaints would say nothing. Those students who had not understood the true nature of the relationship between the tenured faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department and the UCLA Administration now understood this relationship quite well. Order had been restored.

The Decision of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate

This was the backdrop against which the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department followed up on his promise to go to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate and ask that the ban on incoming graduate students be lifted. Graduate students were somewhat taken aback that he would even attempt to do this given the severe nature of the review and given the fact that he had been proven, time and again, to be untruthful in response to repeated inquiries from the internal committee of the Eight-Year Review team. When combined with the feedback requested by the Graduate Council from graduate students on the Eight-Year Review report (including the annotated copy of the report, appended here, which responds in detail to almost every section of the report and which not only exposes more untruths and the scope of the cover up activity, but

also reveals that the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department went so far as to break federal and state law in his attempt to smear one ex-graduate student) the hope was that this request would be seen for what it was, an exercise in temerity.

In the end, this was to be an empty hope. The faculty head of the internal committee argued at length and persuasively that this ban should not be lifted, and that the culture of denial and intimidation that was for so long a part of the UCLA Slavic Department could not be changed in such a short period of time, even if one had had a cooperative faculty that had been willing to assess honestly and forthrightly the sins of the past. The Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, as expected, presented the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate with his quantitatively impressive list of "reforms", and argued that keeping the ban on the admission of new graduate students would hurt both the Department and its students. It is the latter part of this assertion that seems to have carried the day. If the ban hurt the Department itself (and by "Department", we mean here the faculty in it, along with their reputation), then this as it should have been. As for hurting students, one could argue for this or against this, and probably one could come up with compelling arguments either way. Certainly when a department is in trouble and word leaks out, then that cannot be seen as helpful to students who are coming from that department and whose chances at employment depend, to a certain extent, on the reputation of that department. On the other hand, allowing students to go on in a department that has essentially denied that any wrong doing took place at all cannot be good for the remaining graduate students, and it is nothing less than disastrous for any future graduate students. If the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department can be exposed so devastatingly in a review and *still* be allowed to accept and train graduate students, then it would only confirm and embolden them the next time questions of faculty conduct and abuse of students were to arise.

The reaction to this news by graduate students was diverse. Some felt that, given the nature of academe and especially the nature of academic tenure, nothing short of the faculty committing murder was going to be enough to get faculty members terminated, so why prolong the agony? Others felt that perhaps some good might come of this decision and that the faculty would have learned a lesson. Still others were shocked and stunned that the graduate Council of the Academic Senate would again put power into the hands of those who had abused, lied, and broken the law, and then denied it time and time again, even *after* they were caught. The only saving grace that could be imagined was that the Graduate Council had taken this decision with the tacit understanding that the Dean of the Humanities would eventually get around to implementing the recommendation of the Eight-Year Review committee that the UCLA Slavic Department be put into receivership.

The Decision of the Dean of the Humanities

The feeling among some graduate students was that once the line had been crossed into illegal

activity, someone at some level of the UCLA Administration, be it the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate or the Dean of the Humanities or at the level of the College of Letters and Science or at even a higher level would step in and take over. Not only was there nothing to suggest that the UCLA Slavic Department would be capable of running itself, there was everything to suggest that it would not be capable of this: the continued lying, the continued deception, the continued cover ups, the continued minimalization of problems and exaggeration of successes. And when, on top of this, one sees actual violations of the law by the person in charge of the UCLA Slavic Department, it was just assumed by some that, even though the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate had acquiesced to the wishes of the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, that this would simply be a pro forma measure, since the Department would have to be put into receivership given the egregious nature of the violations, violations which were reported to the UCLA Administration. Thus, there was no excuse for the UCLA Administration not to act. They had evidence of wrongdoing, evidence that was provided by graduate students at great risk to themselves. The thinking was, how could the UCLA Administration fail to act given this overwhelming amount of evidence?

And yet, the move to put the UCLA Slavic Department into receivership kept getting delayed. The Dean of the Humanities, the person immediately tasked with making the decision to implement receivership, kept putting it off. Finally someone asked her what the problem was, to which she responded that, instead of immediately making the decision whether or not to follow the recommendation of the Eight-Year Review committee and put the Department into receivership, she was instead going to wait. Incredibly, during this interim period, the same chair who had deceived and covered up during the investigation was going to be allowed to remain in place. When this fact was pointed out to the Dean of the Humanities, she explained that she was going to be acting as the "Co-Chair" of the Department, and thus would have a moderating influence on the Chair that was from the Slavic Department proper.

At this point, any persons even remotely interested in seeing justice done could only throw up their arms in frustration. What more did the Dean of the Humanities need to know? How could any clearer a picture have been painted, not just of the UCLA Slavic Department but also of the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department? His untruths, his deception, his cover-ups — these were all on paper, for all the world to see. What possible point could have been served by keeping on Michael Heim as the Chair, or the "Co-Chair", or in any other capacity? He had proven himself untrustworthy, time and time again. This is someone who broke the law in his attempts to smear students, a fact that was pointed out, on paper, to the UCLA Administration. And yet, the Dean of the Humanities wants to keep him on as the "Co-Chair"? To what possible end? The only response that was forthcoming from the Dean of the Humanities was, tellingly, the same response that came from the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate: this action was being taken "for the good of the students". But one has to ask, how could this possibly be good for the graduate

students? What would have been good for the graduate students would have been to have had the recommendations made by the Eight-Year Review committee implemented, and to have had the UCLA Slavic Department put into the hands of a strong-willed receiver, one who would make the needed changes and reforms and implement them from above. *That* is what would have been good for graduate students.

As it turns out, the Dean of the Humanities was "Co-Chair" in name only. "Co-" would seem to indicate a joint sharing of duties, but that was never, ever the case, and indeed, how could it be? The Dean of the Humanities was just that, a dean, with all the responsibilities and duties attendant to that position. She might have been a "Co-Chair" in that she oversaw major decisions, but when it came to the day-to-day, nuts and bolts decisions and activities that define the duties of a departmental chair, she was nowhere close to being a "Co-Chair". What she did do was to attend various faculty meetings in which the so-called reforms were discussed. There were, of course, times in which she would assert herself. At one meeting of the faculty, in response to a particularly nasty comment by one faculty member as to why the Dean of the Humanities would not commit to a particular course of action, the Dean replied "because I have not yet decided whether or not I will put this department into receivership." Thus, from time to time, the possibility of receivership would raise its head, but it soon became clear that receivership, despite the fact that it had been recommended for the UCLA Slavic Department and that the faculty head of the internal committee had argued forcefully for it, was never a real possibility. Its role was simply to serve as the Sword of Damocles, a subtle reminder to the UCLA Slavic Department faculty that, in theory anyway, there did exist in the University hierarchy a power greater than themselves. Of course, this superincumbent power in the University hierarchy, as can be seen in retrospect, desperately, desperately wanted to keep from having to use that power.

The Consequent Results of the Decisions by the Dean of the Humanities and the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate Not to Follow Through with the Eight-Year Review Team's Recommendations

As the Fall 2000 Academic Quarter progressed with no sign of the UCLA Slavic Department being put into receivership, it soon became depressingly clear that none of these main recommendations--the suspension of graduate student admissions and the placing of the UCLA Slavic Department into receivership--was going to occur. In fact, just the opposite seemed to be happening. While the Department was still under closer supervision than it had been previously, Michael Heim began to reassert his control over the Department. He was "Co-Chair" in name only. In point of fact, he regained most of his former status and the Department began its plan to pull itself out of its current state. This would, one would think, be all to the good, assuming that the plan to accomplish this turn around included a frank assessment of where the Department had been and what needed to be done to turn it around. Unfortunately, such a frank assessment was

all but impossible given the fact that many of those in authority now, and many of those who were gaining in influence behind the scenes, had long been among the main collaborators and apologists for the old regime. They were the same faculty who had turned a blind eye to student abuse, or who had minimized it, or who had lied about it and sought to cover it up.

As was mentioned above, the first instinct of the faculty was to isolate the abusive linguistic faculty. Two had already retired, and one was on the way out, propelled no doubt by the Eight-Year Review. This left just one such linguist still on faculty, too young to be "golden handshaked" into retirement. This faculty member had also published in Russian literature and had actually inquired as to the possibility of crossing over to the literature side of the house. This caused no small amount of titillation among the graduate students, especially the linguists, who had been burdened by this professor for years. Apparently the literature faculty had no problem telling linguistic graduate students that they would "just have to work around" this particular faculty member, one who had a predilection for throwing a conniption fet when confronted with contrary points of view, but when faced with the possibility of this same faculty member joining up with the literature side of the house, the literature professors were at once aghast and unified in their determination to keep this from happening. Apparently what was said to be good for the linguistic goose ("you linguistic students will just have to learn to work around this person") was anathema to the literary gander.

Given the fact that the report was so devastating, especially with regard to the linguistics faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department, for the first time in the Department's existence, the literature faculty were actually in a position to garner control over the Department. Whether or not they no longer feared the linguists, or whether it was simply a case of fearing the potential damage that could come about if things were not brought under control, no one can say. In any case, the literature faculty did indeed begin to assert itself, beginning with the floating of the idea to abolish entirely the linguistic side of the house. For those readers of this document who are not Slavists, this is not as radical as it sounds, since this would be consistent with a long trend in Slavic Departments throughout the country, most of which are now simply literature departments with (sometimes) a small linguistic component. Another approach that was being considered was to bring in new faculty sympathetic to the literature side of the house. In the review documents, mention was repeatedly made of the need to fill three FTEs in the Department, the most pressing of which was a 19th century specialist, after which a 20th century specialist and then a South Slavist. That the primary and most pressing need was for a 19th century specialist was emphasized again and again. From the internal report, commenting on the external reporters observations:

"Both external reviewers considered replacement of the 19th century specialist to be "absolutely crucial to the long-term health and viability of the department" (ER, p.4). This opinion was

expressed repeatedly during the course of the site visit."

From the Faculty Self-Report: "in literature we are currently conducting a search for a junior position in nineteenth-century prose with proven competence in contemporary Anglo-American and/or continental theory (gender studies, cultural studies, postcolonial theory, neo-Marxism, and the like)"

From the Internal Report's Final Recommendations: "1. To maintain the stature of the department and to bolster undergraduate teaching, raise the current search for a 19th century specialist to open rank, preferably someone already highly respected in the field, and ideally someone who might take a leadership role as the department emerges from the present crisis."

And yet, this search never produced such a 19th century specialist. What did happen, in a subsequent search, however, was that a 20th century specialist was hired. While this position had been mentioned during the review, it clearly was not listed as the number one priority. So why then would the UCLA Slavic Department hire a 20th century specialist and not a 19th century specialist? The answer, many suspect, was to do exactly what was mentioned above, to "bring in new faculty sympathetic to the literature side of the house." The choice they finally made was himself a graduate of the UCLA Slavic Department, one who had worked closely with the literature faculty and whose dissertation chairman had been the chairperson of the UCLA Slavic Department during much of the time period in question that was covered by the Eight-Year Review.

At this point it should be made clear that, by bringing this fact to light, an attempt is not being made here to disparage the qualifications or character of that particular new hire. Some of the older graduate students remembered him from his time here as a graduate student, and the consensus was that he was extremely bright and, even better from the point of view of academia, extremely productive. He received a tenure-track position in Canada after finishing his graduate program in record time here at UCLA, quickly published a number of books and just as quickly received tenure from his Canadian institution.

Thus, nothing presented here about this particular individual is meant to reflect negatively upon him. He saw his opportunity and he took it. What his hire does suggest, however, is that the literature component of the UCLA Slavic Department was looking to shore up its side of the house, and since this new hire was a product of that faculty (in so far as they mentored him and served on his committees while he was a student here), it would certainly seem to be a safe bet that his addition to the faculty would serve that particular end.

What was happening was very clear to most of the graduate students on the ground. Of course,

the UCLA Slavic Department had to go through a formal hiring procedure, inviting other candidates to come and give lectures, feedback was solicited, procedures were adhered to. In the end, it came as a surprise to nobody when the Chair of the Slavic Department, in March of 2001, announced that the faculty had voted to offer the position to the applicant who had been a graduate student here, and who had worked under the former chair of the Department. So rather than the specialist in 19th century literature that was deemed by all sides to be so critical to the UCLA Slavic Department's future, rather than "ideally someone who might take a leadership role as the department emerges from the present crisis", the Department instead hired a junior scholar expert in 20th century who had just achieved tenure at his home institution. The reasons behind this choice were clear to all, but at that point, no one was going to be too vocal about their opinions regarding this hire. As has been pointed out above, order had been restored.

This is not to say, however, that there were no opinions regarding this hire. Few of the opinions centered upon the candidate himself, or his abilities, since these were not the issue. It has already been noted that he himself was an outstanding scholar, and that his abilities in this regard were never in question. What was in question, however, was the commitment of the UCLA Slavic Department to rebuild the linguistics program. Graduate students had been told, during the attempts to induce them to cooperate with the investigating committees, that the only way that the Department was going to improve, and that the only way for the linguistics program to improve was for them to cooperate with the investigating committee. Some chose not to, and in retrospect, who could blame them? And yet others did choose to cooperate, at risk to both their advancement through the program as well as at significant risk to their future careers. Their reward for this cooperation turned out to be nothing. Not only were they not protected against inquiries that might come from the faculty itself regarding the Eight-Year Review, now it appeared that the linguistic side of the program was being allowed to die off. The literature faculty denied this, of course, even while they were actively discussing the possibility of allowing this to happen. As it turned out, those linguistic graduate students who did finally agree to cooperate with the investigating committee not only did not help to improve the linguistics side of the house in the UCLA Slavic Department, they in fact ended up contributing to its demise and thus hurting their own chances for entrance into the field.

The Follow Up Review

After such a disastrous review, and given the state of the UCLA Slavic Department with its theoretical "Two Chair" system, it was deemed necessary that the next review should take place not eight years later, but rather the following year. In fact, this was put off even further, probably due to the fact that even small changes took a while to implement. When this review finally did happen, it consisted of the internal committee of the original Eight-Year Review team. The above facts concerning the slow death of the linguistics side of the house and the frustration

among some graduate students that not all that much had changed was received sympathetically by the internal committee, but by then, this committee had learned what the rest of the graduate students had suspected for many years, that the UCLA Administration would do everything in its power--ignore abuse, ignore illegalities, ignore student frustration and anger--in order to keep from having to "discipline" tenured faculty, regardless of how tepid such disciplinary measures might be. The internal committee noted the fact that some improvements had occurred, but then again, how could they not have occurred, given the devastating report of two years before that? The internal committee then backed off its original recommendation that the UCLA Slavic Department be put into receivership, and instead recommended the appointment of a very strong chair from the outside.

The obvious question that arises is why would the internal committee back off its original recommendation of receivership, a recommendation that it argued strenuously in favor of in front of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate? After all, a number of graduate students remained in contact with the internal committee during this whole time, and there was nothing to suggest that the internal committee was in the least bit impressed with what the literature faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department was doing. Without question the internal committee very quickly saw through the attempt to allow the linguistic program to die on the vine, and foremost among their recommendations was that the linguistic program be resuscitated. Of course, it is one thing to suggest this, quite another to get the UCLA Administration to provide the FTEs necessary to make this happen. That fact notwithstanding, the UCLA Slavic Department was forced to turn course and at least put on a respectable show of "reviving" the linguistic program. But if the internal committee had been so quick to spot the attempt by the literature faculty to allow the linguistics program to die, why then did they withdraw their recommendation for receivership and substitute in its stead a recommendation for a strong chair, someone brought in from the outside?

It is the belief of a number of graduate students that the internal committee had finally come to the conclusion that the UCLA Administration, be it in the person of the Dean of the Humanities or in the form of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate, simply did not have the will to implement such measures. If the UCLA Administration itself was going to refuse to implement such strong measures, even in the face of such a devastating Eight-Year Review report, then (so went the thinking) why would or why should the internal committee continue to bang its head against the wall advocating things that were simply going to be ignored anyway? It was known as a fact by some of the graduate students that there was great disenchantment coming from the internal committee, which had taken on the unenviable task of investigating its own colleagues, and which had stuck to its guns in demanding that substantive (as opposed to cosmetic) changes be made, only to, in effect, be ignored.

The End Result

The end result to all this was precisely what the Slavic Department faculty had hoped for. Anger was allowed to simmer and fade, graduate students exhausted by the fight to bring about change either quit the field or quit trying, knowing that their efforts within the context of the system in place at UCLA were doomed to failure, and what had at one point seemed like a tsunami of scandal now appears to be no more in evidence than pond ripples generated from a pebble. It is now early 2005, and no official investigation has taken place, no faculty members have been charged, much less punished, no attempt has been made by the UCLA Administration to pass on to law enforcement officials their knowledge that the Chair of the Slavic Department violated state and federal law, and no efforts have been made to right past wrongs suffered by all who were subjected to the tribulation and suffering meted out by the UCLA Slavic Department.

On the contrary. The Department, having successfully isolated the one remaining abusive linguist, has also had successes in other realms as well. It has, in effect, killed off the linguistics program and in so doing, for all practical purposes driven from the Department the one individual faculty member listed in the Eight-Year Review report as the one who actively and openly attempted to effect positive change. The final act in this redemption drama, a new review of the Department, is about to be completed, if it hasn't been completed already. This review is meant to be the final nail in the coffin of the attempt to expose what went on in the UCLA Slavic Department and to pave the way for a shiny new day for the Department as it rises phoenix-like from the ashes of the 2000 Eight-Year Review, at least in so far as the term "Department" is understood to represent the faculty and their concerns. Many of the students who were subjected to such vicious abuse have left the Department and gone on with their lives, while both UCLA and its Slavic Department remain, as do all institutions, to carry on as before. As far as the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department is concerned, and as far as the UCLA Administration is concerned, the worst is over, the bullet has been dodged, and the system has survived unchanged.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)

www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)

www.graduatestudentabuse.org

III. Explanation of the Documents

In order to substantiate the claims made in this report and to see it in a greater context, a number of documents have been attached to this report. Even for someone with considerable experience in the world of higher education, the intent of these documents is not always clear, and indeed, that is sometimes by design, as documentation in academe is often fashioned as though it were meant for one purpose, when in fact the actual intent is something completely different. (One low-level but extremely common example of this phenomenon is the letter of recommendation. One can write a very good letter of recommendation, but one can also write a recommendation which, to one not yet initiated in the subtleties of academe, would appear to be good, but which actually is intended to damn with faint praise.) Beyond this, academe, like any profession, has its own organizational structures and professional jargon, which can sometimes obscure meaning for those unfamiliar with them. This section of the report is designed simply to list those documents, which comprise Chapter IV of this report, and, when necessary, to explain what they were intended to do.

IV-A. The Eight-Year Review Report Itself and Associated Documentation.

The Eight-Year Review report consists of the following parts:

1. The Internal Report

The Internal Report was prepared by the four internal members of the overall review committee, that is, the four faculty members who are from UCLA itself. In addition, there was a graduate student member of this internal committee who was also from UCLA. The role of the graduate student member on internal review committees varies according to each individual department reviewed, but usually is not seen as critical. In this instance, however, because of the intense distrust of faculty on the part of the graduate students in the Slavic Department, his role was crucial, not only in getting students to open up and talk about their experiences, but also in acting as a conduit to the review committee itself.

The report begins with a short Preface, describing the internal and external committees, and a brief description of the review itself. This is followed by an Introduction, in which the history of the UCLA Slavic Department is addressed, followed by a section on the Department's faculty, and then sections on the undergraduate and graduate programs. It is in this last section that the most damning charges are made against the Slavic Department and its treatment of its own graduate students. Its four subsections dealing with student welfare, funding, attrition, and graduate requirements detail a somewhat representative selection of the abuses visited upon

these graduate students by the Slavic Department. The two concluding sections deal with actions taken by the Graduate Council and recommendations for further action.

2. The External Reviewer Report (Appendix I)

The External Report was prepared by the two outside members of the review committee, David Bethea, a literary scholar from the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Wisconsin, and Alan Timberlake, a linguistic scholar from the University of California, Berkeley, and a former tenured member of the UCLA Slavic Department.

They begin with a general overview of the UCLA Slavic Department and then focus separately on the undergraduate program, the language program, the graduate program, the faculty, leadership and collegiality, and finish with a series of recommendations in their conclusion. The external review team focuses more on the particulars of the program and less on the issue of abusive treatment of graduate students, for reasons already discussed in detail in the previous section, i.e. the refusal of many UCLA Slavic Department graduate students to speak with them due to Alan Timberlake's status as a former UCLA Slavic Department faculty member, and a linguist at that.

3. Site Visit Schedule (Appendix II)

This is simply an hour-by-hour schedule of the on-site meetings that took place from Wednesday, February 3, 2000 to Friday, February 5, 2000.

4. *Factual Errors Statement* from Department Chair, M. Heim and Response to this Statement from H. Martinson (Appendix III)

(In the original report that was made available to students, the response by H. Martinson was listed first, followed by the *Factual Errors Statement*. They have been reversed here in order to represent their chronological order, i.e. first M. Heim's statement and then H. Martinson's response to it.)

As will be discussed in detail in the following sections, the *Factual Errors Statement* section of the review was not intended to be a forum through which the chair of the department under review could rebut individual points of the review itself. That is to say, it was never intended to be an opportunity for the Chair to debate matters of substantive content. Rather, the sole purpose of this section was for the Chair to list purely factual errors. For instance, if the department had four professors at the associate level, but the report listed six at that level, then this would be the sort of thing that would wind up in the *Factual Errors Statement*.

Apparently Michael Heim either did not know these guidelines, or he knew of them but chose to ignore them. No doubt one of the reasons the UCLA Administration does not want to get

into nasty detail in the *Factual Errors Statement* is because it becomes a part of the official review documentation. In any case, Michael Heim did choose to use this section of the review as an opportunity to rebut much of what was in the Internal Report (the report produced by the four UCLA faculty members and the one UCLA graduate student as members of the Internal Review team.) Given that this was indeed destined to be a part of the official review documentation, the chair of the Internal Committee had no choice but to respond. His response follows the *Factual Errors Statement*.

M. Heim's response to the *Factual Errors Statement* is extremely insightful in that it begins the process, albeit unwittingly, of tearing away the façade behind which the UCLA Slavic Department has operated for so many years. As is discussed elsewhere in this report, Michael Heim, when he first learned that his very candid comments (including harsh criticism of the two especially abusive faculty members) would become an official part of the Eight-Year Review report, was visibly upset, asking rhetorically, in front of some graduate students no less, how this could have happened. While it may indeed be the case that he didn't know that this would be included in official documentation, the possibility has been raised that his actions were not as inadvertent as he would have others believe, in that by replying as he did, he was attempting to initiate the process of both spreading and re-directing the blame. The *Factual Errors Statement* is clearly aimed at "two problem faculty", and later, in an email to graduate students dated July 13, 2000, Heim notes that most of the abuses from the time periods in question took place under his predecessors in the departmental chair position. Of course, no one but Michael Heim can know for sure if his long response in the *Factual Errors Statement* was done knowing it would become part of the review's official documentation, but it is intriguing that a mistake of such magnitude would be made in an matter of such importance.

Even more insightful was H. Martinson's response to Michael Heim's objections. The response in many ways speaks for itself, and there is additional commentary on it in the following sections, so suffice it to say for now that it was a devastating point-by-point rebuttal of Michael Heim's claims.

4. Self Review Report (Appendix IV)

The Self Review Report is essentially just the UCLA Slavic Department's view of itself and the job it has done during the eight-year period under review. Not surprisingly, the Department seems to come out with a fairly strong assessment when that assessment is conducted by the Department's own faculty. It is interesting, if not sadly amusing, that the main issue of the Internal Reviewers, that of graduate student abuse and low morale, an issue that even the External Reviewers were forced to acknowledge and to which they devoted a significant amount of time, barely appears in the Self Review Report. It is hinted at in a single sentence at the end of a paragraph dealing with teaching assistantships: "Nonetheless, a number of students

have expressed a desire for a more collegial and transparent atmosphere."

(NOTE: In spite of the fact that the UCLA Administration agreed to release the entire report to all graduate students, for some reason, the first page of the faculty's Self Review Report was missing in the initial distribution and was never redistributed to all the graduate students.)

The Eight-Year Review report consisted only of the four sections listed above. Included here with the Eight-Year Review report are two additional documents, both emails sent by Michael Heim on July 13, 2000. The first is simply Michael Heim passing on to all Slavic Department graduate students an email copy of a report sent by the external reviewers, Alan Timberlake of UC Berkeley and David Bethea of the University of Wisconsin, in which they attempt to backpedal on some of their earlier criticisms and in which they attack the report of the Internal Committee. The second, entitled "Chair's Response to the Internal Review Team's Response", is Michael Heim's attempt to continue the dialog with the chair of the internal committee regarding the latter's point-by-point rebuttal of Michael Heim's *Factual Errors Statement*.

5. Revisionist Letter By Alan Timberlake and David Bethea

The letter by Timberlake and Bethea is addressed specifically to Professor Duncan Lindsey, the then head of the Academic Senate, and to Professor Pauline Yu, the then-Dean of the Humanities, and is addressed in general to all "members of the UCLA community." It is essentially an attempt, after the fact, to soften the picture painted of the UCLA Slavic Department by the internal report and, to an extent, by the external reviewers' own external report. Extensive commentary on this letter is provided below in the annotated version of the Eight-Year Review Report, so no commentary will be provided here.

6. Chair's Response to the Internal Review Team's Response

The response by Michael Heim to the point-by-point rebuttal of his *Factual Errors Statement* by the Chair of the internal committee was also sent to all Slavic Department graduate students. This communication from Michael Heim continues his campaign to rehabilitate the Slavic Department, and himself as well, but the general consensus was that he served only to dig himself and the Slavic Department in that much deeper. From a legal point of view, this email from the Chair escalated both the Chair's personal responsibility and that of the University when he, without permission from the student in question, illegally released grades from the UC Riverside transcripts of the one graduate student who had allowed her story to be made public. As is the case with the revisionist letter sent by Timberlake and Bethea, extensive commentary on this "rebuttal to the rebuttal" is included in the annotated version of the Eight-

Year Review report below, so no further commentary will be provided here.

IV-B. An Annotated Copy of the Eight-Year Review Report in Which Explication of Various Aspects of this Report is Provided.

This is a copy of the same Eight-Year Review report listed above, with all six sections, but with commentary interspersed throughout. It is this annotated copy of the report, issued by some of the graduate students of the Slavic Department, that was provided to the UCLA Graduate Council at the Graduate Council's request. Students were told that the Graduate Council would take this information into account before deciding on the request from the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department to lift the stay on graduate student admissions to the program. It's not possible to know if the Graduate Council did indeed avail itself of this document, but what is without question is that the Graduate Council did indeed acquiesce to Michael Heim's request that the stay on the admission of graduate students for Fall 2000 be lifted.

The document itself is large and can be difficult to follow. To counteract that, different fonts have been used for the various sections, and those fonts have been retained when quoting from one section in a different section. In addition, the student commentary/annotation has been listed in blue font in order to make it easier for the reader to know what is commentary and what is the original text.

IV-C. Letter From the Head of the Internal Review Committee Urging Slavic Department Graduate Students to Participate in Discussions with Slavic Department Faculty Concerning the Eight-Year Review.

This letter, dated July 18, 2000, was included in the mailing of the hardcopies of the Eight-Year Review report that were sent out to all graduate students. More will said of this letter in coming sections. Its main significance lies in the fact that, at a time when graduate students were frantically trying to keep Michael Heim and other faculty members from the UCLA Slavic Department from questioning them about the Eight-Year Review, this letter in effect encourages students to do exactly that, to openly engage in discussions of the review with the Slavic Department faculty. The conditions leading up to this letter and its consequences will be discussed in detail later in this report.

IV-D. Initial Communication of Findings from the Internal Review Team's Graduate Student Representative to the Head of the Internal Review Team

This is one of the initial communications from the graduate student member of the internal review team to the head of the internal review team, describing his findings after having

spoken to a number of students in the UCLA Slavic Department. The first part is a more or less informal communication addressed directly to the head of the internal review team, while the second part is a summation of his findings after having gone through the graduate student surveys, read comments from graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department, and spoken with some of those students. It was meant to convey some of the concerns that the graduate students had to the faculty members of the internal committee as they set about the process of compiling a final report about their findings during the Eight-Year Review process.

IV-E. E-Mail Communications from Internal Committee's Graduate Student Representative Requesting Protection for UCLA Slavic Department Students

This is a series of emails sent from the internal committee's graduate student representative to various officials of the University and to the internal review committee itself. These emails were prompted by graduate student concerns that 1. the UCLA Academic Administration, in the face of threatened lawsuits by the UCLA faculty, withdrew its order that faculty members of the UCLA Slavic Department should not speak to Slavic Department students directly about the results of that review; and 2. The UCLA Administration and the faculty head of the internal review committee were encouraging students to speak with the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, Michael Heim, concerning the results of the Eight-Year Review.

What should stand out is that the tone of these emails becomes progressively more urgent as the graduate student representative to the internal review team is rebuffed time and time again in his attempts to get the UCLA Academic Administration to keep its promise and protect students by adhering to its order to the UCLA Slavic Department faculty not to talk with graduate students in that department directly about the results of the Eight-Year Review. It is interesting to note that by the fourth and last of these emails, the graduate student representative is actually at the point where he questions his own judgment in having encouraged graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department to go along with the requests from the UCLA Academic Administration and to cooperate fully with the investigation.

IV-F. E-mail from Graduate Student Representative on the Internal Committee to an Administrative Official Concerning the Distribution of the Eight-Year Review to Graduate Students

This is an email by the internal review committee's graduate student representative to an administrator in the Academic Senate office concerning the distribution of the Eight-Year Review Report. As was mentioned above in [Section II](#) of this report, the distribution of the report was controversial for a number of reasons. Normally it was not distributed at all except for a copy to the department that was reviewed. While this copy was, in theory, available to students, in

practice this was usually not the case, either because someone had taken out the one available copy or, more likely in the case of the UCLA Slavic Department, students would be too afraid to go into the departmental office and actually ask for the review report.

The problem arose specifically when the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, Michael Heim, began sending out emails to the Department's graduate students in which he challenged individual parts of the report (specifically, those parts which list the many times when he gave false information to the internal review team). The problem was, many of those students were out of town and thus had no access to the report, and most of those who actually were in town, as was mentioned above, would not be likely to walk into the office and ask for a copy of the report. (The fact that this was happening in the summer would make their presence in the Department seem all that much more conspicuous.)

As can be seen in this communication, the graduate student representative addresses this issue and suggests that its solution lies in providing each of the graduate students of the UCLA Slavic Department with their own copy of the Eight-Year Review report.

IV-G. Initial Written Response by the Slavic Department Faculty as a Whole to the Eight-Year Review

This is the first official response by the UCLA Slavic Department as a whole to the Eight-Year Review report. There are a number of interesting points in this document, beginning with its opening sentence, in which it expresses the Department's gratitude (gratitude?) for "the praise for the Department's stature and the accomplishments of both the graduate and undergraduate programs". The second half of the opening statements acknowledges "harsh criticisms" as well, but were one to read this statement without having first read the reports, one might be tempted to think that the "praise-to-criticism" ratio was 1:1.

The document, of course, offers no real alternatives for graduate students who are abused, it merely mouths official policy and waxes eloquent on how such abuse could never be tolerated in a department such as the UCLA Slavic Department. The document quotes the Chair from a student-faculty welcome meeting in Fall 2000: "I want to assure you that as chair I will exercise the full power of my office to discourage [abusive behavior toward graduate students] and ensure that anyone who engages in [such behavior] will be held accountable." Even a cursory glance at the this exposé of the Slavic Department and the review process will quickly make clear of what value such assurances are when coming from the then-Chair of the Slavic Department. These points are made repeatedly, so they will not be addressed here.

Two final related points about this document: in requesting that the Graduate Council

lift the ban on graduate student admissions that had been instituted only at the end of the previous academic year, the Department writes the following: "It may seem questionable whether changes made over the eight months that have passed since the site visit can resolve problems that developed over a period of eight years." This is a ludicrous statement, of course, as anyone who has read this report will clearly see, but what is especially interesting is this statement in the context of the overall Departmental response. While problems existed in both the literature and linguistic sides of the house, the linguistic side was disproportionately represented. What is amusing about this document is that it made all sorts of recommendations for changes specifically in the literature program (seven recommended changes), but when it comes to the linguistic side of the house, the side that was far more affected by the policies in place that allowed for abuse of graduate students, there the UCLA Slavic Department only deemed it necessary to institute a single change, as follows:

"1. The catalogue text describing the PhD requirements in Slavic linguistics shall be modified as follows: Students in linguistics take two three-hour written examinations. In the first of these THE STUDENT IS EXAMINED IN THE GENERAL AREA OF THE PROPOSED DISSERTATION RESEARCH, in the other, in comparative Slavic linguistics, the history of Russian and the history and structure of a second Slavic language."

So apparently, by instituting just one change that specifically applied to the linguistics program, the Department nonetheless felt that it had indeed, in eight short months, remedied the conditions which existed for decades before that, and which had been most prominent in the linguistics side of the house. Perhaps the Department felt that its tactical use of upper-case letters would make clear to the Graduate Council the sincerity and intensity with which it was approaching the problem.

IV-H. Graduate Student Handbook Prepared by the Slavic Department in Response to the Eight-Year Review

The handbook that was put together by the UCLA Slavic Department is, for the most part, simply a restating of information that existed elsewhere and does nothing to address the problem of graduate student abuse in a substantive manner. It appears to be nothing more than an attempt to throw quantitative solutions (or "non-solutions" in this instance) at the problem as opposed to getting to their core, something that neither the Department nor the University itself is capable of doing. As has been stated above, of its thirty-four pages, only the last half-page addresses the issue of graduate student abuse, and even then, it merely restates what had already been official policy. It offers nothing new.

IV-I. INTERNAL REPORT—THE DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES & LITERATURES/NOVEMBER 2001

This is an interim report, issued by the UCLA Slavic Department in November of 2001, approximately a year after the Graduate Council lifted the ban on the admission of graduate students to the Department. It speaks of the hiring of a new professor, of new admissions and funding procedures and policies, and of the structure and procedures for forming M.A. and Ph.D. committees. It also addresses changes in academic programs, policies regarding student welfare, and participation of staff members in departmental meetings. It is interesting for a number of points:

- In both the Internal and External reports from the 2000 Eight-Year Review, the need for a specialist in 19th century literature was repeatedly stressed:

Internal Report

- "Both external reviewers considered replacement of the 19th century specialist to be 'absolutely crucial to the long-term health and viability of the department...' (ER, p.4)";
- "Note that the 19th and 20th century literature appointments will be very important for the undergraduate program as well as for the reasons discussed above, as these areas (particularly 19th century) attract substantial enrollment.";
- "Raise the current search for a 19th century specialist to open rank, preferably someone already highly respected in the field, and ideally someone who might take a leadership role as the department emerges from the present crisis."

External Report

- "There are gaps in current coverage that will need to be filled before the department can be considered to be at full speed and competitive with the top programs in the country: 1) a specialist in "Golden Age" prose (Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, etc.) with theoretical sophistication and a well-established record in the field;... It is our belief that the first position, the Golden Age specialist, is absolutely crucial to the long-term health and viability of the department: this is where the biggest enrollments reside in any Slavic program, and to have a well-known person representing this area would certainly add to the luster of the department. It is the core area of any graduate program, and it would not be unnatural to expect the person filling the position to exercise a leadership role in the definition of the literature program. For this latter reason, we recommend that the search be open as to rank; the department might be extremely well served if it could identify and attract a prominent colleague at an intermediate rank (approximately, the senior associate rank—that is, ready to be promoted to full professor) and with one or more outstanding books to his or her credit. To repeat, however, nothing in our estimation would do more to raise the profile of the department and to solidify its orientation as an equal parts literature and linguistics faculty than this appointment."

For the 20th century literature and South Slavist position, the recommendation was to fill these needs with joint-appointments: "We urge the department and the administration to explore aggressively the possibility of filling the 20th century and the South Slavist positions with joint appointments."

What is clear from this, then, is that everyone who reviewed the UCLA Slavic Department felt that the next appointment should be a specialist in 19th century literature. So important did the External Reviewers feel this appointment to be that they even urged that the Department be allowed to hire an already tenured mid-level or senior scholar to fill it.

And yet, what did the UCLA Slavic Department do? Did they indeed fill this position with a 19th century specialist? As can be seen from this report from November 2001, they did not. They instead hired, with tenure, one of their own former literature students. Nothing against this particular scholar: he is extremely bright, he is personable, and he is young, all good qualities. He is a prodigious writer, having already published a number of books in his field. What he is not, however, is an expert in 19th century literature. This might have been puzzling to those outside the Department, but to those inside, this made perfect sense. The literature side of the house was trying to consolidate its power, and the last thing in the world it wanted was some "prominent colleague" to come in from without, much less one who would "exercise a leadership role in the definition of the literature program". Instead they got a very good 20th century scholar who had done his graduate work under the mentorship of Ron Vroon, who, as Michael Heim pointed out "was chair for most of the period under review".

This is not to suggest that this new hire has been nothing more than a non-threatening "yes-man" to the senior faculty since his hire, a sort of Clarence Thomas to the senior faculty's Antonin Scalia. Not enough is known at this point. What it does suggest, quite clearly, is that the faculty was loath to bring in an outsider. Just as Alan Timberlake was a former member of the Department with whom the Department was comfortable, so too was it the case that this particular hire seemed the least threatening to the faculty, for obvious reasons.

- The supposed "changes" in funding are different only in form, not function. For years this department had depended on recruiting students that it might consider marginal but who were willing to either fund themselves or take out student loans to make their way through the program. This supposedly new policy of guaranteeing four years of funding seemed, on the surface, good: "The Department has committed itself to a policy of offering newly admitted students four-year packages, contingent upon timely progress. Such support will be equivalent in monetary terms to a 50% teaching assistantship (TAship) on the assistant level. This package may consist of fellowships, grants, unrestricted aid, research assistantships, teaching assistantships or any combination of the above." The problem lies with the phrase "unrestricted funds". It was not clear

what this term meant. If it could include student loans, then this would in effect mean no change whatsoever in the amount of funding graduate students were being granted. All this would mean is that graduate students had the right to go tens of thousands of dollars into debt on the off chance they would be one of the lucky few to survive this program and come away with a Ph.D., something which was already the case before the review. No clear answer was ever forthcoming on what the term "unrestricted funds" meant. Perhaps it was not meant to include student loans. (Different faculty said different things on this when questioned.) If it was in fact meant to include student loans, then this would be an example of what the Department does often when confronting problems: they throw a lot of words at these problems, knowing that most people don't have the background or know enough of the situation to interpret what they are saying. The insertion of this one little easy-to-overlook phrase, if it is indeed meant to include student loans, has the effect of keeping the status quo in place, regardless of how much writing the Department does about its new policies with regard to funding.

- This policy of guaranteeing four years of funding to each of its students is actually nothing new. The Department or its representatives would routinely misrepresent to incoming or potential students the amount of funding it gave out. This "four year" rule was in fact usually only a "rule" when a student who had been in the Department more than four years applied for funding, in which case it was conveniently invoked if the Department didn't wish to provide that particular student with funding. (Of course, if this student was favored, then the Department would move heaven and earth to provide funding. This happened on numerous occasions.) In addition, there were students who had never had anywhere close to four years of funding, but who were nonetheless listed as having been funded for four years.
- Finally, the criteria for funding (e.g. "Level of Academic Progress") are, as before, not only vague, but they presuppose a rational faculty that has a quantifiable and verifiable system of assigning grades to graduate students, something which would be essential to keep faculty from assigning grades based on factors other than academic performance. Likewise, the Student Welfare and Internal Resolution policies all presuppose a rational and fair-minded faculty. Given the nature of the faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department, however, the idea that they could or would always assign grades in a rational and fair-minded way is pure fantasy.

IV-J. The Graduate Student Association Resolution, Prompted by the Inadequacies of the Review Process, Passed in 2001

During the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department, the Graduate Student Association (GSA) was invaluable in providing resources and counsel to the Slavic Department student body. What became quickly apparent to the senior officials in the GSA was not just the degree of graduate student abuse that existed within the UCLA Slavic Department, but how the

system itself that was put in place allegedly to protect students and to examine academic departments is itself deficient and in need of overhaul.

In consequence of that belief, the GSA passed a resolution authorizing the incoming GSA to take up certain issues with the Academic Senate and the Graduate Division regarding the efficiency of the Eight-Year Review process, the lag in time between its recommendations and their implementation, the question of resources (more particularly, the lack thereof) in the investigation of departments, the protection of students from abuse of power, the need for objective standards, and the need for easy access to results from eight-year reviews.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

IV-A. Eight-Year Review Report of the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures; Michael Heim's Email to Students; Revisionist Letter by Bethea/Timberlake

1999-2000 ACADEMIC SENATE REVIEW OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Internal Reviewers:

Harold Martinson, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Graduate Council, Chair of Team
Elinor Ochs, Anthropology, Graduate Council
Fred Burwick, English, Undergraduate Council
Chris Stevens, Germanic Languages, Undergraduate Council

External Reviewers:

Alan Timberlake, Slavic Languages & Literatures, UC Berkeley
David Bethea, Slavic Languages & Literatures, U. of Wisconsin

Date of Site Visit: February 24-25, 2000
Date of Report: June 6, 2000

Approved by the Graduate Council: Approved by the Undergraduate Council:

Draft Report of Internal Review Team

Appendix I: External Reviewer Reports

Appendix II: Site Visit Schedule

Appendix III: Factual Errors Statement from Department Chair, M. Heim.

Response to Statement from H. Martinson

Appendix IV: Self Review Report

Internal Report on the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

Preface

The following Academic Senate review of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures was conducted during AY1999-2000 on the normal 8-yr cycle. The core of the review was the site visit on February 24 & 25, 2000 during which the four internal reviewers (Fred Burwick, UGC, Chris Stevens UGC, Elinor Ochs, GC, Harold Martinson, GC, Chair of Team) and the graduate student representative (Mark Quigley) were joined by the two external reviewers (David Bethea, Wisconsin, and Alan Timberlake, Berkeley). The site visit consisted of two full days of interviews with faculty, staff, students and administration. After the site visit, the external reviewers prepared and submitted a joint report (attached), based on the site visit plus additional data and information supplied by the Graduate Division and the Department. Meanwhile, the internal review team conducted additional interviews, as necessary, to clarify issues raised during the site visit. The following account is based on all of the above sources of information, and relies heavily on the report of the external reviewers (henceforth, ER).

Introduction

The Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA has, for decades, been recognized as one of the finest and most distinguished in the country. Not only are all the faculty individually of national or international stature, but also the department as a whole is unique in the breadth of its scholarship. This breadth is two-fold. First, while departments elsewhere tend to be strong in literature at the expense of linguistics, UCLA's strong literature component is paired with a linguistic component that is unmatched in the country. Second, following a period during which good departments nationwide have trimmed non-Russian components from their programs, the department at UCLA has remained dedicated to maintaining its comprehensive Slavic character. In the future, UCLA's continued pre-eminence in Slavic Languages and Literatures will depend both on maintaining the quality of this faculty and on ensuring that adequate FTE are available to sustain its breadth.

Slavic studies, at UCLA as elsewhere, has been uniquely buffeted by international events in recent decades. Shortly after the last review, the initial euphoria following the collapse of the Soviet Union gave way to apathy-and a nationwide decline in Slavic studies enrollments. Now interest is picking up again and Slavic studies at UCLA has emerged from this dark period stronger in comparison to departments elsewhere and is in a privileged position to capitalize on the trend. Indeed, the department worked tirelessly during the dark period to expand and advertise its undergraduate offerings and its undergraduate program is now probably among the best in the country. Undergraduates interviewed during the site visit were effusive in their praise of the program. In the future, to maintain its stature in the field, the department must turn its attention single-mindedly to the graduate program, which is in a state of complete disrepair and endures only because of the resilience and quality of its surviving graduate students.

Faculty

The uniformly high quality of the faculty has been noted above, as has the remarkable breadth of scholarship in the department. However, recent departures have left gaps in current coverage of the literature component that must be filled before the department will be recognized as truly balanced, having equally prestigious linguistic and literature components (ER, pp. 4-5). Both external reviewers considered replacement of the 19th century specialist to be "absolutely crucial to the long-term health and viability of the department" (ER, p.4). This opinion was expressed repeatedly during the course of the site visit. Moreover, to raise the department to a position of unchallenged preeminence both reviewers argued that the appointment must be made at the tenured level (ER, p. 5, and repeated assertions during the site visit). The Dean has authorized a search at the assistant professor level. This search should continue, but it would be wise for the department simultaneously to try to identify a specific mid-career individual, highly respected in the field-and also here, who would be willing to move. The Dean may reconsider the rank if presented with a specific and compelling alternative.

The dilemma in this is that the ladder faculty are already 100% tenured, and only one of these is at the associate professor level. However, there were two faculty losses last year and the above appointment would replace only one of them. The external reviewers urge that the second FTE also be replaced, this time at the junior level (ER, p. 5) and with a twentieth century specialist which the department sorely needs ER, pp. 4 & 5). While the 19th century appointment is critical to the stature of the department, the 20th century appointment also is very important programmatically and (given a senior 19th century appointment) is essential as an opportunity to bring in young blood.

As mentioned earlier, a hallmark of the Slavic Department at UCLA has been the breadth of its scholarship. Essential to maintaining this breadth is representation on the faculty of a permanent South Slavist, an area of expertise represented in most major programs in the country (ER, p.5). Currently this position is filled by an Adjunct appointment which has been satisfactory as a stop-gap measure but which does not give the position permanence. Moreover, it makes it difficult for students because Adjuncts do not "count" on examination committees, and students hesitate to choose this area for their dissertations because they cannot be sure that the expertise will still be there when it comes time to read their theses.

The Slavic Department lost three FTE during the period under review. Ideally they should be replaced as outlined above, including a permanent South Slavist. However, recognizing that this may not be possible at the present time, but in view of the importance of making these appointments, we urge the department and the administration to explore aggressively the possibility of filling the 20th century and the South Slavist positions with joint appointments. This solution is being pursued increasingly across campus, and for a small department like Slavic would be adequate to maintain the breadth that has been a pillar of its reputation.

Undergraduate program (including language instruction)

The reader is referred to the department's excellent self-review (pp. 4-6) for a complete account of the department's many accomplishments in this area. The external reviewers, like the undergraduates mentioned earlier, were effusive in their praise of the Slavic undergraduate program (ER, pp. 1-2). Note that the 19th and 20th century literature appointments will be very important for the undergraduate program as well as for the reasons discussed above, as these areas (particularly 19th century) attract substantial enrollment.

However, while it is usual for literature to attract more students than linguistics, we wish to emphasize, along with the external reviewers (p. 2), that this should not be used as an excuse for the linguists not to participate in the undergraduate program. As the externals point out, "the linguists need not teach only highly specialized courses in linguistics per se." They, like the literature faculty can extend themselves to develop courses of more general interest, and thereby better serve their department and the university community at large. "The asymmetry in the utilization of faculty energy needs to be addressed" (ER p. 2).

Graduate Program

Student welfare. During the site visit the review team heard several amazing accounts of emotional abuse perpetrated on students by certain members of the faculty. So fearful were the students that several asked to meet in private "somewhere far from our dept" after the site visit was finished. These students told of still others who were too fearful to meet with us at all. These meetings led to additional interviews designed to assess the credibility of what was heard. In all, dozens of interviews were conducted with current students, former students, faculty and staff. The picture that emerged was one in which many students live in personal fear of specific faculty members, and in anxiety about their futures within a program perceived as capricious and self-serving. We note that the external

reviewers devoted more space to this issue than to any other single aspect of the Slavic program despite the fact that they heard but a fraction of all the complaints.

It is important to maintain the proper focus on what follows. The mandate to the review team was not to conduct a fact-finding mission or to determine the guilt or innocence of particular individuals, but rather to assess the welfare of the graduate students and to recommend corrective action, if necessary, to assure their well-being. Thus, the issue is not whether any or all of what we heard is correct in its detail or interpretation. The issue is the emotional trauma perceived by the review team in the students entrusted to the care of this department. This is not to cast doubt on any part of what we were told. Great care was taken to ensure the legitimacy of the information upon which we have based the conclusions at the end of this report. Several case histories from different sources were compared and no example of any significant discrepancy was found. In other instances different case histories involving similar situations were compared across time. The consistency was remarkable, even between former students who had never met. But to emphasize again: regardless of the details, the fear and the anxiety among the affected students is real, it is deep, it has interfered with the education of many, and it has crushed the careers of some. This level of graduate program dysfunction is unprecedented in the collective experience of this review team.

Without exception all who spoke with us feared retribution if they were planning to make their career in Slavic studies, and we heard reports of both threatened and perceived retaliation. Some students, initially willing to tell their stories, later requested (even in tears) that we not use any details. Therefore, to preserve anonymity, we will present most information only in general terms, and the students, about half of whom were directly affected, will be referred to collectively. However, we begin our account below with one specific case history whose several facets reflect themes we were to hear repeated over and over. This student, whom we will call simply XX, did not fear recognition because she has left the field. The following is her story.

XX entered the program with excellent credentials. For various reasons-and on the advice of another faculty member-XX decided it was best to drop a particular graduate course during her second quarter. When XX spoke to the professor involved, the professor reportedly went on the offensive, not only insulting XX repeatedly, but also disparaging, with gestures and sarcasm, the other members of the faculty from whom XX had obtained advice. When exchanges like this continued unabated-and after being reduced to tears, XX concluded that she was merely a pawn in a jealous rivalry between this professor and other members of the faculty. Therefore, XX resolved to go to the Chair. According to XX the Chair responded with soothing words, and a statement to the effect that "there are problems among some of the faculty in this department. It is too bad that you have been caught in the middle of it. You just have to work around them." Accordingly, rather than addressing the problem, and with a comment to the effect that enrollment was low, the chair suggested that she re-enroll. Having heard numerous stories about the professor in question, and concluding that the Chair was merely circling the wagons, XX, in "the saddest decision I've ever made", left the program and the field. The "sad decision" quote above was not provided to us by XX simply for effect. Others have quoted her as saying at the time, "I have a broken heart This was the love of my life."

If the above case history were an isolated report it could justifiably be overlooked. However, every detail in this account has counterparts in the accounts of others dealing with this professor. We were told of other highly qualified students who were driven away, of another chair who sat idly by (indeed, reportedly suggesting that a student apologize to the professor for requesting to drop the class!). Thus, the perception of students that this professor takes even the most routine matters personally led XX to leave rather than spend "5 years worrying that the most innocent move or comment can turn into a major battle." And so a highly qualified student with a passion for the field, was lost.

The above is the only case history we have been given permission to present explicitly. However, during the course

of our interviews we were told of

- physical displays of faculty anger including frequent yelling and even slamming a chair on the floor
- students being intimidated into taking particular classes because of enrollment concerns
 - students who fear writing anything but laudatory comments in the "anonymous" course evaluation forms
- a fractious faculty so immobilized by disagreement that no common reading list can be agreed upon (at least for linguistics) to assist the students in preparation for their exams
- students who feel compelled to tailor their intellectual approach in exams to the committee membership, and who are advised to "get one on your side" before going into exams
- students who don't dare complain for fear of retaliation in the MA or PhD exams, or in obtaining a dissertation signature
- students who feel that the only value of their comments is for use as ammunition in the internal squabbles of the faculty
- repeated episodes of students being ridiculed for having various deficiencies in their background; e.g. "What the hell are you doing here?" or "Well, you might as well just be an undergraduate!"
- students feeling abandoned and with no place to turn
 - faculty who appear to change their minds about the quality of work in response to unrelated circumstances
- ladder faculty conspiring against non-ladder faculty in the presence of students
- faculty playing out their rivalries by deprecating students' choices of dissertation advisor
 - students being threatened with loss of funding in arguments with faculty, e.g. " ... and don't think you are going to get funding next year..."
- students being threatened with disciplinary action for voicing disagreement with faculty

Funding. A persistent complaint among students for years has been the chronic shortage of funding and the apparently capricious manner in which it is distributed. Students complain about lack of transparency in the criteria and processes governing the awarding of graduate student support. Certain jealousies and rivalries among the faculty are said to be so conspicuously displayed as to be common knowledge among the students. So vengeful are the faculty, we were told, that many students sincerely believe they are merely pawns among these colliding ambitions and that the awarding of support often is little more than manipulation resulting from jealousy or retribution.

The issue is not the nature of the details giving rise to this perception, but rather the perception itself of a systemic disrespect of graduate students, and their apparent treatment as chattel in the department. The chronic shortage of funds, almost universally identified by the faculty as the principal source of student dissatisfaction, is secondary to the spiritual blight in the department in the eyes of the students. Nevertheless, the inability to find adequate student support is also unacceptable and must be remedied (at least in the short term) by reducing the

number of acceptances into the program.

Attrition. Based on the above one would expect the level of attrition in the Slavic department to be quite high. While attrition cannot reliably be determined from statistics alone, a rough estimate based on the total number of degrees awarded (MA+PhD) compared to the number of admittances between Fall of '88 and Spring of '98 suggests that Slavic has the highest record of attrition of any comparable department in the Humanities (comparison among 10 departments). But the reported mistreatment of students appears not to be the only reason for attrition in the Slavic department. A cursory survey of case histories for students who have left the program in recent years suggests that several were underqualified from the start. In addition, many of the others have had backgrounds considered grossly inadequate by some of the faculty ("What the hell are you doing here?"). In particular, students frequently reported being castigated for insufficiency in Russian. The impression is that the department over-admits and then relies on attrition to select for the students that will eventually get their degrees. Under normal circumstances this would be a healthy selection-capable, well prepared students would be admitted and the motivated ones would persevere and succeed. However, in this department the reports we heard paint a picture of a process that results not in cultivation of the best and the brightest, but in the survival of the toughest and the most resilient-with the rest simply being discarded as damaged goods.

Attrition is a terrible waste. Resources, desperately needed by other students, are squandered on students who do not return. Precious time in the young lives of these students is needlessly lost; they either should not be admitted or, once admitted, they should not be driven away. Talent, important to the field and to UCLA, is shunted aside or destroyed. It is imperative that the department reform its attitude towards graduate students. These are young human beings entrusting themselves to the department for intellectual nurture and professional training. The department should consider more carefully exactly what background and capabilities it expects its students to bring to the program and then should screen the applicants rigorously. But once the students are admitted to the program the department is obligated to work as conscientiously as possible to mentor *each* student to success.

Apparently some faculty have very strong opinions about the level of preparation required of students who enter the program. The admissions committee should enlist these faculty in the screening of the applicants. Where possible, interviews in person should be conducted. When this is impractical, telephone interviews should be substituted. But some kind of direct interaction appears to be necessary to avoid admitting students who are considered inadequate. However, once the students are admitted, no faculty member has the right to ridicule their level of preparation-the faculty are responsible for whom they admit.

Graduate requirements. A number of specific issues were discussed with the review team, leading to the following recommendations by the external reviewers (ER, p. 6). "Reasonable and coherent reading lists [must] be established". The "exam format [must] be regularized ... and the expectations for student performance be made explicit". "The graduate program [must] be simplified and the time to-PhD be reduced". The internal reviewers strongly support these recommendations and refer the reader to the report of the external reviewers for a complete discussion of the issues. However, because none of these issues-nor others the internal reviewers would ordinarily have raised-can be meaningfully addressed unless the problems above are resolved, we forgo further elaboration here.

Moreover, there is an additional problem that must be solved before these graduate program issues can be dealt with. The faculty must find some way to make collective decisions. Repeatedly we were told that particular issues had not been resolved because no consensus could be reached. In some cases this involved dissertation committees whose members, we were told, changed their minds or could not agree-leaving the student stranded! In other cases departmental issues were involved, such as the infamous (and functionally non-existent) reading lists. When we asked the chair what the vote of the department had been, we were told that there had been no vote! Further questioning left the review team, with the impression that the faculty avoids voting on issues that might go against

the strongest personalities in the department. This tendency would be consistent with reports of attempted intimidation following such votes in the past.

Some way must be found for the department to make collective decisions so that the students can have the security of knowing what is and what is not expected of them. In the current climate many students feel obliged to tailor their preparation to the perceived idiosyncratic preferences of specific members of the faculty.

Action

Although the problems reported to us centered primarily on just two members of the faculty, the greatest anger of the affected students was often reserved for the majority of the faculty who they say take no interest in, and no responsibility for, their plight. Again and again the review team heard of mistreated students who received only soothing words from the Chair and from other members of the faculty. In one instance the Chair actually did approach the faculty member involved to suggest outside mediation. When (predictably) the faculty member objected, the matter was dropped. Thus, a situation with its origins in a small minority has become the responsibility of the entire department because of the inaction and complacency of the faculty (with one exception). Therefore, with but this one exception, the entire faculty, collectively and individually, is culpable.

Accordingly: 1) To reduce the burden of students in the department and to preclude additional students from entering an unhealthy environment, the Graduate Council has voted to suspend admissions to the graduate program of the department of Slavic Languages and Literatures until such time as conditions for graduate students in the department improve.

2) To protect students already in the program from further abuse, and to prevent any possibility of retribution against those who may have cooperated with the review team during this review process, it is hereby recommended that the Administration place the department of Slavic Languages and Literatures in receivership until such time as external oversight is no longer deemed necessary to protect the legitimate rights of the students to:

- be treated with respect
- take courses that benefit their education rather than the need for enrollments
- be provided with reasonable and coherent reading lists
- be informed explicitly of the format and expectations for exams
- have their dissertations read in a timely fashion and to receive constructive and useful criticism
- and in other ways, not specified above, to be enabled, not impeded, in their education.

It goes without saying that the willingness of numerous students to speak with the review team (but not to be quoted) was critical in arriving at the decision to take the above actions. Let it, therefore, be clearly understood that the slightest indication of retaliation by faculty against students will be aggressively investigated by the Graduate Council to determine whether charges should be filed with the appropriate Senate Committee for violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct, not only for recent but also for any past offences.

Recommendations

It is the goal of the councils to use the review process to strengthen departments. Therefore, we urge the Administration to refrain from imposing punitive measures (such as withdrawing the 19th century FTE). This would diminish the department's stature and would harm even the graduate students we seek to protect. Instead, we offer the recommendations below in the hope that they will be supported by the administration so that the department may emerge stronger and more respected than before. The department, for its part, can minimize the inevitable stain on its reputation resulting from the measures outlined above, by working quickly to address and redress the problems described in this review.

To the department and the administration

1. To maintain the stature of the department and to bolster undergraduate teaching, raise the current search for a 19th century specialist to open rank, preferably someone already highly respected in the field, and ideally someone who might take a leadership role as the department emerges from the present crisis. It is understood that recruiting such a person may be temporarily delayed by the measures outlined above, however the delay can be shortened by aggressive cooperation on the part of the department to correct the problems that have been noted above.
2. Seek a joint appointment to fill the 20th century position.
3. Seek a joint appointment to provide a permanent South Slavist.

To the department

4. Engage the linguistics faculty in the development of a more balanced undergraduate curriculum in which the linguists share in the undergraduate teaching.
5. Increase the selectivity of admissions to reduce graduate student attrition. The goal should be to generate a smaller (by half), better prepared student body, with more funding per student. Simultaneously, efforts to find additional sources of funding should continue. Any subsequent increase in admissions should be accompanied by commensurate increases in funding opportunities for the students.
6. The procedures for and the criteria upon which funding decisions are made must be clearly explained to the students in writing.
7. Lift the veil of secrecy characteristic of the department. For example, admit the MSO to faculty meetings as is done for all other departments in the Kinsey Humanities Group, and allow graduate students meaningful participation.

Time line

A follow-up review of the department will be conducted in the Spring of 2001 by a process to be decided before June 30, 2000.

Approved by the Graduate Council: June 9, 2000

Approved by the Undergraduate Council: June 9, 2000

Appendix I: External Reviewer Reports

Appendix I External Reviewer Reports

Alan Timberlake, Slavic Languages & Literatures, UC Berkeley
David Bethea, Slavic Languages & Literatures, University of Wisconsin

TO: Duncan Lindsey, Chair, Graduate Council, Academic Senate Office, UCLA

FROM: David Bethea, Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures, University of Wisconsin-Madison;

Alan Timberlake, Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures, University of California at Berkeley

ABOUT: External Review of the Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures, UCLA, February 23-25, 2000

1. General. For several decades UCLA has been a leader in Slavic studies in North America, the hallmarks of its program being an enviable breadth and rigor. It has been especially strong in the area of linguistics and poetics. Perhaps more than any other department in the country, UCLA's has embodied, and to a significant degree still embodies in some of its faculty, what the great structural linguist Roman Jakobson called the study of the "Slavic word"-- the investigation of how the disciplines of linguistics, poetics, folklore, and literary study interrelate and interpenetrate on Slavic soil. UCLA's Slavic faculty are virtually without exception highly productive and distinguished, with national and in several cases international reputations. On the undergraduate level, the department has generally worked hard to make itself accessible and relevant to today's students, and it has done so without abandoning its traditions and high standards. The language program at UCLA, about which we will have more to say below, is one of its singular strengths. With regard to the graduate program, the students appear to be exceptionally well trained, a fact further corroborated by the department's record of placing seven out of seven new Ph.D.s over the past five years. This record of placing students in recent years is unparalleled among Slavic programs in America.

UCLA has thus managed to keep intact a basic infrastructure for Slavic study which should allow it to be well positioned for the future. This depth and breadth will be necessary as a kind of gold reserve, which can be drawn upon over time, as the needs of the world at large and of the student body at UCLA change. It goes without saying that no Slavic program, in the country has been immune to the vast cultural and demographic shifts brought on by the fall of the former Soviet Union and the onset of the new global economy and changing interests on the part of American undergraduates, who ever more treat undergraduate education as training for future employment. The key is to find a way to adapt to external changes while still maintaining the basic integrity of one's programs-to provide needed training to undergraduate and graduate populations without becoming in the process a service department.

The external reviewers sense that Slavic at UCLA can successfully adapt to the demands of a smaller (yet still strategic) language, literature, and culture program in today's academy, but some of the decisions it will have to make will not be easy and will necessarily go against the grain of the department's own traditions. In what follows we try to offer some points of orientation as well as concrete recommendations that the department and administration may want to take into account as they consider the future.

2. *Undergraduate Program.* The interviews with the department's undergraduate students were one of the most pleasant aspects of our two-day review experience. Slavic appears to be blessed with a number of gifted undergraduate instructors. We cannot recall an instance where one of the students being interviewed said something negative about the department or the individual course or courses. So-called "heritage" (émigré or second-generation) students were especially numerous and enthusiastic: they stated repeatedly that the new courses designed to educate them further in a language and culture they left prematurely are both much needed and well taught. Several individuals praised the accessibility of the instructors and TAs. They felt themselves to be part of a small "collective" on a large campus, with the staff making time to accommodate their needs in a cheerful and always professional way. The "Russian room," a specific location where students can drop to chat with TAs or a native Russian speaker (Ninel Dubrovich) is a demonstrable success. The system of offering three parallel tracks for majors (Russian language and literature, Slavic languages and literatures, and Russian studies) appears to work well and to, build on the strengths--especially the breadth--of the department. We would also like to applaud the new major in European studies, which further integrates Slavic into the campus mainstream. The department is to be commended for the efforts it has made in the last decade to broaden its appeal. We are confident that the department is genuinely committed to these efforts, and under the department's present enlightened leadership, even more new courses will emerge and the efforts will continue, organically and effectively, to broaden Slavic's undergraduate presence on campus.

We would like to note, however, that, based on enrollment data for the 1997-98 and 1998-99 academic years provided by Academic Planning and Budget, there appears to be a significant asymmetry between the literature and linguistics faculty in terms of their respective undergraduate teaching assignments. Literature faculty regularly teach undergraduate courses, linguistics faculty do not. It looks to us that virtually every course that contributes substantially to the undergraduate student credit hour numbers for Slavic-Russian 25 (The Russian Novel in Translation), Russian 99A (Introduction to Russian Civilization), Russian 99B (Russian Civilization of the 20th Century), Russian 124D (Dostoevsky), Russian 130B (Russian Poetry of the Late 18th to the Early 20th Century), Russian 140B (Russian Prose from Karamzin to Turgenev), etc.-is taught by a member of the literature faculty, and those student credit hours have allowed their departments to offer low-enrolled graduate courses and thereby to keep these programs going. This creates the impression that, at present, the senior linguists are doing the majority of their teaching at the graduate level, a distribution of faculty energy which naturally results in problems with enrollments and student credit hours. Linguists need not teach only highly specialized courses in linguistics per se, which in any event would have trouble drawing from an undergraduate population; instead, they might consider offering courses in such related fields as folklore, mythology, culture, history of culture, etc. After all, literature faculty around the country have been called upon to "reinvent themselves" by offering more general education and writing-intensive courses that serve the larger college population; literature faculty regularly extend themselves to develop courses in film, art, or periods of literature in which they are not research specialists. Another possibility is that the department's linguists offer already existing courses for other departments and programs--for example, a course on dialectology for the Linguistics Department or a course on discourse theory for Applied Linguistics.

We might note parenthetically that small departments like Slavic would be encouraged in attempts to reach larger audiences if the University were to adopt a policy of crediting the home department of the instructor rather than the department offering the course; this would be an incentive for faculty in small departments to teach established, high-enrollment courses for other departments. And even if it is not UCLA's policy (for now) to give official credit for enrollments logged by home faculty in visiting departments, Slavic in this instance would still get the reputation for being good citizens. The asymmetry in the utilization of faculty energy needs to be addressed and something approaching equality of undergraduate-graduate teaching assignments for all ladder faculty ought to be instituted.

3. *Language Program.* UCLA is fortunate to have an exceptionally strong and well-integrated language program with a bright and responsive staff. Professor Olga Kagan is generally recognized as one of the three leading experts on Russian language pedagogy in the country, along with Patricia Chaput at Harvard and Benjamin Rifkin at Wisconsin. She has remained active as a writer of a widely-used textbook and course materials, and her writing and boundless professional activity also serve to raise the visibility of the department. Her leadership and highly professional manner are in evidence throughout the program. The departments TAs seem very satisfied with Professor Kagan's supervision of their teaching duties and with the preparation they receive in Slavic 375 (Teaching Apprentice Practicum). When we interviewed all the language instructors together, including those in Russian, Czech, Polish, Ukrainian, Hungarian, Romanian, and Serbian/Croatian, there appeared to be excellent camaraderie among them. We were particularly impressed with the numbers of students in Dr. Galateanu's Romanian classes. The enrollments in most upper-level Russian classes are relatively robust, comparing favorably with enrollments in other institutions, and that is a good sign. It is also impressive that there is remarkably little attrition from one quarter to the next in the basic sequence of language courses. There is also much more emphasis on non-linguistic content in the language courses than was the case just a few years ago. Again, students seem to reflect the well organized nature of the program and the dedicated attitude of Professor Kagan and her colleagues with their comments, which virtually to a person show a high degree of satisfaction. It was a wise move to fix Olga Kagan in place as permanent faculty, at a time when it was difficult to make lecturer appointments with SOE. It is our judgment that the language program, while forced like many sister programs around the country to pay heed to enrollments and to continue to reach out to a changing student population, is in good hands for the indefinite future.

Given the relative difficulty of languages in the Slavic group, we would urge the administration to give the department some flexibility in setting smaller class sizes in lower level courses: aiming for the mid-20s (with maximum at 26) seems high to us; a limit of 15 would be better, given the context.

4. *Graduate Program.* As we suggested in our opening remarks, at present Slavic is undergoing as much change as any field in the humanities. Without doubt much of this change has to do with demographics and the "new" economy, but some does not. At many universities deans are not replacing slots automatically, but are waiting to see if student demand warrants the same outlay as in the past. Financial aid for graduate study in the humanities, usually one of the more difficult sells to campus administrations even in prosperous times, has not been helped by news of shrinking applicant pools and the ever fragile job market for new Ph.D.s. Thus, we would like to stress that there are various factors over which no Slavic program, including that of UCLA, has had control since the time of the last review in 1992. Disciplines can grow up when there is a need (say, the "Cold War" or "sputnik"), but they can also languish when that need disappears. We are all historically situated in this way, as any look in a course catalogue just a few short generations ago will show. It is a cliché, but it is perhaps worth repeating: in order to remain viable, today's Slavic departments and programs will have to attract and train today's, not yesterday's, students; they will have to find ways to maintain intellectual integrity while still being responsive to different audiences.

Having said this, we believe that Slavic at UCLA is at an historical crossroads for other reasons as well. If the "infrastructure," in terms of faculty resources and national reputation, is there to insure that the program is well situated to face the future, there are also real challenges that need to be addressed soon, and in a thorough, collegial manner. As capable as UCLA's graduate students in Slavic are, and as appreciative as they are of the intellectual training they receive, they suffer from an alarming level of anxiety, bordering on demoralization. (The issue of faculty collegiality will be addressed farther on.) We realize that to be a graduate student is to be, by definition, in a vulnerable, transitional status, with the result that a certain amount of legitimate (and sometimes less than legitimate) "ventilating" is to be expected. Bearing this in mind, we must nevertheless report that what we found during our visit was much more than what can be attributed to run-of-the-mill graduate student anxiety. We would urge the department to do everything in its power to address these problems in an open, fair, and non-defensive manner. We

do not wish to be alarmist, but neither do we wish to treat euphemistically an atmosphere that can poison and further undermine the continuing life of the department.

To begin with, too many applicants have been accepted in the past relative to the level of support that the department is capable of providing. This in turn has translated into a system where: 1) some (many?) continuing students do not have a reliable sense of their possibilities for aid in the future; 2) not everyone is given the opportunity to teach (a real liability for those going on the job market); and 3) the program has more people in the on-leave status than it ought. (The practice of dividing TA positions into two in order to spread the opportunity to teach perhaps has a certain logic, but it is unheard of at other institutions, and should be eliminated.) We anticipate that the shrinking applicant pool will probably take care of this problem by itself, but even so, the department should as a policy decide to admit fewer students and to provide more initial funding and continue to fund those it does admit on a more regular, longer basis. In addition to being the responsible thing to do given the current job market in Slavic, this would both improve student morale. Some change in initial funding—a commitment to four- or five-year support packages is absolutely necessary to compete successfully against the other strong programs that offer multi-year financial aid packages.

One thing that became clear from the review team's discussions was the need to make a more concerted effort to find teaching and research support positions for Slavic graduate students on campus. It appears that there are very real opportunities for Slavic graduate students to teach in other programs, to serve as: TAs in ESL courses (after the minimal training), TAs in other languages of competence (many grad students in Slavic are foreign), TAs in writing-intensive or composition sections and in literature discussion sections of large General Education lecture courses (if this is a possibility); possibly TAs in content courses in Linguistics, etc. It would take a little effort to learn what the realistic possibilities are, but once the paths of employment in other programs, once discovered, quickly become worn. (sic)

The department also has in place some specific projects, specifically the journals edited by Professors Ivanov and Klenin, that are of value to the profession as a whole. It would be a valuable source of modest support for one or two graduate students if such projects could be funded on a reliable and recurrent basis.

The graduate students interviewed complained repeatedly that the procedures for selecting those to be funded in a given year are not explained to them in a consistent fashion. (For the record, the external reviewers are of the opinion, based on their experiences at home institutions, that the *procedures* for determining who receives financial aid should be made explicit, but that publicizing the actual ranking of all the students can be divisive and ought to be avoided.) Equally troubling were the numerous stories of confusion and frustration with regard to exams and readings lists: there does not seem to be an understanding of what the core material is that all students should know for their M.A. exams (linguistics), as apparently the faculty cannot agree on a single format; likewise, there does not appear to be a clear policy on the composition of examinations: what should come from relevant course work and what from outside reading (NB: no reading list exists). Finally, the Ph.D. exam (linguistics) too often repeats "broad knowledge" aspects of the M.A. exam without allowing the student to do the sort of in-depth analysis he or she will have to show at the dissertation level. On the literature side, the students asked that the reading list be updated, a course on recent Russian literature be instituted (in the bargain, probably displacing moving the requirement of Medieval Literature to the Ph.D. level), and the Movements and Genres course be replaced by Introduction to Graduate Study (or in Other terminology, a pro-seminar on literary theory and research methodology). These are all reasonable requests in our view.

As stated, one of the special strengths of the UCLA graduate program in Slavic has been its breadth in linguistics offerings and its expertise along the "seam" of linguistics and poetics, and some faculty (especially from

the linguists side) continue to teach and do active research in this tradition. But this strength has also created its own weakness. This broad interest could be one of the sources of a problem that we sense both the faculty and the grad students are loathe to acknowledge: the average time to Ph.D. for 21 students from 1988 to 1998 was, by our calculations, 9.347 years (based on the "Profile for Slavic Languages and Literatures," p. 2). Despite some improvement in recent years, we believe this time frame is much too long, given the department's financial aid constraints and the job market in Slavic. Programs should make every effort to advance their (hopefully now better funded) students through all the requirements, including writing the dissertation, in a 5-6 year period.

Understanding this outer limit as a reality will force the department to make some changes in its program. Some of these changes might (and probably should) be: 1) instituting an 4-6 course outside minor (French, Philosophy, History, Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, Film, etc. the list is quite open-ended) that would give the students an added area of expertise (very attractive in today's market) but would have to come *at the expense* of existing requirements; 2) doing away with a formal M.A. exam (with obvious exceptions: when a student comes with a M.A. from elsewhere and needs to be tested or when the M.A. is terminal) and focusing attention entirely on the Ph. D. qualifying exam; 3) using the Ph.D. written examinations to test the student's comprehensive knowledge of the field, but using the Ph.D. oral examination as an opportunity to discuss and refine the dissertation proposal (i.e., replacing what is now called the "qualifying paper" by a new category); 4) considering requiring reading knowledge of French or German rather than French and German; 5) establishing thorough, up-to-date (both in terms of the primary and secondary literature), yet manageable/"realistic" reading lists in linguistics and literature; 6) announcing as policy to students that they be expected to take the qualifying exams by the end of their fourth year of graduate study; 7) making the study of the "second Slavic" language and literature an option for a minor rather than a requirement.

By calling for these or analogous changes, we recognize that in some cases we are asking the department to move in a direction opposite the one they would prefer. For example, we gather from the linguistics graduate students and faculty that many would like for all M.A. students to have demonstrated proficiency in several "core" courses- Introduction to Phonetics, Introduction to Historical Linguistics, Phonology, Syntax-before being admitted to the Ph. D. program. Here the implication is that until all the Ph.D. candidates are on the same level playing field, it is disruptive and inefficient to have them study together. Only by having capable but insufficiently trained new students take the requisite courses outside of the department, presumably in Linguistics, can the situation be dealt with, goes this logic. Again, the impulse to fix the problem has been to add rather than subtract. But we fear that this solution, while understandable and perhaps desirable in a world of unlimited resources, could end up extending further the time to degree of these students. Similarly, students were enthusiastic about the possibility of courses that would extend in the twentieth century past the thirties, but at the same time seemed unwilling to understand that any such addition will lengthen the program.

Evidently some changes need to be made to adjust the real preparation of incoming students. Perhaps it would be better for the colleagues teaching the graduate curriculum in Slavic linguistics to think of ways to provide some of this rudimentary knowledge in phonology or syntax in already existing (or, if necessary, newly designed) courses. Or if they truly believe that students entering the program need to do work outside the department before they are qualified to study with their peers, then the burden will be on these same colleagues to come up with a way to reduce the students' requirements at a later stage.

And lastly, in the spirit of morale building, we would urge the faculty to have an open discussion among themselves and come up with simple guidelines for how to provide feedback to students when correcting papers. Although students applauded the faculty for being generally accessible and responsive in one-on-one situations, they want more explicit feedback on their written work (especially when the professor possesses competence in their

native language). As this is a culturally nuance issue, the best solution may be to establish some general "do's" and "don't's" (including silence). With regard to faculty advising, the students ask that their own professional needs be placed above enrollment issues when recommending courses. They would also like the option of taking exams either by hand or on the computer (a fairly widespread practice these days), and they would like to have greater access to the reading room, but in a way that doesn't jeopardize security.

5. *Faculty.* The Slavic faculty at UCLA gets high marks for its splendid publication record and its national and international visibility. It is true, moreover, that the department has made strides in the 1990s to balance its profile between linguistics/language, on the one hand, and literature, on the other. Professors Ivanov and Yokoyama are major appointments by any standards, and Professor Koropeckyj has been an excellent addition as Polonist with other areas of expertise. Be this as it may, there are gaps in current coverage that will need to be filled before the department can be considered to be at full speed and competitive with the top programs in the country: 1) a specialist in "Golden Age" prose (Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, etc.) with theoretical sophistication and a well-established record in the field; 2) a specialist in twentieth century Russian literature, particularly the contemporary period; 3) a South Slavicist. It is our belief that the first position, the Golden Age specialist, is absolutely crucial to the long-term health and viability of the department: this is where the biggest enrollments reside in any Slavic program, and to have a well-known person representing this area would certainly add to the luster of the department. It is the core area of any graduate program, and it would not be unnatural to expect the person filling the position to exercise a leadership role in the definition of the literature program. For this latter reason, we recommend that the search be open as to rank; the department might be extremely well served if it could identify and attract a prominent colleague at an intermediate rank (approximately, the senior associate rank-that is, ready to be promoted to full professor) and with one or more outstanding books to his or her credit. To repeat, however, nothing in our estimation would do more to raise the profile of the department and to solidify its orientation as an equal parts literature and linguistics faculty than this appointment.

The second literature appointment is also important programmatically and politically: the graduate students would like more training in contemporary literature and they are right to assume that this would make them more marketable-but perhaps a little less so strategically. It could and probably should be at the junior level. The South Slavic position, which both the linguistics faculty and students lobbied for eloquently and for years, is an area that most major programs in the country still have coverage in. Since breadth has always been UCLA's hallmark, it would be a significant blow to its tradition and reputation to do away with this position. The question seems to be whether to fix it in place as a permanent ladder position or to continue to fill it on a visiting/adjunct basis. The adjunct position has evidently been a satisfactory temporary and ad hoc measure (with the reservation that no adjunct person can serve on examinations). If one of the senior linguist positions (two are relatively close to retirement) could be "mortgaged" for this one, and if the position description were crafted not for a narrow linguist but for a person genuinely able to teach the language(s), literature(s), and culture(s) of the former Yugoslavia, then it would make sense to make the appointment sooner rather than later. For, to reiterate, we do believe that UCLA should have a South Slavicist.

6. *Leadership and Collegiality.* We understand from the faculty, graduate students, and staff that the period since the last review has not always been easy for the department. The Slavic field has changed and business as usual, probably never a viable option, is even less a possibility today than it was eight years ago. Moreover, there have on occasion been personnel issues in the department, which we will touch on briefly below, that have sometimes strained relations and caused problems with morale, especially the morale of the graduate students. But we do not believe the fabric of trust and collegiality has been irreparably torn, only frayed. In this respect, it seemed obvious to us that the current chair, Michael Heim, with his patience, good will, sensitivity, and the respect he universally enjoys, has done an admirable job of bringing the department out of a situation of potential crisis; he is

the right chair for the department at this time. It was especially encouraging to us to see the solid relationship that Professor Heim had forged with Dean Yu and the administration-this at a time when a positive relationship needs to be and can be developed. Indeed, in our view (and here we rely on observing analogous situations at our own and other institutions), it can be catastrophic when trust between department and administration breaks down, and there is no justification in this instance for the department not to work cooperatively with the current administration.

Yet all of the patience and intelligent stewardship of one individual will not by themselves succeed in mending the frayed fabric and getting this academically superb department again on sound footing. Nor will additional resources in and of themselves. For this mending process to take place, other colleagues will have to participate. They will have to be willing to compromise on some issues (the shape of the curriculum, the set of requirements, the length of the program of study, etc.) but not on others (what constitutes "Professional" behavior).

Which brings us at last to the thorny issue of (for lack of any other general word) collegiality. We, the external reviewers, heard numerous descriptions from the students and staff of how some Slavic faculty behaved in a manner that can only be called unprofessional. We mention these incidents now neither to denounce specific individuals nor to establish the allegations as true-we were not given the time or the mandate to determine the veracity of these reports or to adjudicate in these matters- but simply to let the department know that there is a significant problem of aggrieved *perception* (and quite possibly fact) with regard to student-faculty and staff-faculty relations. We live in a litigious society and, issues of normal civility aside, the power differential between a tenured faculty member and a graduate student is too great not to take seriously the potential for abuse. To repeat, the issue is not whether any of this, or even a small part of it, happened (although this much smoke suggests there must be some fire). Rather, the issue is that the "air needs to be cleared," the students and staff need to feel that they have been heard, and a statement needs to be made that nothing like this will occur again and that the department is making a fresh start.

We make no official recommendations here other than to say that the department must find a way to reunite around Michael Heim's and others' leadership. How they accomplish that, either with the help of professionals or on their own, is best left up to the department and to the administration. But at the end of the (hopefully short and efficacious) day, *something must be done*.

7. Conclusion. The Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA has been, one of the premier programs in the country for three decades, especially in linguistics, where it arguably has the strongest research faculty in America. Its students are being placed. The research and editorial activity of its faculty are visible and respected by colleagues in the field. But like any program it has evolved to the point where it faces a series of challenges, some external, some of its own making. To respond to those challenges we recommend the following:

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM:

- 1) that undergraduate teaching assignments be shared equally by linguistics and literature faculty through the development of a more balanced curriculum;
- 2) that the department continue to seek ways to include General Education, writing-intensive, and other courses appealing to a campus-wide audience in their curriculum;
- 3) that the beginning sections of Russian not be filled to 26, but be allowed to be smaller (app. 15);

GRADUATE PROGRAM:

- 4) that the number of new students being admitted to the graduate program be reduced and that the goal be to give financial support to all grad students in the program;
- 5) that other forms of financial aid for graduate students on campus be investigated (TA-ing in ESL courses, language courses outside of Slavic, etc.);
- 6) that reasonable and coherent reading lists be established for the Ph.D. (and if still necessary, M.A.) programs in linguistics and literature;
- 7) that an exam, format be regularized for both linguistics and literature exams, M.A. and Ph.D. levels, and that the expectations for student performance be made explicit;
- 8) that the graduate program, be simplified and the time-to-Ph.D. be reduced by a variety of changes, possibly including: eliminating the M.A. exam. (except for specific circumstances), offering the choice of French or German, establishing a non-departmental minor while reducing other requirements, replacing the "qualifying paper" with a "dissertation proposal" (to be discussed at the qualifying exam. oral), etc;

FACULTY:

- 9) that a Golden Age prose specialist, at open rank, be appointed as soon as possible;
- 10) that a junior specialist on contemporary literature be appointed as soon as the Golden Age specialist has been fixed in place;
- 11) that a well-rounded South Slavicist, with possible background in linguistics but with the ability to teach various courses in the language(s), literature(s), and culture(s) of the former Yugoslavia, be appointed as a "mortgage" for one of the senior linguist positions;
- 12) that the department work together to address issues of collegiality that have damaged relations with graduate students, staff, and the administration.

(signed)

David M. Bethea
Vilas Professor
University of Wisconsin-Madison

(signed)

Alan Timberlake
Professor
University of California at Berkeley
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

Appendix II:

Site Visit Schedule

Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
Site Visit Schedule

February 24-25, 2000

*All meetings will take place in 374 Kinsey unless noted otherwise

Wednesday, February 23, 2000

7:00 p.m.: Dinner meeting for review team members only. Tanino's Restaurant, 1043 Westwood Blvd. (between Kinross and Weyburn, (310) 208-0444.

Thursday, February 24, 2000

8:00: Breakfast discussion with Chair Michael Heim

9:00: Meeting with Dean Pauline Yu

10:00- 10:40: Linguistics Faculty (Henning Andersen, Andrew Corin, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Emily Klenin, Olga Yokoyama)

10:40 - 11:20: Literature Faculty (Michael Heim, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Joachim Klein, Emily Klenin, Roman Koropecykj, Alexander Ospovat, Rob Romanchuk)

11:20 - 12:00: Language Faculty (Nelya Dubrovich, Georgiana Galateneau, Michael Heim, Olga Kagan, Roman Koropecykj, Susan Kresin, Judith Simon, Mel Strom)

12:00: Lunch

1:15: Meeting with Undergraduate Students

2:00: Meeting with Graduate Students

2:45: Review of TA Training Program - Olga Kagan , Susan Kresin and Julia Morozova

3:15: Review of Advising - Henning Andersen, Inna Gergel, Roman Koropecykj, Alexander Ospovat

4:00: Closed Session for Review Team only

5:00: Dinner at Michael Heim's home

Friday, February 25, 2000

8:30: Breakfast for Review Team

9:00: Conference call with Ron Vroon

9:15: Conference call with Gail Lenhoff

9:30: Marilyn Gray, graduate student

9:45:

10:00: Minhee Kim, undergraduate student

10:15: Olga Yokoyama, Professor

10:30: Cori Weiner, graduate student

10:45: Susie Bauckus, graduate student

11:00: Julia Verkholtantsev, graduate student

11:15 :

11:30: John Narins, graduate student

11:45

12:00: Lunch

1:00: Meeting with Slavic Staff (Mila August, Inna Gergel, Carol Grese, Jami Jesek, Sasha Mosley and Carolyn Walthour)

2:00: Final review team with Michael Heim

3:00: Closed Session

4:00: Exit Meeting (2121 Murphy): Review Team; Chair Heim; EVC Hume; Assoc. Dean Hune; Dean Yu; Provost Copenhaver; GC Chair Lindsey; Ugc Vice Chair Bjork; FEC rep K. Baker.

Contact Person for the Site Visit:

Inna Gergel
Phone #: X53856
Fax #: 65263
115F Kinsey

Appendix III: •Factual Errors Statement from Department Chair, M. Heim
•Response to Statement from H. Martinson

-
Crespo, Luisa

-
From: MICHAEL HEIM [heim@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2000 1:54 PM
To: crespo@senate.ucla.edu
Subject: response to academic senate review

8 June 2000

Professor Duncan Lindsey
Professor Orville Chapman
Academic Senate Executive Office
3125 Murphy Hall
140801

Dear Professors Lindsey and Chapman:

Please distribute the following to the members of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. It is my response to the drafts of the internal and external reviewers' report of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. I will address both errors of fact and errors of omission.

Let me begin by saying that I have no bones whatever to pick with the external report: it is not only factually accurate but conveys the spirit of the Department. I cannot say the same about the internal report or, rather, about the section of the internal report entitled "Graduate Program" (pp. 2-5). It contains a number of inaccurate statements, fails to make certain important points, and - most important - draws a picture of the Department I do not recognize.

Before I try to set right the general impression, however, I will set right some details. The specific case history on p. 3 opens by stating that the student in question entered the program with "excellent credentials." In fact, her Russian was so poor that she had to take not the usual remedial course we recommend in such circumstances - that is, the fourth-year undergraduate course - but the third-year course.

When she came to me, I did express sympathy, I did say there were problems with some of the faculty, and I did say we would have to work around them. I also promised to talk to the instructor: I needed to hear both sides of the story to find a way to handle the situation. I talked to the instructor for several hours and was ready to talk to the student, but although I phoned and e-mailed her repeatedly she never responded. I was of course sorry that we lost her and I do not condone the conduct of my colleague, but I am certain we could have solved the problem had she come back to see me.

The section entitled "Attrition" on p. 4 includes a statement to the effect that "mistreatment of students is not the only reason for attrition!" In fact, the student in question was the only student we have lost as a direct result of a conflict with a faculty member. The following statement - that several students who have left the program were "under-qualified from the start" is correct; what is incorrect is the conclusion that the department's treatment of students "does not result in cultivation of "the best and the brightest, but in the survival of the toughest and most resilient." In fact, three out of the seven students who have received degrees in the past five years were only marginally acceptable at the time they applied; all of them are now teaching at institutions of higher learning. It was a pleasure to teach them and watch them develop. What the report's discussion of attrition omits are points like the following: because the country has fewer Slavic Departments than most other language departments the pool of applicants is smaller and we have to gamble a bit more; the loss of interest in our field during the nineties restricted the pool even further; the only group of applicants that grew was that of international students, but their qualifications were harder to judge, especially until we had gained some experience. In the early nineties, when fellowships were easier to come by, we could admit more students and let them prove themselves, and as I have indicated a healthy selection did take place.

Now that funds are tight, the situation has changed. Consequently, last year and this year we admitted only two students instead of the cohorts of six to eight students we used to aim for. But all the students we admitted we gave a fine education; never did we discard students "as damaged goods."

In the "Graduate Requirements" section the issues of exam format and reading lists come up several times. Neither is in fact an issue for literature students: the exam format is standard, and the reading list, though currently under revision, is perfectly functional - reasonable and coherent - as it stands. The linguists have not yet agreed on a reading list, but are working on one and have put together a data base as a first step. The section also mentions dissertation committee problems. These have occurred - again only among the linguists - but I mediated one such problem this year, and the student has recently defended the dissertation successfully. The section calls upon the faculty to "find some way to make collective decisions." We have recently agreed to institute a new experimental MA track in Russian Language and Culture and an optional outside concentration at the PhD level, two major decisions. It took many meetings to arrive at a consensus - two linguists opposed the programs - but we have done so.

By now a pattern should be emerging. The students' complaints refer primarily if not exclusively to two members of the faculty, both of whom are in the linguistics program. Until the section entitled "Action" on p. 5 the text reads as if all faculty members were equally guilty. Under "Funding" on p. 4, for example, it states, "So vengeful are the faculty, we were told, that many students believe that they are merely pawns among these colliding ambitions." Some (though not all) of the linguistics students may believe this, but I am certain that none of the literature students (who comprise approximately half the graduate population) do. Even after the "Action" section on p. 5 does allow that only two members of the faculty are involved, it continues to refer to "students," as if all students had experienced the problems equally.

The department I read about in this report is a dysfunctional one (the report in fact speaks of "graduate program dysfunction" on p. 3), a department where no learning can take place because graduate students and faculty are constantly at loggerheads. The department I experience is one where office doors are open and graduate students and faculty are constantly discussing scholarly issues, that is, one in which first-rate training is the order of the day. I do not deny that the regretful aberrations described by the students occurred, but they are aberrations. They make it more difficult for the students involved (who, I repeat, are mostly, if not entirely, students in linguistics, but who do not include all linguistics students), but the record shows that they do not in the end stymie the educational process. This year, for instance, two literature students and one linguistics student passed their MA exams, one linguistics student passed her PhD exams, and one student (the one I referred to above) defended a dissertation in linguistics, another in literature. The latter begins a tenure-track position at the University of Florida in the fall.

What I miss first and foremost in the report, in other words, what I consider the greatest sin of omission, is any indication that the faculty members in question have been given the opportunity to give their side of the story. The Preface to the report states that "the internal review team conducted additional interviews, as necessary, to clarify issues raised during the site visit," but it never asked to see me again. True, the chair of the internal committee got in touch with me twice after the site visit - once by e-mail to request a list of the institutions at which our recent PhD's were teaching and once by phone for details about one student's account (the report as it stands mentions neither) - but why was I not interviewed about the student who left the program after the run-in with her professor? She was interviewed for her side of the story, but I had no chance to tell mine. I have filled in a few details here, but I could say a good deal more about the case. Why was I not asked about admissions and reading lists and dissertation committees? As chair I have been actively involved in all of them. And most important, why was I not asked about what I regard as the most damning accusation, which occurs in the first sentence of the "Action" section: "... the greatest anger of the students was often reserved for the majority of the faculty who take no interest in, and no responsibility for, their plight." Who are "the students" here? What does "often" mean? Who is included and who is excluded from "the majority of the faculty"? How do the students know that I or any of my colleagues take no interest in, and no responsibility for their plight"? I can understand that the internal reviewers were outraged by the student complaints listed on pp. 3-4, but I cannot understand why they assumed there was no other side to hear. The students do not know, for example, about the hours I spend every week mediating between them and the two difficult faculty members; they do not know because it would be unprofessional of me to tell them. But neither do the internal reviewers know, because they have taken everything the students say at face value. I am by no means implying that the students are not telling the truth; they are telling the truth as they see it, but there are many things they do not see. I am not surprised that the reviewers found "no example of any significant discrepancy" (p. 2) among student accounts: their accounts come from the same point of view; I am surprised that the reviewers did not see fit to solicit other points of view, that of the chair, for instance.

There is another point of view missing: as far as I can tell from the report, the reviewers have not interviewed either of the difficult faculty members. Interviewing them would have served several purposes. First, it would have furthered the cause of justice. Is it not normal for both sides of a story to be heard? Second, it would have given the

reviewers first-hand knowledge of what the rest of us (students, colleagues, and staff) are up against. Third, it would have made the two faculty members aware of the accusations that have been leveled against them and of the enormous issue their behavior has become. And fourth, it would have helped the internal reviewers to come up with advice about how to deal with them. Both the faculty and the students looked forward to the review because we hoped it would bring us useful insights. We have in fact received a number of such insights from the external reviewers, but the two recommendations made by the internal reviewers I find not only less than useful; I find them harmful.

The first, "to suspend admissions to the graduate program of the department of Slavic Languages and Literatures until such time as conditions for graduate students in the department improve" (p. 5), will harm both the department and the students. Our field is small and tightly knit. Word travels fast. Once it becomes known that a punitive action like this has been taken against us, we will lose the reputation that has allowed us, for example, to place all our students in tenure-track positions in the last five years. Moreover, for years after the ban is lifted, we will have trouble attracting students. As I pointed out above, we have recently voted in a new MA track and an optional outside concentration on the PhD-level. Just as we are making the first move in the nearly thirty years I have taught in the Department to develop the graduate program in new directions and broaden the applicant pool, we are told to suspend graduate admissions. Furthermore, we are about to make our first new appointment in Russian literature in ten years. We began the search last year and, although for technical reasons we had to suspend it, formed a short list of three candidates. We were the first choice for all three. What will happen this year if we have to tell our candidates that we have been forbidden to accept graduate students? What decent candidate will come to such a department? What will be the effect on the Department and the University of missing the opportunity to hire the best candidate? The internal reviewers do not tell us how the move will help us to solve our problems, only that it will remain in force until the problems are solved. But I can easily imagine that the havoc the move will play with the Department will exacerbate our problems rather than solve them.

The second recommendation is to place the department in receivership, in other words, to deprive it of the right to govern itself. As I have said, both the students and the faculty had hoped that the review would help us to solve our own problems. The fact that we have put into practice some of the suggestions of the external reviewers before their official report even reached us (the institution of the outside PhD concentration, for example) indicates we are perfectly capable of dealing with things on our own. I might also add that within a week of the site visit, following a suggestion that was made then but does not figure in either the external or the internal report, I consulted a member of the Ombuds Office about the difficult faculty members and have adopted a new approach to them, which has begun to yield results. Whether or not the "help of professionals" referred to on p. 8 of the external report is necessary remains to be seen.

Graduate students in our Department have suffered, and there is no excuse for that suffering. But the report blows their suffering out of proportion. It projects the injustices done to a number of linguistics students onto the student body as a whole; it makes it seem as if only suffering and no learning were going on. At the same time it projects the excesses of a minority onto the faculty as a whole. I reject its conclusion on p. 5 that "the entire faculty, collectively and individually, is culpable"; I reject the claims of "inaction" and "complacency." They run counter to the external report and, more important, to my daily interaction with the students and with my colleagues.

If I did not request to talk to the internal reviewers after the site visit, it is because I had no idea they would come to conclusions I can only call one-sided. I have voiced only a fraction of the objections I have to the report because I think we can come to an agreement about how best to remedy the situation only if we talk the issues through in person. I therefore request a meeting with the internal reviewers. I also request that before our meeting takes place they have separate interviews with each of the two difficult faculty members.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Heim
Professor and Chair

Response to Slavic Chair's "Errors of Fact" statement

The review team has the highest personal respect for the Chair of the Slavic department. Nevertheless, there appear to be irreconcilable differences in our respective points of view.

1. The Chair objects to characterizing student "XX" as having "excellent credentials".

- The review team stands by this characterization-XX came in with an undergraduate GPA of 3.97 from UC Riverside, and had a 4.0 at UCLA until her run-in with the faculty member in question.

2. The Chair states that XX is the only student that has been lost as a direct result of conflict with a faculty member.

- This is not true.

3. The Chair repeatedly objects to the failure to identify clearly the specific faculty members and students who are referred to in the report.

- As explained in the report "to preserve anonymity [we presented] most information only in general terms." Also, as stated, it was not our purpose to establish the "guilt or innocence of particular individuals." Some wording in the report will be modified to counter the impression that all students experienced problems equally.

4. The Chair strenuously objects to the failure of the review team to confront specific faculty members with specific complaints so that they could present their point of view.

- As explained in the report, no student would talk without an absolute guarantee of confidentiality. Obviously this precludes going back to the faculty with any specifics. We had already learned that addressing these problems in general terms is fruitless (see below).

5. The Chair feels that he was not adequately consulted in the preparation of the internal report.

- We have explained why checking details with the faculty was not possible, but it was certainly the desire of the review team to work with the Chair of the department. For this reason the chair of the review team brought up, very directly but in general terms, the issue of student dissatisfaction at a presite visit meeting with the Chair of the department. When the Chair of the department said that, aside from funding problems, there was no student dissatisfaction to speak of, the chair of the review team asked the question again to be sure he had heard correctly. Similar questions were asked of the Chair and of other faculty during the site visit. Especially in the beginning, the response was a disavowal of any such problems. At one point an external reviewer was moved to exclaim to a faculty member, "...you are in denial!" The pattern that emerged was consistent denial or minimization of the problem-until confronted with overwhelming evidence. Thus, there was no recourse but to unearth sufficient detail from the students themselves in order to determine whether the initial impressions reflected a situation serious enough to warrant decisive action. Once this bridge was crossed (and precluded from discussing details) there was little to be gained by rehashing generalities with the Chair of the department.

6. The Chair claims to have "had no idea" the review team would come to the conclusions it did.

•During the site visit, the chair of the review team (believing that the Chair of the department did not appreciate the seriousness of the situation) made it very explicit that suspension of graduate admissions was being considered. When, later, the Chair of the department still did not appear to grasp the gravity of the discussion, one of the external reviewers pointedly reminded him of the review team chair's comment. Later, after the exit meeting, both Graduate Council members of the review team reminded the Chair that his department's graduate program was considered "dysfunctional".

7. Many additional issues regarding procedure and interpretation are raised by the Chair.

•These are matters on which we will simply have to agree to disagree. For example:

-- Issues of long standing (more than a decade) that the review team considers to be of fundamental importance, the Chair characterizes as "aberrations".

-- For a festering problem involving abuse of power that the review team believes requires immediate and decisive action, the Chair believes "hours [of mediation] every week" and "a new approach.....which has begun to yield results" is a sufficient response.

--While the review team has been told of years of student abuse which the department has had no will to correct, the Chair offers a recent revision in the graduate program as evidence of the ability of the department to manage its own affairs.

These differences in perception do not give the review team confidence that the problems of student welfare will be dealt with swiftly and effectively (and with no retaliation towards students) without drastic measures. This issue is now a matter for discussion between the Chair and the Administration.

Appendix IV: Self Review Report

First Page Missing

(The first page of the Department's self-evaluation was not released to students. This section begins with page two of this self-evaluation.)

(Henning Andersen, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Emily Klenin, and Olga Yokoyama) and four in literature (Michael Heim, Gail Lenhoff, Aleksandr Ospovat, and Ronald Vroon) one associate professor in literature (Roman Koropecy), and two lecturers for Russian-language instruction (Olga Kagan and Susan Kresin, the former with security of employment); part-time faculty includes one adjunct associate professor in linguistics (Andrew Corin) and lecturers in Romanian (Georgiana Galateanu) and Hungarian (Judith Simon). When ladder faculty members go on sabbatical leave, they are typically replaced by visiting professors who are leading lights in their fields (Leonid Kasatkin, Roza Kasatkina, Roman Timenchik, Elena Zemskaia). We also receive an average of two and a half FTEs yearly for

teaching assistants. We have approximately thirty-five undergraduate students majors and minors and thirty graduate students on the current rolls.

Until approximately a decade ago the Department had the reputation of being stronger in linguistics than literature - the traditional components of Slavic departments since they started appearing on the American academic landscape after the Second World War. Research in our Department has concentrated on comparative cultural, literary, and linguistic studies in a number of fields: early Russian literature (hagiography), major authors of the eighteenth century (Sumarokov, for example), the classical poets of the nineteenth century (Pushkin, Tiutchev, Fet), Russian and Polish Romanticism (especially Mickiewicz) and the post-Symbolist avant-garde of the twentieth century (especially Khlebnikov) - all of which incorporate recently discovered archival materials and pay special attention to the historical context; Slavic historical linguistics in a broad Balto-Slavic and Indo-European context with emphasis on the ethnolinguistic issues connected with defining the Slavic homeland and tracing migration patterns, the analysis of newly surfaced materials (Novgorodian birch-bark letters, Old Believer literature of the seventeenth century, dialectal data including Los Angeles Molokane speech), colloquial Russian and its manifestations in recent written texts, the pragmatic aspects of contemporary Russian, and literary translation and translation studies. Currently we are perceived as being equally strong in literature and linguistics, but we will continue to be perceived as such only if we can compensate for certain recent losses.

Let us take literature first. At the end of the previous review period we acquired a specialist in nineteenth-century Russian poetry, Aleksandr Ospovat, at the beginning of the current period - a specialist in Polish and Ukrainian literature, Roman Koropeckyj. They have been instrumental in improving both the breadth and depth of our offerings.. Although we can still boast scholars publishing in nearly every period of Russian literature, prose and poetry, including the typically less well represented medieval period and the eighteenth century, last year we lost our two specialists in nineteenth century and twentieth-century prose, the core of the undergraduate curriculum and central to graduate studies as well. Dean Yu has authorized a search at the assistant-professor level for one of these positions. We have maintained strength in other Slavic literatures - Czech, Polish, South Slavic, and Ukrainian - in terms of both teaching and research. Only a handful of universities - Berkeley, Chicago, Harvard, Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Wisconsin - can begin to match us here, though none has more than two or three "second" Slavic literatures to our four, and the ability to teach these literatures is emerging as a particularly desirable qualification for new literature PhDs entering the job market.

In linguistics, which has suffered more than literature at most other institutions, the UCLA-Slavic Department has been able to maintain a full panoply of courses - in East, West, and South Slavic (the latter filled at present on a regular basis by an adjunct associate professor), Old Church Slavic, and the phonology, morphology, and syntax of Contemporary Standard Russian. A new appointment at the beginning of the period under review, that of the internationally known Slavic and Indo-European linguist and semiotician Vyacheslav Ivanov, has helped cushion the loss of three linguists to early retirement (Aleksandar Albijanic 1992 and Henrik Birnbaum and Dean Worth in 1994), though Professor Ivanov teaches literature as well as linguistics and contractually devotes one third of his time to Indo-European Studies. The linguistics program has likewise been bolstered by the appointment of Olga Yokoyama, who came to us from Harvard several years later and works in the fields of discourse analysis and gender linguistics using data from the Slavic spectrum. Many of the departments once strong in linguistics - Harvard, Yale, Stanford - have reduced the number of linguists, their primary function being to provide service courses to literature students. As a result, they are less likely to produce new doctorates in Slavic linguistics. (Of the eight doctoral dissertations in Slavic linguistics for 1997 [Slavic Review, Winter 1998, 959-60], two come from UCLA; of the other six, several come from universities with recently reduced linguistics faculty. UCLA is the only university represented by more than one dissertation.)

The Department considers the crossover between literature and linguistics central to the mission of its graduate

program. This is reflected in the MA requirements (students must take a number of courses in both), in approaches applied in PhD courses (structural analysis of literary texts, discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, semiotics, translation studies, the interface between literature and history and literature and anthropology) and, naturally, in the faculty's research. A recent development - and one that is becoming increasingly common - is the joint publication of articles by faculty members and graduate students. Graduate students also regularly give papers at national conferences: eight will participate at the annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages this December in Chicago. They note with satisfaction that the Department is helping to prepare them for the job market by rehearsing them before their talks and staging mock interviews, but would like to see general advising and mentoring strengthened as well.

The Department provides more regular, required Russian-language instruction on the graduate level than comparable programs and has a native speaker available for conversation and consultation on a drop-in basis for twenty hours a week, a feature no other department in the country offers. It also requires a working knowledge of one or two other Slavic languages. Practical language preparation has proven an important factor in the competitiveness of our graduate students on the job market, and some graduate students would like to see more emphasis on perfecting their command of Russian and the other Slavic languages. The Department prides itself on training its TA's in the latest in language-teaching methodology. Not surprisingly, then, the Department plays a leading role in formulating language-teaching policy on the UCLA campus. And not surprisingly, Professor Kagan was recently named the first chair of a newly instituted campus-wide Foreign Language Resource Committee. The Department also houses Romanian for the Romanian studies Program and has recently elected to take over Hungarian from the Department of Germanic Languages.

The Department is committed to undergraduate education. We offer two or three general education courses a quarter: The Russian Novel, Russian civilization, Russian Civilization in the Twentieth Century, Slavic Civilization. We offer three majors (Russian Language and Literature, Russian Studies, and Slavic Languages and Literatures, the latter unique in the country in requiring the study of Russian and an additional Slavic language) and three minors (Russian Language, Russian Literature, and Russian Studies, all of which require Russian language study). In the past few years we have made a highly successful effort to attract heritage speakers of Russian by creating language and literature courses with their interests in mind. The Russian club provides undergraduates with a wide range of extra-curricular activities. The number of courses required to sustain this breadth tended to tax our faculty even before we lost two of our faculty members most involved in the undergraduate program, but we feel confident of being able to carry on once they are replaced. If we can make such a claim, it is largely because, while maintaining their reputation for scholarly excellence, members of the ladder faculty regularly teach five courses a year (and many have in fact taught six or seven on an overload basis) and earn consistently high evaluation ratings from both undergraduates and graduates.

During the mid-nineties, when the decision was made to consolidate the staff of several departments into a single administrative unit, the Kinsey Humanities Group, we went through a bad patch. Our main office was left unmanned, and many of us spent an inordinate amount of time directing lost students, answering other people's phone calls, and the like. Mercifully, the situation improved dramatically when Marcia Kurtz, our student affairs officer, was returned to us, and now under Mila August's capable leadership - and Marcia's highly capable Russian-speaking replacement, Inna Gergel - things administrative are again on an even keel. We are currently gearing up for the seismic retrofitting and general renovation of Kinsey Hall. In a year's time we will move to Hershey Hall for the two years it will take to gut and completely reconfigure our current quarters. The chair has had numerous and fruitful consultations with the architects and assures the Department that while individual faculty offices will decrease slightly in size there will be a notable increase in public space: a second lounge/seminar room, a student commons room, and a set of dedicated computer work stations.

The Undergraduate Program

The euphoria that followed the fall of the east-bloc regimes in the late eighties and early nineties, the period covered by the previous eight-year review, quickly evaporated when the transition to democracy proved more arduous than expected. Undergraduate enrollments in our field, especially in Russian-language courses, dropped dramatically country-wide. The Department nonetheless continued to give regular instruction in five Slavic languages (Russian, Czech, Polish, Serbian/Croatian, Ukrainian) and Romanian; it continued to offer instruction at all levels of Russian - including self-paced Russian and First- and Second-Year Russian during Summer Session - every year. (Five of the textbooks used in courses have been or are being developed by members of the Department: V puti [1996, second-year Russian, Olga Kagan], Cestina hrou: Czech for Fun [1998, first-year Czech, Susan Kresin], Readings in Czech (1985, second-year Czech, Michael Heim, Dean Worth), Communicative Romanian [first-year Romanian, Georgiana Galateanu, Michael Heim], Balakajmo!-A Basic Course for English-Speaking Students [first-year Ukrainian, Roman Koropeckyj, Robert Romanchuk.] Our attempts at boosting dwindling enrollments included publicity campaigns (posters, sandwich boards, advertisements in the Daily Bruin), mass e-mailings (lists of our offerings to all eleven thousand undergraduates), regular alphabet-learning sessions, reinvigoration of the Russian Club (with many off-campus activities and integration into the local Russian community), increased frequency of general education courses (the Russian Novel, Russian Civilization, Slavic Civilization) and popular literature-in-translation courses (Tolstoy, Dostoevsky), experimentation with flexible scheduling patterns for language courses, introduction (in addition to the successful self-paced, that is, one-on-one first-year courses) of an intensive Russian course covering the first year in two quarters, and a series of senior seminars taught by advanced graduate students (because of the quality of our students' proposals the Slavic Department, though one of the smallest in the College of Letters and Science, was the only one allotted two such courses by the Office of Instructional Development last year). Professor Heim piloted a new type of General Education course for the College, a writing-intensive course based on Russian 99B (Russian Civilization in the Twentieth Century); Professor Vroon introduced Russian 30 (Russian Literature and World Cinema), which TAs have now taught for University Extension and the Summer School.

Another tack we took was to increase efforts to attract the pool of heritage speakers from the Russian community, which, again contrary to general expectations, has kept replenishing itself. As a result, we were able to make up for our decrease in elementary language enrollments with enrollments of up to sixty students in advanced classes like Professor Ospovat's Russian poetry and prose series (Russian 130 and 140.), classes which, because readings and lectures are entirely in Russian, were traditionally limited to majors and therefore five or, at most, ten students. The Department is also offering a number of new advanced language courses aimed specifically at Russian heritage speakers: Russian 100 (Literacy in Russian), Russian 103 (Russian for Native and Near-Native Speakers: 103A/Russian National Identity, 103B/Literature and Film, 103C/Special Topics). In this connection Professor Kagan is working on the first textbook for heritage speakers, Russian for Russians. The emphasis on heritage speakers is especially important in view of a major outreach project created by Professor Ivanov to study the diverse language communities of greater Los Angeles, a project that began as an undergraduate seminar in the Department.

The Department was the first in the College to create a minor; in fact, it was Professor Heim who during his stint on the Executive Committee in the early nineties proposed that the College as a whole institute minors. The Department now gives students a choice of three, all of which have a language component.

Finally, we have incorporated video components and web-based material into virtually all courses, language and literature, at the undergraduate level. We have offered Fourth-Year Russian to UC Riverside and Russian civilization to UC Irvine via a distance-teaching hook-up. Support for such activities comes from a variety of campus-wide facilities like Humanities Computing, the Office of Instructional Development, the Faculty New Media Center,

and the Instructional Media Laboratory. Graduate research and teaching fellows have designed programs of internet-based instructional materials at various levels. (You may visit our site at www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/slavic and click, for example, on the tutorials for Golosa, the textbook for first-year Russian.) Finally, in conjunction with her second-year textbook of Russian and as a result of a \$30,000 grant from Provost Copenhaver, Professor Kagan is working on a pilot project to supplement classroom instruction with interactive web-based exercises that can serve as a template for other foreign languages.

In other words, we have been careful to pull our weight on the university level even when circumstances have kept enrollments and the number of majors lower than we would have liked. One major problem remains. The loss of Professors Irina Gutkin and Peter Hodgson has cut deeply into the Department's undergraduate program in literature: eight of the ten courses they collectively taught per year belonged to the undergraduate curriculum, that is, together they taught approximately 45% of the undergraduate Russian literature courses in translation. We are currently conducting a search for one of their positions and have requested authorization for the second. Our goal is to maintain at the highest level what we feel to be an intellectually stimulating and viable liberal arts program. One student who took several courses in our department but graduated from another recently told us she regretted not having majored in Slavic, which she called "one of UCLA's undiscovered treasures."

The Graduate Program

Several years after the nation-wide decline in undergraduate enrollments the Department began to experience a concomitant decline in graduate applications. With Slavic departments failing to replace retiring faculty, reducing FTEs, and facing mergers with other language and literature departments or even abolishment, with ever decreasing funds available for recruiting and retaining graduate students, morale plummeted throughout the field. The funding situation became especially precarious when our Center for European and Russian Studies lost its Department of Education grant three years ago: the grant had included several annual FLAS fellowships that supported our graduate students. (Fortunately, the Graduate Division, the College of Letters and Science, and the International Studies and Overseas Programs have made up the difference each year, and we are confident the Center will regain the grant for the coming three-year period.)

Hard times have prompted us to re-examine our mission, that is, to ask how we can best ensure the vitality of our traditions, enhance our present strengths, and accommodate the future needs of the university and the profession. While faculty and students alike agree that it should build on those strengths - namely, the commitment to the entire Slavic field rather than Russian alone and to the interplay between linguistics and literature - we also agree that they can be complemented by certain changes. A once required proseminar is no longer taught and has not been replaced with basic training in research techniques, bibliography, style sheets, etc.; it is sorely lacking. Reading lists for the MA and PhD examinations in both literature and linguistics need to be updated.

On a more global level the first area that needs addressing is that of theory. The Slavs have contributed richly to the theoretical background of twentieth-century linguistic and literary studies with Russian Formalism, Czech Structuralism, Lotman's cultural semiotics, and the Bakhtinian approach, and here we are on firm ground. What we need is to cross-fertilize their contributions with current Anglo-American and continental theory. We have expanded the theoretical purview in linguistics by attracting Professor Yokoyama; in literature we are currently conducting a search for a junior position in nineteenth-century prose with proven competence in contemporary Anglo-American and/or continental theory (gender studies, cultural studies, postcolonial theory, neo-Marxism, and the like). We need to help our students better integrate theoretical perspectives into their work starting at the basic, MA level.

Closely related is the issue of the direction the field as a whole is taking. Students have expressed an interest in making the program flexible enough to include a new, third track within the Department, one combining

linguistics and literature. Professors Ivanov, Klenin, and Yokoyama have been publishing scholarship on the cusp of literature and linguistics for years. We intend to explore the possibility of setting up joint degree programs with the Department of Linguistics (where a graduate student in Slavic is currently a TA in an undergraduate course) and the Department of Applied Linguistics (where, for instance, the theory of language pedagogy is taught). Such programs would considerably broaden our students' options on the job market. We were highly gratified by the fact that last year, for example, the three students who applied for positions (two in literature and one in linguistics/language pedagogy) each received two offers, and all three are currently teaching (at Brandeis, Connecticut College, and Grinnell). This is a record matched by no other department in the country. Other institutions at which our students found positions during the period under review include the University of Iowa, Ohio State, Dalhousie, Rice, and the Russian State Pedagogical University, and two received tenure (at Brown and the University of North Carolina).

The Department has lobbied the College of Letters and Science for two FTEs to replace those it lost from retirement during the period under review. One is for a South Slavic specialist, the position currently being filled by Adjunct Associate Professor Corin and one that is essential to the Department's programmatic commitment to Slavic languages and literatures. In the framework of our interest in current theory the South Slavist would ideally represent a prominent school in theoretical linguistics not currently represented in the Department (formal, cognitive, etc.) and be versatile enough to develop and teach, for example, undergraduate courses on the cultures of the Balkan Slavs. The other is for a literary specialist whose principal expertise lies in the Soviet and Russian postmodern periods. Current students - both graduate and undergraduate - and many recent applicants have expressed a strong interest in post-Soviet developments in literature, the arts, and popular culture. By filling the second position with a specialist in this area, which is not yet widely taught anywhere in the country, we would be able to compete more effectively for the best students. Such a specialist would also have much to contribute to the Department of Comparative Literature and the Center for Modern and Contemporary Studies.

A department is as good as its faculty - and its students. We are currently making our web site more applicant-friendly and doing everything we can to attract qualified candidates for graduate study. However, despite our best efforts at recruitment and retention we are unable to compete with the financial incentives offered by a number of other institutions. The problem is compounded by the fact that, given the Department's international reputation, we have had a number of excellent international graduate students, mostly from Asia and (now that they are free to travel) Eastern Europe, but these students strain our resources inordinately because they must pay non-resident tuition in addition to university fees. To support both them and other qualified applicants - and to fill the Department's sorely depleted coffers - we have begun a fundraising campaign among our alumni and the public at large. We have made contact with all our alumni by means of a departmental Newsletter and collected several thousand dollars. This new source of funds together with increased support from the Graduate Division will help us to compete with the multi-year financial-aid packages with which other institutions have wooed promising students away from us in the recent past.

Comparison to the Previous Review

Let us begin by addressing the recommendations made by the previous review agencies, the Committee on Undergraduate Courses and Curricula (CUCC) and the Graduate Council (GC). Both advised the Department to establish clear and consistent written guidelines for distributing TA assignments and to select TAs in a timely manner. The guidelines have been established and are distributed to graduate students annually together with the guidelines for receiving all types of financial aid. We understand that students wish to learn about TA assignments in the spring preceding the academic year during which they will teach, but since the funding of TAships is inextricably bound with other varieties of funding some of them may simply have to be assigned later. We are careful to keep everyone apprised of the situation as it develops. Nonetheless, a number of students have expressed a desire for a

more collegial and transparent atmosphere.

We immediately followed the GC recommendation that we create a course to provide students with training in methods of language teaching. All students now take Professor Kagan's Teaching Slavic Languages at the College Level (Slavic 495) in preparation for teaching and her Teaching Apprentice Practicum (Slavic 375) while teaching. We also immediately followed the CUCC recommendation that we evaluate and revamp Russian 1. Methods developed in Slavic 495 laid the foundations for the new elementary language course, but other changes - a new textbook, Golosa, more emphasis on video and computer-assisted instruction - occurred as well. We have also begun to take advantage of the TA consultant position funded by the office of Instructional Development to enable experienced TAs to help train their peers.

The CUCC recommendation that we lobby for funds to use TAs to teach sections in the larger literature and civilization courses took longer to address, but within the past few years funds have been forthcoming and we now regularly offer discussion sections in two General Education courses, The Russian Novel (Russian 25) and Russian Civilization in the Twentieth Century (Russian 99B), which, as mentioned above, served as a pilot course for the writing-intensive component of the new General Education program.

There was a concern among the graduate students about the availability of TAships given the ratio of graduate students to available TA FTE's. To address this issue, not raised at the time of the previous report, we have begun to allot TAships at 25% rather than the full 50% level. The argument in favor of breaking up a TAship is that it gives both experience and fee remission to two students rather than one; the argument against it is that it may result in fragmentation in the classroom. Another problem is how to insure that TAs hired at 25% do not work proportionally more than those hired at 50%.

Instead of adopting the recommendation that the graduate adviser be a given course relief, which would have proved difficult in light of our already tight resources, we decided to divide the responsibilities of the office among four faculty members: a linguistics adviser, a literature adviser, and two members of the admissions and support committee. The way in which admissions and support decisions are reached has also changed: the faculty used to submit comments to the committee, which then made the decisions; now every faculty member rates every applicant for admission and every continuing student, and we meet as a body to discuss and vote on the candidates.

Special Circumstances

We feel we have emerged from a difficult period of transition in our own field (the transformation of East-Central Europe and its very real repercussions in the academy) and in the university (the reduction of public funding and the call for the financial accountability of academic programs) with a sense of where our strengths lie, how best to capitalize on them, and how to adapt to the new situations confronting us. We do not yet have all the answers, of course: we spent a good deal of energy, for example, formulating a new pre-professional MA program in Russian, but the chair postponed discussion until the outcome of our FTE requests is clear. Still, we have come through with our reputation and achievements intact - every faculty member contributes not only to the teaching program but also to the departmental profile of a center of research in a variety of fields - and we look forward to contributing even more to UCLA and to the scholarly community as a whole.

.....
Date: Thu, 13 Jul 2000 18:17:48 -0800 (PST)
From: MICHAEL HEIM <heim@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU>
Subject: missing external attachment (apologies)
To: slavic.department.graduate.students@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU

MIME-version: 1.0

Priority: normal

June 26, 2000

Professor Duncan Lindsey
Academic Senate Executive Office
3125 Murphy Hall
UCLA
Los Angeles CA 90024

Professor Pauline Yu
Dean of Humanities
3125 Murphy Hall
UCLA
Los Angeles CA 90024

Professor Michael Heim
Chair, Department of Slavic Languages
115 Kinsey Hall
UCLA
Los Angeles CA 90024

Dear members of the UCLA community:

Towards the end of last week, we, the two members of the external review committee, received copies of the 1999-2000 Academic Senate Review of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, a document which includes the Draft Report of the Internal Review Team as well as our own report. We recognize that no response to the Draft Report was solicited from us, the external reviewers. Nevertheless, we would ask you to consider our remarks below, regardless of procedures, because of the importance of the matter: the very existence of this academic unit is at stake. We have sent this letter first by e-mail (through the address of Ms. L. Crespo:crespo@senate.ucla.edu) with the hard copy with signatures to follow. We have addressed it to a minimal number of individuals, but we trust it can be made known to the full bodies of the relevant committees.

When we two left Los Angeles, having heard the same evidence as the internal committee and having given a quite detailed and rigorous exit interview, we believed that we shared approximately the same perception as the members of the internal committee of the state of the department, of both its strengths and its difficulties. Accordingly, we were astonished when we read the Draft Report and found that it includes a thoroughly negative evaluation of the department's treatment of its graduate students and, further, that it includes the dual recommendations that the department be obliged to suspend graduate admissions indefinitely and that the department be placed into receivership. The evaluation does not correspond to what we heard during our two-day visit. These recommendations are counter-productive. >>In greater detail: >>1. The Draft Report (p. 2) states that students perceive the program as "capricious and self-serving," and then follows this assertion by the statement that the external reviewers "devoted more space to this issue than to any other single aspect..." as if to suggest that we, the external reviewers, were in agreement with the immediately preceding statement and, by extension, with the whole of the internal report. Not so. In our exit interview and our written report, we identified a problem, and we wrote about it at some length in order to make it clear exactly what our perception of the severity of the problem was--serious but circumscribed--and in order to offer a recommendation on how to deal with it. We do not find the program capricious and self-serving. We do not agree with the language of the Draft Report that characterizes the department as treating students as "chattel" and "damaged goods." This simply does not correspond to our judgment of life in the department, and as external reviewers, we want to distance ourselves as far as possible from this characterization of the department.

2. The dual recommendations to suspend graduate admissions and place the department in receivership punish the whole department for the sins of a few, invoking the logic that all are "culpable." The logic is peculiar, and the recommendations are unfair to the department as a whole. Punishing the collective for the acts of individuals (a scenario with which we are familiar from our study of the Soviet Union) is a strategy of desperation. It represents a refusal to take any responsibility for the practical implementation of change.
3. The judgments about the transgressions of individuals place complete trust in the versions of the students. In all the extensive interviews that went on after we left, there was apparently no attempt to interview any of the faculty members who are tacitly held responsible.
4. Above all, the recommendations are simply ineffectual. They contain no suggestion of a practical mechanism that would improve the behavior of individuals or the ethos of the department. (There is also no exit strategy: how can the department ever prove that they no longer mistreat their graduate students?) The recommendations punish, but they offer no mechanisms for improvement. They offer nothing that can be implemented.

These harsh sanctions have come out of the blue. If the perception within the university was that the department was dysfunctional, the problem should have been addressed in some more productive, positive, problem-solving fashion by the administration prior to this review. There is a fundamental issue of fairness and justice to the academic unit that is at issue here. In fact, we, the external reviewers, while we know full well the nature of the historical tensions within the department, do not find it dysfunctional. The training is excellent. The department has recently placed its graduates with extraordinary success (though we do not have the figures, we expect its placement record in recent years is better than that of any other national language-and-literature program at UCLA). And--especially under its current chair--the department has come to a mature understanding of the nature of its problems as a collective and it has begun to find ways of resolving conflict and functioning effectively as a collective. The historical problems are real, but the resolve to get beyond these problems is no less manifest. The department should be congratulated for its recent efforts to move forward, not punished for the residue of its historical tensions.

As a more efficacious alternative to these precipitous and harsh sanctions, one might consider a concrete two-step strategy that would consist, first, of a meeting between representatives of the university community--possibly Dean Yu and the chair of the internal committee--and the whole of the faculty of the department. Such a meeting could be used to make clear how the Administration and the larger university community perceive the problems of the department and could serve to remind the faculty of the standards for comportment. After such a meeting, once the ground-rules are set, the department can then, as a long-term strategy, articulate and utilize an internal mechanism for conflict resolution, where necessary involving the services of a professional mediator.

We, the members of the external review committee, would take the liberty of reminding you that our external review was an extremely rigorous review. We listened carefully while we there, and discussed with each other quite intensely our ongoing perceptions and incipient recommendations. This was no sweetheart review. It was a review that identified problems and made clear judgments and strong recommendations, some of which, we knew in advance, would not be popular with all of the individual faculty members at UCLA. For this reason, we feel particularly distressed that the language and recommendations of the Draft Report run so thoroughly counter to our perceptions of the program, our perceptions of the sense of the committee during our visit, and our judgment of what is practical and necessary to move this department forward.

As the members of the external review committee--as individuals who were likewise charged with evaluating how well the department fulfills its academic mission, as individuals who observed the same department and heard the same testimony as the internal committee--we would urge you to reconsider the decision to impose harsh sanctions on the department and, instead, to formulate a more measured and more constructive response. These sanctions are unwarranted. These sanctions will destroy overnight a department that has been making extraordinary and earnest efforts to improve its undergraduate curriculum, its already effective graduate program, and its historically imperfect but improving departmental ethos. What is needed instead is a response that will lead to productive change, in the relevant individuals and in the ethos of the department as a whole, rather than to further factionalism and rancor.

Sincerely,

David M. Bethea, Vilas Research Professor, University of Wisconsin
External Member, 1999-2000 Academic Senate Review of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA
Alan Timberlake, Professor, University of California at Berkeley
External Member, 1999-2000 Academic Senate Review of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA

.....
Date: Thu, 13 Jul 2000 16:01:02 -0800 (PST)
From: MICHAEL HEIM <heim@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU>
Subject: eight-year review follow-up
To: slavic.department.graduate.students@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Priority: normal

By now you will have had time to read the Internal and External Departmental Reviews, my "Errors of Fact" statement, and the Internal Review Committee's response to that statement. I am pasting below my point-by-point reaction to the response and sending under separate cover the External Committee's response to the Internal Review. Once you have perused these documents and reviewed the earlier ones, I would like to talk to each of you and hear your suggestions for addressing the Department's problems. I will be out of town from 14 July to 21 July, but will be in town for the rest of the summer. Please drop in or call for an appointment. If you would rather respond with an anonymous letter, please feel free to do so.

Chair's Response to the Internal Review Team's Response

1. The Chair objects to characterizing student "XX" as having "excellent credentials."

The student in question had excellent credentials on paper, which is why we accepted her; they turned out to be less than excellent in reality. Given that she had to take our third-year undergraduate Russian course (we normally require four years of undergraduate Russian of incoming students) after receiving A's and A+'s in the Riverside third-year Russian course (the Russian placement examination she took upon arriving at UCLA is in her file), I conclude that grade inflation was at work at UCR. I would also point out that her 4.0 GPA at UCLA consists of an A in the undergraduate third-year course she was retaking and two A's in graduate courses from the faculty member with whom she had the conflict.

2. The Chair states that XX is the only student that has been lost as a direct result of conflict with a faculty member.

The response "This is not true" is not a rebuttal. Do the internal reviewers mean I have not told the truth or do they merely think I am wrong? In either case, I must know which student or students they have in mind before I can defend my name or viewpoint. Retaliation here is beside the point because by definition the student/s involved have left the program.

3. The Chair repeatedly objects to the failure to identify clearly the specific faculty members and students who are referred to in the report.

Not only do I not "repeatedly object to the failure to identify clearly the specific faculty members and students who are referred to in the report"; I never once do so. I can see how one sentence, taken out of context, might be misconstrued to read as a call for identity. But that sentence - "Who are 'the students' here?" - is the first in a series of four clearly rhetorical questions. I am not asking which students came forth: I do not need to ask who the offended students are because I know who they are. Most if not all of the students in question have come to talk to me, or I have proactively gone and talked to them. I also - again proactively - encouraged all students who I knew had had problems to talk to the review committee openly. The report could at least have stated 1) what percentage of the graduate student body as a whole reported problems and 2) what percentage of those who reported problems were in linguistics as opposed to literature. That would have given a clearer and more balanced picture of the issue.

4. The Chair strenuously objects to the failure of the review team to confront specific faculty members with specific complaints so that they could present their point of view.

I still strenuously object to the failure of the review team to confront specific faculty members with specific complaints, but not only "so that they could present their point of view" but also, as I stated in my letter, so that 1) the team could judge the complexity (and abnormality) of the problem and offer advice on how to deal with it and 2) the faculty members themselves would understand how seriously the team took the problem. Then there is the issue of confidentiality. How can anyone - review team, chair, colleague - deal with the issues without citing specific instances? The reason students called for confidentiality was to prevent retaliation, but retaliation has never occurred and I will be glad to outline the measures the Department has taken to ensure that it not occur.

5. The Chair feels that he was not adequately consulted in the preparation of the internal report.

When I expressed my dissatisfaction at not being adequately consulted, I referred specifically to the period following the site visit. From my single post-site conversation with the chair of the team, I knew that he had talked to one student. He told me that he was checking my version of an incident against hers and that her case was linked to several others, but he did not tell me how. I cannot imagine that any student would fear retaliation from me (in fact, on the first day of the site visit the Departmental graduate-student representative asked me to deliver a statement of their grievances to the committee, a statement that was not sealed or even in an envelope), and as chair of the Department I was in a position to give objective information

on any number of cases. The students knew I was aware of the problems: in some cases they had come to me; in others, as I have pointed out, I took the initiative and went to them. I expected to hear about specific cases and was not interested in "rehashing generalities." We held an open meeting with the graduate students before preparing our self-review; we also invited - and received - anonymous statements from them after the meeting. I therefore went into the site visit with my eyes open. I am here quoted as having given the impression that "aside from funding problems there was no student dissatisfaction to speak of." I certainly never felt that that was the case, and I am not aware of having given or wishing to give such an impression. The disaffected students gave their picture of the Department, which I never questioned, but it was not the whole picture. My job as chair was to give a well-rounded picture, which I might add, coincides in both its positive and negative assessments with the external report.

6. The Chair claims to have "had no idea" the review team would come to the conclusions it did.

The statement here is unequivocal: I was told three times during the site visit that "suspension of graduate admissions was being considered." I can only say that I was stunned when I read in the report that the Graduate Council had voted to suspend graduate admissions. Had I known of the possibility during the visit, I would have reacted on the spot with the arguments against it I raise in my letter and perhaps a few more: the waste of resources, the curtailment of the literature program because of problems in the linguistics program, the punitive rather than curative nature of the "solution," its unforeseeable aftermath, etc. As a result, I phoned Professor Timberlake and asked him whether he remembered the suspension issue coming up during the site-visit interviews with me. His response was that he remembered the issue being mentioned only in closed session, that is, when I was not present.

7. Many additional issues regarding procedure and interpretation are raised by the Chair. (Three are listed.)

Let me address each of the three issues separately.

First, the review team objects to my use of the word "aberrations" to refer to "issues of long standing" and "of fundamental importance." By using the word "aberrations," I do not mean or even imply that the issues are not of long standing or of fundamental importance; they are clearly that. What I mean is that they are a "departure from the norm" (the standard definition), that is, they affect a minority of the students and that learning goes on even among that minority. I do not condone the aberrations; I qualify them in my letter as "regretful," but - as I try to show by citing the rate of success in MA and PhD examinations this year and the number of PhD's granted and teaching positions secured in the past five years - aberrations they are.

Second, the review team demands "immediate and decisive action." Besides the suggestion to consult the Ombuds Office, it has given no advice as to what form that action should take. I have however taken action on my own and in conjunction with various colleagues. Immediate results are easy to demand, but - and here we have no argument with the report - the problem is a recalcitrant one and far from easy to repair, especially in a department as small as ours.

In larger departments students have many faculty members to choose from and can move from one to another should problems arise. The linguistics students in our Department work with only three and a half faculty members. I do not intend this as an excuse (the literature students work with only two more and do not experience the linguistics students' problems); I intend it as a partial explanation of why the problem has proved so difficult to solve. Which brings me to the final point.

I resent the review team's insistence that the Department "has had no will to correct" the situation. I say "insistence" because its report made a similar accusation in similar terms. I cannot claim we have been as successful as we might have liked, but we have not ignored the problems by any means. Professor Vroon, who was chair for most of the period under review, tried any number of strategies. I know this from the innumerable conversations we have had on the subject over the years and from the progress, intermittent as it was, that was in fact made.

Let me conclude by reiterating my strong belief that suspending admissions will harm rather than help the graduate program, that it is a punitive rather curative measure. I plan to go before the Graduate Council at its first fall meeting and demonstrate why the efforts towards a permanent resolution of the problems during the months since the site visit warrant a vote to lift the suspension.

.....

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

IV-B. Annotated Copy of Eight-Year Review Report Provided to the Academic Senate by Linguistics Graduate Students of the UCLA Slavic Department

October 30, 2000

What follows is our reaction, as some of the linguistics graduate students in the Slavic Department, to the 8-year review report of the UCLA Slavic Department, and to some of the documents associated with this report. Our comments are interspersed in blue type with the original text in black type.

We would ask that this document be read only by members of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, with the proviso that no member of the Slavic Department be given access to this document. Moreover, we would ask those who do take the time to read this to be mindful of the need to preserve confidentiality. To this end, we would further request that the contents of this document not be discussed by those who read it with members of the Slavic Department, nor with those whom the readers of this document might have reason to suspect are sympathetic to the Slavic Department faculty. We realize this sounds quite paranoid, but experience has taught us that in instances such as this, there can be no such thing as too much caution.

We would also ask that this document be read only in Luisa Crespo's office and in Luisa Crespo's presence.

We apologize for any typographical errors we might not have caught. We were pressed for time to make the submission deadline, and did not want to sacrifice content for style. We realize that this is a rather longish document, but felt a document of this length was necessary to address adequately the points brought up in the 8-year review report and in the documents associated with this report...

1999-2000 ACADEMIC SENATE REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Internal Reviewers:

Harold Martinson, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Graduate Council, Chair of Team
Elinor Ochs, Anthropology, Graduate Council
Fred Burwick, English, Undergraduate Council
Chris Stevens, Germanic Languages, Undergraduate Council

External Reviewers:

Alan Timberlake, Slavic Languages & Literatures, UC Berkeley

David Bethea, Slavic Languages & Literatures, U. of Wisconsin

Date of Site Visit: February 24-25, 2000

Date of Report: June 6, 2000

Approved by the Graduate Council: Approved by the Undergraduate Council:

Draft Report of Internal Review Team

Appendix I: External Reviewer Reports

Appendix II: Site Visit Schedule

Appendix III: Factual Errors Statement from Department Chair, M. Heim.

Response to Statement from H. Martinson

Appendix IV: Self Review Report

Internal Report on the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

Preface

The following Academic Senate review of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures was conducted during AY1999-2000 on the normal 8-yr cycle. The core of the review was the site visit on February 24 & 25, 2000 during which the four internal reviewers (Fred Burwick, UGC, Chris Stevens UGC, Elinor Ochs, GC, Harold Martinson, GC, Chair of Team) and the graduate student representative (Mark Quigley) were joined by the two external reviewers (David Bethea, Wisconsin, and Alan Timberlake, Berkeley). The site visit consisted of two full days of interviews with faculty, staff, students and administration. After the site visit, the external reviewers prepared and submitted a joint report (attached), based on the site visit plus additional data and information supplied by the Graduate Division and the Department. Meanwhile, the internal review team conducted additional interviews, as necessary, to clarify issues raised during the site visit. The following account is based on all of the above sources of information, and relies heavily on the report of the external reviewers (henceforth, ER).

Introduction

The Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA has, for decades, been recognized as one of the finest and most distinguished in the country. Not only are all the faculty individually of national or international stature, but also the department as a whole is unique in the breadth of its scholarship. This breadth is two-fold. First, while departments elsewhere tend to be strong in literature at the expense of linguistics, UCLA's strong literature component is paired with a linguistic component that is unmatched in the country.

This last part ("a linguistic component that is unmatched in the country") is debatable. There are many in the field who feel that the *synchronic* linguistic component of the UCLA Slavic Department has failed to remain current with linguistic theory. The *diachronic* linguistic component remains strong.)

Second, following a period during which good departments nationwide have trimmed non-Russian components from

their programs, the department at UCLA has remained dedicated to maintaining its comprehensive Slavic character. In the future, UCLA's continued pre-eminence in Slavic Languages and Literatures will depend both on maintaining the quality of this faculty and on ensuring that adequate FTE are available to sustain its breadth.

Slavic studies, at UCLA as elsewhere, has been uniquely buffeted by international events in recent decades. Shortly after the last review, the initial euphoria following the collapse of the Soviet Union gave way to apathy-and a nationwide decline in Slavic studies enrollments. Now interest is picking up again and Slavic studies at UCLA has emerged from this dark period stronger in comparison to departments elsewhere and is in a privileged position to capitalize on the trend. Indeed, the department worked tirelessly during the dark period to expand and advertise its undergraduate offerings...

(It should be noted here that this effort was confined primarily to Olga Yokoyama and Olga Kagan, and was indeed opposed by a significant segment of the faculty...),

...and its undergraduate program is now probably among the best in the country. Undergraduates interviewed during the site visit were effusive in their praise of the program. In the future, to maintain its stature in the field, the department must turn its attention single-mindedly to the graduate program, which is in a state of complete disrepair and endures only because of the resilience and quality of its surviving graduate students.

Faculty

The uniformly high quality of the faculty has been noted above, as has the remarkable breadth of scholarship in the department. However, recent departures have left gaps in current coverage of the literature component that must be filled before the department will be recognized as truly balanced, having equally prestigious linguistic and literature components (ER, pp. 4-5).

This is problematic at two levels:

1. Not everyone in the department sees the need to achieve a "balance" between literature and linguistics. As was correctly noted, most Slavic departments barely have a linguistic presence, and many have none. Given this state of affairs, it is unclear why the UCLA Slavic department cannot remain the one department in the country with an emphasis on linguistics. This is not to say that the literature side of the department cannot also be of the highest quality, but not everyone sees the need for this aforementioned "balance". Indeed, even when one overlooks the wildly exaggerated claims made by the department as to placement of its graduates, it must be stated that it has been more successful than some (but not all) major Slavic departments in placing its *literature* graduates in tenure-track positions. Thus, it seems that in spite of the fact that this department has a profile tilting towards linguistics, it has nonetheless been relatively successful in placing its graduate students, thus begging the question, why change? If anything, it is the department's linguistic graduates who have had difficult times as of late competing for and obtaining tenure-track jobs.

2. The question of "prestige" is also problematic, especially with regard to this department. For years, the department's reputation has been measured by the prestige of its faculty and its publications. What was not measured to any significant degree, and thus not taken into the calculations which determine a department's "prestige", is the effectiveness with which the faculty trains new scholars and allows them to contribute to the growth of the field in general. We feel that the failure to measure accurately this part of the department's obligation has contributed greatly to the current state of affairs now obtaining within the department. Many of the faculty feel that as long as their academic reputation remains strong and intact, they have *carte blanche* to run the program and interact with graduate students and staff alike in any manner they choose. The result may (or may not) be a continuing stream of high quality publications, but what cannot come out of this is a healthy graduate program, one in which the next generation of leading Slavic scholars will be trained. In the prevailing atmosphere, innovation and exploration of

other aspects of our field and of other disciplines in an attempt to gain new perspective on our own discipline are not only not encouraged, they are actively discouraged and openly scorned. What is encouraged is very safe, very detailed work which will not embarrass the faculty, but which also takes no chances whatsoever and which contributes very little to the overall body of knowledge in our field.

We understand that, as a part of the faculty's responsibility in producing valued scholars, they must from time to time rein in overly enthusiastic graduate students who might want to run before they have learned to crawl. This is, in our view, both necessary and appropriate. However, when the attitude becomes so restrictive and so self-enclosed that outside influences aren't even allowed to filter in, then we feel that the faculty not only deprives the graduate student of the wide ranging liberal arts foundation necessary for innovative approaches to the type of scholarship which characterize leaders in any field of academic endeavor, but even worse, the faculty is then forced to take the less than ground-shaking papers and dissertations which result from this atmosphere and declare them significant.

This attitude that students learn here as graduate students cannot help but carry over into their professional lives, the result being that, with the exception of Gil Rappaport at the University of Texas, Austin, none of UCLA's Slavic linguistic graduates is even close to taking over the reins as a leader in the field. One former graduate student who left our department to continue his education at another university was quietly pulled aside by some members of that faculty and asked what the situation is with the linguistics faculty at UCLA: why, given the size and quality of that faculty, are the next generation of leaders in the field of Slavic linguistics not emerging? To those of us who are going through the UCLA program in Slavic linguistics, the answer to this question is clear.

Thus, we feel that we as students, and the field as a whole, would be better served by a department concerned less with difficult to quantify concepts such as "prestige" and more with the time it devotes to mentoring its graduate students in an intellectually open manner. We are confident that this would be a much better and more honest approach to the goal of obtaining prestige, since said prestige would emanate not only from the reputation of the faculty, but the quality of its graduates as measured by their ability to lead, and contribute to, the field.

Both external reviewers considered replacement of the 19th century specialist to be "absolutely crucial to the long-term health and viability of the department" (ER, p.4). This opinion was expressed repeatedly during the course of the site visit.

While a Golden Age specialist would of course bolster the literature profile of the department, we would emphasize that in the search for a highly regarded specialist in this field, UCLA should not lose sight of the problems that have led to the current state of affairs in the Slavic Department. From our point of view, better a young and fair-minded junior scholar than a highly regarded senior scholar who shares the opinions of the current faculty with regard to the treatment of graduate students.

Moreover, to raise the department to a position of unchallenged preeminence both reviewers argued that the appointment must be made at the tenured level (ER, p. 5, and repeated assertions during the site visit). The Dean has authorized a search at the assistant professor level. This search should continue, but it would be wise for the department simultaneously to try to identify a specific mid-career individual, highly respected in the field-and also here, who would be willing to move. The Dean may reconsider the rank if presented with a specific and compelling alternative.

The dilemma in this is that the ladder faculty are already 100% tenured, and only one of these is at the associate professor level. However, there were two faculty losses last year and the above appointment would replace only one

of them. The external reviewers urge that the second FTE also be replaced, this time at the junior level (ER, p. 5) and with a twentieth century specialist which the department sorely needs (ER, pp. 4 & 5). While the 19th century appointment is critical to the stature of the department, the 20th century appointment also is very important programmatically and (given a senior 19th century appointment) is essential as an opportunity to bring in young blood.

As mentioned earlier, a hallmark of the Slavic Department at UCLA has been the breadth of its scholarship. Essential to maintaining this breadth is representation on the faculty of a permanent South Slavist, an area of expertise represented in most major programs in the country (ER, p.5). Currently this position is filled by an Adjunct appointment which has been satisfactory as a stop-gap measure but which does not give the position permanence.

For the record, the South Slavist position has been filled much, much more than "adequately" by the current adjunct professor. Not only are his publications outstanding, but so is his willingness to help so many students in our department and serve on committees as an outside member. As the leading department in the country in Slavic linguistics, the South Slavic position is fundamental, since the earliest attested Slavic writings are South Slavic in nature, and it is these writings which have influenced the development of a great many of the Slavic standard literary languages. Since the retirements of Birnbaum and Albijanac, this adjunct professor has pulled the entire weight of the department in this regard, in addition to being an excellent instructor in Serbo-Croatian, in which he has a truly native-speaker capacity.

The problem the he has encountered, and which those of us who are familiar with the linguistic program in the Slavic Department know all too well, is that, for whatever reason, he has fallen out of favor with those linguists who are identified in this report as "the two difficult faculty members...both of whom are in the linguistics program". Why he would be out of favor with them, no one of us could possibly know or understand, but given the respective histories with the people involved, it is not in the least difficult to infer with whom the problem lies.

Moreover, it makes it difficult for students because Adjuncts do not "count" on examination committees, and students hesitate to choose this area for their dissertations because they cannot be sure that the expertise will still be there when it comes time to read their theses.

The Slavic Department lost three FTE during the period under review. Ideally they should be replaced as outlined above, including a permanent South Slavist. However, recognizing that this may not be possible at the present time, but in view of the importance of making these appointments, we urge the department and the administration to explore aggressively the possibility of filling the 20th century and the South Slavist positions with joint appointments. This solution is being pursued increasingly across campus, and for a small department like Slavic would be adequate to maintain the breadth that has been a pillar of its reputation.

Strongly disagree. We need a full-time South Slavist. This department made its reputation on historical linguistics, and the key to historical linguistics in Slavic is South Slavic linguistics.

Undergraduate program (including language instruction)

The reader is referred to the department's excellent self-review (pp. 4-6) for a complete account of the department's many accomplishments in this area. The external reviewers, like the undergraduates mentioned earlier, were effusive in their praise of the Slavic undergraduate program (ER, pp. 1-2). Note that the 19th and 20th century literature appointments will be very important for the undergraduate program as well as for the reasons discussed above, as these areas (particularly 19th century) attract substantial enrollment.

However, while it is usual for literature to attract more students than linguistics, we wish to emphasize, along with the external reviewers (p. 2), that this should not be used as an excuse for the linguists not to participate in the undergraduate program. As the externals point out, "the linguists need not teach only highly specialized courses in linguistics per se." They, like the literature faculty can extend themselves to develop courses of more general interest, and thereby better serve their department and the university community at large. "The asymmetry in the utilization of faculty energy needs to be addressed" (ER p. 2).

Strongly agree. It is our feeling that the failure of linguistics faculty to participate in the undergraduate program is closely connected to their overall problems in dealing with students. Graduate students are, by their nature, easier to teach, and they are much, much less likely to challenge their professors, whereas undergraduates, whose success at the university is not dependent on just one or two faculty members, readily and freely question and challenge their instructors. It comes as absolutely no surprise that these difficult linguistic faculty members shy away from undergraduate courses.

It is also worth noting that the UCLA Slavic Department, which has always prided itself on its strength in linguistics, barely addresses this subject at the undergraduate level anymore, with only one linguistic course listed for undergrads, down from three a decade ago. The UCLA Slavic Department is hardly in a position to complain about the lack of preparation on the part of its incoming graduate students in the field of Slavic linguistics when its own undergraduate program is so deficient in this field.

Graduate Program

Student welfare. During the site visit the review team heard several amazing accounts of emotional abuse perpetrated on students by certain members of the faculty. So fearful were the students that several asked to meet in private "somewhere far from our dept" after the site visit was finished. These students told of still others who were too fearful to meet with us at all. These meetings led to additional interviews designed to assess the credibility of what was heard. In all, dozens of interviews were conducted with current students, former students, faculty and staff. The picture that emerged was one in which many students live in personal fear of specific faculty members, and in anxiety about their futures within a program perceived as capricious and self-serving. We note that the external reviewers devoted more space to this issue than to any other single aspect of the Slavic program despite the fact that they heard but a fraction of all the complaints.

The last part of this sentence--" ...despite the fact that they heard but a fraction of all the complaints"--should be noted when reading the most recent comments of the two external reviewers in which they lend their strong support to the UCLA Slavic Department.

It is important to maintain the proper focus on what follows. The mandate to the review team was not to conduct a fact-finding mission or to determine the guilt or innocence of particular individuals, but rather to assess the welfare of the graduate students and to recommend corrective action, if necessary, to assure their well-being.

This then begs the question as to what *exactly* the mandate of the review team was. While we do not question the sincerity of the review team's efforts and while we acknowledge that, in comparison with other 8-year reviews, this review was indeed severe, it is nonetheless the case that this review focuses on but a fraction of the abuses that have occurred in this department over time. The review committee itself, as it was constituted, was simply incapable of doing the type of in-depth study of the department which would have been needed to present a true picture of the abuses that have become institutionalized there. There was, to our knowledge, no detailed (i.e.

involving extensive review of all financial aid awards) investigation done into the system for distributing financial aid, nor was there any financial auditing of the department's funding accounts to ascertain the allegations made by students as to irregularities and inconsistencies in the distribution of financial aid. While the report states that former graduate students were contacted, in fact only a very small percentage of these former students were actually contacted.

If the mandate of the 8-year review committee did not include an in-depth investigation and analysis of the department's fiscal practices and did not include a comprehensive examination of all former graduate students, then who in the Administration *is* charged with looking into these matters? If the 8-year review committee was indeed not instructed to "conduct a fact-finding mission or to determine the guilt or innocence of particular individuals", then who *is* charged with this task? Graduate students in the Slavic Department took and continue to take considerable risk to their future careers by cooperating so closely and extensively with the 8-year review committee to uncover the abuses which have existed for years in this department. Now that some of these abuses have been discovered and now that the Administration has been alerted to the fact that such abuse is extensive and of long standing, what does the Administration plan to do about this? Is it the Administration's plan to be satisfied with what was uncovered in the 8-year review process, hoping that once reforms are made the situation will be forgotten, or, having been alerted by Slavic graduate students as to the real nature of the department, is the Administration going to authorize the real and in-depth type of investigation of this department that needs to be done? A failure to do this begs the question as to who, if anyone, controls the behavior of academic departments at UCLA. In addition, any such failure of the Administration to continue the investigation into the Slavic Department could create the impression that the Administration simply wants this problem to go away, to fade with time.

The Slavic Department, and by extension UCLA, is guilty not only of repeated and institutionalized abuse of its graduate students, but also of lying to its graduate students concerning funding and academics, resulting in students who have been forced out of the field, or in students who have been trying to hold on and suffering financially because of this. The Administration must realize that the UCLA Slavic Department is not a thing apart, not an academic entity "associated" with UCLA, but rather it is a part of UCLA. Moreover, it was UCLA's representative to the students, UCLA's conduit to students and the conduit by which UCLA monies were distributed to students. To the extent that the UCLA Slavic Department abused its powers and abused its students, it is to this same extent that UCLA as an academic institution abused power and abused its graduate students in the Slavic Department. UCLA has transgressed. UCLA has for decades harmed and wronged students in the Slavic Department. It is now incumbent upon UCLA to right that wrong, to make right what it has allowed to happen, and to do whatever is necessary, financially, academically, and professionally, to remedy the situation vis-a-vis those of its past and present graduate students adversely affected.

Thus, the issue is not whether any or all of what we heard is correct in its detail or interpretation. The issue is the emotional trauma perceived by the review team in the students entrusted to the care of this department. This is not to cast doubt on any part of what we were told. Great care was taken to ensure the legitimacy of the information upon which we have based the conclusions at the end of this report. Several case histories from different sources were compared and no example of any significant discrepancy was found. In other instances different case histories involving similar situations were compared across time. The consistency was remarkable, even between former students who had never met. But to emphasize again: regardless of the details, the fear and the anxiety among the affected students is real, it is deep, it has interfered with the education of many, and it has crushed the careers of some. This level of graduate program dysfunction is unprecedented in the collective experience of this review team.

Without exception all who spoke with us feared retribution if they were planning to make their career in Slavic

studies, and we heard reports of both threatened and perceived retaliation. Some students, initially willing to tell their stories, later requested (even in tears) that we not use any details. Therefore, to preserve anonymity, we will present most information only in general terms, and the students, about half of whom were directly affected, will be referred to collectively. However, we begin our account below with one specific case history whose several facets reflect themes we were to hear repeated over and over. This student, whom we will call simply XX, did not fear recognition because she has left the field. The following is her story.

XX entered the program with excellent credentials. For various reasons-and on the advice of another faculty member-XX decided it was best to drop a particular graduate course during her second quarter. When XX spoke to the professor involved, the professor reportedly went on the offensive, not only insulting XX repeatedly, but also disparaging, with gestures and sarcasm, the other members of the faculty from whom XX had obtained advice. When exchanges like this continued unabated-and after being reduced to tears, XX concluded that she was merely a pawn in a jealous rivalry between this professor and other members of the faculty. Therefore, XX resolved to go to the Chair. According to XX the Chair responded with soothing words, and a statement to the effect that "there are problems among some of the faculty in this department. It is too bad that you have been caught in the middle of it. You just have to work around them." Accordingly, rather than addressing the problem, and with a comment to the effect that enrollment was low, the chair suggested that she re-enroll. Having heard numerous stories about the professor in question, and concluding that the Chair was merely circling the wagons, XX, in "the saddest decision I've ever made", left the program and the field. The "sad decision" quote above was not provided to us by XX simply for effect. Others have quoted her as saying at the time, "I have a broken heart This was the love of my life."

If the above case history were an isolated report it could justifiably be overlooked.

(We wonder at this statement. Even if it were just one person and one incident, why would the review committee think it would be "justifiable" to overlook it?)

However, every detail in this account has counterparts in the accounts of others dealing with this professor. We were told of other highly qualified students who were driven away, of another chair who sat idly by (indeed, reportedly suggesting that a student apologize to the professor for requesting to drop the class!). Thus, the perception of students that this professor takes even the most routine matters personally led XX to leave rather than spend "5 years worrying that the most innocent move or comment can turn into a major battle." And so a highly qualified student with a passion for the field, was lost.

The above is the only case history we have been given permission to present explicitly. However, during the course of our interviews we were told of

- physical displays of faculty anger including frequent yelling and even slamming a chair on the floor
- students being intimidated into taking particular classes because of enrollment concerns
 - students who fear writing anything but laudatory comments in the "anonymous" course evaluation forms
- a fractious faculty so immobilized by disagreement that no common reading list can be agreed upon (at least for linguistics) to assist the students in preparation for their exams
- students who feel compelled to tailor their intellectual approach in exams to the committee membership, and who are advised to "get one on your side" before going into exams
- students who don't dare complain for fear of retaliation in the MA or PhD exams, or in obtaining a dissertation signature

- students who feel that the only value of their comments is for use as ammunition in the internal squabbles of the faculty
- repeated episodes of students being ridiculed for having various deficiencies in their background; e.g. "What the hell are you doing here?" or "Well, you might as well just be an undergraduate!"
- students feeling abandoned and with no place to turn
 - faculty who appear to change their minds about the quality of work in response to unrelated circumstances
- ladder faculty conspiring against non-ladder faculty in the presence of students
- faculty playing out their rivalries by deprecating students' choices of dissertation advisor
 - students being threatened with loss of funding in arguments with faculty, e.g. " ... and don't think you are going to get funding next year..."
- students being threatened with disciplinary action for voicing disagreement with faculty

We would take pains to emphasize that the above list is accurate, but *very* general and not comprehensive.

Funding. A persistent complaint among students for years has been the chronic shortage of funding and the apparently capricious manner in which it is distributed. Students complain about lack of transparency in the criteria and processes governing the awarding of graduate student support. Certain jealousies and rivalries among the faculty are said to be so conspicuously displayed as to be common knowledge among the students. So vengeful are the faculty, we were told, that many students sincerely believe they are merely pawns among these colliding ambitions and that the awarding of support often is little more than manipulation resulting from jealousy or retribution.

The issue is not the nature of the details giving rise to this perception, but rather the perception itself of a systemic disrespect of graduate students, and their apparent treatment as chattel in the department. The chronic shortage of funds, almost universally identified by the faculty as the principal source of student dissatisfaction, is secondary to the spiritual blight in the department in the eyes of the students. Nevertheless, the inability to find adequate student support is also unacceptable and must be remedied (at least in the short term) by reducing the number of acceptances into the program.

Attrition. Based on the above one would expect the level of attrition in the Slavic department to be quite high. While attrition cannot reliably be determined from statistics alone, a rough estimate based on the total number of degrees awarded (MA+PhD) compared to the number of admittances between Fall of '88 and Spring of '98 suggests that Slavic has the highest record of attrition of any comparable department in the Humanities (comparison among 10 departments). But the reported mistreatment of students appears not to be the only reason for attrition in the Slavic department. A cursory survey of case histories for students who have left the program in recent years suggests that several were underqualified from the start. In addition, many of the others have had backgrounds considered grossly inadequate by some of the faculty ("What the hell are you doing here?"). In particular, students frequently reported being castigated for insufficiency in Russian. The impression is that the department over-admits and then relies on attrition to select for the students that will eventually get their degrees. Under normal circumstances this would be a healthy selection-capable, well prepared students would be admitted and the motivated ones would persevere and succeed.

It is not clear to us what the internal reviewers mean by this. Our complaint has always been that the department issues a blanket statement to the effect that if students "do well", then they will be funded. Never is the term "do well" defined, for the to us all too obvious reason that the department can never fund all of its graduate students. What if all the graduate students did equally well? Would they all get funded? Of course not. The department has always known this yet it often keeps this information from potential graduate students. The department has no ethical or moral obligation to fund every graduate student. The department does have, however, a moral and ethical obligation to be truthful to all its current and potential graduate students about the state of funding in this department.

What is potentially troubling about the statement of the internal reviewers above, i.e. "Under normal circumstances this would be a healthy selection-capable, well prepared students would be admitted and the motivated ones would persevere and succeed," is how one interprets the term "motivated". What if all students were equally motivated? Would all then be provided funding? Or is could this criteria be used in exactly the same way the department has used the terms "good" and "satisfactory" in the past, with funding only available for those who fall under the "good" rubric according to criteria known only to the faculty? In other words, if *all* the students of a given class proved to be outstanding, would they *all* then be provided funding? Or is this just another construct (with "motivated vs. non-motivated" replacing "good vs. merely satisfactory") through which the department could continue its policy of Social Darwinism?

However, in this department the reports we heard paint a picture of a process that results not in cultivation of the best and the brightest, but in the survival of the toughest and the most resilient-with the rest simply being discarded as damaged goods.

Attrition is a terrible waste. Resources, desperately needed by other students, are squandered on students who do not return. Precious time in the young lives of these students is needlessly lost; they either should not be admitted or, once admitted, they should not be driven away. Talent, important to the field and to UCLA, is shunted aside or destroyed. It is imperative that the department reform its attitude towards graduate students. These are young human beings entrusting themselves to the department for intellectual nurture and professional training. The department should consider more carefully exactly what background and capabilities it expects its students to bring to the program and then should screen the applicants rigorously. But once the students are admitted to the program the department is obligated to work as conscientiously as possible to mentor *each* student to success.

Apparently some faculty have very strong opinions about the level of preparation required of students who enter the program. The admissions committee should enlist these faculty in the screening of the applicants. Where possible, interviews in person should be conducted. When this is impractical, telephone interviews should be substituted. But some kind of direct interaction appears to be necessary to avoid admitting students who are considered inadequate. However, once the students are admitted, no faculty member has the right to ridicule their level of preparation-the faculty are responsible for whom they admit.

Here we, quite obviously, strongly agree with the internal reviewers and we appreciate the forceful way in which these points are made.

Graduate requirements. A number of specific issues were discussed with the review team, leading to the following recommendations by the external reviewers (ER, p. 6). "Reasonable and coherent reading lists [must] be established". The "exam format [must] be regularized ... and the expectations for student performance be made explicit". "The graduate program [must] be simplified and the time to-PhD be reduced". The internal reviewers strongly support

these recommendations and refer the reader to the report of the external reviewers for a complete discussion of the issues. However, because none of these issues-nor others the internal reviewers would ordinarily have raised-can be meaningfully addressed unless the problems above are resolved, we forgo further elaboration here.

Moreover, there is an additional problem that must be solved before these graduate program issues can be dealt with. The faculty must find some way to make collective decisions. Repeatedly we were told that particular issues had not been resolved because no consensus could be reached. In some cases this involved dissertation committees whose members, we were told, changed their minds or could not agree-leaving the student stranded! In other cases departmental issues were involved, such as the infamous (and functionally non-existent) reading lists. When we asked the chair what the vote of the department had been, we were told that there had been no vote! Further questioning left the review team, with the impression that the faculty avoids voting on issues that might go against the strongest personalities in the department. This tendency would be consistent with reports of attempted intimidation following such votes in the past.

Even now, as this is being typed, months after the release of the report, it is *still* the case that the radical changes that need to be made are being thwarted by the same two linguistic faculty members mentioned in the report proper. We have heard of faculty shying away from changes which need to be made because "you-know-who would raise a fuss." *This*, then, is precisely what the 8-year review pointed out, the Slavic Department faculty avoiding issues and proposed changes which "might go against the strongest personalities in the department".

Some way must be found for the department to make collective decisions so that the students can have the security of knowing what is and what is not expected of them. In the current climate many students feel obliged to tailor their preparation to the perceived idiosyncratic preferences of specific members of the faculty.

Action

Although the problems reported to us centered primarily on just two members of the faculty, the greatest anger of the affected students was often reserved for the majority of the faculty who they say take no interest in, and no responsibility for, their plight. Again and again the review team heard of mistreated students who received only soothing words from the Chair and from other members of the faculty. In one instance the Chair actually did approach the faculty member involved to suggest outside mediation. When (predictably) the faculty member objected, the matter was dropped. Thus, a situation with its origins in a small minority has become the responsibility of the entire department because of the inaction and complacency of the faculty (with one exception). Therefore, with but this one exception, the entire faculty, collectively and individually, is culpable.

With one small exception, we agree fully with this assessment. We do feel that some of the native Russian faculty should not be held to the same degree of responsibility as the Americans on the faculty since their understanding of the academic system as a whole is not as comprehensive as one would expect from an American scholar whose academic training and teaching has, in the main, been done in the American system. In fact, certain of these native Russians have made significant attempts to rein in the two problem faculty members in linguistics and to circumvent difficulties associated with these two faculty members.

Accordingly: 1) To reduce the burden of students in the department and to preclude additional students from entering an unhealthy environment, the Graduate Council has voted to suspend admissions to the graduate program of the department of Slavic Languages and Literatures until such time as conditions for graduate students in the department improve.

2) To protect students already in the program from further abuse, and to prevent any possibility of retribution

against those who may have cooperated with the review team during this review process, it is hereby recommended that the Administration place the department of Slavic Languages and Literatures in receivership until such time as external oversight is no longer deemed necessary to protect the legitimate rights of the students to:

- be treated with respect
- take courses that benefit their education rather than the need for enrollments
- be provided with reasonable and coherent reading lists
- be informed explicitly of the format and expectations for exams
- have their dissertations read in a timely fashion and to receive constructive and useful criticism
- and in other ways, not specified above, to be enabled, not impeded, in their education.

It goes without saying that the willingness of numerous students to speak with the review team (but not to be quoted) was critical in arriving at the decision to take the above actions. Let it, therefore, be clearly understood that the slightest indication of retaliation by faculty against students will be aggressively investigated by the Graduate Council to determine whether charges should be filed with the appropriate Senate Committee for violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct, not only for recent but also for any past offences.

These are certainly strong words. Unfortunately, it seems as though the Administration is incapable of providing the protection it promised to students who would volunteer to come forth and speak with the committee. Immediately after the release of the report the Chair of the Slavic Department, Michael Heim, announced that he wanted to speak individually with each and every one of the graduate students in the department. This was immediately brought to the attention of the Administration. Subsequent to this, one of the emeritus professors also began asking students what they knew about the 8-year review, and this same professor then openly confronted one student, accusing her of trying to bring down the department.

The Slavic Department graduate student representative several times made clear to the Chair of the Slavic Department that she thought this sort of interaction, one-on-one, between *any* professor in the Slavic Department, including the Chair, with graduate students concerning the 8-year review would be inappropriate, simply because it would put the student in a position of having either to openly state his/her opinions of the review to the Department Chair, or it would force him/her to lie in instances where he/she did agree with the report. Additionally, for every student that *does* speak with the Chair, this draws further suspicion to those who choose not to speak with him, especially in a small department such as Slavic. The Slavic Department graduate student representative offered to act as a conduit to the Chair if he wanted to solicit feedback from the students, but the Chair continued to disregard her request (made several times) that he not seek to meet with students individually to discuss the report, even after other students voiced complaints.

Eventually, the Administration took action, instructing the Slavic Department faculty that only the Chair of the Department should be talking with students. While this was a good first step as far as it went, it was bad in that, far from instructing the Chair not to discuss the 8-year review with the students individually, it in fact appeared to give him a mandate to do so.

What follows is perhaps some of the clearest evidence that the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, far from being inclined to accept the report and to work with the Administration to fix what is clearly a broken program, is

intent on holding on to its power and on attempting to defend its treatment of graduate students. Certain members of this faculty actually threatened legal action against the Administration and the University for abridging their First Amendment rights. This strikes us as outrageous. We are not lawyers, so we cannot comment on the validity of their claim. It seems that in other areas of employer-employee relations, an employer would be more than justified in asking his/her employees not to speak with customers about certain issues. Apparently, however, because of the "special status" of professors vis-a-vis the university for which they work, i.e. issues related to academic freedom and tenure, these restrictions cannot be placed on tenured professors.

We do not know for sure that this is true, i.e. that professors in this instance are privileged over and above non-academic workers in this regard. As we have said, we are not lawyers. What we do know is that the Administration, when challenged by these dissatisfied Slavic Department faculty members, quickly acquiesced and recognized the faculty's "right" to approach students and speak with them at will concerning the 8-year review. This implies one of two possible scenarios:

1. That the Administration conferred with its lawyers who told them that those Slavic Department faculty and their legal representation were in fact correct, and that the Administration has no power and no right to preclude conversations between faculty and students on certain issues. If this is the case, then the UCLA Administration should have known this beforehand, and should have made it clear to students that, if they were to honor the Administration's request to participate fully in the eight-year review process, then they would be doing so knowing that there is no way they could be protected from direct inquiries from the UCLA Slavic Department faculty. The fact that the effort was made by the Administration to preclude such conversations (excepting the Chair) shows good faith on the part of the Administration, but clearly this was an area in which the Administration was ill-prepared and as a result, led the Administration to offer what it could not provide, namely protection from the Slavic Department faculty.

2. The second possible scenario is that the Administration, when confronted with the threat of legal action from the Slavic Department faculty, chose simply to give in, not wanting to risk an intra-university legal battle which could open up a legal can of worms vis-a-vis the always sensitive issues of academic freedom and tenure. In other words, rather than taking the difficult road of engaging its own faculty in the legal arena, the Administration defaulted to the faculty's position and thus left Slavic Department graduate students open to this type of intrusive questioning. If this is the case, there is no other word for it than shameful.

Regardless of which of these two scenarios is true, it is clear that either the Administration or the Graduate Council or both is still either unable or unwilling to protect Slavic Department graduate students from unwanted conversation with Slavic Department faculty members regarding the 8-year review. When the Graduate Council was asked by graduate students to make the 8-year review available via e-mail (this in response to Michael Heim's sending out to graduate students via e-mail documentation which supported the position of the Slavic Department faculty), the Graduate Council was extremely reluctant to do so. This reluctance itself seems to indicate a bias toward faculty sensibilities. Whatever arguments might have been made against releasing the report via e-mail surely would lose their justification in light of the fact that the Slavic Department faculty itself was using e-mail to communicate its own side of the story (and *only* its side of the story) to graduate students. In spite of the fact that the Slavic Department itself was sending out reports which reached graduate students immediately, regardless of where these graduate students were (i.e., student out of the area or abroad would instantly get the department's side of the story via e-mail, but not the original report to which the department was responding), it appears as though the Graduate Council did finally buckle in to the Slavic Department itself and refused to send out the report via e-mail. A sort of "compromise" solution was reached whereby the Graduate Council agreed to send out paper copies of the report to individual graduate students.

Even more disturbing than the double standard seen here (e-mail for statements and arguments favorable to the faculty, snail-mail for the report itself), was the letter which accompanied the report, in which Slavic Department graduate students, many of whom had already expressed clearly their desire not to discuss the 8-year review with Slavic Department faculty (including the Chair, Michael Heim), were actually encouraged to participate in what the letter termed the department's "self-review process". In spite of student objections to communicating directly with Michael Heim and other Slavic Department faculty members about the 8-year review, the University has not only failed to prohibit Michael Heim from communicating with graduate students concerning the 8-year review, it has in fact given him a mandate to do so.

UCLA's handing of this matter in promising what it could not (or would not) provide in terms of protection from retaliation will cast a long shadow not only over future 8-year reviews but on the reputation of the University as a whole.

Recommendations

It is the goal of the councils to use the review process to strengthen departments. Therefore, we urge the Administration to refrain from imposing punitive measures (such as withdrawing the 19 century FTE). This would diminish the department's stature and would harm even the graduate students we seek to protect.

We sincerely appreciate the internal review committee's desire to protect graduate students. We do not, however, necessarily see a contradiction between such protection and punitive measures being taken, not against the department per se, but against those faculty members who have abused graduate students and those who stood by and allowed it to happen.

Problematic in this regard, however, is that, as things stand now, the censure procedure as it exists requires students to come forth, give up their shield of anonymity, and testify on record as to the wrong-doing of the professor in question. In a field such as ours, going public with complaints about one's own institution is tantamount to making oneself persona non grata in the Slavic world. That is not especially fair, but it is true nonetheless. UCLA should have in place an investigative and censure procedure which would not rely on the direct testimony of graduate students.

Another problem with academic censure, as we understand it, is that, astoundingly, this is supposed to be a "confidential" process, the result of which is to be known only to the Administration and the faculty member involved. While we doubt that any graduate student would want to even avail him- or herself of the opportunity to try the censure option, simply because of the need to lift the shield of confidentiality, the absurdity of this "confidentiality" requirement begs the question as to what value the entire procedure could possibly be? If a student *were* willing to give up confidentiality to participate in a censure procedure, the hope would be that, by censuring a faculty member, that faculty member's standing and prestige in the field would be negatively affected, as would, consequently, his or her power to harm graduate students, either by outright negative commentary or by instances of "damning with faint praise" directed towards colleagues in the field who might be considering hiring the graduate student in question. But if the entire process itself is "secret", then there would be no sense of disapprobation visited upon the faculty member by others in the field, again leaving open the question, why would a graduate student even bother? As long as graduate students are giving up their confidentiality anyway, they might as well file suit in court, where at least they stand a reasonable chance of collecting damages, and in addition, they can at the same time focus the spotlight on the misdeeds of the offending faculty member.

Instead, we offer the recommendations below in the hope that they will be supported by the administration so that the department may emerge stronger and more respected than before. The department, for its part, can minimize the inevitable stain on its reputation resulting from the measures outlined above, by working quickly to address and redress the problems described in this review.

The one thing this department has not done since the release of the report is to work "quickly to address and redress the problems described in this review." On the contrary, this department has fought against these results tooth and nail from the very beginning, and continues to do so today. The Chair of the Slavic Department has not only refused requests from the graduate student representative that he refrain from engaging students in one-on-one conversations concerning the 8-year review, he has continued his campaign against a former graduate student in this department who had the courage not only to speak out, but to allow her story to be used publicly.

In the internal review team's response to Michael Heim's "Error of Fact" statement, it is made abundantly clear that Michael Heim will twist and shade the truth, and even completely deny the truth, in his efforts to undo the results of the 8-year review. To quote from this response from the internal reviewers: "The pattern that emerged was consistent denial or minimization of the problem-until confronted with overwhelming evidence.". This pattern of which the internal reviewers speak continues to the present day. One would think, after having been confronted so openly and undeniably with such a characterization of his actions, the Chair of the Slavic Department would mend his ways, but not so. In the above-mentioned e-mail he sent out to all graduate students, *in spite of the fact* that the Slavic Department's practice of always striking out at the weakest and most vulnerable of its members, namely graduate students, had been exposed in the 8-year review report, and *in spite of the fact* that the internal reviewers had effectively rebuffed his attempt to demonize the one student brave enough to allow her story to be told (the very first point addressed in the internal reviewers' response to the Chair's "Error of Fact" statement), the Chair of the Slavic Department unbelievably *continues* to attack this same student. In doing so, not only does he falsely characterize her abilities, but he actually releases details of her private transcript from UC Riverside, without her consent, to other students, thus putting him in violation of UC regulations, to say nothing of the Family Privacy Act of 1974.

Far from complying with the suggestions in the 8-year review, the Chair of the Slavic Department has done everything in his power to refute the facts stated in the review. He has stated his intention of not only arguing against receivership (which is the very *least* that the Slavic Department should receive), but also his intention to ask that the ban on incoming graduate students be lifted.

As for the rest of the faculty, clearly there are elements who will stop at nothing to thwart the University's attempts to reform the Slavic Department. They have already challenged the University's authority legally (and won?). Tenure grants them next to absolute security in their positions, and they are well aware of this. If they succeed in avoiding receivership, which is what the rumor mill is saying will happen, this will only strengthen their resolve, for they will know that not only have they consistently and grotesquely abused graduate students, but that even though this has been exposed publicly, they have still managed to hang on to power, which will make them even more arrogant (if that is possible) than before.

The University should be under no illusion that this department will ever voluntarily comply with the suggestions contained in the 8-year review. It will never voluntarily acknowledge that it was abusive to students. It will never consent to give up power or to reform itself, because to take steps to do so would in effect acknowledge the correctness of the report, namely that reform was needed and that abuses did occur.

To the department and the administration

1. To maintain the stature of the department and to bolster undergraduate teaching, raise the current search for a 19th century specialist to open rank, preferably someone already highly respected in the field, and ideally someone who might take a leadership role as the department emerges from the present crisis. It is understood that recruiting such a person may be temporarily delayed by the measures outlined above, however the delay can be shortened by aggressive cooperation on the part of the department to correct the problems that have been noted above.
2. Seek a joint appointment to fill the 20th century position.
3. Seek a joint appointment to provide a permanent South Slavist.

As mentioned above, not all of us agree that a 19th century position is as important as a South Slavist. Some of us believe that a *full-time* South Slavist should be the next appointment approved, assuming the Slavic Department continues to be a viable academic department at UCLA.

To the department

4. Engage the linguistics faculty in the development of a more balanced undergraduate curriculum in which the linguists share in the undergraduate teaching.
- Increase the selectivity of admissions to reduce graduate student attrition. The goal should be to generate a smaller (by half), better prepared student body, with more funding per student. Simultaneously, efforts to find additional sources of funding should continue. Any subsequent increase in admissions should be accompanied by commensurate increases in funding opportunities for the students.
6. The procedures for and the criteria upon which funding decisions are made must be clearly explained to the students in writing.
 7. Lift the veil of secrecy characteristic of the department. For example, admit the MSO to faculty meetings as is done for all other departments in the Kinsey Humanities Group, and allow graduate students meaningful participation.

Time line

A follow-up review of the department will be conducted in the Spring of 2001 by a process to be decided before June 30, 2000.

It is now October of 2000, four months have passed since this process was to be determined, and no one among the students has heard anything of it.

Approved by the Graduate Council: June 9, 2000

Approved by the Undergraduate Council: June 9, 2000

Appendix I: External Reviewer Reports

Appendix I
External Reviewer Reports

Alan Timberlake, Slavic Languages & Literatures, UC Berkeley
David Bethea, Slavic Languages & Literatures, University of Wisconsin

TO: Duncan Lindsey, Chair, Graduate Council, Academic Senate Office, UCLA

FROM: David Bethea, Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures, University of Wisconsin-Madison;

Alan Timberlake, Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures, University of California at Berkeley

ABOUT: External Review of the Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures, UCLA, February 23-25, 2000

1. General. For several decades UCLA has been a leader in Slavic studies in North America, the hallmarks of its program being an enviable breadth and rigor. It has been especially strong in the area of linguistics and poetics. Perhaps more than any other department in the country, UCLA's has embodied, and to a significant degree still embodies in some of its faculty, what the great structural linguist Roman Jakobson called the study of the "Slavic word"-- the investigation of how the disciplines of linguistics, poetics, folklore, and literary study interrelate and interpenetrate on Slavic soil. UCLA's Slavic faculty are virtually without exception highly productive and distinguished, with national and in several cases international reputations.

This is true for some faculty in the Slavic Department. Others are looked upon as productive, but not particularly relevant or distinguished, as they have failed to keep up with developments in the field.

On the undergraduate level, the department has generally worked hard to make itself accessible and relevant to today's students, and it has done so without abandoning its traditions and high standards. The language program at UCLA, about which we will have more to say below, is one of its singular strengths. With regard to the graduate program, the students appear to be exceptionally well trained,.....

Yes and no. Linguistically, the program here is seriously deficient in current theory. No one is saying that the linguistic component of the UCLA Slavic Department should turn its focus completely on current linguistic theory. There is much to be said for its emphasis on historical and Jakobsonian linguistics. But it does its students no favors when it fails to offer even a cursory introduction into Government/Binding and Minimalist linguistic theory. One need not be able to claim expertise in this area in order to be taken seriously in the field, but one should at least be conversant in this school of linguistic thought, since it is the dominant scholarly construct for linguistics in this country. One need not necessarily agree with it, but in order to even debate it, one must know what it is.

In this respect, then, not only has the UCLA Slavic Department not trained its charges well, it hasn't trained them at all. It's a problem. Of the seven UCLA Slavic Ph.D.'s in linguistics who received tenure track positions in the 1990's, three received tenure, three were denied tenure, and one has yet to come up for tenure. It is telling to see UCLA graduates at national conferences delivering papers on issues brought up by Jakobson 50 years ago while their colleagues are addressing cutting edge topics in the world of linguistics.

Thus, while *some* of the linguistic training received by UCLA students is good, much of it is not, and much of it is non-existent. This raises the question of how the external reviewers came to this evaluation of the teaching in the UCLA Slavic Department. Was Timberlake (the linguistic member of the external review team) relying on his own memories of UCLA when he was a tenured faculty member in the 1980's, or did he do a full investigation into the current UCLA Slavic linguistic training which he ranks so highly?

.....a fact further corroborated by the department's record of placing seven out of seven new Ph.D.s over the past five years. This record of placing students in recent years is unparalleled among Slavic programs in America.

Indeed, UCLA's record of "placing seven out of seven new Ph.D.s over the past five years" is in fact unparalleled, more so than Profs. Timberlake and Bethea can know, since not even UCLA has managed to do this. When statements like this occur, one is forced to ask if the external review committee did any reviewing/investigation at all, or did it simply allow the UCLA Slavic Department to feed it information? It is not as if this would be a difficult claim to check: the UCLA Slavic Department web site lists all the department's recent Ph.D. recipients. It would have been a simple matter of asking where exactly each of these graduates has received the "tenure track positions" they are supposed to have.

In point of fact, of the ten students who have received Ph.D.'s during this time period (Rob Romanchuk-99, Andrea Lanoux-98, Kelly Herald-97, Eun-Ji Song-97, Lingyao Lai Walsh-97, Christopher Gigliotti-97, Iida Katerina Hirvasaho-97, Amanda Nowakowski-96, David Macfadyen-95, Karen McCauley-95) only four received tenure-track positions. Interestingly, for a department which claims such expertise in linguistics, none of these four positions were in linguistics. Of the three linguistics Ph.D.'s, one is working as a lecturer in Korea, one is working in a library, and one is out of the field altogether. When combined with the fact that full half (3 of 6) of the UCLA Slavic linguistic graduates who came up for tenure in the 1990s failed to receive tenure, a very different picture of the department's academic successes emerges.

How would the external reviewers explain the discrepancy between 7 out of 7, on the one hand, and 4 out of 10, on the other? Perhaps the external reviewers should be asked why they were so eager to accept blindly whatever information was provided to them. At best, this suggests they were careless, lax and naive. At worst, it suggests collusion on their part with the faculty of the Slavic Department in an attempt to somehow neutralize the record of long-term abuse of students with an impressive placement record.

It has been suggested by some that this is not the fault of the external reviewers, that they took the information provided to them simply because this was the customary way of conducting 8-year reviews at UCLA, i.e. they would have never dreamed that they would have been provided false information. This may or may not be the case. If it is, however, then this begs another question, namely why even have external members (or internal members, for that matter) on an 8 year review if the reviewers are going to accept unquestioningly statistics provided by the very entity they have been asked to investigate? . This practice in essence turns the review into a self-review. Why even bother with external members if they are simply going to parrot the statistics provided them by the department itself and echo the department's own view of itself? Why not just have the Slavic Department review itself?

It is this, frankly, which is most disturbing. This incident serves not only as an indictment of this particular external review team, but of the entire review process. It leaves the impression (and indeed, can anyone argue that in this case this impression is not that far removed from reality) that this is nothing more than an "Old Boys Network", with each department nominating as potential external review members only those scholars whom it knows to be sympathetic to the department under review. Thus, the purpose is not to actually review the department from without, but rather

to provide cover for the department, to make perhaps some superficial criticism of the department, but basically to confirm the department's view of itself and allow the department to claim that it is indeed subject to oversight of sort (granted, only once every eight years, but that is beside the point).

If the external review committee's blind acceptance of the department's statistics is not convincing enough evidence that this was indeed the case in this review, then one need look no farther than the external reviewers' shameful letter in support of the Slavic Department (appended and commented on below) which was solicited by the Slavic Department after the review came out and which was distributed to all Slavic Department graduate students via e-mail, a letter in which the external reviewers frantically attempt to distance themselves from their initial report and to undermine the internal report. (Because of Alan Timberlake's close association with two of the problem linguistic members in the Slavic Department, the two mentioned explicitly by the Slavic Department chair in his Statement of Facts response, *and* because he himself was a former member of the UCLA Slavic Department, many of the senior graduate students would have nothing to do with the report, fearing bias on Timberlake's part. Given the results of the internal report, and given the aforementioned revisionist letter on the part of the external reviewers, can anyone say that it was a mistake on the part of these graduate students *not* to talk to them? More on this below in the section dealing with this revisionist letter.)

UCLA has thus managed to keep intact a basic infrastructure for Slavic study which should allow it to be well positioned for the future. This depth and breadth will be necessary as a kind of gold reserve, which can be drawn upon over time, as the needs of the world at large and of the student body at UCLA change. It goes without saying that no Slavic program, in the country has been immune to the vast cultural and demographic shifts brought on by the fall of the former Soviet Union and the onset of the new global economy and changing interests on the part of American undergraduates, who ever more treat undergraduate education as training for future employment.

God forbid that anyone should ever accuse the UCLA Slavic Department of being concerned with its students' future employment opportunities.

The key is to find a way to adapt to external changes while still maintaining the basic integrity of one's programs-to provide needed training to undergraduate and graduate populations without becoming in the process a service department.

What exactly does this mean? A "service" department? Is it not the duty and role of a state university to provide service to its students and to the public at large which supports it?

This type of statement is distressingly familiar to the graduate students in this department, usually because it is a code of sort, wherein "service"-type activity is defined as anything that the faculty does not happen to be interested in at a given moment. The refusal of the department historically to involve itself in (not *advocate*, mind you, but simply *teach/make aware of*) the various incarnations of Chomskian linguistics, i.e. in that school of linguistic thought which dominates the field, has often been justified using that same phrase: "Oh, we are not a *service* department, dancing to the tune of whoever has the loudest whistle. We are *true* scholars."

Perhaps the Slavic Department at UCLA, should it survive this review, would do well to think of it self more in terms of service, however much that might offend the pure and scholarly aesthetics of those currently in power there.

The external reviewers sense that Slavic at UCLA can successfully adapt to the demands of a smaller (yet still strategic) language, literature, and culture program in today's academy, but some of the decisions it will have to make

will not be easy and will necessarily go against the grain of the department's own traditions. In what follows we try to offer some points of orientation as well as concrete recommendations that the department and administration may want to take into account as they consider the future.

2. Undergraduate Program. The interviews with the department's undergraduate students were one of the most pleasant aspects of our two-day review experience. Slavic appears to be blessed with a number of gifted undergraduate instructors. We cannot recall an instance where one of the students being interviewed said something negative about the department or the individual course or courses. So-called "heritage" (émigré or second-generation) students were especially numerous and enthusiastic: they stated repeatedly that the new courses designed to educate them further in a language and culture they left prematurely are both much needed and well taught. Several individuals praised the accessibility of the instructors and TAs. They felt themselves to be part of a small "collective" on a large campus, with the staff making time to accommodate their needs in a cheerful and always professional way. The "Russian room," a specific location where students can drop to chat with TAs or a native Russian speaker (Ninel Dubrovich) is a demonstrable success.

[Ms. Dubrovich is one of the few bright points in the Slavic Department and she should be compensated accordingly.](#)

The system of offering three parallel tracks for majors (Russian language and literature, Slavic languages and literatures, and Russian studies) appears to work well and to, build on the strengths-especially the breadth---of the department. We would also like to applaud the new major in European studies, which further integrates Slavic into the campus mainstream. The department is to be commended for the efforts it has made in the last decade to broaden its appeal. We are confident that the department is genuinely committed to these efforts, and under the department's present enlightened leadership, ...

[It should be obvious at this point in the reply that not all share this view of the present leadership as "enlightened". Quite the contrary: the present leadership of the department, while not himself one of the main abusers, has for years turned a blind eye to such abuses, his objections notwithstanding. The response to his Statement of Fact by the internal reviewers makes this clear.](#)

...even more new courses will emerge and the efforts will continue, organically and effectively, to broaden Slavic's undergraduate presence on campus.

[Again, it is important to note that this effort is supported much more by some faculty members than by others, who have no interest whatsoever in the undergraduate program. See our reaction to the internal reviewers brief commentary on the undergraduate program above.](#)

We would like to note, however, that, based on enrollment data for the 1997-98 and 1998-99 academic years provided by Academic Planning and Budget, there appears to be a significant asymmetry between the literature and linguistics faculty in terms of their respective undergraduate teaching assignments. Literature faculty regularly teach undergraduate courses, linguistics faculty do not. It looks to us that virtually every course that contributes substantially to the undergraduate student credit hour numbers for Slavic-Russian 25 (The Russian Novel in Translation), Russian 99A (Introduction to Russian Civilization), Russian 99B (Russian Civilization of the 20th Century), Russian 124D (Dostoevsky), Russian 130B (Russian Poetry of the Late 18th to the Early 20th Century), Russian 140B (Russian Prose from Karamzin to Turgenev), etc.-is taught by a member of the literature faculty, and those student credit hours have allowed their departments to offer low-enrolled graduate courses and thereby to keep these programs going. This creates the impression that, at present, the senior linguists are doing the majority of their teaching at the graduate level, a distribution of faculty energy which naturally results in problems with enrollments

and student credit hours. Linguists need not teach only highly specialized courses in linguistics per se, which in any event would have trouble drawing from an undergraduate population; instead, they might consider offering courses in such related fields as folklore, mythology, culture, history of culture, etc. After all, literature faculty around the country have been called upon to "reinvent themselves" by offering more general education and writing-intensive courses that serve the larger college population; literature faculty regularly extend themselves to develop courses in film, art, or periods of literature in which they are not research specialists. Another possibility is that the department's linguists offer already existing courses for other departments and programs—for example, a course on dialectology for the Linguistics Department or a course on discourse theory for Applied Linguistics.

We very strongly agree with this sentiment. Again, we would refer to the aforementioned undergraduate section of the internal reviewers report above as to exactly why certain linguistics faculty members shy away from contact with undergraduates. As to working with students in other departments, this would expose some of these faculty members to 1. students who are not under their direct control and thus not amenable to pressure, and 2. students who are versed in areas of linguistics about which this faculty knows very little or students who are current in schools of linguistic thought in which this faculty has not remained current.

We would also point out that not all of the linguistic faculty in the Slavic Department fall into this category. Two of the "non-problematic" linguistics faculty (both of whom have strong reputations in the field) have in fact taught large undergraduate classes here at UCLA, drawing in students from outside of Slavic.

We might note parenthetically that small departments like Slavic would be encouraged in attempts to reach larger audiences if the University were to adopt a policy of crediting the home department of the instructor rather than the department offering the course;...

Strongly agree.

...this would be an incentive for faculty in small departments to teach established, high-enrollment courses for other departments. And even if it is not UCLA's policy (for now) to give official credit for enrollments logged by home faculty in visiting departments, Slavic in this instance would still get the reputation for being good citizens. The asymmetry in the utilization of faculty energy needs to be addressed and something approaching equality of undergraduate-graduate teaching assignments for all ladder faculty ought to be instituted.

3. Language Program. UCLA is fortunate to have an exceptionally strong and well-integrated language program with a bright and responsive staff. Professor Olga Kagan is generally recognized as one of the three leading experts on Russian language pedagogy in the country, along with Patricia Chaput at Harvard and Benjamin Rifkin at Wisconsin. She has remained active as a writer of a widely-used textbook and course materials, and her writing and boundless professional activity also serve to raise the visibility of the department. Her leadership and highly professional manner are in evidence throughout the program. The departments TAs seem very satisfied with Professor Kagan's supervision of their teaching duties and with the preparation they receive in Slavic 375 (Teaching Apprentice Practicum). When we interviewed all the language instructors together, including those in Russian, Czech, Polish, Ukrainian, Hungarian, Romanian, and Serbian/Croatian, there appeared to be excellent camaraderie among them. We were particularly impressed with the numbers of students in Dr. Galateanu's Romanian classes. The enrollments in most upper-level Russian classes are relatively robust, comparing favorably with enrollments in other institutions, and that is a good sign. It is also impressive that there is remarkably little attrition from one quarter to the next in the basic sequence of language courses. There is also much more emphasis on non-linguistic content in the language courses than was the case just a few years ago. Again, students seem to reflect the well organized nature of the program and the dedicated attitude of Professor

Kagan and her colleagues with their comments, which virtually to a person show a high degree of satisfaction. It was a wise move to fix Olga Kagan in place as permanent faculty, at a time when it was difficult to make lecturer appointments with SOE. It is our judgment that the language program, while forced like many sister programs around the country to pay heed to enrollments and to continue to reach out to a changing student population, is in good hands for the indefinite future.

The work done by all the teachers of non-Russian languages in the Slavic Department has been outstanding, again one of the few bright points in a department such as this. Dr. Galateanu has gone out of her way to recruit undergraduate students to her class, and Dr. Kresin is very much liked and respected by both undergraduate and graduate students, having done a wonderful job in undergraduate teaching in both Czech and Russian and in sponsoring UCLA's Russian Club. Dr. Corin's contribution to the undergraduate program in Serbocroatian has been nothing short of outstanding, especially so in light of the fact that he has been the department's de facto South Slavist for the last six years or so. (See responses above to the internal reviewers section on the need for a South Slavist for more on Dr. Corin's role in this department.)

(We omit comment on Dr. Simon not as an implied slight--indeed, from what we have heard her students appreciate her course--but simply because we don't have any experience with her since Hungarian was just last year added to Slavic Department offerings.)

Given the relative difficulty of languages in the Slavic group, we would urge the administration to give the department some flexibility in setting smaller class sizes in lower level courses: aiming for the mid-20s (with maximum at 26) seems high to us; a limit of 15 would be better, given the context.

4. Graduate Program. As we suggested in our opening remarks, at present Slavic is undergoing as much change as any field in the humanities. Without doubt much of this change has to do with demographics and the "new" economy, but some does not. At many universities deans are not replacing slots automatically, but are waiting to see if student demand warrants the same outlay as in the past. Financial aid for graduate study in the humanities, usually one of the more difficult sells to campus administrations even in prosperous times, has not been helped by news of shrinking applicant pools and the ever fragile job market for new Ph.D.s. Thus, we would like to stress that there are various factors over which no Slavic program, including that of UCLA, has had control since the time of the last review in 1992. Disciplines can grow up when there is a need (say, the "Cold War" or "sputnik"), but they can also languish when that need disappears. We are all historically situated in this way, as any look in a course catalogue just a few short generations ago will show. It is a cliché, but it is perhaps worth repeating: in order to remain viable, today's Slavic departments and programs will have to attract and train today's, not yesterday's, students; they will have to find ways to maintain intellectual integrity while still being responsive to different audiences.

Having said this, we believe that Slavic at UCLA is at an historical crossroads for other reasons as well. If the "infrastructure," in terms of faculty resources and national reputation, is there to insure that the program is well situated to face the future, there are also real challenges that need to be addressed soon, and in a thorough, collegial manner. As capable as UCLA's graduate students in Slavic are, and as appreciative as they are of the intellectual training they receive, they suffer from an alarming level of anxiety, bordering on demoralization.

In light of this comment by the external reviewers, and other similar comments that they will make throughout their review, one can only wonder how they were able to justify writing the aforementioned revisionist support letter, a copy of which is appended and commented upon below.

(The issue of faculty collegiality will be addressed farther on.) We realize that to be a graduate student is to be, by

definition, in a vulnerable, transitional status, with the result that a certain amount of legitimate (and sometimes less than legitimate) "ventilating" is to be expected. Bearing this in mind, we must nevertheless report that what we found during our visit was much more than what can be attributed to run-of-the-mill graduate student anxiety. We would urge the department to do everything in its power to address these problems in an open, fair, and non-defensive manner...

If nothing else has come out of this review, it should be abundantly clear that this department is utterly incapable of receiving criticism in an "open, fair, and non-defensive manner". Indeed, they are incapable of taking criticism at all, as is evidenced by the Chair's repeated attempts to deny the substance of the internal report.

...We do not wish to be alarmist, but neither do we wish to treat euphemistically an atmosphere that can poison and further undermine the continuing life of the department.

To begin with, too many applicants have been accepted in the past relative to the level of support that the department is capable of providing. This in turn has translated into a system, where: 1) some (many?) continuing students do not have a reliable sense of their possibilities for aid in the future; 2) not everyone is given the opportunity to teach (a real liability for those going on the job market);

This is a sore point among graduate students. Those graduate students who do manage to survive this program and graduate are many times woefully under prepared in terms of teaching experience. It should also be pointed out that the allotment of teaching slots is far from uniform, with some graduate students teaching for years while others have been denied any chance to teach at all.

and 3) the program has more people in the on-leave status than it ought. (The practice of dividing TA positions into two in order to spread the opportunity to teach perhaps has a certain logic, but it is unheard of at other institutions, and should be eliminated.)

We disagree. Until the faculty takes steps to increase enrollments, these divided TA-ships are absolutely essential to providing teaching experience to graduate students.

We anticipate that the shrinking applicant pool will probably take care of this problem by itself, but even so, the department should as a policy decide to admit fewer students and to provide more initial funding and continue to fund those it does admit on a more regular, longer basis.

What the department needs to do more than anything is be up-front and honest when discussing the possibilities for funding with potential graduate students. There is no disgrace in not having enough money for your graduate students. Stigma should be attached, however, to those who promise funding to students *knowing in advance* that this funding cannot be provided to all students. This is a shameful practice of long-standing in the Slavic Department.

In addition to being the responsible thing to do given the current job market in Slavic, this would both improve student morale. Some change in initial funding-a commitment to four- or five-year support packages-is absolutely necessary to compete successfully against the other strong programs that offer multi-year financial aid packages.

One thing that became clear from the review team's discussions was the need to make a more concerted effort to find teaching and research support positions for Slavic graduate students on campus. It appears that there are very real

opportunities for Slavic graduate students to, teach in other programs, to serve as: TAs in ESL courses (after the minimal training), TAs in other languages of competence (many grad students in Slavic are foreign), TAs in writing-intensive or composition sections and in literature discussion sections of large General Education lecture courses (if this is a possibility); possibly TAs in content courses in Linguistics, etc. It would take a little effort to learn what the realistic possibilities are, but once the paths of employment in other programs, once discovered, quickly become worn.

Strongly agree. This is the single best suggestion for the improvement of the Slavic Department offered by the external reviewers.

The department also has in place some specific projects, specifically the journals edited by Professors Ivanov and Klenin, that are of value to the profession as a whole. It would be a valuable source of modest support for one or two graduate students if such projects could be funded on a reliable and recurrent basis.

The graduate students interviewed complained repeatedly that the procedures for selecting those to be funded in a given year are not explained to them in a consistent fashion. (For the record, the external reviewers are of the opinion, based on their experiences at home institutions, that the *procedures* for determining who receives financial aid should be made explicit, but that publicizing the actual ranking of all the students can be divisive and ought to be avoided.)

For the record, based on our experiences at *this* institution, we are of the opinion that publicizing rankings should *certainly* be done. For years this department has chosen to operate in the fog, where requirements, criteria for success, and true evaluations of students all remained in the dark. This attitude very much suits the faculty of this department, for they know that the murkier the requirements, the greater their freedom to act in whatever manner they please, since they are, in the end, the final arbiter of grades, funding, and success or failure.

If this department is only going to fund only *some* of its graduate students, then *all* of the students have a right to know how they were evaluated against their peers.

Equally troubling were the numerous stories of confusion and frustration with regard to exams and readings lists: there does not seem to be an understanding of what the core material is that all students should know for their M.A. exams (linguistics), as apparently the faculty cannot agree on a single format; likewise, there does not appear to be a clear policy on the composition of examinations: what should come from relevant course work and ,what from outside reading (NB: no reading list exists). Finally, the Ph.D. exam (linguistics) too often repeats "broad knowledge" aspects of the M.A. exam without allowing the student to do the sort of in-depth analysis he or she will have to show at the dissertation level.

Strongly agree. The exam process here, especially in linguistics, is both one of the major abuses perpetrated upon students as well as a major source of power for the problem faculty discussed above. Especially abusive are the oral exams, in which the faculty is unrestrained and free to go wherever they choose. In a department with fair-minded faculty, this would not be much of a problem. Clearly, that is not the case here.

We would take pains to point out that not all students object to the concept of an MA exam *per se*; the objection is to having to take an exam without having any idea as to what body of knowledge we are responsible for knowing. When this objection has been put to the faculty in the past, we have been accused of wanting to be "spoon-fed" the exam. No one expects to be spoon-fed anything, certainly not in this department. What we do expect is to have the corpus of knowledge which we are expected to assimilate be clearly, comprehensively, and precisely defined, such

that the faculty cannot (as they have done so often in the past) pull something out of the air, accuse the student, with an air of disbelief, of "not knowing something so basic to the field" (a direct quote, by the way), and then use this "shocking" lapse on the part of the student either to assign a lower grade (thereby putting future funding in jeopardy) or to fail the student in a comprehensive exam.

Defining this corpus of knowledge clearly, precisely, and in detail is not, in our view, anything close to the "spoon-feeding" of which the Slavic Department faculty speaks so derisively and with such disdain. Quite the contrary, this is part of what the University itself and the taxpayers who support it demand that they do. A vigorous and demanding exam based on such clear criteria is certainly possible. Defining and crafting this body of knowledge would, however, require effort on the part of the faculty, and even worse, from their point of view, it would limit their ability to be arbitrary in their assessment of students and in the type of questions they could pose to students on exams, which is of course *exactly* the reason why this type of detailed definition for the corpus of knowledge covered by the exam should be required.

On the literature side, the students asked that the reading list be updated, a course on recent Russian literature be instituted (in the bargain, probably displacing moving the requirement of Medieval Literature to the Ph.D. level), and the Movements and Genres course be replaced by Introduction to Graduate Study (or in Other terminology, a pro-seminar on literary theory and research methodology). These are all reasonable requests in our view.

We agree. This proposed "pro-seminar on literary theory and research methodology" should not, however, be merged with a similar class for linguists. This has happened before in the past with the result being a course no one wanted to take and no faculty member wanted to teach.

As stated, one of the special strengths of the UCLA graduate program in Slavic has been its breadth in linguistics offerings and its expertise along the "seam" of linguistics and poetics, and some faculty (especially from the linguists side) continue to teach and do active research in this tradition. But this strength has also created its own weakness. This broad interest could be one of the sources of a problem that we sense both the faculty and the grad students are loathe to acknowledge: the average time to Ph.D. for 21 students from 1988 to 1998 was, by our calculations, 9.347 years (based on the "Profile for Slavic Languages and Literatures," p. 2). Despite some improvement in recent years, we believe this time frame is much too long, given the department's financial aid constraints and the job market in Slavic. Programs should make every effort to advance their (hopefully now better funded) students through all the requirements, including writing the dissertation, in a 5-6 year period.

We agree. We would point out that, while spending nine or more years in a Ph.D. program is indeed a grotesquely wasteful use of time, at least those students whose time-to-degree was analyzed by the external reviewers actually *received* their Ph.D., for what it is worth. There are other students in this program who spent that much time and left with nothing, good students who had been highly regarded and recruited by the Slavic Department.

Understanding this outer limit as a reality will force the department to make some changes in its program. Some of these changes might (and probably should) be: 1) instituting an 4-6 course outside minor (French, Philosophy, History, Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, Film, etc. the list is quite open-ended) that would give the students an added area of expertise (very attractive in today's market) but would have to come *at the expense* of existing requirements; 2) doing away with a formal M.A. exam (with obvious exceptions: when a student comes with a M.A. from elsewhere and needs to be tested or when the M.A. is terminal) and focusing attention entirely on the Ph.D. qualifying exam;

Again, not all students object to the concept of an M.A. exam in and of itself, we simply want to know what the corpus of material is on which we are being tested. Some among us would also object to *automatically* granting an M.A. to students who are continuing on into the Ph.D. program while requiring at the same time terminal M.A. students to take an exam in order to receive their M.A. If the M.A. is granted, it should mean the same thing for everyone who receives it, otherwise you call into question the academic integrity of the degree-granting entity. From what we have seen and heard at other universities, when the type of "automatic" M.A. granting system is in place, one will often see students who claim from the outset that their goal is to get the Ph.D., but who in fact want only the M.A. and who, upon receipt of the automatic M.A., simply drop out of the Ph.D. program, with their M.A. in their back pocket.

3) using the Ph.D. written examinations to test the student's comprehensive knowledge of the field, but using the Ph. D. oral examination as an opportunity to discuss and refine the dissertation proposal (i.e., replacing what is now called the "qualifying paper" by a new category); 4) considering requiring reading knowledge of French or German rather than French and German; 5) establishing thorough, up-to-date (both in terms of the primary and secondary literature), yet manageable/"realistic" reading lists in linguistics and literature; 6) announcing as policy to students that they be expected to take the qualifying exams by the end of their fourth year of graduate study; 7) making the study of the "second Slavic" language and literature an option for a minor rather than a requirement.

By calling for these or analogous changes, we recognize that in some cases we are asking the department to move in a direction opposite the one they would prefer. For example, we gather from the linguistics graduate students and faculty that many would like for all M.A. students to have demonstrated proficiency in several "core" courses- Introduction to Phonetics, Introduction to Historical Linguistics, Phonology, Syntax-before being admitted to the Ph. D. program. Here the implication is that until all the Ph.D. candidates are on the same level playing field, it is disruptive and inefficient to have them study together. Only by having capable but insufficiently trained new students take the requisite courses outside of the department, presumably in Linguistics, can the situation be dealt with, goes this logic. Again, the impulse to fix the problem has been to add rather than subtract. But we fear that this solution, while understandable and perhaps desirable in a world of unlimited resources, could end up extending further the time to degree of these students.

We disagree. Most graduate students who come here and opt for the Slavic linguistics track come here with next to no formal training in linguistics, and this is not taken into account by the linguistics faculty. The result is not only frustration on the part of the students, but also gross inefficiency, a horrible waste of time spent looking up and trying to understand even the simplest of linguistic concepts (phone vs. phoneme, etc.). If one were to have even the most elementary of linguistic background, and by that we mean the type of undergraduate introductory courses for phonetics, phonology, syntax, historical linguistics, and semantics taught in our Linguistics Department here, it would make a world of difference for students.

Similarly, students were enthusiastic about the possibility of courses that would extend in the twentieth century past the thirties, but at the same time seemed unwilling to understand that any such addition will lengthen the program.

It is unfortunate that the students with whom the external reviewers spoke "seemed unwilling to understand" the point of the view of the external reviewers. We would hold open the possibility, however, that they did indeed understand with this position, they simply, however, disagreed with it. In fact, it may even be the case that these same students can appreciate the need to reduce the time to degree more than the external reviewers could ever hope to realize, but that they want this done in such a way as to preserve the academic integrity of the program. To imply, which the external reviewers seem to do here, that there is an unresolvable contradiction between the presence of

well-prepared graduate students and a reasonable time-to-degree strikes us as illogical. The *real* causes for the absurdly long time-to-degree (or "time-to-*no*-degree, as the case may be) have nothing to do with efforts to make sure students have an elementary foundation of knowledge before entering into graduate courses concentrating on highly abstract and complex concepts, but rather have everything to do with failure of this faculty to carry out their responsibilities and the litany of abuses listed (and the many abuses *not* listed) in the internal review. When you take care of that problem, you will have gone a long way towards solving the time-to-degree problem. Ignoring the common sense suggestion that students have the prerequisite knowledge needed to understand, much less assimilate, the material presented in advanced graduate courses does not only does little to affect the time-to-degree problem, it also damages the integrity of the program and the level of scholarly discourse which can take place in it.

These points were made clearly to the external reviewers. It is unfortunate, however, that they seemed unwilling to understand them.

Evidently some changes need to be made to adjust the real preparation of incoming students. Perhaps it would be better for the colleagues teaching the graduate curriculum in Slavic linguistics to think of ways to provide some of this rudimentary knowledge in phonology or syntax in already existing (or, if necessary, newly designed) courses. Or if they truly believe that students entering the program need to do work outside the department before they are qualified to study with their peers, then the burden will be on these same colleagues to come up with a way to reduce the students' requirements at a later stage.

And lastly, in the spirit of morale building, we would urge the faculty to have an open discussion among themselves and come up with simple guidelines for how to provide feedback to students when correcting papers. Although students applauded the faculty for being generally accessible and responsive in one-on-one situations, they want more explicit feedback on their written work (especially when the professor possesses competence in their native language). As this is a culturally nuance issue, the best solution may be to establish some general "do's" and "don't's" (including silence). With regard to faculty advising, the students ask that their own professional needs be placed above enrollment issues when recommending courses.

We strongly agree.

They would also like the option of taking exams either by hand or on the computer (a fairly widespread practice these days), and they would like to have greater access to the reading room, but in a way that doesn't jeopardize security.

5. Faculty. The Slavic faculty at UCLA gets high marks for its splendid publication record and its national and international visibility. It is true, moreover, that the department has made strides in the 1990s to balance its profile between linguistics/language, on the one hand, and literature, on the other. Professors Ivanov and Yokoyama are major appointments by any standards, and Professor Koropeckyj has been an excellent addition as Polonist with other areas of expertise. Be this as it may, there are gaps in current coverage that will need to be filled before the department can be considered to be at full speed and competitive with the top programs in the country: 1) a specialist in "Golden Age" prose (Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, etc.) with theoretical sophistication and a well-established record in the field; 2) a specialist in twentieth century Russian literature, particularly the contemporary period; 3) a South Slavicist. It is our belief that the first position, the Golden Age specialist, is absolutely crucial to the long-term health and viability of the department: this is where the biggest enrollments reside in any Slavic program, and to have a well-known person representing this area would certainly add to the luster of the department. It is the core area of any graduate program, and it would not be unnatural to expect the person filling the position to exercise a leadership role in the definition of the literature program. For this latter reason, we recommend that the search be open as to rank; the department might be extremely well served if it could identify and attract a prominent colleague at an

intermediate rank (approximately, the senior associate rank-that is, ready to be promoted to full professor) and with one or more outstanding books to his or her credit. To repeat, however, nothing in our estimation would do more to raise the profile of the department and to solidify its orientation as an equal parts literature and linguistics faculty than this appointment.

As was discussed above, our priorities are different. We see the most critical need being for a *full-time* South Slavicist, and we do not see the need for the department to "solidify its orientation as an equal parts literature and linguistics faculty". Every other Slavic Department in the country has an orientation strongly toward literature. We do not see why this department could not continue to be the one department in the country with an orientation towards linguistics. Just because the problem faculty members have overwhelmingly come from the linguistics side of the house does not mean that this need remain the case. Two of the problem faculty have already retired, and at least one other soon will (we hope).

There is a misconception among some in the field that being in such a department is a disadvantage for students of Slavic literatures. In fact, coming from such a department, i.e. a department with a strong linguistics profile and a solid (yet not the most prominent) literature faculty does not at all seem to be an impediment to receiving jobs. As was stated above, despite the Slavic Department's ludicrous claims as to the amount of students they place, the fact is that the last three students they have placed in tenure-track jobs during the last four years have all been literature students. If anything, it is the *linguistic* students in this department who have had a difficult time competing for tenure-track jobs, for reasons already discussed.

The second literature appointment is also important programmatically and politically: the graduate students would like more training in contemporary literature and they are right to assume that this would make them more marketable-but perhaps a little less so strategically. It could and probably should be at the junior level. The South Slavic position, which both the linguistics faculty and students lobbied for eloquently and for years, is an area that most major programs in the country still have coverage in. Since breadth has always been UCLA's hallmark, it would be a significant blow to its tradition and reputation to do away with this position. The question seems to be whether to fix it in place as a permanent ladder position or to continue to fill it on a visiting/adjunct basis. The adjunct position has evidently been a satisfactory temporary and ad hoc measure (with the reservation that no adjunct person can serve on examinations). If one of the senior linguist positions (two are relatively close to retirement) could be "mortgaged" for this one, and if the position description were crafted not for a narrow linguist but for a person genuinely able to teach the language(s), literature(s), and culture(s) of the former Yugoslavia, then it would make sense to make the appointment sooner rather than later.

We agree. Both the last South Slavicist and the current adjunct replacement have fit this profile of a broad linguistic, literary, and cultural background. We urge that, should the Slavic Department remain intact after this review, this be the first appointment made.

For, to reiterate, we do believe that UCLA should have a South Slavicist.

6. Leadership and Collegiality. We understand from the faculty, graduate students, and staff that the period since the last review has not always been easy for the department. The Slavic field has changed and business as usual, probably never a viable option, is even less a possibility today than it was eight years ago. Moreover, there have on occasion been personnel issues in the department, which we will touch on briefly below, that have sometimes strained relations and caused problems with morale, especially the morale of the graduate students.

The external review team, as was mentioned above, was not privy to all the information which the internal review

team received because of the presence of Timberlake. Thus, it would be unfair, since they were lacking this information, to upbraid them for some of the conclusions they have reached. It is fair, however, to correct some of the misimpressions they may have received.

It is inaccurate to characterize the "personnel issues" as something which happens "on occasion". These "personnel issues" are much more the norm than the exception. True, there may not be an outburst at every meeting with a problem faculty member, or perhaps not even every second or third meeting, but they happen often enough such that the atmosphere of potential/probable retaliation is always in the air. This cannot help but effect the nature of the relationship between student and faculty member, causing anxiety and fear, and stifling the exchange of scholarly opinion. (Who wants to put forth an idea only to have it ridiculed publicly, and potentially be penalized for it in terms of grades/funding?) The result is a system wherein opinions of students (or even questions they might have) are put forth very cautiously, if at all. Even worse, one often finds oneself in the humiliating position of having to confirm in the presence of the faculty conclusions drawn by the faculty, even if the student is not in agreement with that position.

As students, we do not expect that our opinions will always be right: indeed, we are here to learn from those who supposedly are the best in the field. And yet, if we live in fear of even uttering dissenting opinions (or even opinions which in some way question the opinion of the instructor) then how can the learning process flourish? It is a vexing and humiliating position in which to find oneself.

But we do not believe the fabric of trust and collegiality has been irreparably torn, only frayed.

We find it very possible that trust and collegiality has been irreparably torn.

In this respect, it seemed obvious to us that the current chair, Michael Heim, with his patience, good will, sensitivity, and the respect he universally enjoys, has done an admirable job of bringing the department out of a situation of potential crisis; he is the right chair for the department at this time.

Clearly, we could not be more at odds with this statement. Michael Heim is not and cannot be a part of the solution to this department's woes. On the contrary, he has been and is a part of the problem. Although he is not one of the faculty members who regularly abuses students, he is clearly one of those guilty of appeasement, of letting this abuse continue unabated for years. Why he does this, we do not and cannot know. He is tenured, he has a solid reputation in the field, and he is certainly not lacking in perception. And yet, for years, he has denied that there were any real problems in the department. Nothing makes this more clear than his Factual Errors Statement and the response to it by the internal reviewers. Even now, he continues, in front of students, his attempt to defend the indefensible, namely the conduct of this faculty.

Not only has Michael Heim not done "an admirable job of bringing the department out of a situation of potential [potential?] crisis", but in fact he is an impediment to positive change. Michael Heim is not a part of the solution, he is a part of the problem. This fact needs to be clearly understood.

It was especially encouraging to us to see the solid relationship that Professor Heim had forged with Dean Yu and the administration-this at a time when a positive relationship needs to be and can be developed.

This is very troubling. It is our understanding that the recommendation of the Academic Senate that the Slavic Department be placed in receivership has been rejected by Dean Yu in favor of allowing for a one-year period of

supervised adjustment and reformation.

We very much disagree with this course and cannot help but wonder if the "solid relationship that Professor Heim had forged with Dean Yu" has played a role in her choice not to follow through with the Academic Senate's recommendations. This department has next to no ability to govern itself. With the exception of a brief chairmanship cut short several years ago, this department has never shown the leadership and the willingness to deal with the problems which lie at the core of the current crisis.

Indeed, in our view (and here we rely on observing analogous situations at our own and other institutions), it can be catastrophic when trust between department and administration breaks down, and there is no justification in this instance for the department not to work cooperatively with the current administration.

We find it startling that the external reviewers can, on the one hand state that "there is no justification in this instance for the department not to work cooperatively with the current administration", and then, on the other hand, after having seen Michael Heim's continued pattern of evasion and excuse, write the aforementioned revisionist letter (appended below).

Yet all of the patience and intelligent stewardship of one individual will not by themselves succeed in mending the frayed fabric and getting this academically superb department again on sound footing. Nor will additional resources in and of themselves. For this mending process to take place, other colleagues will have to participate. They will have to be willing to compromise on some issues (the shape of the curriculum, the set of requirements, the length of the program of study, etc.) but not on others (what constitutes "Professional" behavior).

Which brings us at last to the thorny issue of (for lack of any other general word) collegiality. We, the external reviewers, heard numerous descriptions from the students and staff of how some Slavic faculty behaved in a manner that can only be called unprofessional. We mention these incidents now neither to denounce specific individuals nor to establish the allegations as true-we were not given the time or the mandate to determine the veracity of these reports or to adjudicate in these matters- but simply to let the department know that there is a significant problem of aggrieved *perception* (and quite possibly fact) with regard to student-faculty and staff-faculty relations...

The fact that the external reviewers, like the internal reviewers, were "not given the time or the mandate to determine the veracity" of much of what they are reporting, thus making it necessary, as was also the case with the internal reviewers, to state the problem in terms of "*perception*", again underscores the need for the University itself to undertake an official investigation of this department to determine the extent to which wrongdoing was done, and the extent to which individual students suffered abuse. The University can take no steps to reprimand or terminate offending faculty without first having conducted such an investigation.

We live in a litigious society...

We agree.

...and, issues of normal civility aside, the power differential between a tenured faculty member and a graduate student is too great not to take seriously the potential for abuse. To repeat, the issue is not whether any of this, or even a small part of it, happened (although this much smoke suggests there must be some fire). Rather, the issue is that the "air needs to be cleared," the students and staff need to feel that they have been heard, and a statement needs to be made that nothing like this will occur again and that the department is making a fresh start.

While this suggested remedy falls far, far short of what needs to be done, it is understandable that the external reviewers might come to such a conclusion, since few graduate students were willing to meet with them because of the presence of Alan Timberlake on the external review team. (Again, in hindsight, especially in light of the aforementioned revisionist letter, this correctness of this decision on the part of those graduate students has been fully confirmed.)

We make no official recommendations here other than to say that the department must find a way to reunite around Michael Heim's and others' leadership. How they accomplish that, either with the help of professionals or on their own, is best left up to the department and to the administration. But at the end of the (hopefully short and efficacious) day, *something must be done*.

7. *Conclusion*. The Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA has been, one of the premier programs in the country for three decades, especially in linguistics, where it arguably has the strongest research faculty in America....

"Arguably" is the operative word here. Some of the faculty have done and continue to do quality work in diachronic, especially Slavic/Indo-European, linguistics, and one is doing innovative work in synchronic linguistics. Others long ago burnt out and confined themselves to areas of linguistics which are not only not current, but frankly, not even that interesting. There is a serious lack of scholarship and dearth of knowledge among the faculty as a whole in the field of theoretical linguistics.

...Its students are being placed....

The external reviewers' misperceptions as to the placement record of the UCLA Slavic Department has already been discussed above.

...The research and editorial activity of its faculty are visible and respected by colleagues in the field. But like any program it has evolved to the point where it faces a series of challenges, some external, some of its own making. To respond to those challenges we recommend the following:

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM:

- 1) that undergraduate teaching assignments be shared equally by linguistics and literature faculty through the development of a more balanced curriculum;
- 2) that the department continue to seek ways to include General Education, writing-intensive, and other courses appealing to a campus-wide audience in their curriculum;
- 3) that the beginning sections of Russian not be filled to 26, but be allowed to be smaller (app. 15);

GRADUATE PROGRAM:

- 4) that the number of new students being admitted to the graduate program be reduced and that the goal be to give financial support to all grad students in the program;

- 5) that other forms of financial aid for graduate students on campus be investigated (TA-ing in ESL courses, language courses outside of Slavic, etc.);
- 6) that reasonable and coherent reading lists be established for the Ph.D. (and if still necessary, M.A.) programs in linguistics and literature;
- 7) that an exam, format be regularized for both linguistics and literature exams, M.A. and Ph.D. levels, and that the expectations for student performance be made explicit;
- 8) that the graduate program, be simplified and the time-to-Ph.D. be reduced by a variety of changes, possibly including: eliminating the M.A. exam. (except for specific circumstances), offering the choice of French or German, establishing a non-departmental minor while reducing other requirements, replacing the "qualifying paper" with a "dissertation proposal" (to be discussed at the qualifying exam. oral), etc;

FACULTY:

- 9) that a Golden Age prose specialist, at open rank, be appointed as soon as possible;
- 10) that a junior specialist on contemporary literature be appointed as soon as the Golden Age specialist has been fixed in place;
- 11) that a well-rounded South Slavicist, with possible background in linguistics but with the ability to teach various courses in the language(s), literature(s), and culture(s) of the former Yugoslavia, be appointed as a "mortgage" for one of the senior linguist positions;

[Our disagreements with the external reviewers have been detailed above. We feel that the South Slavicist position should be filled and maintained, and *not* at the expense of another linguist position.](#)

- 12) that the department work together to address issues of collegiality that have damaged relations with graduate students, staff, and the administration.

(signed)

David M. Bethea
Vilas Professor
University of Wisconsin-Madison

(signed)

Alan Timberlake
Professor
University of California at Berkeley
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

Appendix II:

Site Visit Schedule

Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
Site Visit Schedule
February 24-25, 2000

*All meetings will take place in 374 Kinsey unless noted otherwise

Wednesday, February 23, 2000

-
7:00 p.m.: Dinner meeting for review team members only. Tanino's Restaurant, 1043 Westwood Blvd. (between Kinross and Weyburn, (310) 208-0444.

Thursday, February 24, 2000

8:00: Breakfast discussion with Chair Michael Heim

9:00: Meeting with Dean Pauline Yu

10:00- 10:40: Linguistics Faculty (Henning Andersen, Andrew Corin, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Emily Klenin, Olga Yokoyama)

10:40 - 11:20: Literature Faculty (Michael Heim, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Joachim Klein, Emily Klenin, Roman Koropecykj, Alexander Ospovat, Rob Romanchuk)

11:20 - 12:00: Language Faculty (Nelya Dubrovich, Georgiana Galateneau, Michael Heim, Olga Kagan, Roman Koropecykj, Susan Kresin, Judith Simon, Mel Strom)

12:00: Lunch

1:15: Meeting with Undergraduate Students

2:00: Meeting with Graduate Students

2:45: Review of TA Training Program - Olga Kagan , Susan Kresin and Julia Morozova

3:15: Review of Advising - Henning Andersen, Inna Gergel, Roman Koropecykj, Alexander Ospovat

4:00: Closed Session for Review Team only

5:00: Dinner at Michael Heim's home

Friday, February 25, 2000

-
8:30: Breakfast for Review Team

9:00: Conference call with Ron Vroon

9:15: Conference call with Gail Lenhoff

9:30: Marilyn Gray, graduate student

9:45:

10:00: Minhee Kim, undergraduate student

10:15: Olga Yokoyama, Professor

10:30: Cori Weiner, graduate student

10:45: Susie Bauckus, graduate student

11:00: Julia Verkholtantsev, graduate student

11:15 :

11:30: John Narins, graduate student

11:45

12:00: Lunch

1:00: Meeting with Slavic Staff (Mila August, Inna Gergel, Carol Grese, Jami Jesek, Sasha Mosley and Carolyn Walthour)

2:00: Final review team with Michael Heim

3:00: Closed Session

4:00: Exit Meeting (2121 Murphy): Review Team; Chair Heim; EVC Hume; Assoc. Dean Hune; Dean Yu; Provost Copenhaver; GC Chair Lindsey; Ugc Vice Chair Bjork; FEC rep K. Baker.

Contact Person for the Site Visit:

Inna Gergel
Phone #: X53856
Fax #: 65263
115F Kinsey

Appendix III: •Factual Errors Statement from Department Chair, M. Heim
•Response to Statement from H. Martinson

-
Crespo, Luisa

-
From: MICHAEL HEIM [heim@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2000 1:54 PM
To: crespo@senate.ucla.edu
Subject: response to academic senate review

8 June 2000

Professor Duncan Lindsey
Professor Orville Chapman
Academic Senate Executive Office
3125 Murphy Hall
140801

Dear Professors Lindsey and Chapman:

Please distribute the following to the members of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. It is my response to the drafts of the internal and external reviewers' report of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. I will address both errors of fact and errors of omission.

Let me begin by saying that I have no bones whatever to pick with the external report: it is not only factually accurate but conveys the spirit of the Department. I cannot say the same about the internal report or, rather, about the section of the internal report entitled "Graduate Program" (pp. 2-5). It contains a number of inaccurate statements, fails to make certain important points, and - most important - draws a picture of the Department I do not recognize.

This statement leaves us struggling to understand. For years Michael Heim has heard of the abuses visited upon students by certain faculty members. Indeed, he has somewhat of a reputation as the professor to whom students go when they are at the end of their rope and need a shoulder to cry on. He has been part of the problem here in that he has allowed to continue, and tried to excuse, the behavior of some of his colleagues, but he himself was never one who psychotically lashed out at his students. Why, then, he would feel the need to try to defend what has happened in this department for so many years is a mystery to us. If Michael Heim does not understand the picture of this department presented by the 8 year review report--a picture which, by the way, is not comprehensive and which homogenizes individual acts of abuse in order to preserve the anonymity of the students, and which passes over other abuses altogether--if this picture is unrecognizable to Michael Heim, it can only be because he does not wish to recognize it.

Before I try to set right the general impression, however, I will set right some details. The specific case history on p. 3 opens by stating that the student in question entered the program with "excellent credentials." In fact, her Russian was so poor that she had to take not the usual remedial course we recommend in such circumstances - that is, the fourth-year undergraduate course - but the third-year course.

This is a deliberate misrepresentation of facts on Michael Heim's part. What happened is this: several students of that year's incoming class had weak Russian. (And again, this is not their fault: they were accepted into the program as is. If this student with the 3.9 GPA out of Riverside was indeed too "weak" for this department, then it is the department's fault for having admitted her.) These students were given the *choice*, with emphasis on the word "choice", as to which of the two classes they wanted to take, 3rd- or 4th-year Russian. There are very good reasons why the student in question opted for 3rd year Russian over 4th year Russian. These two courses have widely different content, with the 3rd year course being much more a review of the grammar and grammar rules, while 4th year is much more free-flowing and much less concerned with the grammar and formal structure of the language, and much more concerned with widening the student's exposure to Russian in a variety of contexts.

The student in question (XX) was a linguist and as such, felt that the 3rd year course would be much better suited for her than the 4th year course, and she was absolutely correct in this belief. Another of her colleagues who came in with her that year, a literature student whose Russian was at a similar level, was also given the option of taking 3rd or 4th year Russian, and she opted for the 4th year course.

What must be understood, then, is that these are two very different kinds of courses. This department has a history of admitting students, especially in linguistics, and then berating them mercilessly because their Russian is not up to par. The knee-jerk recommendation of this department is for such students to take 4th year Russian, but the problem is that 4th year Russian doesn't provide the type of linguistic knowledge about Russian that the linguistic faculty demands of its students. And, to be truthful, neither does 3rd year, but it is much closer in this regard than 4th year.

To someone not in the department (e.g. all of you reading this) it would be easy to come away with the idea that 4th year is more advanced than 3rd year, and in some respects it is, but in many respects it is simply a very different course. XX could just as easily have taken 4th-year Russian. The reason she chose not to is because of the content of the course, not because of its degree of difficulty. Michael Heim knows very well that this is true. This is yet one more attempt by him to twist facts and smear the one student who had enough courage to come out and tell her story openly.

When she came to me, I did express sympathy, I did say there were problems with some of the faculty, and I did say we would have to work around them. I also promised to talk to the instructor: I needed to hear both sides of the story to find a way to handle the situation. I talked to the instructor for several hours and was ready to talk to the student, but although I phoned and e-mailed her repeatedly she never responded.

XX herself is at odds with this account by Michael Heim of his attempts to communicate with her concerning this incident. We would suggest that, if and when an official investigation of the Slavic Department is begun, that she be contacted and asked to give her account of what went on between her and Michael Heim.

I was of course sorry that we lost her and I do not condone the conduct of my colleague, but I am certain we could have solved the problem had she come back to see me.

Exactly how would Michael Heim have solved this problem? This professor in question, one of "problem faculty" so often mentioned, is a full professor with tenure. Just how was Michael Heim going to force her to allow this student to audit the class? Any attempt to do this would have been met instantly and ferociously with cries from her and her husband, an emeritus professor in the same department, that her "academic freedom" was being violated. The *only* way to possibly bring about change is to expose them publicly, something Michael Heim refused to do.

Even worse, the very act of having challenged her would have been enough to make XX's remaining time in this department a living hell. This exact same scenario happened years before with other students, students who eventually wound up packing it in and either transferring or quitting the field altogether. Michael Heim knows this as well.

The section entitled "Attrition" on p. 4 includes a statement to the effect that "mistreatment of students is not the only reason for attrition!" In fact, the student in question was the only student we have lost as a direct result of a conflict with a faculty member.

Unbelievable. For Michael Heim to make a statement such as this leaves us stunned. Not only is it false, not only does he *know* it is false, but what is so stunning is that surely, surely he must know how easy this statement would be to disprove. Is he so sure of himself and so sure that, as a tenured faculty member, his statements would never be challenged, that he feels he can say whatever he needs to say at any given moment, regardless of whether or not his statements correspond to reality? If Michael Heim were under oath, would he continue to make statements like the one above?

The following statement - that several students who have left the program were "under-qualified from the start" is correct;

If these students were "under-qualified from the start", then why were they admitted to this department in the first place? Surely if this department is as highly regarded in the field as it claims to be, then it would have well-qualified

students knocking down the doors in an attempt to get in, and there would be no need to accept such "under-qualified" students.

This is simply another example of the department doing what it does best: when confronted with problems existing in the department, their first, second, and last instinct is to deflect blame by turning on that segment of the department which is most vulnerable and least able to defend itself, that being the graduate students.

If students are "under-qualified" by the department's estimation, then the department has no one to blame but itself. Instead of checking on each potential student's level of Russian, however, this department has always relied on a Social Darwinistic approach of welcoming people with open arms, thus taking care of the need to keep their enrollments up, only to crush them out of the program a year or two later (sometimes with a low-pass M.A., sometimes with nothing more than another ten thousand dollars in student loan debt) once these students have fulfilled their role as warm bodies for the enrollment count.

...what is incorrect is the conclusion that the department's treatment of students "does not result in cultivation of "the best and the brightest, but in the survival of the toughest and most resilient."

This is utter nonsense. For years, very highly qualified students have entered this program, only to leave a few years later, broken and discouraged. It is *exactly* the truth that this program is designed for the "survival of the toughest and most resilient". Slavic department faculty have even said as much. For Heim to say otherwise is galling.

In fact, three out of the seven students who have received degrees in the past five years were only marginally acceptable at the time they applied; all of them are now teaching at institutions of higher learning.

We know all the students (ten, not seven) who have received degrees in the past five years (see list above) and we have no idea as to which of these students were deemed by Heim to be only "marginally acceptable". The backgrounds of these students were superb: almost any Slavic Department would have been happy to have such students. One wonders what sort of background an applicant must have in order to be classified above the level of "marginally acceptable" for this department. (We have already seen how Michael Heim characterizes the background of XX.) Must an applicant already have a Ph.D. in order to be considered "acceptable"? This question could easily be characterized as a semi-rhetorical, sarcastic barb aimed at Michael Heim and the Slavic Department *were it not for the fact* that there actually was an instance of this department accepting into the program an applicant with a Ph.D. in Slavic linguistics from another Slavic country. Then again, even this, apparently, was not enough to raise this applicant above the level of "marginally acceptable", since this particular student lasted less than two years in this program.

It was a pleasure to teach them and watch them develop.

Please...

What the report's discussion of attrition omits are points like the following: because the country has fewer Slavic Departments than most other language departments the pool of applicants is smaller and we have to gamble a bit more; the loss of interest in our field during the nineties restricted the pool even further; the only group of applicants that grew was that of international students, but their qualifications were harder to judge, especially until we had gained some experience.

The reason fewer applicants apply to UCLA has little to do with the a restricted pool of applicants and much to do with the reputation of the UCLA Slavic Department throughout our field as a place to pursue graduate study. Many of us had heard the whispers before we applied to UCLA, and more than a few of us had been told by our undergraduate professors that UCLA was not the place to be if you had any hope of getting through with a Ph.D. in a reasonable period of time.

It is the common belief among graduate students that one of the reasons we have so many foreign students in our department (Koreans, Taiwanese, Russians, Eastern Europeans) is that they are perceived as being more compliant than American students, partially, perhaps, because of cultural factors or from the uncertainty that always comes from studying in a foreign country, but almost certainly because they are more reliant than even their American colleagues on funding from the Department, for if they fail to receive funding, not only do they have to pay fees, which are at \$1500 per quarter, but also they have to pay out-of-state tuition, which for almost all of them would effectively mean the end of their graduate studies at UCLA.

We would also emphasize that almost all of these students, in spite of the claim that "their qualifications were harder to judge", are in fact very qualified.

In the early nineties, when fellowships were easier to come by, we could admit more students and let them prove themselves, and as I have indicated a healthy selection did take place.

This is the second time in this report that the phrase "healthy selection" has been employed. We stand by our aversion to this phrase and all that it connotes.

Now that funds are tight, the situation has changed. Consequently, last year and this year we admitted only two students instead of the cohorts of six to eight students we used to aim for. But all the students we admitted we gave a fine education; never did we discard students "as damaged goods."

This is absolutely not true. Regularly were students allowed to drop off the department's map as damaged goods. Of course, the department never saw it that way: to the faculty, this was a "healthy selection". Again, it is stunning to us that Michael Heim would make this claim given the relative ease with which one could refute it. Look at the number of students admitted vs. the number who graduate. Do the math.

In the "Graduate Requirements" section the issues of exam format and reading lists come up several times. Neither is in fact an issue for literature students: the exam format is standard, and the reading list, though currently under revision, is perfectly functional - reasonable and coherent - as it stands.

Again, untrue. The problems on the literature side of the house are not nearly as severe as with the linguists, but it is untrue to say that neither the exam format nor the reading lists are an issue for literature students. The last two students to take the MA exam in literature can attest to this, as can the faculty members (including Michael Heim) who administered that exam.

The linguists have not yet agreed on a reading list, but are working on one and have put together a data base as a first step.

They linguists have been working on a reading list since 1991 (so we are told). *Never* have they been able to agree on a reading list. One would think that after the 8-year review report, they would finally be able to put together such

a list.

The section also mentions dissertation committee problems. These have occurred - again only among the linguists - but I mediated one such problem this year, and the student has recently defended the dissertation successfully. The section calls upon the faculty to "find some way to make collective decisions." We have recently agreed to institute a new experimental MA in Russian Language and Culture and an optional outside concentration at the PhD level, two major decisions. It took many meetings to arrive at a consensus - two linguists opposed the programs - but we have done so.

By now a pattern should be emerging.

Yes, we have indeed noticed a pattern.

The students' complaints refer primarily if not exclusively to two members of the faculty, both of whom are in the linguistics program. Until the section entitled "Action" on p. 5 the text reads as if all faculty members were equally guilty.

We have commented on this above.

Under "Funding" on p. 4, for example, it states, "So vengeful are the faculty, we were told, that many students believe that they are merely pawns among these colliding ambitions." Some (though not all) of the linguistics students may believe this, but I am certain that none of the literature students (who comprise approximately half the graduate population) do.

This is partially true. Not all the linguistics students believe this. The vast majority, however, do. Most of the literature students do not feel that this description applies to them, although a few do.

Even after the "Action" section on p. 5 does allow that only two members of the faculty are involved, it continues to refer to "students," as if all students had experienced the problems equally.

The department I read about in this report is a dysfunctional one (the report in fact speaks of "graduate program dysfunction" on p. 3), a department where no learning can take place because graduate students and faculty are constantly at loggerheads. The department I experience is one where office doors are open and graduate students and faculty are constantly discussing scholarly issues, that is, one in which first-rate training is the order of the day.

Some literature students may feel this way. Very few if any of the linguists share this point of view. What good is an open door if what awaits you inside is an unbalanced, vicious, and unpredictable faculty member? It is precisely because of this that, with the exception of a couple of tenured linguists, there can be no true intellectual give-and-take, no sharing of ideas or attempts to innovate or to approach problems from new and different perspectives. We have already discussed at the beginning of our commentary on this report (above) the attitude taken by faculty toward such attempts at innovation and the consequences this attitude has for the reputation of those who do a Ph.D. in Slavic linguistics here at UCLA.

I do not deny that the regretful aberrations described by the students occurred, but they are aberrations.

Again, we are stunned at Michael Heim's assertion. This is not unlike the claims made by dictators who, once the

enormity of the crimes they have committed is made clear to the world, then "fess up" with a sort of general purpose statement such as "Well, it's true, mistakes were made. But..." Not only are the incidents described not "aberrations", they are regularly occurring events. This report, because of the time and manpower limitations placed on the 8-year review committee, was limited in its ability to investigate this department, thus it was forced to concentrate only on this incidents which were the most egregious. (Or, to state it better, on those egregious incidents which graduate students were willing to talk about. There are some incidents which people refused to bring up again, not wanting to go through that type of turmoil.) This report scratched the surface of the abuse that goes on in the Slavic Department. It is for this reason that an official, intensive, and thorough investigation of the department, using outside auditors, is what is needed.

They make it more difficult for the students involved (who, I repeat, are mostly, if not entirely, students in linguistics, but who do not include all linguistics students), but the record shows that they do not in the end stymie the educational process. This year, for instance, two literature students and one linguistics student passed their MA exams, one linguistics student passed her PhD exams, and one student (the one I referred to above) defended a dissertation in linguistics, another in literature.

Again, it stuns us that Michael Heim can make a statement such as "the record shows that they do not in the end stymie the educational process." Surely he must understand how easy it would be to prove him wrong, a simple matter of going through the records and looking at the ratio of students admitted to students who finally finished.

The latter begins a tenure-track position at the University of Florida in the fall.

What we see running constantly through this department's attempt to defend itself and its actions is this leitmotif, this mantra of "our students get tenure-track jobs", as though that will somehow resonate with the Academic Senate and somehow place their abuse of students in a better light. So desperate is the department to defend itself that it even resorts to providing false figures as to who gets tenure-track positions and who does not (see above).

The point is, though, that even if this false profile provided by the department were true, even if most or all of its students did indeed graduate, even if most or all of its students did receive not only tenure-track positions, but also tenure—even if all this were true, it still *would not* and *could not* justify the way they have mistreated students for all these years. Aside from being angered by this, we also find it more than a small bit pathetic (although not at all surprising) that they would even attempt to make this argument.

What I miss first and foremost in the report, in other words, what I consider the greatest sin of omission, is any indication that the faculty members in question have been given the opportunity to give their side of the story.

If the faculty wanted to give their side of the story, we would have no objection to this. In fact, we would welcome it. We know very well what the story is, and we know the usual rhetorical ruses employed by the faculty to cover up their actions. Nothing would please us more to have them go on record and *in detail* as to their version of events. We would hope that any official investigation into the Slavic Department will cause this to happen.

Asking the faculty at the time of the investigation, however, would have been disastrous for students, many of whom had grades, recommendation letters, and comprehensive masters or doctoral exams scheduled before the end of the school year. This was also the same time that funding decisions were being made for the next academic year. We already caught a small example of what this faculty is capable of when they immediately began questioning students (and, in one instance, shouting accusations at a student) at the beginning of the summer after the report had come out. One can only imagine what things would have been like had the content of the report been made available to

them while classes were still in session. This is a student body which lives in fear of this faculty and the actions which come out of their mood swings. It is very possible that more than a few students would have broken under that sort of pressure. (Yet another reason why the University's refusal/inability to keep Michael Heim from questioning students about the report is so disturbing.)

The other problem with this is if the 8-year review committee spoke in detail about any of this with the faculty, it would immediately identify the student in question, bringing about a swift and fierce response from the faculty. As was stated above when discussing the University's "censure" policy, ours is a very small field (and growing smaller!). Word does travel fast, and it wouldn't take much at all for a job candidate to receive the label of "troublemaker" or "rabble-rouser". In a field where you have hundreds of people applying for a single job, it doesn't take much to have an application nudged from the "possible" pile to the "reject" pile. This faculty not only has connections throughout this country, but throughout the world. It is no exaggeration to say that they could and would do their utmost to blackball a candidate from getting a job. Clearly, many of them are abusive and vindictive, but what they are not is stupid. They understand academe, they understand the value system of academe, and they understand the need to be sophisticated and low-key in doing something such as blackballing a candidate. They are truly masters of damning with faint praise. We have seen this done personally.

And again, Michael Heim knows all this. Why he insists of maintaining this course of denial is beyond our understanding.

The Preface to the report states that "the internal review team conducted additional interviews, as necessary, to clarify issues raised during the site visit," but it never asked to see me again. True, the chair of the internal committee got in touch with me twice after the site visit - once by e-mail to request a list of the institutions at which our recent PhD's were teaching and once by phone for details about one student's account (the report as it stands mentions neither) - but why was I not interviewed about the student who left the program after the run-in with her professor? She was interviewed for her side of the story, but I had no chance to tell mine. I have filled in a few details here, but I could say a good deal more about the case. Why was I not asked about admissions and reading lists and dissertation committees? As chair I have been actively involved in all of them. And most important, why was I not asked about what I regard as the most damning accusation, which occurs in the first sentence of the "Action" section: "... the greatest anger of the students was often reserved for the majority of the faculty who take no interest in, and no responsibility for, their plight." Who are "the students" here? What does "often" mean? Who is included and who is excluded from "the majority of the faculty"?

What would Michael Heim have the 8-year review committee do? Identify the students? As to who is excluded from "the majority of the faculty", it is quite clear to most of us who that person is. (Although, as we said above, we would also exclude to a large degree those faculty members from Russia and of course all non-tenured faculty, whose precarious job position precludes them from forcefully advocating for the students.) The question of "how often" is easy enough to answer: often enough to become the norm.

How do the students know that I or any of my colleagues take no interest in, and no responsibility for their plight"?

You know people by their actions. We know that Michael Heim has made efforts to deal with problem faculty. We have always known that. The problem is that he is only willing to go so far, and that he is not willing to do what is necessary to bring about change. What was necessary to bring about change was to expose publicly the abuses which occur in that department. Of course he was right to attempt initially to deal with these problems quietly, but that more often than not that does not work in our department, and if he tells you otherwise then he is not telling you the truth. We have seen what happens, all too often, when problem faculty get their minds made up. They have tenure, they can't be threatened with losing their jobs, and when they get stubborn, no power on earth is going to move them,

especially not Michael Heim's delicate efforts.

What we truly find offensive, however, is how Heim, time and again, attempts to justify what the faculty has done, or tries to put it in a different light in an attempt to make it seem as though there is no real conflict, just a matter of mutual misunderstanding on the part of professor and graduate student alike. This is not only insulting, it's infuriating. Michael Heim needs to be disabused of the notion that he can never say anything critical about another professor to a student. This type of "collegiality" does nothing but serve to cover up problems. There is nothing wrong with Michael Heim saying to a student "Yes, my colleague's action in this respect is offensive and inexcusable, but he/she is tenured and there is really little that I can do about it just by talking to him/her." We understand that. What we don't understand are these repeated attempts to maintain "civility" in dialog when that civility is completely one-sided.

For years and years we have watched Michael Heim refuse to acknowledge that there is a problem. To do so would have been unpleasant. We understand that. And yet, he, and the others who said nothing, must be held accountable. He and they are protected: they have tenure. We have nothing. We as linguists are totally at the mercy of the faculty. If he and his colleagues aren't going to stand up and expose the abuse which characterizes the Slavic Department, then who will?

I can understand that the internal reviewers were outraged by the student complaints listed on pp. 3-4, but I cannot understand why they assumed there was no other side to hear. The students do not know, for example, about the hours I spend every week mediating between them and the two difficult faculty members; they do not know because it would be unprofessional of me to tell them.

Clearly, from what we have just said in the paragraph above, we do not agree with this. Quite the contrary: we felt it was unprofessional of Michael Heim to continue, year after year, to provide cover for abusive faculty and to try to justify their actions.

This section of Michael Heim's response is also interesting in that it seems to conflict with what he had said earlier. According to Michael Heim, the internal reviews drew a picture of a department in chaos, which is, according to Michael Heim, "a picture of the Department I do not recognize". And yet here Michael Heim speaks openly of "the hours I spend every week mediating between them [the students] and the two difficult faculty members". It is disturbing, and telling, that Michael Heim can hold these two contradictory facts in his mind and not experience any cognitive dissonance. This illustrates perhaps better than any other thing the essence of his approach to the Slavic Department and what goes on there.

But neither do the internal reviewers know, because they have taken everything the students say at face value.

The second part of this statement is, as far as we know, very wrong. We cannot speak for every Slavic Department student, but our experience with the internal reviewers leads us to a different conclusion. Not only did they not take everything we told them at face value, they were constantly challenging the information, asking for clarifications and repetitions of what they were being told.

I am by no means implying that the students are not telling the truth; they are telling the truth as they see it, but there are many things they do not see.

Does Michael Heim really believe that his perspective as a fellow professor gives him a better perspective on professor-student abuse than does our perspective as students? Yes, indeed, we were telling the truth as we saw it. Regardless of what Michael Heim has done or hasn't done, that doesn't change the reality of the abuses we have

experienced and seen here year after year. The reality of these abuses exists independently of his ability (or lack thereof) to perceive them.

I am not surprised that the reviewers found "no example of any significant discrepancy"(p. 2) among student accounts: their accounts come from the same point of view;

What Michael Heim appears to be suggesting here is that because there is one point in common among all the students, namely just exactly that, the fact that they are students, this then implies that their points of view would all be the same. As students, we have a very wide array of backgrounds. If one follows the "logic" proffered by Michael Heim, all of us then must share the same point of view. Presumably, then, not only do we all share the same point of view, but we also all made the same mistake in thinking that abuse was being perpetrated by the faculty.

I am surprised that the reviewers did not see fit to solicit other points of view, that of the chair, for instance.

The result of which would have been what? That there is no abuse going on in the Slavic Department? To be sure, this is exactly what Michael Heim told the internal reviewers at the beginning of the review process. (See "Response to Slavic Chair's "Errors of Fact" statement", point 5, below)

There is another point of view missing: as far as I can tell from the report, the reviewers have not interviewed either of the difficult faculty members. Interviewing them would have served several purposes. First, it would have furthered the cause of justice. Is it not normal for both sides of a story to be heard?

Again, as stated above, we have absolutely no objection to this. We very much do want to here the detailed responses by these faculty members to charges brought against them. Unfortunately, there is no way to make specific charges without losing anonymity. Michael Heim's desire to "[further] the cause of justice" is to be admired. Michael Heim also knows full well that faculty and students are not operating on an even playing field in this situation. The faculty members have tenure. In the last 50 years, only a handful of tenured faculty members have ever lost their jobs at UC. Contrasting markedly with this almost iron-clad job security is the situation of the students, who not only have no job security or jobs, but who don't even have their degree yet, and who are dependent upon this same faculty not only for grades and guidance, but also for recommendations, and who also have to fear the influence of this faculty throughout the field. (For example, the one faculty member who actually shouted accusations at one of the students right after the release of the report is actually a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences. This same faculty member has also, by the way, been allowed to participate in the meetings of the Slavic Department linguistics faculty which have taken place since the results of the 8-year review were made public, even though he has been retired for 8 years. Given the fact that he himself has always been one of the most abusive faculty members in the department, this gives us further cause to doubt the department's sincerity in wanting to reform itself.)

Given this discrepancy in status between student and professor, and in light of the fact that confronting these faculty members with the specifics of their behavior (as if they don't know already!) would immediately identify the students involved and leave them vulnerable to the retributive acts which would surely follow, we are curious why Michael Heim has failed to integrate these facts into the calculus supporting his admirable desire to further the cause of justice.

Second, it would have given the reviewers first-hand knowledge of what the rest of us (students, colleagues, and staff) are up against.

Again, no cognitive dissonance on Michael Heim's part: he claims that the internal reviewers present "a picture of the Department I do not recognize" while at the same time he speaks of providing the reviewers with "first-hand knowledge of what the rest of us (students, colleagues, and staff) are up against". It seems to us that the reviewers know full well what those associated with the Slavic Department are up against.

Third, it would have made the two faculty members aware of the accusations that have been leveled against them and of the enormous issue their behavior has become.

Yet again: how can Michael Heim on the one hand speak of "the enormous issue their behavior has become" while at the same time claiming non-recognition of the Slavic Department as described by the internal reviewers?

And fourth, it would have helped the internal reviewers to come up with advice about how to deal with them.

What would Michael Heim have had them say? These abusive faculty members are tenured, they can't be fired, and beyond that, they have been provided cover for the behavior for years by Michael Heim and other faculty members like him. What possible advice could the internal reviewers have provided to the abusive faculty in question and to those who continually enabled and helped to obscure that abuse? How does one give advice to a faculty which refuses even to admit that there is a problem?

Both the faculty and the students looked forward to the review because we hoped it would bring us useful insights.

Absolutely untrue. In no way, shape or form was the Slavic Department faculty looking forward to this review. In fact, the Slavic Department faculty actually polled Slavic Department graduate students asking them what they thought of the possibility of putting off the review for two more years, which resulted in a near unanimous vote by the students (there may have been one or two dissenting votes or abstentions) against putting off the review.

We have in fact received a number of such insights from the external reviewers, but the two recommendations made by the internal reviewers I find not only less than useful; I find them harmful.

The first, "to suspend admissions to the graduate program of the department of Slavic Languages and Literatures until such time as conditions for graduate students in the department improve" (p. 5), will harm both the department and the students.

Let us be very clear of what Michael Heim is saying here: his drawing of a distinction between the department and the students, but not between the department and its faculty, is telling. Yes, if one draws no distinction between a department and its faculty, then the department will indeed be hurt, and that is as it should be. Whatever small amount of punishment the university is able to mete out to tenured faculty members should be meted out, to the fullest extent possible.

We as students are all too aware that these recommendations may hurt some of us in the short run, especially those of us close to finishing and being out on the job market. Yet, we are willing to take that risk. This should be obvious from the numbers of students who were willing to talk to the internal committee despite the risk of incurring the wrath of the faculty. Anytime a tumor is excised some healthy tissue is inevitably taken with it. This is by far preferred to allowing the tumor to remain and grow.

Our field is small and tightly knit. Word travels fast.

We agree. It should be noted, however, that word had already gotten out about the UCLA Slavic Department, and

about its failure, given the brilliance of its faculty, to produce the next generation of leaders in the field of Slavic linguistics. (See above.)

Once it becomes known that a punitive action like this has been taken against us, we will lose the reputation that has allowed us, for example, to place all our students in tenure-track positions in the last five years.

In the first place, whatever positive reputation the UCLA Slavic Department might have had deserves to be lost.

Secondly, once again we see Michael Heim throwing out inaccurate statistics in an attempt to somehow ameliorate the depiction of the department's behavior in the eyes of the Academic Senate. This appears to us to be an almost desperate attempt by Michael Heim to hoist whatever meager arguments he can find to the fore to neutralize the impact of the 8-year review. Apparently, he believes (and it may well be true) that for high-powered research institutions such as UCLA, success in placing graduate students in tenure-track positions is the "coin of the realm", so to speak.

As we have already stated above, even if Michael Heim's claims were true, that would not justify the type of abuse visited regularly upon graduate students by this faculty. Also as stated above, however, this statement on Michael Heim's part (his claim that the Slavic Department has placed "all our students in tenure-track positions in the last five years") is nowhere close to the truth. As was explained above in our commentary on the external reviewers' report, only four of the ten students who finished during the time period referred to by Michael Heim (four of 12 if we include two who finished before the start of this academic year) have received tenure-track positions.

Moreover, for years after the ban is lifted, we will have trouble attracting students.

Indeed. This is as it should be. This faculty has forfeited its rights to train graduate students. It would be a gross injustice to allow graduate students into this program without major and sweeping changes which would, in our opinion, take years to bring about.

As I pointed out above, we have recently voted in a new MA track and an optional outside concentration on the PhD-level. Just as we are making the first move in the nearly thirty years I have taught in the Department to develop the graduate program in new directions and broaden the applicant pool, we are told to suspend graduate admissions. Furthermore, we are about to make our first new appointment in Russian literature in ten years. We began the search last year and, although for technical reasons we had to suspend it, formed a short list of three candidates. We were the first choice for all three. What will happen this year if we have to tell our candidates that we have been forbidden to accept graduate students? What decent candidate will come to such a department?

What will happen is that UCLA will still be the first choice for all three. The job market in Slavic is always very tight. It is highly unlikely that any candidate for a job here would turn it down because of the suspension of graduate student admissions. Even if a candidate were to turn down a job here, however, does that mean that it was wrong to suspend admissions? This exemplifies much of what is wrong about the Slavic Department: rather than worry about graduate students, this department worries about not filling a faculty slot. Of course, since Michael Heim apparently believes that there was no problem and no abuse of graduate students, outside of the occasional regrettable "aberration", perhaps this can explain his concern about not filling this open faculty slot.

What will be the effect on the Department and the University of missing the opportunity to hire the best candidate?

The University is strong and resilient. We suspect that it will be able to muddle through somehow.

The internal reviewers do not tell us how the move will help us to solve our problems, only that it will remain in force until the problems are solved. But I can easily imagine that the havoc the move will play with the Department will exacerbate our problems rather than solve them.

The second recommendation is to place the department in receivership, in other words, to deprive it of the right to govern itself.

Given the fact that this department has shown that it is clearly *unable* to govern itself, the loss of this "right" does not impress us as all that great a loss. What receivership would do, however, is to prevent, at least to some extent, is the ability of this faculty to threaten, abuse, and arbitrarily lash out at its graduate students.

As I have said, both the students and the faculty had hoped that the review would help us to solve our own problems.

As we have said, this is not in the least true. The only hopes the faculty had for the 8-year review was that it wouldn't take place.

The fact that we have put into practice some of the suggestions of the external reviewers before their official report even reached us (the institution of the outside PhD concentration, for example) indicates we are perfectly capable of dealing with things on our own.

Our reaction to Michael Heim's claim that he and the other faculty members "are perfectly capable of dealing with things on our own" would not differ substantially from that found below in the "Response to Slavic Chair's "Errors of Fact" statement".

I might also add that within a week of the site visit, following a suggestion that was made then but does not figure in either the external or the internal report, I consulted a member of the Ombuds Office about the difficult faculty members ...

Again, no cognitive dissonance here. Either one of two things can be true: either this is a department which had faculty members so difficult that one is required to consult the Ombuds Office in dealing with them, or this is a department in which "there was no student dissatisfaction to speak of". It cannot be that both of these statements are true.

...and have adopted a new approach to them, which has begun to yield results. Whether or not the "help of professionals" referred to on p. 8 of the external report is necessary remains to be seen.

Graduate students in our Department have suffered, and there is no excuse for that suffering.

But that is all that Michael Heim is doing and all that he has done: offer excuse after excuse after excuse. It is neither unfair nor an exaggeration to say that he never saw a case of professor-induced suffering in the Slavic Department for which he couldn't find some sort of excuse.

But the report blows their suffering out of proportion.

This is offensive and arrogant beyond measure. It may be the case that Michael Heim does not know the true extent of the abuse visited upon students in this department. In fact, we would say that is probable. What cannot be, however, is that he is unaware of the fact that graduate students have, at the hands of the faculty, for years undergone

extensive abuse, mistreatment, insult, and harm, a representative part of which was detailed in this 8-year review report. For years, Michael Heim himself has spoken with and offered some measure of comfort to students who have been scorched by the ferocity of the linguistic faculty. How is it then possible for him to turn around and dismissively claim that this report "blows their suffering out of proportion". This is either outright prevarication or a case of denial so severe that it would have to be said to border on mental instability. We see no alternative to these two possibilities.

It projects the injustices done to a number of linguistics students onto the student body as a whole;

We disagree. While it is possible for different readers to reach different conclusions as to what is projected and what is not projected by this report, it is our belief that this report does not project "the injustices done to a number of linguistics students onto the student body as a whole". Obviously, a lion's share of the problems originate with the linguistic faculty, so it is only natural that the fate of linguistic students is more thoroughly documented in this report than that of literature students.

Two further points:

1. Many of the literature faculty, particularly Michael Heim, have long pointed to the fact that the difference between linguistics and literature in our department is such that it is not only not possible, but indeed inappropriate, for literature faculty to intervene on issues between linguistic faculty and linguistic students. While this reluctance to intervene is presented by many of the literature faculty as a determination on their part to honor traditional academic decorum (e.g. "It would be inappropriate and a violation of academic freedom to intervene in the way a fellow faculty member interacts with his students..."), we see this explanation as nothing more than a rather thin facade hiding the fact that, for them, not confronting their linguistics colleagues is a winning proposition on a number of levels: their students don't receive the same level of abuse as do linguistic students (although they do at times experience such abuse, contrary to what Michael Heim says--see point 2 below), and they avoid the always unpleasant task of having to confront the unstable personalities who for many years now have predominated in the linguistics side of the house. We see this desire to look at the Slavic Department as almost two mini-departments as the result of their not wanting to take responsibility for what is happening in the linguistic side of the department. We have seen and heard this before: "Well, that's unfortunate, but that's something for the linguists to work out among themselves."

2. In making statements such as "[The report] projects the injustices done to a number of linguistics" Michael Heim seems to be implying that it is only linguists who have been subjected to such injustices. This is not at all true. Literature students, although not bearing the brunt of such abuse, have continually been subject to it intermittently for years now. Contrary to what they might have others believe, we are not two mini-departments, but one single department. Literature students do have to take a certain number of linguistic classes, and some of the problem faculty have also in the past offered literature classes. Linguistic faculty sit on funding committees and have influence in other ways, both within the department and within the field. At times, linguists have sat on literature M.A. and Ph.D. committees.

To imply that only linguists have been subject to this abuse is wrong. Even some of the very general scenarios listed in the internal reviewers' report represent events involving literature students, some of whom have been driven out of this program because of this abuse. Michael Heim himself has spoken to such literature students and knows what went on between them and the problem linguistic faculty. For him to act as though he doesn't know of any such examples (which is the clear implication of the statement above) is disingenuous.

it makes it seem as if only suffering and no learning were going on. At the same time it projects the excesses of a

minority onto the faculty as a whole. I reject its conclusion on p. 5 that "the entire faculty, collectively and individually, is culpable";

We have touched upon this point above when commenting on the "action" section of the internal reviewers' report.

I reject the claims of "inaction" and "complacency."

Clearly, we could not disagree more with Michael Heim on this point.

They run counter to the external report and, more important, to my daily interaction with the students and with my colleagues.

As has been discussed above, the external reviewers had nowhere near the access to graduate students that the internal reviewers did because of the presence of Alan Timberlake on the external review committee. We have also indicated above the extent of our disagreement with the external reviewers vis-a-vis their opinion of Michael Heim.

If I did not request to talk to the internal reviewers after the site visit, it is because I had no idea they would come to conclusions I can only call one-sided. I have voiced only a fraction of the objections I have to the report because I think we can come to an agreement about how best to remedy the situation only if we talk the issues through in person.

It is unfortunate that Michael Heim chose to list but a fraction of his objections as we would have preferred to have heard all of his objections to this report. We would repeat our assertion that, because of the time and manpower constraints placed on the 8-year review committee (and because of the need to protect sources and anonymity), what is represented in the 8-year review itself is but a fraction of the abuses which have occurred in the Slavic Department.

I therefore request a meeting with the internal reviewers. I also request that before our meeting takes place they have separate interviews with each of the two difficult faculty members.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Heim
Professor and Chair

Response to Slavic Chair's "Errors of Fact" statement

The review team has the highest personal respect for the Chair of the Slavic department. Nevertheless, there appear to be irreconcilable differences in our respective points of view.

1 . The Chair objects to characterizing student "XX" as having "excellent credentials".

- The review team stands by this characterization-XX came in with an undergraduate GPA of 3.97 from UC Riverside, and had a 4.0 at UCLA until her run-in with the faculty member in question.

2. The Chair states that XX is the only student that has been lost as a direct result of conflict with a faculty member.

- This is not true.

3. The Chair repeatedly objects to the failure to identify clearly the specific faculty members and students who are referred to in the report.

- As explained in the report "to preserve anonymity [we presented] most information only in general terms." Also, as stated, it was not our purpose to establish the "guilt or innocence of particular individuals." Some wording in the report will be modified to counter the impression that all students experienced problems equally.

4. The Chair strenuously objects to the failure of the review team to confront specific faculty members with specific complaints so that they could present their point of view.

- As explained in the report, no student would talk without an absolute guarantee of confidentiality. Obviously this precludes going back to the faculty with any specifics. We had already learned that addressing these problems in general terms is fruitless (see below).

5. The Chair feels that he was not adequately consulted in the preparation of the internal report.

- We have explained why checking details with the faculty was not possible, but it was certainly the desire of the review team to work with the Chair of the department. For this reason the chair of the review team brought up, very directly but in general terms, the issue of student dissatisfaction at a presite visit meeting with the Chair of the department. When the Chair of the department said that, aside from funding problems, there was no student dissatisfaction to speak of, the chair of the review team asked the question again to be sure he had heard correctly. Similar questions were asked of the Chair and of other faculty during the site visit. Especially in the beginning, the response was a disavowal of any such problems. At one point an external reviewer was moved to exclaim to a faculty member, "...you are in denial!" The pattern that emerged was consistent denial or minimization of the problem-until confronted with overwhelming evidence. Thus, there was no recourse but to unearth sufficient detail from the students themselves in order to determine whether the initial impressions reflected a situation serious enough to warrant decisive action. Once this bridge was crossed (and precluded from discussing details) there was little to be gained by rehashing generalities with the Chair of the department.

6. The Chair claims to have "had no idea" the review team would come to the conclusions it did.

- During the site visit, the chair of the review team (believing that the Chair of the department did not appreciate the seriousness of the situation) made it very explicit that suspension of graduate admissions was being considered. When, later, the Chair of the department still did not appear to grasp the gravity of the discussion, one of the external reviewers pointedly reminded him of the review team chair's comment. Later, after the exit meeting, both Graduate Council members of the review team reminded the Chair that his department's graduate program was considered "dysfunctional".

7. Many additional issues regarding procedure and interpretation are raised by the Chair.

- These are matters on which we will simply have to agree to disagree. For example:

-- Issues of long standing (more than a decade) that the review team considers to be of fundamental importance, the Chair characterizes as "aberrations".

-- For a festering problem involving abuse of power that the review team believes requires immediate and decisive action, the Chair believes "hours [of mediation] every week" and "a new approach.....which has begun to yield results" is a sufficient response.

--While the review team has been told of years of student abuse which the department has had no will to correct, the Chair offers a recent revision in the graduate program as evidence of the ability of the department to manage its own affairs.

These differences in perception do not give the review team confidence that the problems of student welfare will be dealt with swiftly and effectively (and with no retaliation towards students) without drastic measures. This issue is now a matter for discussion between the Chair and the Administration.

Appendix IV:
Self Review Report

First Page Missing

(The first page of the Department's self-evaluation was not released to students. This section begins with page two of this self-evaluation.)

(Henning Andersen, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Emily Klenin, and Olga Yokoyama) and four in literature (Michael Heim, Gail Lenhoff, Aleksandr Ospovat, and Ronald Vroon) one associate professor in literature (Roman Koropecjy), and two lecturers for Russian-language instruction (Olga Kagan and Susan Kresin, the former with security of employment); part-time faculty includes one adjunct associate professor in linguistics (Andrew Corin) and lecturers in Romanian (Georgiana Galateanu) and Hungarian (Judith Simon). When ladder faculty members go on sabbatical leave, they are typically replaced by visiting professors who are leading lights in their fields (Leonid Kasatkin, Roza Kasatkina, Roman Timenchik, Elena Zemskaia). We also receive an average of two and a half FTEs yearly for teaching assistants. We have approximately thirty-five undergraduate students majors and minors and thirty graduate students on the current rolls.

Until approximately a decade ago the Department had the reputation of being stronger in linguistics than literature - the traditional components of Slavic departments since they started appearing on the American academic landscape after the Second World War. Research in our Department has concentrated on comparative cultural, literary, and linguistic studies in a number of fields: early Russian literature (hagiography), major authors of the eighteenth century (Sumarokov, for example), the classical poets of the nineteenth century (Pushkin, Tiutchev, Fet), Russian and Polish Romanticism (especially Mickiewicz) and the post-Symbolist avant-garde of the twentieth century (especially Khlebnikov) - all of which incorporate recently discovered archival materials and pay special attention to the historical context; Slavic historical linguistics in a broad Balto-Slavic and Indo-European context with emphasis on the ethnolinguistic issues connected with defining the Slavic homeland and tracing migration patterns, the analysis of newly surfaced materials (Novgorodian birch-bark letters, Old Believer literature of the seventeenth century, dialectal data including Los Angeles Molokane speech), colloquial Russian and its manifestations in recent written texts, the pragmatic aspects of contemporary Russian, and literary translation and translation studies. Currently we are perceived as being equally strong in literature and linguistics, but we will continue to be perceived as such only if we can compensate for certain recent losses.

Let us take literature first. At the end of the previous review period we acquired a specialist in nineteenth-century Russian poetry, Aleksandr Ospovat, at the beginning of the current period - a specialist in Polish and Ukrainian

literature, Roman Koropeckyj. They have been instrumental in improving both the breadth and depth of our offerings.. Although we can still boast scholars publishing in nearly every period of Russian literature, prose and poetry, including the typically less well represented medieval period and the eighteenth century, last year we lost our two specialists in nineteenth century and twentieth-century prose, the core of the undergraduate curriculum and central to graduate studies as well. Dean Yu has authorized a search at the assistant-professor level for one of these positions. We have maintained strength in other Slavic literatures - Czech, Polish, South Slavic, and Ukrainian - in terms of both teaching and research. Only a handful of universities - Berkeley, Chicago, Harvard, Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Wisconsin - can begin to match us here, though none has more than two or three "second" Slavic literatures to our four, and the ability to teach these literatures is emerging as a particularly desirable qualification for new literature PhDs entering the job market.

In linguistics, which has suffered more than literature at most other institutions, the UCLA-Slavic Department has been able to maintain a full panoply of courses - in East, West, and South Slavic (the latter filled at present on a regular basis by an adjunct associate professor), Old Church Slavic, and the phonology, morphology, and syntax of Contemporary Standard Russian. A new appointment at the beginning of the period under review, that of the internationally known Slavic and Indo-European linguist and semiotician Vyacheslav Ivanov, has helped cushion the loss of three linguists to early retirement (Aleksandar Albijanic 1992 and Henrik Birnbaum and Dean Worth in 1994), though Professor Ivanov teaches literature as well as linguistics and contractually devotes one third of his time to Indo-European Studies. The linguistics program has likewise been bolstered by the appointment of Olga Yokoyama, who came to us from Harvard several years later and works in the fields of discourse analysis and gender linguistics using data from the Slavic spectrum. Many of the departments once strong in linguistics - Harvard, Yale, Stanford - have reduced the number of linguists, their primary function being to provide service courses to literature students. As a result, they are less likely to produce new doctorates in Slavic linguistics. (Of the eight doctoral dissertations in Slavic linguistics for 1997 [Slavic Review, Winter 1998, 959-60], two come from UCLA; of the other six, several come from universities with recently reduced linguistics faculty. UCLA is the only university represented by more than one dissertation.)

The Department considers the crossover between literature and linguistics central to the mission of its graduate program. This is reflected in the MA requirements (students must take a number of courses in both), in approaches applied in PhD courses (structural analysis of literary texts, discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, semiotics, translation studies, the interface between literature and history and literature and anthropology) and, naturally, in the faculty's research. A recent development - and one that is becoming increasingly common - is the joint publication of articles by faculty members and graduate students. Graduate students also regularly give papers at national conferences: eight will participate at the annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages this December in Chicago. They note with satisfaction that the Department is helping to prepare them for the job market by rehearsing them before their talks and staging mock interviews, but would like to see general advising and mentoring strengthened as well.

The Department provides more regular, required Russian-language instruction on the graduate level than comparable programs and has a native speaker available for conversation and consultation on a drop-in basis for twenty hours a week, a feature no other department in the country offers. It also requires a working knowledge of one or two other Slavic languages. Practical language preparation has proven an important factor in the competitiveness of our graduate students on the job market, and some graduate students would like to see more emphasis on perfecting their command of Russian and the other Slavic languages. The Department prides itself on training its TA's in the latest in language-teaching methodology. Not surprisingly, then, the Department plays a leading role' in formulating language-teaching policy on the UCLA campus. And not surprisingly, Professor Kagan was recently named the first chair of a newly instituted campus-wide Foreign Language Resource Committee. The Department also houses Romanian for the Romanian studies Program and has recently elected to take over Hungarian from the Department of Germanic

Languages.

The Department is committed to undergraduate education. We offer two or three general education courses a quarter: The Russian Novel, Russian civilization, Russian Civilization in the Twentieth Century, Slavic Civilization. We offer three majors (Russian Language and Literature, Russian Studies, and Slavic Languages and Literatures, the latter unique in the country in requiring the study of Russian and an additional Slavic language) and three minors (Russian Language, Russian Literature, and Russian Studies, all of which require Russian language study). In the past few years we have made a highly successful effort to attract heritage speakers of Russian by creating language and literature courses with their interests in mind. The Russian club provides undergraduates with a wide range of extra-curricular activities. The number of courses required to sustain this breadth tended to tax our faculty even before we lost two of our faculty members most involved in the undergraduate program, but we feel confident of being able to carry on once they are replaced. If we can make such a claim, it is largely because, while maintaining their reputation for scholarly excellence, members of the ladder faculty regularly teach five courses a year (and many have in fact taught six or seven on an overload basis) and earn consistently high evaluation ratings from both undergraduates and graduates.

During the mid-nineties, when the decision was made to consolidate the staff of several departments into a single administrative unit, the Kinsey Humanities Group, we went through a bad patch. Our main office was left unmanned, and many of us spent an inordinate amount of time directing lost students, answering other people's phone calls, and the like. Mercifully, the situation improved dramatically when Marcia Kurtz, our student affairs officer, was returned to us, and now under Mila August's capable leadership - and Marcia's highly capable Russian-speaking replacement, Inna Gergel - things administrative are again on an even keel. We are currently gearing up for the seismic retrofitting and general renovation of Kinsey Hall. In a year's time we will move to Hershey Hall for the two years it will take to gut and completely reconfigure our current quarters. The chair has had numerous and fruitful consultations with the architects and assures the Department that while individual faculty offices will decrease-slightly in size there will be a notable increase in public space: a second lounge/seminar room, a student commons room, and a set of dedicated computer work stations.

The Undergraduate Program

The euphoria that followed the fall of the east-bloc regimes in the late eighties and early nineties, the period covered by the previous eight-year review, quickly evaporated when the transition to democracy proved more arduous than expected. Undergraduate enrollments in our field, especially in Russian-language courses, dropped dramatically country-wide. The Department nonetheless continued to give regular instruction in five Slavic languages (Russian, Czech, Polish, Serbian/Croatian, Ukrainian) and Romanian; it continued to offer instruction at all levels of Russian - including self-paced Russian and First- and Second-Year Russian during Summer Session - every year. (Five of the textbooks used in courses have been or are being developed by members of the Department: V puti [1996, second-year Russian, Olga Kagan], Cestina hrou: Czech for Fun [1998, first-year Czech, Susan Kresin], Readings in Czech (1985, second-year Czech, Michael Heim, Dean Worth), Communicative Romanian [first-year Romanian, Georgiana Galateanu, Michael Heim], Balakajmo!-A Basic Course for English-Speaking students [first-year Ukrainian, Roman Koropecykj, Robert Romanchuk.]) Our attempts at boosting dwindling enrollments included publicity campaigns (posters, sandwich boards, advertisements in the Daily Bruin), mass e-mailings (lists of our offerings to all eleven thousand undergraduates), regular alphabet-learning sessions, reinvigoration of the Russian Club (with many off-campus activities and integration into the local Russian community), increased frequency of general education courses (the Russian Novel, Russian Civilization, Slavic Civilization) and popular literature-in-translation courses (Tolstoy, Dostoevsky), experimentation with flexible scheduling patterns for language courses, introduction (in addition to the successful self-paced, that is, one-on-one first-year courses) of an intensive Russian course covering the first year in two quarters, and a series of senior seminars taught by advanced graduate students (because of the

quality of our students' proposals the Slavic Department, though one of the smallest in the College of Letters and Science, was the only one allotted two such courses by the Office of Instructional Development last year). Professor Heim piloted a new type of General Education course for the College, a writing-intensive course based on Russian 99B (Russian Civilization in the Twentieth Century); Professor Vroon introduced Russian 30 (Russian Literature and World Cinema), which TAs have now taught for University Extension and the Summer School.

Another tack we took was to increase efforts to attract the pool of heritage speakers from the Russian community, which, again contrary to general expectations, has kept replenishing itself. As a result, we were able to make up for our decrease in elementary language enrollments with enrollments of up to sixty students in advanced classes like Professor Ospovat's Russian poetry and prose series (Russian 130 and 140.), classes which, because readings and lectures are entirely in Russian, were traditionally limited to majors and therefore five or, at most, ten students. The Department is also offering a number of new advanced language courses aimed specifically at Russian heritage speakers: Russian 100 (Literacy in Russian), Russian 103 (Russian for Native and Near-Native Speakers: 103A/Russian National Identity, 103B/Literature and Film, 103C/Special Topics). In this connection Professor Kagan is working on the first textbook for heritage speakers, Russian for Russians. The emphasis on heritage speakers is especially important in view of a major outreach project created by Professor Ivanov to study the diverse language communities of greater Los Angeles, a project that began as an undergraduate seminar in the Department.

The Department was the first in the College to create a minor; in fact, it was Professor Heim who during his stint on the Executive Committee in the early nineties proposed that the College as a whole institute minors. The Department now gives students a choice of three, all of which have a language component.

Finally, we have incorporated video components and web-based material into virtually all courses, language and literature, at the undergraduate level. We have offered Fourth-Year Russian to UC Riverside and Russian civilization to UC Irvine via a distance-teaching hook-up. Support for such activities comes from a variety of campus-wide facilities like Humanities Computing, the Office of Instructional Development, the Faculty New Media Center, and the Instructional Media Laboratory. Graduate research and teaching fellows have designed programs of internet-based instructional materials at various levels. (You may visit our site at www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/slavic and click, for example, on the tutorials for Golosa, the textbook for first-year Russian.) Finally, in conjunction with her second-year textbook of Russian and as a result of a \$30,000 grant from Provost Copenhaver, Professor Kagan is working on a pilot project to supplement classroom instruction with interactive web-based exercises that can serve as a template for other foreign languages.

In other words, we have been careful to pull our weight on the university level even when circumstances have kept enrollments and the number of majors lower than we would have liked. One major problem remains. The loss of Professors Irina Gutkin and Peter Hodgson has cut deeply into the Department's undergraduate program in literature: eight of the ten courses they collectively taught per year belonged to the undergraduate curriculum, that is, together they taught approximately 45% of the undergraduate Russian literature courses in translation. We are currently conducting a search for one of their positions and have requested authorization for the second. Our goal is to maintain at the highest level what we feel to be an intellectually stimulating and viable liberal arts program. One student who took several courses in our department but graduated from another recently told us she regretted not having majored in Slavic, which she called "one of UCLA's undiscovered treasures."

The Graduate Program

Several years after the nation-wide decline in undergraduate enrollments the Department began to experience a concomitant decline in graduate applications. With Slavic departments failing to replace retiring faculty, reducing

FTEs, and facing mergers with other language and literature departments or even abolishment, with ever decreasing funds available for recruiting and retaining graduate students, morale plummeted throughout the field. The funding situation became especially precarious when our Center for European and Russian Studies lost its Department of Education grant three years ago: the grant had included several annual FLAS fellowships that supported our graduate students.

What you are not told here is the role the UCLA Slavic Department played in losing that grant. The grant application is very specific, and it is very much language-instruction oriented, meaning that those in DoEd. who issue the grant care less about those things which usually are considered prestigious at a research institution such as UCLA, e.g. previous grants awarded, articles published, positions held within professional societies, etc.) and very much more with the nuts and bolts of teaching language and most importantly, a set series of language classes in the target languages for that FLAS area, and respectable, steady enrollments in those classes. There were times when some Slavic Department faculty out and out ignored the requested information and instead simply reported on what they felt was important (publications, receipt of a Guggenheim Fellowship, etc.). We know there were other irregularities as well involving the Slavic Department in the loss of these FLAS fellowships, but we do not have the specifics.

(Fortunately, the Graduate Division, the College of Letters and Science, and the International Studies and Overseas Programs have made up the difference each year, and we are confident the Center will regain the grant for the coming three-year period.)

Hard times have prompted us to re-examine our mission, that is, to ask how we can best ensure the vitality of our traditions, enhance our present strengths, and accommodate the future needs of the university and the profession. While faculty and students alike agree that it should build on those strengths - namely, the commitment to the entire Slavic field rather than Russian alone and to the interplay between linguistics and literature - we also agree that they can be complemented by certain changes. A once required proseminar is no longer taught and has not been replaced with basic training in research techniques, bibliography, style sheets, etc.; it is sorely lacking. Reading lists for the MA and PhD examinations in both literature and linguistics need to be updated.

In the case of linguistics, these reading lists need to be more than updated--they need to exist.

On a more global level the first area that needs addressing is that of theory. The Slavs have contributed richly to the theoretical background of twentieth-century linguistic and literary studies with Russian Formalism, Czech Structuralism, Lotman's cultural semiotics, and the Bakhtinian approach, and here we are on firm ground. What we need is to cross-fertilize their contributions with current Anglo-American and continental theory. We have expanded the theoretical purview in linguistics by attracting Professor Yokoyama; in literature we are currently conducting a search for a junior position in nineteenth-century prose with proven competence in contemporary Anglo-American and/or continental theory (gender studies, cultural studies, postcolonial theory, neo-Marxism, and the like). We need to help our students better integrate theoretical perspectives into their work starting at the basic, MA level.

Closely related is the issue of the direction the field as a whole is taking. Students have expressed an interest in making the program flexible enough to include a new, third track within the Department, one combining linguistics and literature. Professors Ivanov, Klenin, and Yokoyama have been publishing scholarship on the cusp of literature and linguistics for years. We intend to explore the possibility of setting up joint degree programs with the Department of Linguistics (where a graduate student in Slavic is currently a TA in an undergraduate course) and the Department of Applied Linguistics (where, for instance, the theory of language pedagogy is taught).

We strongly support setting up such joint degree programs with the Linguistics and Applied Linguistics

departments. This would not only expand the options for us as students of linguistics, it would also serve to provide for us options not involving the two problem linguistic faculty members in our own department. We would encourage the Slavic Department to also look into similar possibilities for joint programs in conjunction with the interdepartmental Comparative Literature graduate program.

Such programs would considerably broaden our students' options on the job market. We were highly gratified by the fact that last year, for example, the three students who applied for positions (two in literature and one in linguistics/ language pedagogy) each received two offers, and all three are currently teaching (at Brandeis, Connecticut College, and Grinnell). This is a record matched by no other department in the country. Other institutions at which our students found positions during the period under review include the University of Iowa, Ohio State, Dalhousie, Rice, and the Russian State Pedagogical University, and two received tenure (at Brown and the University of North Carolina).

The Department has lobbied the College of Letters and Science for two FTEs to replace those it lost from retirement during the period under review. One is for a South Slavic specialist, the position currently being filled by Adjunct Associate Professor Corin and one that is essential to the Department's programmatic commitment to Slavic languages and literatures. In the framework of our interest in current theory the South Slavist would ideally represent a prominent school in theoretical linguistics not currently represented in the Department (formal, cognitive, etc.) and be versatile enough to develop and teach, for example, undergraduate courses on the cultures of the Balkan Slavs. The other is for a literary specialist whose principal expertise lies in the Soviet and Russian postmodern periods. Current students - both graduate and undergraduate - and many recent applicants have expressed a strong interest in post-Soviet developments in literature, the arts, and popular culture. By filling the second position with a specialist in this area, which is not yet widely taught anywhere in the country, we would be able to compete more effectively for the best students. Such a specialist would also have much to contribute to the Department of Comparative Literature and the Center for Modern and Contemporary Studies.

A department is as good as its faculty - and its students.

Yes, well...

We are currently making our web site more applicant-friendly and doing everything we can to attract qualified candidates for graduate study. However, despite our best efforts at recruitment and retention we are unable to compete with the financial incentives offered by a number of other institutions. The problem is compounded by the fact that, given the Department's international reputation, we have had a number of excellent international graduate students, mostly from Asia and (now that they are free to travel) Eastern Europe, but these students strain our resources inordinately because they must pay non-resident tuition in addition to university fees. To support both them and other qualified applicants - and to fill the Department's sorely depleted coffers - we have begun a fundraising campaign among our alumni and the public at large. We have made contact with all our alumni by means of a departmental Newsletter and collected several thousand dollars.

It should be noted that these last two activities, the fund-raising and the alumni newsletter, were instituted by the one Departmental Chair whose tenure in this position lasted only half a year. Not once but several times and from several different faculty did we as students hear the derisive remarks directed against the efforts. Apparently, for some of our faculty, such activities are "beneath the dignity" of a department with as high an academic and scholarly profile as our own.

This new source of funds together with increased support from the Graduate Division will help us to compete with the multi-year financial-aid packages with which other institutions have wooed promising students away from us in

the recent past.

Comparison to the Previous Review

Let us begin by addressing the recommendations made by the previous review agencies, the Committee on Undergraduate Courses and Curricula (CUCC) and the Graduate Council (GC). Both advised the Department to establish clear and consistent written guidelines for distributing TA assignments and to select TAs in a timely manner. The guidelines have been established and are distributed to graduate students annually together with the guidelines for receiving all types of financial aid. We understand that students wish to learn about TA assignments in the spring preceding the academic year during which they will teach, but since the funding of TAships is inextricably bound with other varieties of funding some of them may simply have to be assigned later. We are careful to keep everyone apprised of the situation as it develops. Nonetheless, a number of students have expressed a desire for a more collegial and transparent atmosphere.

Yes, that would be nice.

We immediately followed the GC recommendation that we create a course to provide students with training in methods of language teaching. All students now take Professor Kagan's Teaching Slavic Languages at the College Level (Slavic 495) in preparation for teaching and her Teaching Apprentice Practicum (Slavic 375) while teaching. We also immediately followed the CUCC recommendation that we evaluate and revamp Russian 1. Methods developed in Slavic 495 laid the foundations for the new elementary language course, but other changes - a new textbook, Golosa, more emphasis on video and computer-assisted instruction - occurred as well. We have also begun to take advantage of the TA consultant position funded by the office of Instructional Development to enable experienced TAs to help train their peers.

The CUCC recommendation that we lobby for funds to use TAs to teach sections in the larger literature and civilization courses took longer to address, but within the past few years funds have been forthcoming and we now regularly offer discussion sections in two General Education courses, The Russian Novel (Russian 25) and Russian Civilization in the Twentieth Century (Russian 99B), which, as mentioned above, served as a pilot course for the writing-intensive component of the new General Education program.

There was a concern among the graduate students about the availability of TAships given the ratio of graduate students to available TA FTE's. To address this issue, not raised at the time of the previous report, we have begun to allot TAships at 25% rather than the full 50% level. The argument in favor of breaking up a TAship is that it gives both experience and fee remission to two students rather than one; the argument against it is that it may result in fragmentation in the classroom. Another problem is how to insure that TAs hired at 25% do not work proportionally more than those hired at 50%.

Instead of adopting the recommendation that the graduate adviser be a given course relief, which would have proved difficult in light of our already tight resources, we decided to divide the responsibilities of the office among four faculty members: a linguistics adviser, a literature adviser, and two members of the admissions and support committee. The way in which admissions and support decisions are reached has also changed: the faculty used to submit comments to the committee, which then made the decisions; now every faculty member rates every applicant for admission and every continuing student, and we meet as a body to discuss and vote on the candidates.

Special Circumstances

We feel we have emerged from a difficult period of transition in our own field (the transformation of East-Central Europe and its very real repercussions in the academy) and in the university (the reduction of public funding and the call for the financial accountability of academic programs) with a sense of where our strengths lie, how best to capitalize on them, and how to adapt to the new situations confronting us. We do not yet have all the answers, of course: we spent a good deal of energy, for example, formulating a new pre-professional MA program in Russian, but the chair postponed discussion until the outcome of our FTE requests is clear. Still, we have come through with our reputation and achievements intact - every faculty member contributes not only to the teaching program but also to the departmental profile of a center of research in a variety of fields - and we look forward to contributing even more to UCLA and to the scholarly community as a whole.

.....

Date: Thu, 13 Jul 2000 18:17:48 -0800 (PST)
From: MICHAEL HEIM <heim@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU>
Subject: missing external attachment (apologies)
To: slavic.department.graduate.students@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Priority: normal

June 26, 2000

Professor Duncan Lindsey
Academic Senate Executive Office
3125 Murphy Hall
UCLA
Los Angeles CA 90024

Professor Pauline Yu
Dean of Humanities
3125 Murphy Hall
UCLA
Los Angeles CA 90024

Professor Michael Heim
Chair, Department of Slavic Languages
115 Kinsey Hall
UCLA
Los Angeles CA 90024

Dear members of the UCLA community:

Towards the end of last week, we, the two members of the external review committee, received copies of the 1999-2000 Academic Senate Review of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, a document which includes the Draft Report of the Internal Review Team as well as our own report. We recognize that no response to the Draft Report was solicited from us, the external reviewers. Nevertheless, we would ask you to consider our remarks below, regardless of procedures, because of the importance of the matter: the very existence of this academic unit is at stake. We have sent this letter first by e-mail (through the address of Ms. L. Crespo:crespo@senate.ucla.edu) with the hard copy with signatures to follow. We have addressed it to a minimal number of individuals, but we trust it can be made known to the full bodies of the relevant committees.

When we two left Los Angeles, having heard the same evidence as the internal committee,...

This is completely untrue. For reasons touched upon several times above, a great many students would not speak with the internal review committee because of Alan Timberlake's presence on it. The internal review committee

made this very clear: "We note that the external reviewers devoted more space to this issue than to any other single aspect of the Slavic program despite the fact that they heard but a *fraction* [our emphasis] of all the complaints." This fact cannot be overemphasized in assessing this revisionist letter by Bethea and Timberlake: they heard but a fraction of the abuses heard by the internal reviewers, and the internal reviewers themselves heard but a fraction of the abuses that have gone on over the years in the UCLA Slavic Department. Any conclusions drawn by Bethea and Timberlake were based on this fraction of a fraction.

...and having given a quite detailed and rigorous exit interview, we believed that we shared approximately the same perception as the members of the internal committee of the state of the department, of both its strengths and its difficulties. Accordingly, we were astonished when we read the Draft Report and found that it includes a thoroughly negative evaluation of the department's treatment of its graduate students and, further, that it includes the dual recommendations that the department be obliged to suspend graduate admissions indefinitely and that the department be placed into receivership. The evaluation does not correspond to what we heard during our two-day visit.

It is fair and reasonable that the external reviewers would state that "The evaluation does not correspond to what we heard during our two-day visit". Given the fact that they heard so little directly from graduate students, the evaluation logically could not correspond to what they heard.

These recommendations are counter-productive. >>In greater detail: >>1. The Draft Report (p. 2) states that students perceive the program as "capricious and self-serving," and then follows this assertion by the statement that the external reviewers "devoted more space to this issue than to any other single aspect...," as if to suggest that we, the external reviewers, were in agreement with the immediately preceding statement and, by extension, with the whole of the internal report. Not so. In our exit interview and our written report, we identified a problem, and we wrote about it at some length in order to make it clear exactly what our perception of the severity of the problem was--serious but circumscribed--and in order to offer a recommendation on how to deal with it.

Again, fine as far as it goes. If the external reviewers feel that their position was misrepresented by the internal reviewers, then they have every right to speak up. It is important, however, to note the external reviewers' own words here: "we identified a problem, and we wrote about it at some length in order to make it clear exactly what *our perception* [our emphasis] of the severity of the problem was--serious but circumscribed--". What was in fact circumscribed, albeit through no fault of their own, was the amount of information available to the external reviewers by which to come to the conclusions they eventually did reach, conclusions based on *their perception*, a perception which could be no more accurate than the input they had received and on which they based this perception.

We do not find the program capricious and self-serving. We do not agree with the language of the Draft Report that characterizes the department as treating students as "chattel" and "damaged goods." This simply does not correspond to our judgment of life in the department, and as external reviewers, we want to distance ourselves as far as possible from this characterization of the department.

Once again, fine as far as it goes. We quite obviously disagree with them. For us, the characterization of the department treating students as "chattel" and "damaged goods" is quite mild. But again, we have directly experienced the Slavic Department as students. The external reviewers have not, and, furthermore, were denied direct input from us as to the nature of the faculty-student relationship in this department.

2. The dual recommendations to suspend graduate admissions and place the department in receivership punish the whole department for the sins of a few, invoking the logic that all are "culpable." The logic is peculiar, and the recommendations are unfair to the department as a whole. Punishing the collective for the acts of individuals (a scenario with which we are familiar from our study of the Soviet Union) is a strategy of desperation.

We have discussed above our view of this section of the internal report, and our feeling that some of the faculty

coming from Russia proper should not be held accountable, at least not to the same degree as their American counterparts. Having said this, we would make two points here:

1. We by and large *do* agree that a great majority of the Slavic Department faculty should be held accountable for failing to take steps to stop the institutionalized abuse which has for years (decades?) characterized the Slavic Department.

2. We are aghast and well nigh dumbfounded that the external reviewers would have the chutzpah to draw a comparison with the Slavic Department faculty and victims of Soviet oppression. For year after year it has been the *Slavic Department faculty* acting the role of the capricious thug, stifling any hint of dissent and demanding unquestioning loyalty. For years it has been the *Slavic Department faculty* who have acted with near impunity in any way they saw fit, riding roughshod over anyone who dared get in their way. It has been the *Slavic Department faculty* which has used its protected position to institute a reign of fear and intimidation, primarily over the graduate students, but at times over staff and other faculty as well.

Perhaps the only appropriate analogy to the Soviet Union would be those rare instances in its history when Soviet citizens rose up and rebelled, eliminating the thugs and goons who did the dirty work of the Soviet regime, which would respond by first crushing the revolt and then elevating those same thugs and goons to the position of martyrs. This would be the only appropriate Soviet-era comparison one could make with the Slavic Department faculty.

The external reviewers here perversely attempt to turn the situation on its head. Although there might be some regrettable "aberrations" concerning the mistreatment of students, it is in point of fact the faculty which is truly suffering! In fact, so horribly ill-treated are the faculty by this report that it evokes images in their minds of the victims of Soviet oppression, we are told. In making such an odious and artificial comparison, the external reviewers find themselves adopting the same tactic traditionally used by the Slavic Department: when problems arise, instead of going to and identifying the source of those problems, they attempt to place blame elsewhere. Since graduate students, the normal recipient of this blame, are in this once instance unavailable to fulfill this task because of the nature of the charges made in the report about the abuse of graduate students, the external reviewers instead lay the blame at the feet of those vicious Stalinists who comprise the internal review committee, and who (apparently) are bent on punishing the collective for the sins of the few.

It represents a refusal to take any responsibility for the practical implementation of change.

What would the external reviewers have the internal reviewers do other than report the facts and make the recommendations which are within its purview to make? It is our understanding that the 8-year review committee was charged with reviewing the department in order to offer up suggestions for change. Was it also the charge of the 8-year review committee to take "responsibility for the practical implementation of change"?

In fact, if one takes at face value what the internal review committee said at the beginning of its report on the Slavic Department graduate program ("The mandate to the review team was not to conduct a fact-finding mission or to determine the guilt or innocence of particular individuals, but rather to assess the welfare of the graduate students and to recommend corrective action, if necessary, to assure their well-being.") then we would think that the internal review team has shown great responsibility to the graduate students and has in fact fulfilled its mandate. This is, of course, not to say that this is enough. As we have mentioned above, an official fact-finding mission and an investigation to determine the guilt or innocence of certain faculty members is certainly called for. But that wasn't the mandate of the internal review committee, just as the "practical implementation of change" was not the mandate of the internal review committee.

3. The judgments about the transgressions of individuals place complete trust in the versions of the students.

How do the external reviewers know this? At the beginning of this report, the internal reviewers write the following:

"Great care was taken to ensure the legitimacy of the information upon which we have based the conclusions at the end of this report. Several case histories from different sources were compared and no example of any significant discrepancy was found. In other instances different case histories involving similar situations were compared across time. The consistency was remarkable, even between former students who had never met."

Do the external reviewers mean to question the veracity of the internal reviewers? Is it their opinion that the internal reviewers were deliberately untruthful when they said they verified the information they had received from graduate students? If so, then the external reviewers should come out and say this. Then they should come out and give us, *in detail*, the information they have which supports the statement that complete trust was put in the students' versions of these transgressions.

(Is it not possible that student XX, whose Russian turned out to be extraordinarily weak, was in fact not capable of graduate studies?)

Of course it is possible. There are instances of the problem faculty members chairing Ph.D. committees and approving Ph.D. theses which have no business being approved, which are an embarrassment to the field, from students who were not capable of graduate studies.

So it is indeed possible. It is, however, completely untrue in this instance. This student was a brilliant student who simply happened to have, just as most of us had upon entering this program, weak Russian.

The external reviewers here characterize XX's Russian as "extraordinarily weak". Again, we ask, how do they know this? Do they know XX? Have they heard her speak Russian? Do they know there were two other students who came in the same year as XX and who had similar if not weaker Russian than XX, and yet somehow managed to high-pass their M.A. exams last Spring? Or do they base this bold statement about her not only "weak" but "*extraordinarily weak*" Russian on what they have heard from their UCLA Slavic Department colleagues, presumably the same colleagues who told them about "the department's record of placing seven out of seven new Ph. D.s over the past five years."? Do they know and can they support any of what they say about XX, or are they merely joining in the time-honored defense stratagem of the Slavic Department: attack the weak, especially if they are no longer in the program, and thus presumably no longer around to defend themselves.

It is disturbing, yet at this point not in the least surprising, that the external viewers are so ready and quick to parrot the lines fed them by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, both with regard to the state of XX's Russian and the placement record of the UCLA Slavic Department.

In all the extensive interviews that went on after we left, there was apparently no attempt to interview any of the faculty members who are tacitly held responsible.

The reasons for this were made abundantly clear in the internal review. As we have said, we would love nothing more to see the "tacitly" responsible faculty put forth a detailed response to charges made against them.

4. Above all, the recommendations are simply ineffectual. They contain no suggestion of a practical mechanism that would

improve the behavior of individuals or the ethos of the department. (There is also no exit strategy: how can the department ever prove that they no longer mistreat their graduate students?) The recommendations punish, but they offer no mechanisms for improvement. They offer nothing that can be implemented.

The implication here seems to be that because the recommendations contain no practical mechanisms, they are therefore "simply ineffectual". Again, we would ask: is the implementation of the recommendations the charge of the 8-year review committee or of the University Administration?

These harsh sanctions have come out of the blue.

This is untrue. For several years now Slavic Department faculty have known that there were questions being raised about them. This reached a head several years ago when one faculty member was made chairman and attempted to institute real reform, only to be stymied at every turn. This faculty member, frustrated at having her hands tied and being rebuffed whenever she tried to introduce even the mildest of reforms, resigned after only six months, ending our brief Prague Spring.

To say that these sanctions (hardly "harsh", by the way, especially when compared with the actions of the faculty which made them necessary) come out of the blue is ludicrous, but even if it were true, so what? The nature of the transgressions by this faculty are such that, in our opinion, the University was thoroughly justified in taking this action.

If the perception within the university was that the department was dysfunctional, the problem should have been addressed in some more productive, positive, problem-solving fashion by the administration prior to this review.

Nonsense. Attempts were made repeatedly, both from below and above, to make it clear to the Slavic Department that their behavior was unacceptable. The result was the same pattern of denial and equivocation.

There is a fundamental issue of fairness and justice to the academic unit that is at issue here.

Again, this is utter nonsense. This department has been warned and approached and pleaded with for years. This is a department that is utterly *incapable* of seeing itself for what it is. Michael Heim's response to the report is the very best evidence for that. The Slavic Department has been warned time and again, but chose to ignore/could not help but ignore these warnings. Not only has the University Administration bent over backwards to be fair to the Slavic Department, it has gone way too far, allowing the Slavic Department to get away with grotesque abuse of its students for years on end. To say that there is "a fundamental issue of fairness and justice to the academic unit that is at issue here" is absurd. What might well be at stake, however, is the reputation and the integrity of the external reviewers who here act as nothing more than advocates for the department which they are supposedly critiquing.

In fact, we, the external reviewers, while we know full well the nature of the historical tensions within the department, do not find it dysfunctional.

Given the fact that they did not have the benefit of speaking with most of the graduate students affected by this faculty, this would be a fair statement. We would suggest, however, that the external reviewers, in spite of Alan Timberlake's tenure as a professor 12 years ago, might very well not be aware of the present day manifestations of the aforementioned "historical tensions within the department". Beyond that, there are issues concerning this department which were not issues during Timberlake's time here, to say nothing of the presence of certain faculty members who were not here when Timberlake was here.

Needless to say, we very much disagree with the opinion of the external reviewers, namely that "do not find it dysfunctional." Indeed, examination of the external reviewers' first report on the Slavic Department suggests that perhaps even they could be persuaded to disagree with themselves: "real challenges that need to be addressed soon"; "[students who] suffer from an alarming level of anxiety, bordering on demoralization"; "UCLA's graduate students in Slavic...suffer from an alarming level of anxiety, bordering on demoralization...*much* [emphasis in the original] more than what can be attributed to run-of-the-mill graduate student anxiety"; "this much smoke suggests there must be some fire".

Are these the characteristics which the external reviewers associate with a non-dysfunctional department? If so, we find ourselves wondering what this says about the state of the graduate programs at Wisconsin and UC Berkeley. (Of course, if the Slavic departments at these two universities can expect UCLA Slavic Department faculty to "return the favor", so to speak, and serve as external members in *their* review process, then the faculties of both those Slavic departments should come out fine.)

The training is excellent.

How do the external reviewers know this? Some of the training is excellent. Much of it is not. Much of it is out of date and poorly presented. And a great deal of it is not coordinated among the faculty members themselves, with the result being that students have paid the price on comprehensive exams as they were forced to choose between competing views on certain issues, with the faculty administering the exams holding different views on these issues.

The department has recently placed its graduates with extraordinary success (though we do not have the figures, we expect its placement record in recent years is better than that of any other national language-and-literature program at UCLA).

It may be that the external reviewers felt here that they "do not have the figures", but that certainly wasn't their feeling in their section of the 8-year review report, in which they wrote with great confidence "With regard to the graduate program, the students appear to be exceptionally well trained, a fact further corroborated by the department's record of placing *seven out of seven new Ph.D.s over the past five years* [Our emphasis]. This record of placing students in recent years is unparalleled among Slavic programs in America."

We have already commented on this above.

And--especially under its current chair--the department has come to a mature understanding of the nature of its problems as a collective and it has begun to find ways of resolving conflict and functioning effectively as a collective.

We have already made clear opinion of Michael Heim's leadership. The idea that this department "has come to a mature understanding of the nature of its problems as a collective" is a flight of fancy. As we have repeatedly said, this faculty is incapable of governing itself or coming to an understanding of itself which is even close to reality.

The historical problems are real, but the resolve to get beyond these problems is no less manifest. The department should be congratulated for its recent efforts to move forward, not punished for the residue of its historical tensions.

This would be laughable were it not so infuriating. This department "should be congratulated for its recent efforts to move forward"? What efforts? Trying to put off the 8-year review? This department does *nothing* unless it is pushed. That is crystal clear to anyone who has had anything to do with this department.

As a more efficacious alternative to these precipitous and harsh sanctions...

We find these "sanctions" to be neither precipitous nor harsh, certainly not in the light of the actions and abuses of the Slavic Department faculty. If anything, the Slavic Department faculty will be getting off lightly if nothing else is done, if no other investigations are conducted. Not one of them has lost his/her job, not one of them has been personally singled out and censured by name, not one of them has been forced to answer before a board for their actions.

..., one might consider a concrete two-step strategy that would consist, first, of a meeting between representatives of the university community--possibly Dean Yu and the chair of the internal committee--and the whole of the faculty of the department. Such a meeting could be used to make clear how the Administration and the larger university community perceive the problems of the department and could serve to remind the faculty of the standards for comportment. After such a meeting, once the ground-rules are set, the department can then, as a long-term strategy, articulate and utilize an internal mechanism for conflict resolution, where necessary involving the services of a professional mediator.

We strongly disagree with this. The Slavic Department should either be put into receivership while official investigations into its actions take place, or it should be disbanded altogether.

We, the members of the external review committee, would take the liberty of reminding you that our external review was an extremely rigorous review.

This is all very relative. Compared with a normal review, this might indeed have been a rigorous review. What it was not, and in our opinion, could not be, is "an extremely rigorous review", simply because the external reviewers did not have anywhere near the requisite amount of time to conduct such a review, a fact which they themselves seem to acknowledge in their section of the 8-year review: "we were not given the time or the mandate to determine the veracity of these reports or to adjudicate in these matters".

We listened carefully while we there, and discussed with each other quite intensely our ongoing perceptions and incipient recommendations. This was no sweetheart review.

It may not have been a "sweetheart review", but for whatever reason, it certainly did not come close to identifying the severity and breadth of the problems which plague the Slavic Department. Because of time and manpower restraints, not even the internal reviewers' report, which had the benefit of input from graduate students, was able to come close to identifying all of these problems, so certainly the external reviewers' report could not do so.

It was a review that identified problems and made clear judgments and strong recommendations, some of which, we knew in advance, would not be popular with all of the individual faculty members at UCLA.

Two points here:

1. Yes, it did identify problems and it did make clear judgments. But we would ask, is that not what an 8-year review committee is supposed to do? Is that not their job, what they are paid to do? Why does the identification of problems and the issuance of clear judgments qualify this review as "no sweetheart review"? There were very clear problems and these reviewers commented on the small part of these problems which was brought to their attention. In other words, they did what they were supposed to do.

2. The external reviewers take pains to point out that they made "strong recommendations, some of which, we knew in advance, would not be popular with all of the individual faculty members at UCLA." Again, what is the implication of this statement? That this review qualifies as "no sweetheart review" because they made statements which might offend their colleagues and, in the case of Timberlake, former co-workers? Again, is that not their job, to report on their findings *regardless* of whom these results offend? Such statements support the inference that the practice of

external reviewers being brought in at the suggestion of the department being reviewed is just another way to keep the "Old Boys Network" in place: "You don't be too critical of us, and we won't be too critical of you." (We have addressed this issue in more detail in our comments on the external reviewers' original report.)

For this reason, we feel particularly distressed that the language and recommendations of the Draft Report run so thoroughly counter to our perceptions of the program, our perceptions of the sense of the committee during our visit, and our judgment of what is practical and necessary to move this department forward.

As the members of the external review committee--as individuals who were likewise charged with evaluating how well the department fulfills its academic mission, as individuals who observed the same department and heard the same testimony as the internal committee--we would urge you to reconsider the decision to impose harsh sanctions on the department and, instead, to formulate a more measured and more constructive response. These sanctions are unwarranted.

Given the fact that the external reviewers, during their two-day visit, had neither the time to conduct an in-depth review of the department nor the graduate student input needed to conduct such an in-depth review, they are in no position to make the statement that "[t]hese sanctions are unwarranted." Since they do not know the true extent of abuse which has gone on in this department, they also have no way of knowing whether these sanctions are warranted or not. The fact that they are nonetheless willing to go on record saying that the sanctions *are* unwarranted does two things:

1. It undermines their *personal* credibility;

2. It undermines the credibility of the process. For them to present such an easily challenged conclusion to you their colleagues and fellow academics suggests they believe that none of you would ever be discourteous enough to call them on this inconsistency. Again, the picture this presents is one of tenured academics taking care of each other, so confident of the fact that they will protect one another and keep anonymous one another's comments that they are willing to put forth the most frivolous and facetious of arguments.

These sanctions will destroy overnight a department...

If, as a result of this 8-year review and the relatively mild (in our view) sanctions resulting from it, the UCLA Slavic Department ceases to exist as an academic entity, then that would at least be better than the alternative, namely to allow it go on as it had been. It not only did not help its own students, but it actually hurt the field as a whole by taking in students willing to give of their time and effort and then crushing them, so that they were lost not only to UCLA, but to the field itself.

We do not agree, however, that these mild sanctions "will destroy overnight a department". They will and should be reflected in the reputation of the UCLA Slavic Department, but options are available for change. It is our opinion that it is doubtful that the UCLA Slavic Department, given the myopia which has characterized it for years, will avail itself of these options, but failure to do so could be then laid only at the feet of the department itself.

...that has been making extraordinary and earnest efforts to improve its undergraduate curriculum,...

Efforts which, as we have pointed out above, have often been ridiculed loudly by some members of the faculty, especially the problem faculty members, as unworthy of a Slavic department of their academic stature. Some of these same faculty members have even speculated aloud as to how much better a place the UCLA Slavic Department would be were it not forced to have an undergraduate program.

its already effective graduate program,...

How the external reviewers could dare characterize the Slavic Department graduate program as "effective", especially after having read the report of the internal reviewers (and knowing that *you*, the members of the Academic Senate, have also read the report), in our eyes further undermines their credibility and strengthens the feeling that this entire review process is for them nothing more than a means of providing cover for colleagues who find themselves in trouble.

.... and its historically imperfect but improving departmental ethos. What is needed instead is a response that will lead to productive change, in the relevant individuals and in the ethos of the department as a whole, rather than to further factionalism and rancor.

Sincerely,

David M. Bethea, Vilas Research Professor, University of Wisconsin
External Member, 1999-2000 Academic Senate Review of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA
Alan Timberlake, Professor, University of California at Berkeley
External Member, 1999-2000 Academic Senate Review of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UCLA

.....
Date: Thu, 13 Jul 2000 16:01:02 -0800 (PST)
From: MICHAEL HEIM <heim@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU>
Subject: eight-year review follow-up
To: slavic.department.graduate.students@HUMnet.UCLA.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Priority: normal

By now you will have had time to read the Internal and External Departmental Reviews, my "Errors of Fact" statement, and the Internal Review Committee's response to that statement. I am pasting below my point-by-point reaction to the response and sending under separate cover the External Committee's response to the Internal Review. Once you have perused these documents and reviewed the earlier ones, I would like to talk to each of you and hear your suggestions for addressing the Department's problems. I will be out of town from 14 July to 21 July, but will be in town for the rest of the summer. Please drop in or call for an appointment. If you would rather respond with an anonymous letter, please feel free to do so.

Not once, but several times, Michael Heim was asked by the graduate student representative for the Slavic Department not to speak directly with graduate students concerning the content of the eight-year review. The reasons for this we have already discussed above when commenting on the section of the internal reviewers' report dealing with possible retaliation against students who participated in the review. The graduate student representative informed Michael Heim that if he wanted input from graduate students, then she would be happen to take that input from the graduate students and pass it on to him. Twice he rejected this.

Michael Heim has had twenty years here at UCLA to listen to student complaints. Moreover, he often has listened to student complaints, more often than not trying to downplay them or explain them away as "aberrations". The implications of his refusal to agree to the request of the graduate student representative have already been discussed above.

Chair's Response to the Internal Review Team's Response

1. The Chair objects to characterizing student "XX" as having "excellent credentials."

The student in question had excellent credentials on paper, which is why we accepted her; they turned out to be less than excellent in reality. Given that she had to take our third-year undergraduate Russian course (we normally require four years of undergraduate Russian of incoming students) after receiving A's and A+'s in the Riverside third-year Russian course (the Russian placement examination she took upon arriving at UCLA is in her file), I conclude that grade inflation was at work at UCR. I would also point out that her 4.0 GPA at UCLA consists of an A in the undergraduate third-year course she was retaking and two A's in graduate courses from the faculty member with whom she had the conflict.

Truly shocking that Michael Heim, after having been exposed so thoroughly and completely in "Response to Slavic Chair's "Errors of Fact" statement", would, in the UCLA Slavic Department tradition of never blaming itself but instead always seeking to place the blame on the weakest members of the department, continue his attempt to discredit this student. The particulars of the arguments he makes here have already been discussed above, including his violation of the Family Privacy Act of 1974 by sending out the particular's of a former student's transcripts to other students without her consent. Still, we cannot help but respond to his statement that "grade inflation was at work at UCR".

XX had a 3.9 GPA at an institution (UC Riverside) which has plus/minus grading (thus making such a GPA even harder to attain as even an A-minus would lower such a GPA). Achieving a 3.9 GPA says two things:

One, that this individual must have formidable scholarly abilities. She may not be a genius, whatever that term may mean, but clearly she is no idiot.

Two, that this is a person who understands how to interact with faculty, how to avoid getting on their bad side, how to present herself in their presence. This is not to say that such knowledge should come into play when assigning grades, but we all know that in some instances, it does come into play.

Thus, when Michael Heim tries to make the claim that "grade inflation was at work at UCR", the question that immediately comes to our mind is this: was grade inflation at work with *all* of her courses at UCR? Or was it just with regard to her Russian that grade inflation was at work? If the latter was the case, we would like to Michael Heim to share with us how he knows where grade inflation had "stained" XX's transcript and where it had not.

2. The Chair states that XX is the only student that has been lost as a direct result of conflict with a faculty member.

The response "This is not true" is not a rebuttal. Do the internal reviewers mean I have not told the truth or do they merely think I am wrong?

Michael Heim here writes as though these two options were mutually incompatible. Clearly they are not. Michael Heim *is* wrong. Michael Heim *did not* tell the truth. Whether or not the act of delivering such untruthful information

can be characterized as a lie would, we suppose, depend on the semantics of the word "lie". By our reckoning, one lies when one provides untruthful information with intent and knowledge of its untruthfulness. Thus, the question of whether Michael Heim lied to the internal reviewers is a question of intent, a question presumably answerable only by Michael Heim himself.

What is absolutely certain, however, is that Michael Heim provided untruthful information. Of that there is no doubt.

In either case, I must know which student or students they have in mind before I can defend my name or viewpoint. Retaliation here is beside the point because by definition the student/s involved have left the program.

This is nonsense and Michael Heim knows it is nonsense. The power and influence of this department, as has already been discussed above, extends not only throughout this country, but across international borders, even into Russia itself. Faculty members themselves have commented on this influence. Regardless of whether or not a student has left this particular program, if he/she has any hopes of landing a tenure-track job in this field and making a career in Slavic, he/she would be foolish to allow him-/herself to be identified as having taken part in this review process.

3. The Chair repeatedly objects to the failure to identify clearly the specific faculty members and students who are referred to in the report.

Not only do I not "repeatedly object to the failure to identify clearly the specific faculty members and students who are referred to in the report"; I never once do so. I can see how one sentence, taken out of context, might be misconstrued to read as a call for identity. But that sentence - "Who are 'the students' here?" - is the first in a series of four clearly rhetorical questions.

How can we possibly respond to a statement such as this? To try to deny the intent behind a statement such as "'Who are 'the students' here?'" borders on absurdity.

I am not asking which students came forth: I do not need to ask who the offended students are because I know who they are.

This is chilling and, in our view, very much meant to intimidate. What Michael Heim is telling us, the graduate students, is that we might as well go talk to him. "The jig's up: I know who talked and what they talked about. You might as well come clean." It is an indictment of this process that even *after* Michael Heim has made a statement such as this the University Administration still refused to direct him to cease talking to students directly about the 8-year review.

Most if not all of the students in question have come to talk to me, or I have proactively gone and talked to them.

This is incorrect. Most of the students *refuse* to talk to Michael Heim about this.

I also - again proactively - encouraged all students who I knew had had problems to talk to the review committee openly. The report could at least have stated 1) what percentage of the graduate student body as a whole

reported problems and 2) what percentage of those who reported problems were in linguistics as opposed to literature. That would have given a clearer and more balanced picture of the issue.

4. The Chair strenuously objects to the failure of the review team to confront specific faculty members with specific complaints so that they could present their point of view.

I still strenuously object to the failure of the review team to confront specific faculty members with specific complaints, but not only "so that they could present their point of view" but also, as I stated in my letter, so that 1) the team could judge the complexity (and abnormality) of the problem and offer advice on how to deal with it and 2) the faculty members themselves would understand how seriously the team took the problem. Then there is the issue of confidentiality. How can anyone - review team, chair, colleague - deal with the issues without citing specific instances? The reason students called for confidentiality was to prevent retaliation, but retaliation has never occurred...

Retaliation has never occurred? It is just disgraceful for Michael Heim to make a statement such as this. Retaliation and threat thereof are the defining characteristics of this department. It is the primary method of keeping others in line and preventing outsiders from questioning what goes on "in house".

..., and I will be glad to outline the measures the Department has taken to ensure that it not occur.

5. The Chair feels that he was not adequately consulted in the preparation of the internal report.

When I expressed my dissatisfaction at not being adequately consulted, I referred specifically to the period following the site visit. From my single post-site conversation with the chair of the team, I knew that he had talked to one student. He told me that he was checking my version of an incident against hers and that her case was linked to several others, but he did not tell me how. I cannot imagine that any student would fear retaliation from me

We, on the other hand, *can* imagine this. Very easily.

(in fact, on the first day of the site visit the Departmental graduate-student representative asked me to deliver a statement of their grievances to the committee, a statement that was not sealed or even in an envelope), and as chair of the Department I was in a position to give objective information on any number of cases. The students knew I was aware of the problems: in some cases they had come to me; in others, as I have pointed out, I took the initiative and went to them. I expected to hear about specific cases and was not interested in "rehashing generalities." We held an open meeting with the graduate students before preparing our self-review; we also invited - and

received - anonymous statements from them after the meeting. I therefore went into the site visit with my eyes open. I am here quoted as having given the impression that "aside from funding problems there was no student dissatisfaction to speak of." I certainly never felt that that was the case, and I am not aware of having given or wishing to give such an impression.

[So to be clear: Is Michael Heim then denying the truthfulness of that part of the internal reviewers' report which says the following:](#)

When the Chair of the department said that, aside from funding problems, there was no student dissatisfaction to speak of, the chair of the review team asked the question again to be sure he had heard correctly.

[If it is Michael Heim's intention to claim that the internal reviewers are lying about his comments, then he should come out and say so, officially and for the record.](#)

The disaffected students gave their picture of the Department, which I never questioned, but it was not the whole picture. My job as chair was to give a well-rounded picture, which I might add, coincides in both its positive and negative assessments with the external report.

[It surprises us not at all that Michael Heim's "well-rounded picture" coincides with the external report.](#)

6. The Chair claims to have "had no idea" the review team would come to the conclusions it did.

The statement here is unequivocal: I was told three times during the site visit that "suspension of graduate admissions was being considered." I can only say that I was stunned when I read in the report that the Graduate Council had voted to suspend graduate admissions. Had I known of the possibility during the visit, I would have reacted on the spot with the arguments against it I raise in my letter and perhaps a few more:...

[What is Michael Heim saying here? If he, as he writes here, "was told three times during the site visit that 'suspension of graduate admissions was being considered.'", then how could he have been "stunned" when he read that graduate admissions had indeed been suspended?](#)

...the waste of resources, the curtailment of the literature program because of problems in the linguistics program,...

[We have already commented above on the tendency of those enabling members of the literature faculty to highlight the division of the department into literature and linguistics sections rather than to take the hard steps needed to confront those members of the linguistics faculty who regularly abuse students, including literature students.](#)

...the punitive rather than curative nature of the "solution,"...

[Frankly, we don't see these steps in the least as punitive. In our opinion, those who abused students and wrecked lives and careers are getting off very easily, much to the discredit of the University, which, even in the face of](#)

overwhelming evidence of wrong-doing, has yet to launch an official fact-finding investigation into the abuse which has occurred in the Slavic Department.

...its unforeseeable aftermath, etc. As a result, I phoned Professor Timberlake and asked him whether he remembered the suspension issue coming up during the site-visit interviews with me. His response was that he remembered the issue being mentioned only in closed session, that is, when I was not present.

7. Many additional issues regarding procedure and interpretation are raised by the Chair. (Three are listed.)

Let me address each of the three issues separately.

First, the review team objects to my use of the word "aberrations" to refer to "issues of long standing" and "of fundamental importance." By using the word "aberrations," I do not mean or even imply that the issues are not of long standing or of fundamental importance; they are clearly that. What I mean is that they are a "departure from the norm" (the standard definition),...

We can only hope that the events which have taken place within the UCLA Slavic Department are indeed a "departure from the norm" for Slavic departments in general, although the revisionist letter penned by Professors Timberlake and Bethea does give us pause.

...that is, they affect a minority of the students and that learning goes on even among that minority. I do not condone the aberrations; I qualify them in my letter as "regretful," but - as I try to show by citing the rate of success in MA and PhD examinations this year and the number of PhD's granted and teaching positions secured in the past five years - aberrations they are.

We are pleased to know that Michael Heim finds these "aberrations" to be regretful. As to the placement record of the department, that has been discussed in detail above.

Second, the review team demands "immediate and decisive action." Besides the suggestion to consult the Ombuds Office, it has given no advice as to what form that action should take. I have however taken action on my own and in conjunction with various colleagues. Immediate results are easy to demand, but - and here we have no argument with the report - the problem is a recalcitrant one and far from easy to repair, especially in a department as small as ours.

Once again, we ask why there is no evidence of cognitive dissonance on the part of Michael Heim. If indeed this "problem is a recalcitrant one and far from easy to repair", then how can this square with his earlier assessment of the department as one "where office doors are open and graduate students and faculty are constantly discussing scholarly issues, that is, one in which first-rate training is the order of the day."

In larger departments students have many faculty members to choose from and

can move from one to another should problems arise. The linguistics students in our Department work with only three and a half faculty members. I do not intend this as an excuse (the literature students work with only two more and do not experience the linguistics students' problems); I intend it as a partial explanation of why the problem has proved so difficult to solve. Which brings me to the final point.

I resent the review team's insistence that the Department "has had no will to correct" the situation.

We resent Michael Heim for appeasing and enabling, for years and years, those who perpetrated the very worst sort of abuse upon graduate students in the Slavic Department. Perhaps the righteous indignation he shows here originates from the school of thought which states that the best defense is a good offense. We would assert, however, that in the case of Michael Heim, there is no possible defense of his failure to act, and no possible defense for his constant attempts to downplay the abuse within the department.

I say "insistence" because its report made a similar accusation in similar terms. I cannot claim we have been as successful as we might have liked, but we have not ignored the problems by any means. Professor Vroon, who was chair for most of the period under review, tried any number of strategies. I know this from the innumerable conversations we have had on the subject over the years and from the progress, intermittent as it was, that was in fact made.

For the umpteenth time, we ask: Why no cognitive dissonance on Michael Heim's part? If the department is indeed wonderfully nurturing place he claims it to be, then how can it be that the previous chair was involved in "any number of strategies" engendering "innumerable conversations...on the subject over the years [our emphasis]".

Let me conclude by reiterating my strong belief that suspending admissions will harm rather than help the graduate program, that it is a punitive rather curative measure. I plan to go before the Graduate Council at its first fall meeting and demonstrate why the efforts towards a permanent resolution of the problems during the months since the site visit warrant a vote to lift the suspension.

Summary of Main Recommendations:

1. At the very least this department should be placed into receivership. If it seems as though receivership will not suffice to bring about change, some of us would recommend that the University consider the possibility of closing the department. (This is a minority opinion among us.) Under no circumstances should this department be given back the power to govern itself. Michael Heim will soon be coming before you with all sorts of superficial changes (different course requirements, new reading lists, a decision to grant graduate

students open access to the reading room, and no doubt a slew of others). He will present these as evidence that the department has indeed fundamentally changed. We hope we have presented to you here more than enough evidence to know that this is not, and cannot, be so. Until at a very minimum the two problem faculty are removed from the department, fundamental change cannot take place. These faculty members still have the power to threaten students, and can still do harm outside of the UCLA environment.

2. Maintain the ban on incoming graduate students. It would be unconscionable for the University to knowingly allow potential graduate students into a program such as this one.
3. Conduct an *official* inquiry and fact-finding investigation designed to bring to light wrongdoing by the faculty and irregularities in the administration of the program. This investigation should include a complete financial audit of all funding directed towards the department and a comprehensive examination of the manner in which financial aid was dispersed to students. This investigation should also include interviews with all graduate students, especially past graduate students, in an effort to get a complete picture of the actions of the Slavic Department both during and when possible before the review period.
4. Provide an official explanation as to why the University was unable/unwilling to rein in Slavic Department faculty members who insisted on speaking with graduate students about the results of the 8-year review.
5. Take steps to right the wrongs done to UCLA graduate students in the Slavic Department, to make amends for the financial, professional, and academic damage done to graduate students in this program, both past and present. In addition, graduate students who either left the program of their own accord or who were forced out because of the testing procedure in place in the Slavic Department should be given the option (should they still want it) to re-enter the program and finish the degree. We do not imagine that many would want to avail themselves of this option, but as a matter of principle it should nonetheless be offered.
6. The system in place for departmental reviews needs to be completely revised:
 - a. A review once every eight years is not nearly often enough. Reviews should take place at least every three years, if not more often. When reviews are done with so much time in between them, what happens is that many of the students who were hurt/abused (assuming there are any abuse) have already left the program and have no opportunity to tell their story. Those students still remaining are of course reluctant to come forth as openly as they should, since they are completely dependent on the faculty being reviewed. Failure to do this results in what you see today in the Slavic Department. The previous 8-year review in the Slavic Department was worse than having no review

whatsoever, because it barely scratched the surface of all the abuse going on at that time. What this does, then, is provide the department with cover, in that it can claim that, while it might have a few problems now and again (and after all, what program doesn't?) things are by and large all right, and in support of this assertion, they can simply point to the 8-year review.

b. The department being reviewed should not be allowed to suggest a list of possible external reviewers. Before the external reviewers are finally selected, their names should be run past the graduate students of that department to prevent situations which happened with this most recent review when we discovered that Alan Timberlake was going to be on the external review committee.

c. Provisions should be made not only for external *faculty* reviewers, but for external *graduate student* reviewers as well.

d. Both internal and external reviewers should be given the time and administrative support they need to do a through review, including, if necessary, personnel qualified to do financial accounting. As it stands with this most recent review of the Slavic Department, as bad as the results appear to be, there is much more that was never ever touched upon.

7. A system for disciplining and censuring faculty members which does not require graduate students to identify themselves must be implemented by the University, otherwise it will never be possible to punish faculty for wrongdoing. Since graduate students, for obvious reasons, cannot come right out and accuse their own faculty, this will involve markedly increased oversight of the faculty from those above them administratively. If the University comes to the conclusion that it cannot provide such increased oversight authority with an eye towards enabling it to discipline, when needed, faculty members, then the University should be prepared to explain why it is unable to ensure a proper standard of behavior from its faculty and why it is unable to punish its own faculty.

8. Exit interviews should be done for all graduate students. In instances where graduate students have simply stopped attending, UCLA should take the initiative in contacting these graduate students to ascertain why it is they have chosen to leave their program.

9. The University, in future review sessions, should be absolutely clear what it can and cannot do in terms of protecting graduate students and in keeping them from being questioned by their own faculty members as to the content of the departmental review in which the students participated.

10. The University needs to take a long, hard look at what should fall under the rubric of academic freedom and what should not. Anytime anyone ever tries to bring the problem faculty members in the Slavic Department in line (or at least to get them to stay within the

norms of expected behavior), they immediately cry out that their freedom as scholars is being violated and that this is an unspeakable affront not only to them, but to the University as a whole. Academic freedom and academic tenure are hallmarks of the American system of higher education. While we realize that there are pluses and minuses to these two institutions, as is the case with any institution, we in general have no problem with them per se, realizing they are important to the educational and intellectual process. This does not mean, however, that we think they can or should be interpreted as a license to act arbitrarily. When the situation is such that these two concepts are equated with complete freedom from University oversight and authority, at this point we feel that these institutions are being abused, to the detriment both of students and the public at large who support institutions of higher learning.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

IV-C. Letter from the Faculty Head of the Internal Review Team **Encouraging Students to Speak with UCLA Slavic Department** **Chair Michael Heim**

July 18, 2000

Academic Senate Executive Office Los Angeles Division

TO: All Faculty and Students
Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures

FROM: Harold Martinson, Graduate Council, Chair of Review Team

Re: Academic Senate Review of the Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures

In consultation with the Undergraduate and Graduate Council Chairs, I have authorized the distribution of the review report to all faculty and students in the Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures. The typical procedure is that faculty and students review the report in the departmental office, with copies being distributed upon request. This procedure reduces the Senate cost for reproducing the report. However, in light of the significant recommendations in this report, and in response to specific requests to do so, we are providing all faculty and students with copies of the report to facilitate the preparation of thoughtful responses.

Please submit your comments to the Academic Senate Office by October 30, 2000. All such comments will be kept strictly confidential if so requested. Confidential comments will not be duplicated or distributed but may be paraphrased (identity kept confidential) in discussions with the administration. We also encourage you to participate in the departmental discussions of the report so that the chair may prepare the departmental response.

Submit responses to:

Attention: Luisa Crespo

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

IV-D. Initial Report of Graduate Student Representative to Internal Review Committee

Dear Hal,

Below you will see my report on the Slavic Review. Sorry to get it to you after so long. It has been an extremely busy quarter for me and I wasn't aware that drafts of your report were circulating until I received my Graduate Council agenda packet yesterday. While you have obviously already written your report, I thought it would be useful to have mine for your records.

With regards to your report, I strongly agree with your conclusions. I have a few comments, however, that I wanted to offer. I'm not sure as to how the receivership would work if approved. Some consideration should be given, however, as to how to protect students when they are most subject to faculty power abuses: namely in exams, letters of recommendation, job placement assistance etc. Secondly, there needs to be some clearer means of facilitating redress for students who have *already* been the victims of faculty abuse. This would involve the referral of complaints to appropriate Senate disciplinary bodies for further investigation and possible action. It also involves consideration as to what, if anything, can be done to "make whole" those who have been abused. I understand that these are difficult issues and that they may well fall outside of the purview of the review's mandate. But they are issues that the review report could suggest that the "receiver" take on as a means of bringing healing to the department and building student confidence in the new regime. I realize that shutting down admissions and placing the department in receivership are very significant actions. In order for it to work from the perspective of the students, however, there needs to be a strong sense that the changes are not cosmetic and that departmental faculty can really be held accountable for promoting student welfare and actively helping students to progress. Accountability involves both redress of past wrongs and strong safeguards at the points where students are most vulnerable.

Unfortunately, I cannot make tomorrow's meeting as I'll be out of town. Thus, I won't be able to make any of these points in person. But I hope you will consider them as you revise your draft and/or devise a mandate for the "receiver." I will also see if Luisa can distribute copies of this memo so that the issues mentioned above might be considered during the Council's discussion.

I hope that you find this helpful.

Best,
Mark

To:
Harold Martinson
Chair, Slavic Languages and Literatures Review Team

Dear Hal,

From the information I have seen, the graduate program in the Slavic Languages and Literatures Department has significant problems. The comments on the student questionnaires are quite alarming with their accounts of physical and verbal abuse of students by faculty members. From the questionnaires and the accounts of the two students who provided me with extensive written comments, there are huge problems with student morale. The reasons for the morale problem are many. The main reasons appear to be the aforementioned faculty abuse, tolerance of the abuse by other departmental faculty, the lack of a clear and consistent articulation of expectations especially with regard to exams, grossly inadequate coordination between course and exam requirements, hostility toward contemporary theoretical approaches resulting in an almost complete “blackout” of such approaches in courses, exams, etc., the separation of linguistics faculty into rival camps that are extremely hostile to each other and to students working with members of the rival camp, and funding that is inadequate and awarded through a process that is far from transparent. Taken together, these problems present a very disturbing portrait of the department. It is important to consider the cumulative effect of these conditions as they create an atmosphere of disempowerment for graduate students where it is difficult for them to expect that they have any effective recourse if they feel that they are being treated unfairly.

Indeed, it is not difficult to understand that students in such a situation might simply adopt a survival approach of saying nothing and just weathering things as best they can. I mention this because both the written and oral student comments showed an extremely high level of anxiety about the possibility of attribution and faculty retaliation. Exacerbating this anxiety was the information students had gotten from Murphy Hall that the confidentiality of their comments could not be guaranteed. A number of students also expressed concern about whether comments made to the review team might also get back to Slavic faculty. A student suggested to me that many students would not talk to me and purposely avoided the review visit out of fear that departmental faculty might attribute any negative comments about the department to them. The student offered this suggestion as a reason for why I might not hear a lot of information

directly from other students that would echo the comments that student had made. I certainly did not immediately or unthinkingly accept that argument. I obviously realized the problems with automatically interpreting others' silence as tacit agreement. After hearing the same observation from another student, reviewing the survey comments and discussing the issue extensively with the student who originally made the comment, however, I find it very plausible that many other students than approached me directly share the concerns articulated above. Without question, the survey comments echo the concerns about faculty abuse of students that lay at the heart of the more extensive individual critiques I heard.

Having said that, I must note that the students at the large group meeting did not mention any major problems except for funding and the lack of clear guidelines for exams. A number of students said that their concerns were represented in a document that they had circulated to the review committee. Not having received a copy, however, I cannot comment on the document or whether it corroborates or challenges the views mentioned above. In addition, a number of students said that they wanted to reserve their comments for individual meetings they were having with the review committee. Again, I have no idea what the students said in these individual meetings and what light they shed on the issues mentioned above. The number of students requesting individual meetings and their reluctance to speak in front of the whole group seemed atypical of the reviews for which I have served as the student representative.

Although I have listed the main problems above, I would like to offer a few particularly striking examples to illustrate my concerns. It is important, however, to view these as symptoms of the larger underlying problems of a lack of respect for students and a lack of a mechanism for holding faculty accountable; the examples themselves are not the problems and cannot be simply solved by recommending that the faculty no longer abuse students. Some of the most notorious examples include a faculty member requiring a student *on a class handout* to do five times as many presentations as any of the other students in a class and on at least two occasions throwing chairs at students. In terms of exams, students reported facing grossly disparate exams and hearing that some faculty feel capable of determining whether or not they are going to pass or fail a student before she/he has even taken the exam. One student reported being asked questions in an exam that no one in the field had yet been able to solve. In terms of fostering professional development, students reported that they were actually *discouraged* by faculty from publishing or giving conference papers. Students also report that they are strongly discouraged from intellectually engaging with developments in related disciplines. This seems particularly problematic for linguistics students. According to the students I heard from, they are prevented from taking even basic linguistics classes as well as being discouraged from familiarizing themselves with the latest theoretical debates in the field. The result is that many students' initial progress is slowed considerably and that most students are not even sufficiently conversant with contemporary linguistics theory to articulate a position on it. Commenting on the former point, one student described the situation as "trying to do quantum mechanics without ever having

studied calculus.” The opacity of funding procedures is certainly a problem and one not unique to Slavic. Even more troubling however were the reports I heard of a pregnant student being defunded because it was expected that she would take a leave of absence and another female student being told that her funding was not a priority because she was married and it was assumed that her husband could adequately support her. Reflecting the other side of this sexist coin, I was told that a male student about to have a child was informed that his funding would be increased so as to help him meet his new financial obligations.

While a certain amount of attrition is inevitable in every graduate program, I heard from students that attrition in Slavic seemed to them to be particularly high. I have neither the time nor the resources to investigate this thoroughly and see how Slavic’s attrition rate compares to the rest of the university and to other Humanities departments. That needs to be examined. I strongly recommend an analysis of Slavic’s attrition rate and placement rate in comparison to the rest of UCLA, to other Humanities departments and the Slavic departments at other universities. Also, as students reported seeing their colleagues leaving the department because of faculty harassment, I recommend an analysis of exit interviews of students who have left Slavic before completing their doctorate. Even more important, however, is the issue of interviewing these former students now. While this is unorthodox and is obviously not going to yield a particularly happy assessment of the department, it has to be looked into. If students are feeling hounded out of the department, the review team needs to know that and address it.

I am under no illusion that my information gathering has been as exhaustive or comprehensive as is necessary to justify the radical reform of the department that my preliminary information suggests is necessary. I am confident, however, that the information gleaned from students is more than sufficient to justify a much more far-reaching investigation of the department than is typical of most 8-year reviews. This would include an audit of the handling of graduate student support funds. Clearly, there are deeply engrained problems in the Slavic department that cannot be solved simply through the recommendations typical of 8-year reviews. In addition to significant curricular reform regarding exam preparation, the department needs ongoing oversight over the faculty and strong student protections. The current Slavic faculty has shown itself to be incapable of providing even the most basic elements of a supportive and collegial environment and of disciplining faculty members who abuse students. The review team should thus consider referring student complaints to appropriate Senate disciplinary committees for further investigation.

Given this situation, it is not an overstatement to suggest that the credibility of the Academic Senate and the UCLA administrative structure is at stake with this review. If the Senate and the administration are serious about protecting and advancing student welfare and maintaining the intellectual credibility of the program, neither can allow the situation to continue as it is. While

concerns about collegiality and faculty members' academic freedom certainly need to be considered in this process, the welfare and academic freedom of the graduate students in the program are obviously no less important. Indeed, one might say that the Senate has an even greater duty to protect the welfare and academic freedom of the students because students are in a particularly vulnerable position and the Senate review process claims the moral and intellectual authority of an unbiased and thorough evaluation of academic programs. This situation may raise some thorny questions about accountability in the university. If the only way to hold faculty members accountable in such circumstances is to have students file formal charges, the university and the Senate are not adequately discharging their responsibility to the students. In addition, the university and the Senate are missing an opportunity to resolve problems more expeditiously and perhaps with less legal liability.

As I understand the review process, it is designed to unearth problems and provide constructive criticism to departments and programs. It also serves as a means of providing outside perspective and assistance for any whom might feel the internal power structure of a department or program prevents them from getting fair treatment. As such, the review process serves a crucial role in maintaining the credibility of programs and the university as a whole. This review of Slavic Languages and Literatures clearly reveals significant problems. Further investigation is needed to determine the full extent of the problems and the appropriate solutions. In this regard, the situation in this department may not be entirely amenable to the normal review process. If more resources, time, and different procedures need to be drawn upon to fully appreciate the situation and the possible methods of resolution, however, the Senate must work vigorously to ensure that happens. Such investigation and ameliorative action needs to occur as quickly as possible.

Please do not hesitate to call upon me if I can be of any further assistance in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

Mark Quigley
Graduate Student Representative

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)

www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

IV-E. E-Mail Communications from Internal Committee's Graduate Student Representative

1a. E-Mail to the Dean of the Humanities

-----Original Message-----

From: quigley@ucla.edu [mailto:quigley@ucla.edu]
Sent: Saturday, June 24, 2000 2:52 PM
To: pauliney@college.ucla.edu
Subject: FW: Urgent action needed in Slavic

Dean Yu,

My name is Mark Quigley. I'm a doctoral student in English, have been on the Graduate Council for the past two years and served as the graduate student representative to the 8 year review of the Slavic Languages and Literatures Department. I am forwarding a message I just sent to Harold Martinson and Duncan Lindsey about my concerns with the appearance of faculty intimidation of students in Slavic. I am taking the liberty of forwarding my concerns directly to you because I think immediate action is necessary. Since it is summer, I know people are not always around all of the time. Thus, I didn't want to risk your not hearing about this for a while. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Mark Quigley

1b. E-Mail Response from the Dean of the Humanities

Dear Mark Quigley,

Thank you very much for your message. I understand your concern, and I think your suggestion of having the review sent to all students is a reasonable one. However, while I can easily imagine intimidating conversations on the part of some of the faculty in the department, I'm not sure

whether we ought to preclude the chair's solicitation of student response to the review. Since he has been asked to respond to the review, and since he (rightly, in my view) wants to include student views in that response, it's not clear to me how he can avoid talking to them. Do you have any suggestions for how he (as opposed to other faculty) could otherwise proceed? I don't mean this as a rhetorical question, by the way. Needless to say, I am perturbed by the reports you are receiving. Best, Pauline Yu.

2. E-Mail to the Head of the Internal Review Committee and to the Head of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate

---Original Message----

Hal and Duncan,

I am writing to you to request your urgent attention to the situation in the Slavic Department. Some faculty have apparently been asking students what they know about the review report and wanting to talk to students about it. Some students feel understandably uncomfortable with this. While some faculty may only have the best intentions with this and are hoping to have the students help them make sense of the report, it is not difficult to see how this could be intimidating to students, whether or not faculty intend it that way. It is also not difficult to imagine that faculty may intentionally be using such discussions to try to determine what students were involved with the review process and/or to intimidate students into silence. Well-intentioned or not, however, it cannot be allowed to continue. From my experience in the labor movement, I can tell you that such discussions and "captive audience" meetings are a common tactic for intimidating subordinates when an outside authority is asserting itself to investigate labor abuses or certify the formation of a union. In order to avoid the possibility of people feeling intimidated in such situations, much of that activity is actually illegal under labor law. As you may know from UCLA, for example, it is illegal for faculty or administrators to inquire of Academic Student Employees whether or not they are a union member or whether or not they intend to participate in a strike or labor action. The purpose is to protect the employee from feeling intimidated or being subject to the coercion of their supervisor. I think it is fairly clear why this is necessary and how subtly threats or coercion can be communicated, perhaps even unintentionally. Adherence to this rule thus also protects supervisors/faculty from being subject to claims of intimidation later.

The same logic pertains to the situation in Slavic. Given the situation and the level of student anxiety, it takes very, very little for students to feel intimidated by faculty. Thus, for the benefit of both faculty and students, it is imperative that you and/or Dean Yu immediately send a letter and/or e-mail to the Slavic faculty members ("active" and emeriti) instructing them not to discuss the review with students, ask students to send letters to the Senate or the Dean commenting on

the review, or ask students what they know about the review or people's participation in it. Such questions or requests carry a strong risk of appearing coercive or intimidating and are not the way to begin reforming the department or building student confidence.

Time is of the essence on this as the review is starting to filter out more to the faculty and they are likely to begin trying to talk to students in the near future if they are going to do so at all. Thus, any damage in terms of intimidation or discovery of student participation in the review process could happen soon and should be pre-empted if at all possible. Once such damage starts, it will likely have a snow-balling effect and student confidence in the new regime could be lost forever. Even more troubling is the possibility that faculty members could quickly determine who potential "whistle-blowers" are and such students' academic futures could be significantly compromised. Thus, this letter really needs to go out as soon as possible, perhaps even this weekend or Monday.

Let me make it clear that I am not suggesting that any charges be pursued against faculty at the moment. I am requesting that all current and emeriti faculty be instructed to not talk to their students in any way about the review so as to reduce the likelihood of feelings and/or charges of intimidation. If such instruction is given and such intimidation does occur, faculty members should be warned that they will not be able to say that they didn't realize that things could be interpreted in that way. It reduces the liability of faculty and of the university on this score and makes it more likely that the department can begin a real healing process.

I can easily imagine that a caring faculty member may genuinely want student input and not even think they could be intimidating. Thus, it should be made clear that nobody is being accused of anything in such an instruction and it is not only "malicious" discussion that is being prohibited. Rather, in order to promote a sense of confidence and safety for the students and avoid even the appearance of faculty coercion or intimidation, all faculty members are instructed not to talk about the review or the receivership with students.

In addition, in order to promote student confidence in the process, I think it's important to provide a copy of that letter and the review report to all students in the department. I have heard of some students having difficulty getting copies or feeling anxious about being marked as a malcontent if they request one. Thus, given the extraordinary situation of the receivership, I think the report and the faculty letter I'm requesting should be sent to the home of all the students in the department. That would send a strong message from the Senate that they want students to feel included in the process and will remove any possible stigma from those who have read the report.

I will send a copy of this e-mail to Dean Yu and Luisa Crespo.

I hope that you share my concern on this matter and will take swift action. I realize that we are now in the midst of summer and you may be travelling or trying to devote more attention to your research. Thus, I am sorry to bother you with such a request for your immediate attention. However, I fear any delay on this matter could have disastrous effects.

Please let me know how you intend to proceed. You can e-mail me at the above address or call me at (310) [PHONE NUMBER REMOVED].

Thanks very much,

Mark

3. Second E-Mail to the Dean of the Humanities

From: quigley@ucla.edu
To: pauliney@college.ucla.edu
Cc: hgm@chem.ucla.edu, dlindsey@ucla.edu
Subject: RE: Urgent action needed in Slavic
Sent: Sun, 25 Jun 2000 12:34:45 -0800

Dear Dean Yu,

I greatly appreciate your prompt reply and your concern about the situation. I'm glad that you can understand how such conversations could be intimidating. I also understand why solicitation of student views would be helpful in compiling a response to the review. I think it would be most effective, however, if such responses were gathered by someone other than a member of the Slavic faculty.

With his "Factual Errors Response," the chair has already demonstrated a serious inability to fully appreciate the magnitude of the problem for students in the department. I think that Harold Martinson's official response to that document underscores this. This is not to suggest that the departmental chair has some sort of nefarious purpose in mind with his plan of interviewing students. But he is obviously implicated in the problems cited by the review as a member of the Slavic faculty who failed to act and even more so as the departmental chair who allowed such problems to continue "on his watch." Thus, it does not make sense to expect him to be able to compile an accurate student response to the report. What student is going to want to have to go meet the departmental chair to confirm the fact that he has failed as the departmental leader and allowed gross abuses to go on, especially if that means contradicting what he has recently written in his "Factual Errors" document? In addition to anxieties about criticizing one's departmental

chair to his face, there is obviously the additional anxiety that the chair is a colleague of those who are most actively abusive and thus could carry tales back to those faculty members, whether maliciously or in a genuine attempt to resolve the situation. Again, his "Factual Errors" statement states that he thinks real improvements are being made with the problem faculty in the department. Harold Martinson's response notes the inadequacy of that "solution" and rightly suggests that such a claim shows the chair's failure to fully appreciate the gravity and scope of the problem for students. If the current departmental leadership structure were capable of handling this problem, things would not have degenerated to this point and the Graduate Council would not be recommending receivership.

So, given that there are real problems with having the chair seek such student input, I would suggest some possible alternatives: the graduate student representative in Slavic, Harold Martinson, Duncan Lindsey, the potential "receiver," yourself, or some designee of yours. The chair could still prepare a response from the faculty perspective and the student response could be submitted separately. I would imagine such a student response would reflect some diversity of opinion. But there could be at least some measure of confidence that the response was not tainted by coercion. It seems naive to think that a student response prepared by the chair could claim the same even if the chair did not consciously intend to coerce anyone. In fact, I think it may appear that the university administration and/or the Senate is not serious about reform in Slavic if they are putting the students in the position of having to confront the people they have said have been abusive or have allowed such abuse to continue. If some students think things are wonderful in the department and the review is egregiously wrong, they can still report that to a third party. Thus, I can see no real benefit in having the chair soliciting response from students.

I talked to Harold Martinson this morning about this matter. He was reluctant to take the action I suggested unless he heard directly from more students who were concerned about faculty questioning. Harold and I have both talked to one student who has told us about the concerns of some of his peers. Harold did not want to rely heavily on such secondhand accounts even though we both agree that the student in question is very credible. While I think Harold has done an outstanding job as chair of the review and is obviously deeply concerned about student welfare in Slavic, I think more decisive action is needed now to protect students and maintain their confidence in the process. I am confident that the student concern is real. To delay action seems to be courting disaster.

Since talking with Harold, I have heard of another student who can speak directly to feeling intimidated by faculty questioning and is willing to speak to Harold or you about this. I am also working on trying to get a third student who had a bad encounter last week with a faculty member about the review to speak directly to Harold or you. This third student is apparently reluctant to speak as he or she is concerned about triggering an investigation and/or charge against that particular faculty member. The concern is that if there were any investigation of or admonition to

the faculty member in question, he or she would immediately know who had complained. I have contact information for the initial student who contacted me and the other student who is willing to talk about feeling intimidated. I have been asked, however, not to disclose this via e-mail because of concerns about security and e-mail's longevity, etc. I am happy to provide that information to you via phone, however, if you would like it. I have also left the contact information for the second student on Harold Martinson's answering machine at home. I also understand that the department's graduate student representative has heard additional reports of student concerns about intimidation and has sent an e-mail to the departmental chair asking for him and other departmental faculty to refrain from discussing the report with students. A copy of this e-mail was also forwarded to Harold yesterday. I do not think he has had the opportunity to read it, however, as he mentioned that his e-mail at home is currently down.

I understand Harold's caution and his need to maintain his neutrality as chair of the review. Hopefully, he may be more willing to support action along the lines I suggested yesterday if he talks with the "second" student mentioned above and to the departmental graduate student representative. In any case, I still believe that current and emeriti Slavic faculty need to be instructed before the new week begins not to discuss the review with students so as to avoid making students uncomfortable or even giving the appearance of trying to coerce them. Obviously, this is a highly irregular thing to do but it is a highly irregular situation.

Please feel free to contact me via e-mail or phone (310) [PHONE NUMBER DELETED] if you would like to discuss this further or would like contact information for the students mentioned above.

Thank you again for your concern.

Best,

Mark Quigley

4. E-Mail to the Dean of the Humanities, Head of Internal Committee, and Chair of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate

From: quigley@ucla.edu

To: pauliney@college.ucla.edu, hgm@chem.ucla.edu, dlindsey@ucla.edu

Cc: mgray@humnet.ucla.edu

Subject: Slavic

Sent: Tue, 27 Jun 2000 13:17:28 -0800

Dear Dean Yu, Harold and Duncan,

I appreciate your responsiveness regarding the issue of Slavic faculty discussing the review with students. It's certainly helpful.

I feel obliged, however, to suggest you think further about the departmental chair's discussion of the review with students. Let me first say that I deeply respect your commitment to protecting student welfare in the department. I hope you realize that is my motivation too. We all have things we'd much prefer to be doing rather than spending time on this. But it is out of my belief that we all share a genuine concern for the students in Slavic that I am bothering to pursue the point further with you.

As the departmental chair is clearly implicated in the problems identified in the review, how can any student who is sympathetic to the review's conclusions feel comfortable talking with the chair about it? There may well be students who share the chair's frustration with the review's conclusion. They should certainly express that view. But to have the chair meeting with students and determining who does and who doesn't agree with the review obviously puts those who do agree in a very difficult position and helps narrow down the possibilities of who may have cooperated with the review. Certainly, students who support the review's conclusions but feel uncomfortable can lie to the chair and assure him that they have no problems with the department. But they should not be put in the position of having to do that, of being intimidated into compromising their integrity. It also becomes a bigger problem if the chair then calls upon the students to write letters to the Senate or the Dean repudiating the review's conclusions (and potentially even what they themselves told the review). I would think we would all agree that would be coercive and unacceptable. Such coercion would still be a problem even if the chair was unaware that students were expressing any views that they did not sincerely hold.

This obviously points to the necessity of having outside reviewers in the first place. One of the main reasons why a departmental self-review is not considered adequate in and of itself is because there is too much danger of coercion/fear inhibiting the healthy airing of problems. That certainly turned out to be the case in Slavic. To now put the departmental chair in charge of another round of reviewing after such negative conclusions have been reached by the Senate review team is to substantially raise the likelihood of coercion and to put at great risk many of those who cooperated with the Review team.

Those students who do not wish to talk to the departmental chair can, I suppose, refuse to meet with him. But such a refusal obviously puts them under a cloud of suspicion. We are aware of at least two senior graduate students who are uncomfortable with the chair approaching students about the review, one of them the department's graduate student representative who referred to the chair "cornering" students. I think that should be sufficient along with the general

context of fear in the department cited above to ask the chair to refrain from approaching students. Are we to wait for a particular number of students to object before action can be taken? What is the appropriate threshold? Are we to wait for definite damage to be done as it was last week?

I appreciate that the review process and the administration have welcomed student input and participation in deciding how best to proceed. I have communicated my enthusiasm for this to the students in Slavic. I am finding it increasingly difficult, however, to continue doing so. I am beginning even to question whether I was right to encourage students to participate in the review at all. If the departmental chair begins meeting with students one-by-one with the blessing of the Senate and the administration, both will have failed in their duty to protect the students who cooperated with the review. That would be simply shameful.

I am confident that none of us wants that to happen. Thus, I think that the departmental chair should at least be instructed not to approach students on his own initiative to discuss the review. Rather, he can put out word through the various communication channels in the department that he is eager to talk to students about the review and ask them to contact him. This approach still leaves a danger of students being labelled "cooperative" or "non-cooperative" by the chair. That is why I still prefer having a third party collect student reaction, an option with no significant down-sides. But asking the chair to refrain from directly approaching students is certainly much better than giving him free rein to investigate.

It would be nice if the chair would show his sensitivity to student concerns by heeding the graduate representative's request that he not approach students about the review. But given his consistent refusal to acknowledge the extent of the problem in the department and the pressure that is likely to build upon him from his colleagues, it seems unwise, to say the least, to rely upon him honoring the graduate representative's request.

I appreciate your willingness to consider my ideas on this matter. I trust you realize that I would not to continue to press the issue if I did not think it was of great importance. I feel that the very credibility of our assurances to students that they would be protected is at stake here.

Please let me know your thoughts at your earliest convenience.

Best,

Mark Quigley

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

IV-F. Graduate Student Member of the Internal Committee to an Administrative Official Concerning the Distribution of the Eight-Year Review to Graduate Students

Sent: Sun, 16 Jul 2000 10:17:49 -0800

Luisa,

I'm writing to see how we might be able to distribute the Slavic review report (including the various responses from the department and responses to responses, etc.) to all of the students in Slavic. While I have made this recommendation before to Harold, Duncan, and Dean Yu, it seems even more necessary now.

Obviously, this situation is quite different from most reviews and the comments from students on the review are more important and more likely to come than with most reviews. In order for students to know what's going on and to feel confidence that they are being included in the process, they should be directly informed. The need for distributing copies to each graduate student is even greater now given that the departmental chair has been e-mailing selected materials that support his position to graduate students and then asking for their response. Clearly, they need to have a full picture of things before they can really respond.

In addition, the departmental copy of the review has apparently been in the hands of a faculty member for a number of days and is thus not readily available. In any case, there is some understandable nervousness about having to ask for the copy in the first place so as not to appear overly interested in it. I realize that students can contact you or Harold directly to get copies. But if people are unfamiliar with the process or with either of you, they are less likely to do so. I think that the Senate should be facilitating the flow of information on this issue that greatly affects students rather than putting the onus on them.

E-mail seems somewhat impractical given the size of the documents involved. Thus, I think it would be best to mail copies of the report directly to students' home addresses. But perhaps there is another distribution alternative. In any case, I would hope that distribution could occur relatively soon as discussions are continuing in the department.

As soon as you get a chance, please let me know how we might proceed on this.

I hope you're having a good summer.

Best,

Mark

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | Section
4g | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

IV-G. RESPONSE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES TO THE EIGHT-YEAR REVIEW

We are gratified by the praise for the Department's stature and the accomplishments of both the graduate and undergraduate programs, but we have also taken the harsh criticisms to heart. In a series of four faculty meetings in late September and early October and a number of less formal gatherings of the Department's literature and linguistics caucuses we passed approximately twenty motions designed to address each of the recommendations made by the internal review team and the external review team and to redress the offenses they set forth. To a large extent the motions arose from a careful perusal of all materials relevant to the report. These include the questionnaire distributed by the Department to graduate students in the spring of 1999 in connection with the preparation of the departmental self-review, notes on the discussion at the meeting, the students' written responses following the meeting, the self-review, the external report, the draft of internal report, the Chair's response to the draft, the report itself, the response of the internal committee chair to the Chair's response, the response of the external committee to the report of the internal committee, and student comments solicited by the graduate student representative Marilyn Gray, who also took active part in the faculty meetings. Equally important, however, were the suggestions for dealing with the issues garnered by the Chair during the summer from one-on-one meetings with faculty members and a number of students and with Interim University Ombudsperson Nancy Barbee, Dean of Humanities Pauline Yu, Dean of the Graduate Division Claudia Mitchell-Kernan, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration Allen Solomon.

Let us begin by treating the issue the internal report revolves around, that is, what it terms the unhealthy environment among the graduate students and its relation to faculty conduct. Although we understand that an unhealthy environment cannot be legislated out of existence, we feel we have taken the necessary decisive actions to restore that environment to health. First and foremost, we have undertaken to provide graduate students with a handbook that will go a long way to lifting what they have perceived as the veil of secrecy surrounding a number of departmental procedures. It will contain detailed explanations of all current policies, including the ones recently passed in connection with the review. Of the new policies the one most directly relevant to the issue of faculty conduct is the establishment of a formal grievance procedure in

cases involving a potential violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct. Given its central importance let us cite it in toto: Students believing they have a grievance involving a faculty member are advised to attempt to resolve the matter with the faculty member in question. If the grievance remains unresolved or if students feel hesitant about approaching the faculty member, they may bring the matter to the attention of the chair and request the chair's mediation. At any point students may avail themselves of the campus Ombuds Office. Other courts of resort include the Graduate Division and the Office of the Dean of the Humanities. In cases of grievances involving a potential violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct (see UCLA Faculty Handbook [www.apo.ucla.edu/lapoweb/facultyhandbook19.htm#49c]) students may consult with a member of the Academic Senate Grievance and Discipline Procedures Committee (3125 Murphy Hall, 310-825.3891) for help in deciding on an appropriate course of action. For further details see UCLA General Catalogue, Appendix A, Charges of Violation. We are also undertaking a number of initiatives to foster student-faculty collegiality: a) introduction of a new system of advising that allows students to choose a mentor/adviser after the first year, b) establishment of a pro-seminar team-taught by faculty members, c) stipulation of norms for dissertation feed-back, d) modification and clarification of norms for MA and PhD examinations, and e) development of informal faculty-student seminars.

Now let us go through the recommendations made by the review committees point by point. The first three recommendations of the internal committee concern future FTE's: 1) to "raise the current search for a nineteenth century [literature] specialist to open rank", 2) to "seek a joint appointment to fill the twentieth-century position," and 3) to "seek a joint appointment to provide a permanent South Slavist." We have obtained permission from the Dean for 1) and are actively lobbying for 2) and 3). In response to 4) - engaging the linguistics faculty in undergraduate teaching - we have established a requirement for all faculty members to teach at least one undergraduate course a year and have come up with several new possibilities for undergraduate linguistics courses

(one of which, Russian 40M [Language and Gender] is scheduled for the spring). We have gone beyond the recommendation in 5) - to increase admissions selectivity so as to reduce attrition - by agreeing not only to restrict admission to a group of two to four exceptional students but also to follow the lead of many UCLA departments and offer those students four-year packages. We have also gone beyond the recommendation in 6) - to make the criteria for funding decisions available to students in writing (which we have to in fact done for years) and made the support process more "student-friendly" by a) soliciting a yearly self-assessment of progress and information on circumstances adversely affecting progress, and b) making public each spring the kinds and amount of student funding the Department has for distribution and each fall the number of students supported from each category. The latter also addresses the final recommendation, 7), namely, to lift the veil of secrecy, which, as we have mentioned above, is also the goal of the student handbook. The specific issue named in 7) - admitting the MSO to faculty meetings - has

been acted upon: the MSO (as well as the Student Affairs Officer) attended the faculty meetings referred to above and will continue to attend them.

Since some of the recommendations of the external committee (1, 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12) coincide with those of the internal committee, we will treat only the ones that differ. We have again gone beyond the recommendation in 2) - to continue seeking ways to appeal to a campus-wide audience - by offering yet another writing-intensive literature course this quarter (Russian 25W [The Russian Novel]), a new upper-division literature course in the winter (Russian 126 [Russian Drama]), a new lower-division writing course (Slavic 90), a new lower-division linguistics course (the Russian 40M course alluded to above, which is a General Education course crosslisted with East Asian Languages and Cultures and Communication Studies) in the spring, and by proposing a freshman honors seminar. The issue in 3) - a section of First-Year Russian with twenty-six students - has not recurred. We have gone beyond the suggestions in 5) - to investigate ESL and foreign language departments as sources for TAs: we are investigating Writing Programs and Comparative Literature as well and have made the search for extramural funding a priority issue. As requested by 6), literature students now have an updated MA and PhD reading list; linguistics students have an updated MA reading list, and PhD lists will be compiled for each student on an individual basis. As requested by 7), we have regularized the format and content for MA and PhD examinations, the MA examination testing a broad, comprehensive knowledge of the field, the PhD examination testing a number of specific topics in depth and including a dissertation proposal. Reaction to 8) - methods for streamlining the program and reducing the time-to-degree - was varied: the overwhelming majority of students and faculty opposed the elimination of the MA examination, and we therefore retained it. There was more controversy about whether the currently required reading knowledge of French and German should be changed to French or German, but in the end we decided to retain both and test only one, while requiring the use of both in doctoral-level classes and examinations and in the dissertation. We have instituted the suggested sub-specialty at the PhD level, but made it optional so as not to encumber students who feel it would impede their progress. We have not converted the "second Slavic language" requirements to electives (conceivably as a PhD sub-specialty option) even though, as the external committee pointed out, it might reduce the time-to-degree, because the overwhelming majority of students and faculty opposed the measure as incommensurate with the Department's profile and commitment to excellence. Finally, we have implemented the suggestion of abolishing the qualifying paper and made a dissertation proposal an integral part of the doctoral examinations.

We believe we have acted forcefully and in good faith to resolve the central but intangible concern voiced by the internal report, that of the unhealthy environment. (At the student-faculty welcome meeting this fall the Chair said, "The internal report speaks of kinds of behavior that are damaging not only to the learning environment but also to one's sense of self and mutual respect. I want to assure you that as chair I will exercise the full power of my office to discourage them

and ensure that anyone who engages in them will be held accountable."); we also believe we have addressed every other concern raised in both reports, all of which are more tangible and more readily repairable by repairing rules, regulations, and policy. We therefore request that the Graduate Council reinstate the Department's right to admit graduate students into its program, effective immediately. It may seem questionable whether changes made over the eight months that have passed since the site visit can resolve problems that developed over a period of eight years. Should the Graduate Council have any doubts about the current ability of the Department to create an atmosphere productive of intellectual stimulation and growth, we invite you to ask the opinions of our students, including those interviewed during and after the site visit. We request that you do so by your meeting of 17 November, however, because we still hope to attract a cohort of fine new students for the coming academic year and thus continue our mission without a wrenching and potentially harmful hiatus. Our field is small and tightly knit; word travels fast. Normalizing the situation is particularly important at a time when Dean Yu. has authorized us to make an open-rank search for the first new ladder faculty member in literature in nearly a decade: a program in abeyance will hardly attract stellar applicants.

Please let the Chair know if you have any questions. He will be happy to answer them in writing prior to the meeting or in person at the meeting.

18 October 2000

Motions Passed

1. The Department shall issue a Graduate Student Handbook reflecting present and/or revised policies.
2. First year students shall receive advising from a troika consisting of the Student Affairs Office (SAO), the Russian language coordinator, and the chair. The SAO apprises students of general requirements, funding possibilities, etc.; the Russian language coordinator assesses students' proficiency in Russian; the chair reviews students' undergraduate records for strength and deficiencies (French, German, background in general linguistics and literary theory). From the second year on, students choose their own adviser. Should they desire, they may change advisers in the fall of any year. Students must apprise the SAO of the adviser selected.
3. Students believing they have a grievance involving a faculty member are advised to attempt to resolve the matter with the faculty member in question. If the grievance remains unresolved or if students feel hesitant about confronting the faculty member, they may bring the matter to the attention of the chair and request the chair's mediation. At any point, however, students may avail themselves of the campus Ombuds Office. Other courts of resort include the Graduate Division and the Office of the Dean of Humanities. In cases of grievances involving a potential violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct (see UCLA Faculty Handbook [www.apo.ucla.edu/apoweb/]

[facultyhandbook/9.htin#9c](#)]) students may consult with a member of the Academic Senate Grievance and Discipline Procedures Committee (3125 Murphy Hall, 310-825-3891) for help in deciding on an appropriate course of action. For further details see UCLA General Catalogue, Appendix A, Charges of Violation.

4. It is department policy to offer admitted students four-year packages contingent upon timely progress. Support will be equivalent in monetary terms to a 50% TAship on the assistant level. The package may consist of fellowships, grants, unrestricted aid, research assistantships, teaching assistantships, or any combination of the above. Most favorable consideration for further funding shall be given to students who maintain normative progress beyond advancement to candidacy.
5. MA reading lists in literature and linguistics shall be provided each academic year to all entering graduate students and be reviewed in a timely manner.
6. 25% TAships for scheduled language courses shall be used only in case of emergency funding needs.
7. Every faculty member shall teach at least one undergraduate course a year.
8. A pro-seminar shall be reinstated as required course for all first-year students.
9. The MSO of the Kinsey Humanities Group shall be present at faculty meetings.
10. Every graduate student and faculty member shall receive keys to the Slavic Reading Room.
11. Students may expect timely responses to the dissertation or individual chapters from their committees, that is, generally within one month of submission.
12. Non-native progress towards advanced degrees shall be defined as follows: six academic quarters from the onset of graduate study to the awarding of the MA degree; six academic quarters from the awarding of the MA degree to advancement to candidacy; six academic quarters from advancement to candidacy to the completion of the dissertation.
13. Each spring the Support Coordinators shall calculate and make public to faculty and students the kinds and amounts of student funding it has or recommends for distribution, and each fall the Support Coordinators shall calculate and make public the number of students supported from each category.
14. Students shall submit a Self Evaluation to the support coordinators by 15 March including 1) a list of all courses taken in graduate school together with the grades received, 2) self-assessment of progress to date and information on circumstances affecting progress, 3) talks given, papers published, etc., 4) prospects for coming year(s).
15. The Department shall appoint two faculty members, one in linguistics and one in literature, as recruitment officers.

Changes in the Graduate Program

1. The Department shall institute an optional sub-specialty at the PhD level consisting of at least four courses selected by the student and approved by the graduate adviser. The courses will come from graduate offerings in one or more UCLA departments or programs (Anthropology, Applied Linguistics, Art History, Classics, Comparative Literature, English, Film, Folklore and

Mythology, French, Germanic, History, Indo-European Studies, language and literature departments [French, Germanic, etc.], Linguistics, Music, Philosophy, Psychology, Theater, Women's Studies) and including courses from within the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures (students in linguistics choosing from courses in literature and students in literature choosing from courses in linguistics).

2. A pro-seminar, consisting of 2-4 units, shall be reinstated as a required course for the MA.

3. Proficiency in either French or German shall be required for the MA. Proficiency must be demonstrated by passing a departmental translation examination. Although the examination may be deferred until after the MA examinations, the degree will not be awarded until it has been passed. Students are therefore urged to demonstrate proficiency as soon as possible after matriculation.

4. Students shall be given written notice of the results of the MA and PhD examination one hour after the conclusion of the oral portion of the examination and a written evaluation of their performance within one week.

5. Students may request MA or PhD examinations at the beginning of the academic year as well as at the end of each academic quarter.

6. The qualifying paper shall be abolished.

7. Proficiency in both French and German shall be required for the PhD. Proficiency in one of the languages will have been formally tested prior to the awarding of the MA. Proficiency in the second is to be demonstrated by the inclusion of texts in that language on the bibliographies prepared for the PhD examinations and the demonstration of familiarity with said texts in the written and/or oral portions of the PhD examinations.

Changes in the Linguistics Program

1. The catalogue text describing the PhD requirements in Slavic linguistics shall be modified as follows: Students in linguistics take two three-hour written examinations. In the first of these **THE STUDENT IS EXAMINED IN THE GENERAL AREA OF THE PROPOSED DISSERTATION RESEARCH**, in the other, in comparative Slavic linguistics, the history of Russian and the history and structure of a second Slavic language.

Changes in the Literature Program

1. Russian 215 (Contemporary Russian Literature) shall be renumbered Russian 213B and made an MA requirement.
2. The MA written examination shall consist of three 2-hour examinations, spaced one day apart over the course of a week, the first devoted to medieval and eighteenth-century Russian literature, the second to nineteenth-century Russian literature, and the third to twentieth-century Russian literature.
3. The MA oral examination shall be open to observation by faculty members other than those constituting the examination committee should the examinee so desire.
4. Russian 220A (Structure of Modern Russian: Phonology and Morphology) and Russian 204 (Introduction to the History of Modern Russian) and Russian 219 (Movements and Genres in Russian Literature) shall be eliminated as MA requirements for students specializing in Russian literature; Russian 220A and Russian 204 shall be added to the PhD requirements.
5. The number of seminars required for the PhD shall be reduced from 4 to 3.
6. The PhD written examination shall consist of seven one-hour examinations, spaced over the course of two weeks, devoted to topics distributed as follows:
 - a. the medieval period
 - b. the eighteenth century
 - c. the nineteenth century
 - d. the twentieth century
 - e. literary theory
 - f. a second Slavic literature
 - g. the provisional dissertation topicThe specific topics and the accompanying bibliographies shall be developed by the student in consultation with and the approval of the members of the examination committee.
7. A course will be developed in which students at the dissertation stage are required to give regular reports on the progress of their research. The course may be conflated with regular meetings of the literary faculty devoted to the discussion of ongoing faculty research.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)

www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

IV-H. UCLA Slavic Department Graduate Student Handbook

UCLA Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures

Graduate Student Handbook

The Graduate Student Handbook is designed to bring together in one document the most critical information that students need as they pursue graduate studies in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. In addition to reviewing Department academic programs, policies and procedures, it culls critical information from a wide variety of sources published by the Graduate Division and other University agencies, whose formulations are legally binding.

The Handbook is a dynamic document, one that will be reviewed and revised as necessary from year to year. Comments about the contents and suggestions for emendations are welcome and should be addressed to the Department Chair.

Academic Year 2001-2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Academic and Administrative Calendar, 2001-2002 - 2

Calendar of Deadlines - 8

Important Telephone Numbers - 10

Infrastructure - 10

Building Maintenance, Building Hours, Building Use

Mailboxes

Electronic Mail

Computers

Reading Room

Russian Room

Slavic Department Faculty, 2001-2002 - 12

Kinsey Humanities Group Staff - 14

Graduate Program Policies and Procedures

Preliminaries - 16

Practical Matters, Housing, Orientation

Initial Appointment

Placement Examination

Reading lists

Advising and Mentoring

Course Load

Academic Standards

Normative Time to Degree

Study Abroad

Course Work - 17

Assignments

Independent Study

Incompletes

Requirements for the MA Degree - 18

Foreign Language requirement (literature and linguistics specializations)

Course Requirements for the MA Program in Russian Literature

Course Requirements for the MA Program in Slavic Linguistics

Comprehensive Examinations for the MA Degree: general procedures

The Format of MA Examinations in Russian Literature

The Format of MA Examinations in Slavic Linguistics

Requirements for the PhD Degree - 21

Foreign Language Requirements for the PhD

Course Requirements for the PhD Program in Russian Literature

Course Requirements for the PhD Program in Slavic Linguistics

Sub-Specialization

Comprehensive examinations for the PhD: General Procedures

Format of PhD Qualifying Examinations in Literature

Format of PhD Qualifying Examinations in Linguistics

Advancement to Candidacy - 24

Formal Lecture

The Dissertation - 24

The Dissertation Prospectus

Writing the Dissertation

Preparing the Final Manuscript

Filing Procedures

Defense of the Dissertation

Student Support - 26

Extramural Support Intramural support

Departmentally Nominated and Funded Awards

Procedures for Applying for Aid

Departmental Procedures for Allocating Financial Aid

Criteria Considered in Allocating Aid to Continuing Students

Teaching Assistantships

Eligibility

Selection Criteria

Types of Teaching Assistantships T

A Training

Extra-Curricular Academic Activities - 30

Graduate Student Colloquium

Lecture Series

Medieval Literature and Culture Workshop Conferences

Departmental Officers and Standing Committees - 32

Officers

Faculty Committees

Departmental Officers and Standing Committees, 2001-2002

Student-Faculty and Student Committees

Codes of Conduct and Mediation of Grievances - 34

Codes of Conduct

Mediation of Grievances

Appendices

A. Reading list for MA and PhD in Russian Literature Program

B. Reading list for MA in Slavic Linguistics Program

Calendar of Deadlines, 2001-02

Students are responsible for observing the following dates and deadlines as published by the

Registrar's Office. Requests for exceptions to published deadlines are subject to a penalty fee of \$10. *URSA enrollment deadlines end at midnight on the published date.*

The calendar below and academic calendars to the year 2005 are available online at www.registrar.ucla.edu/calendar.

	Fall 2001	Winter 2002	Spring 2002
Filing period for undergraduate applications (file with UC Undergraduate Application Processing Service, P.O. Box 23460, Oakland CA 94623-0460)	November 1-30, 2000		
Last day to file application for graduate admission or readmission with application fee, with Graduate Admissions/Student and Academic Affairs, 1225 Murphy Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1428	Consult Department	Consult Department	Consult Department
Last day to file graduate change of major petitions with Graduate Division, 1255 Murphy Hall	Consult Department	Consult Department	Consult Department
First day to obtain Student Parking Request forms at Parking and Commuter Services	June 4	October 1	January 4
<i>Schedule of Classes</i> available online	June 4	October 29	February 4
First day for continuing students to check URSA at (310) 208-0425 or http://www.ursa.ucla.edu/ for assigned enrollment appointments	June 6	October 31	February 6
Reentering students eligible to enroll begin to receive URSA notification letter at their mailing address	June 11	November 5	February 11
<i>Schedule of Classes</i> goes on sale at UCLA Store	June 11	November 5	February 11
URSA enrollment appointments begin	June 20	November 13	February 20

Last day to submit Student Parking Request for campus parking permit	August 3	November 2	February 1
Last day to file Undergraduate Application for Readmission form at 1113 Murphy Hall (late applicants will pay a \$50 late payment fee)	August 15	November 26	February 25
Mailing of UCLA Billing Statement showing registration fee assessment to student's mailing address (verify your mailing address on record at http://www.ursa.ucla.edu)	September 1	December 1	March 1

First day of issuing UCLA Bruin Card to new and reentering students	September 4	December 3	March 1
Last day for continuing students to file 2002-03 undergraduate scholarship applications			March 1
\$50 late fee waived for students using loan/grant checks to pay registration fees	September 17-28	TBA	TBA
Financial Aid nonelectronic FFELP checks available	September 18	TBA	TBA
Registration Fee Payment Deadline	September 20	December 20	March 20
<i>LATE registration fee payment In person with \$50 late fee</i>	September 21-October 12	December 21-January 18	March 21-April 12
Quarter Begins	September 24	January 2	March 27
Classes are dropped if fee payment is not completed by 5 p.m.	September 28	January 4	March 29
Instruction Begins	September 25	January 7	April 1

Orientation meetings on format for master's theses and doctoral dissertations (see the Theses and Dissertations Adviser, 330 Powell Library)	October 11-13	January 17-19	April 11-13
Last Day (End of Second Week)	October 12	January 18	April 12
To drop impacted courses (L&S undergraduate students) To change Study List (add, drop courses) without fee through URSA To enroll in courses for credit without \$50 late Study List fee through URSA To check wait lists for courses through URSA To file advancement to candidacy petition for master's degree with major department To file graduate leaves of absence with Graduate Division, 1255 Murphy Hall To file undergraduate request for educational fee reduction with college or school			

or Nursing undergraduates to add/drop without school approval To declare bachelor's degree candidacy for current term (with fee depending on units completed -- see Degree Policies in the Academic Policies section for details) For full refund on textbooks with UCLA Store receipt (exception made with proof of drop or withdrawal up to 8th week; summer deadlines are end of first week of the session)			
Last Day (End of Third Week)	October 19	January 25	April 19

For all undergraduate and graduate students to ADD courses with \$3 per course fee through URSA			
For undergraduate and graduate students to file Late Study List with \$50 fee			
Undergraduates approved for reduced educational fee are audited (must be enrolled in 10 units or less to be eligible for reduction) as of this date			
<i>Last Day (End of Fourth Week)</i>	October 26	February 1	April 26
For all L&S undergraduates to DROP non-impacted courses without a transcript notation (\$3 per transaction fee through URSA) For HSSEAS, SOAA, and TFT undergraduate students to DROP courses with a \$3 per transaction fee through URSA			
Undergraduate course materials fees are assessed based on enrollment at end of fourth week (see Miscellaneous Fees section in "Registration")	October 26	February 1	April 26
Last day to submit final drafts of dissertations to doctoral committee for degrees to be conferred in current term	November 5	February 4	May 6
Last day for undergraduates to change grading basis (optional P/NP) with \$3 per transaction fee through URSA	November 9	February 15	may 10
Last day to submit final drafts of theses to master's committees for degrees to be conferred in current term	November 19	February 25	May 20

Last day to file completed copies of theses for master's degrees and dissertations for doctoral degrees to be conferred in current term with the University Theses and Dissertations Adviser, 330 Powell Library	December 3	March 11	June 3
<i>Instruction Ends</i>	December 7	March 15	June 7
<i>Last Day to Withdraw</i>	December 7	March 15	June 7
<i>Last Day (End of Tenth Week)</i>	December 7	March 15	June 7
For L&S undergraduates to drop non-impacted courses by petition with instructor approval, \$13 per course fee, and transcript notation For graduate students to change grading basis (optional S/U) with \$3 per course fee through URSA For graduate students to DROP courses with \$3 per course fee through URSA			
<i>Common Final Examinations</i>	December 8-9	March 16-17	June 8-9
<i>Final Examination Week</i>	December 10-14	March 18-22	June 10-14
<i>Quarter Ends</i>	December 14	March 22	June 14
Commencement weekend (by college/school)			
First day to obtain GPA for term grades through URSA	December 29	April 5	June 29

Academic and Administrative Holidays	November 12		
	November 22-23	January 21	March 25
	December 24-25	February 18	May 27
	December 31-January 1		

IMPORTANT TELEPHONE NUMBERS

Information (from off campus)	825-4321
Information (from on campus)	0 or 33
Emergency Information Hotline (24 hours. Takes reports on potential safety hazard and Broadcasts campus instructions during emergencies.)	206-7994
UCPD Information Line May be used to supplement 206-7994 during major incidents	206-8883
UCLA Emergency Medical Center (24 hrs)	825-2111
Helpline Counseling Graduate Division	825-IMLP
Police (Campus) Emergency	35 or 911
Police Desk	825-1491
LA Rape & Battery Hotline (24 hours)	392-8381
Suicide Prevention Line	(213) 381-5111
Kinsey Emergency Coordinator (Mila August, Kinsey 371) Office	(310) 206-6818
ASUCLA Switchboard	(825-0611
Campus Events (24-hour information line)	825-1070
Central Ticket Office	825-2101

Child Care Service	825-5086
Daily Bruin	825-98-98
Dental Clinic (Patient Care Area)	825-2337
Escort Service (dusk to 1 a.m.)	825-1493
	(call about 20 minutes before you need an escort)
Financial Aid Office	
Counseling	206-0400
Emergency Loans	825-9864
Gay and Lesbian Association	825-8053
Graduate Division	
Fellowships and Assistantships	825-1985
Student and Academic Affairs	825-3819
Graduate Student Association	206-8512
Lecture Notes	825-8016
Office of Instructional Development/EIP	825-6939
Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS)	825-1681
Ombuds Office	825-7627
Organizations Relations (Center for Student Programming)	825-7041
Parking Services - student information	825-9871
Placement & Career Planning Center	825-2981
Psychological Services	
(mid campus)	825-0768
(south campus)	825-7985
Student Health Service (Arthur Ashe Student Wellness Ctr.)	
Student Legal Service	825-9894
Student Stores (ASUCLA)	
Ackerman Union	825-7711
LuValle Commons	825-7238
UCLA Travel Service	825-9131
Undergraduate Students Association	825-7068

Women's Resource Center

825-3945

INFRASTRUCTURE

BUILDING MAINTENANCE

The Kinsey Hall Building Manager is located in Kinsey 371. Please report problems with heating/air conditioning, lighting, custodial services, etc. to your SAO at x55675.

BUILDING HOURS

Regular Session:

Monday through Saturday 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Sunday 1:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.

Inter-Session & Summer Hours:

Monday through Friday 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Saturday 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Sunday Closed

Holiday hours: Please refer to the signs posted on the various general bulletin boards.

For safety reasons, students are not permitted in Kinsey Hall when the building is closed. Campus Security officers have been instructed to enforce this policy.

Graduate students are permitted to use the central Slavic Department Office (Kinsey 115) for study and computer-related research both during and after business hours. The last person to leave should turn off lights, computers, and the printing and copying machines. The door leading into the main office should not be propped open when the office is officially closed.

No food or drinks should be consumed within the vicinity of computer hardware.

MAILBOXES

Department mailboxes for faculty and graduate students are located in Kinsey 115. Mail is generally delivered and picked up between 9 and 10 am. Students should check their mailboxes regularly for Department announcements.

ELECTRONIC MAIL

Each student is assigned an electronic mail address and account on the Humanities Computing Network (Humnet), and the Center for Digital Humanities (CDH) staff will facilitate access to Bruin On-Line accounts if needed. Departmental announcements such as meetings, fellowship and job opportunities, and conference information are now regularly disseminated via electronic mail. If you need assistance with logging on or instructions on how to receive and send electronic mail messages, please contact Inna Gergel.

COMPUTERS

Four computers and a printer, all of them networked to the Humanities Network (Humnet), are available for use by students in the main Slavic Department Office. Graduate students have first priority for use, followed by undergraduate majors needing them for research projects.

Individual student files should not be stored on the hard drives (they may be erased inadvertently), nor should any fonts or other software packages be installed without the consent of the Computer Committee (See "Departmental Officers and Standing Committees" below).

THE READING ROOM

The Slavic Department Reading Room, located in Kinsey 199D, houses an extensive research library, which includes standard reference materials and the major works of Slavic literature and studies in Slavic linguistics. It also houses the Markov Archive of Modern Russian Poetry, a unique collection of photocopies and photographs of rare works dating from the Russian Modernist period, and the James Ferrell Slavic Linguistics Collection.

The Reading Room library is not a circulating collection. Books may not be checked out; they may be removed briefly during working hours to be photocopied, but the name of the book and the time and date it has been removed must be noted in the registry on the main counter, and the book must be returned within two hours, and the time of return entered in the same registry. Food and drink may not be brought into the Reading Room.

A student librarian is generally assigned to the reading room four or five hours per day (hours are posted each quarter on the reading room door). The librarian can assist in finding research material, and is also responsible for cataloging new acquisitions. Students and faculty are encouraged to review the collection regularly; and suggestions for acquisitions as well as for the "retiring" of obsolete editions should be forwarded to the Library Committee.

The Reading Room operates on the honor system. All graduate students receive keys. Failure to

observe the rules noted above may result in the abrogation of Reading Room privileges.

THE RUSSIAN ROOM ("RUSSKAIA KOMNATA")

Opposite the Reading Room, in Kinsey 199C, is the Department's "Russkaia konmata," where students at all levels of proficiency have the opportunity to work with our resident tutor and native informant, Ms. Nelya Dubrovich, to improve oral, aural and compositional skills in Russian. The Russian Room also contains audio-visual equipment, tapes, records, slides, computers, and reading material for student use.

SLAVIC DEPARTMENT FACULTY 2001-2002

HENNING ANDERSEN

Professor. Comparative and historical Slavic and Baltic linguistics, general linguistics and semiotics. Member, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.

Office: 115H Kinsey Hall E-mail: andersen@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-8123

GEORGIANA GALATEANU

Lecturer. Romanian language and culture, Romanian for heritage speakers, women and literature in Eastern Europe, foreign language pedagogy.

Office: 115A Kinsey Hall E-mail: farnoaga@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-45790

MICHAEL HEIM

Professor and Chair. Czech, Croatian, Serbian and Russian language and culture, translation theory and practice. Literary translator.

Office: 115L Kinsey Hall E-mail: heim@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-7894

VYACHESLAV V. IVANOV

Professor. Slavic, Baltic, and Indo-European linguistics, mythology and folklore, Russian literature and culture, languages of Los Angeles.

Office: 191 Kinsey Hall E-mail: ivanov@ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-6397

OLGA KAGAN

Senior Lecturer. Foreign language pedagogy. Coordinator of the Russian Language Program and Director of the UCLA Language Resource Program.

115K Kinsey Hall E-mail: okagan@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-2947

EMILY KLENIN

Professor. Russian literature (Fet and his circle), metrics, verse theory, Russian language history, Old Russian, Church Slavonic, IT for poets, 19th-century Russo-German cultural ties.

Office: 115E Kinsey Hall E-mail: klenin@ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-4448

ROMAN KOROPECKYJ

Associate Professor. Polish and Ukrainian language, literature and culture, Romanticism, anthropology and literary theory.

Office: 199B Kinsey Hall E-mail: koropec@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-2135

SUSAN KRESIN

Lecturer. Czech and Russian language pedagogy, contrastive studies of contemporary Czech and Russian (definiteness, aspect, discourse).

Office: 115 A Kinsey Hall E-mail: kresin@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 267-2219

GAIL LENHOFF

Professor. Medieval and 17th-century Russian literature and culture (saints' lives, history writing, rhetoric, art), Russo-Tatar relations, political theology.

Office: 115 G Kinsey Hall E-mail: lenhoff@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-6974

DAVID MACFADYEN

Visiting Associate Professor. Post-war Russian literature, Soviet cinema and animation, popular entertainment, the "small stage" (estrada) and song, 20th-century philosophy, -literary theory.

Office: 190 Kinsey Hall E-mail: dmacfady@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-9212

ALEXANDER OSPOVAT

Professor. Late-18th- and 19th-century Russian literature and intellectual history (Pushkin, ARZAMAS, Tyutchev, Dostoevsky), cultural mythology.

Office: 190 Kinsey Hall e-mail: aospovat@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-8151
(Russia: a.ospovat@mtu-net.ru)

JUDITH SIMON

Lecturer. Hungarian language and culture

Office: 68K Kinsey Tel. (310) 825-2676

RONALD VROON

Professor. 20th-century Russian poetry (Symbolism, Futurism, the Peasant School); Baroque and Neoclassicism (Polotsky, Sumarokov, Derzhavin).

Office: 11M Kinsey Hall E-mail: vroon@humnet.ucla.edu Tel. (310) 825-8724

OLGA YOKOYAMA

Professor. Discourse pragmatics, Russian intonation, poetics, and folklore.

Office: 188 Kinsey Hall E-mail: olga@humnet.ucla.edu Tel.: (310) 825-6158

KINSEY HUMANITIES GROUP STAFF

The Slavic Department forms part of a cluster of Humanities Division departments, Kinsey Humanities Group, an administrative entity responsible for fiscal and personnel issues. Each Department has its own dedicated Student Affairs Officer. Duties are distributed as follows:

MILA AUGUST, MANAGER

Responsible for the overall administration of Kinsey Humanities Group and the supervision of the office staff. Maintains and controls all budget accounts as well as staff and faculty personnel and payroll matters. Oversees facilities, security, computer resources, and space utilization.

Office: 371 Kinsey Hall E-mail: maugust@humnet.ucla.edu (310) 206-6818

Hours: M-F 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

INNA GERGEL, SLAVIC DEPARTMENT STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER

Provides administrative support for the Department Chair, faculty and students. Provides course information to students. Schedules rooms for departmental course meetings. Coordinates photo copying accounts, places book orders and coordinates annual schedule of classes. Coordinates parking for faculty, staff, and teaching assistants. Works with Chair and Russian Program Director in advising first-year graduate students. Coordinates graduate admissions and processing graduate student support awards. Requests electronic mail accounts for graduate students. Responsible for the maintenance and distribution of the departmental and university audio-visual

equipment, audio and videotape resources and data bases

Office: 115 Kinsey Hall E-mail: gergel@humnet.ucla.edu 825-3856
Hours: M-F 7 a.m. to 4 p.m.

CAROL GRESE, ACADEMIC PERSONNEL SPECIALIST

Under supervision of Carolyn Walthour, responsible for building permits, faculty identification cards, and housing information. Coordinate searches.

Processes sabbaticals/leaves, visas and visiting scholar paperwork.

Office: 371 Kinsey Hall E-mail: grese@humnet.ucla.edu 206-4686
Hours: M-F 7 a.m. to 4 p.m.

ERIKA CHAU', SENIOR FINANCIAL ANALYST

Processes hiring paperwork and payroll for Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Research Assistants, and Senate research grants. Manages budgets and supervises two accounting specialists. Responsible for purchasing and reimbursement.

Office: 371 Kinsey Hall E-mail: chau@humnet.ucla.edu 206-6815
Hours: M-F 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

SASHA MOSLEY, FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST Under supervision of Erika Chau, responsible for purchase orders (under \$2,500.00), Instructional Mini-Grants/OID applications, purchasing and reimbursement, recharges, and travel reimbursements. Responsible for hiring and time reporting of work-study assistants.

Office: 371 Kinsey Hall E-mail: smosley@humnet.ucla.edu 267-4956
Hours: M-F 7 a.m. to 4 p.m.

CAROLYN WALTHOUR, SENIOR PERSONNEL ANALYST Responsible for all academic personnel actions, including appointment, merit and promotion dossiers. Supervises academic personnel specialist.

Office: 371 Kinsey Hall E-mail: walthour@humnet.ucla.edu 206-6815
Hours: M-F 7 a.m. to 4 p.m.

COURTNEY KLIPP, FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATIVE SPECIALIST

Responsible for Office Depot Supply orders, departmental deposits, processing facilities and

phone repair requests. Responsible for purchase orders and reimbursements.

Office: 371 Kinsey Hall

E-mail: klipp@humnet.ucla.edu

206-6815

Hours: M-F 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.

GRADUATE PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

1. PRELIMINARIES

Practical matters. Housing. Orientation on Campus.

Initial Appointment. Before the beginning of the fall quarter new students should contact the Student Affairs Officer (SAO), whose job is to apprise students of general requirements, funding possibilities and practical matters. The departmental web site has useful links to the Student Housing Office, the Graduate Division, and other informational pages. The SAO will set up two further appointments: with the Russian Language Coordinator (RLC) and the Chair. The RLC will assess students' proficiency in Russian. The Chair will review the students' undergraduate records for strengths and deficiencies and, taking into account the RLC's assessment, assist them in setting up a specific program of study for the fall quarter and a preliminary plan for the entire academic year.

Placement Examination. Before classes begin in the fall quarter, new students will be given a written test and an oral interview in Russian to determine whether there are any weaknesses or deficiencies that should be addressed through course work or on a tutorial basis.

Reading Lists. All incoming students will receive a copy of the Department's reading lists for the MA or PhD in literature or linguistics, and will find it useful to review it regularly as they pursue their studies. The lists contain the works on which students will be tested in the written and oral MA and PhD examinations and include works not covered in courses. It is each student's responsibility to draw up a personal reading schedule to make sure the indicated works are covered by the time the examinations are taken.

Advising and Mentoring. First-year students receive their advising from the SAO, the RLC, and the Chair, as described above. Beginning with their second year, students may choose their own advisor. This system is designed to encourage mentorship of students by faculty members who share intellectual interests and insure a timely and expeditious progress to degree. It is the Students' responsibility to inform the SAO of the advisor selected. They may change advisors only at the beginning of the academic year. Once a student's doctoral committee is established

(see below) the chair of the committee assumes the role of advisor (Standards and Procedures, p. 5).

It is the duty of the advisor to review the students' academic progress, insuring that it remains within the guidelines of the degree programs, and to approve the courses selected for each quarter. To this end, a study sheet will be distributed to graduate students at the beginning of each quarter which must be filled out, signed by the advisor, and given to the SAO. Only after the graduate advisor and the student agree on a program of study for the quarter may the student enroll through URSA. Petitions to alter the study list (drop/add or change the number of credit units) after the program has been formulated must be approved by the graduate advisor before the student makes any changes through URSA. At the end of each academic year the advisor will provide students with brief written assessments of the progress they have made. Copies of the assessments will go into the students' files.

Course Load. Students are expected to enroll for 12 credit units per quarter. Requests for a reduced course load (less than 12 units per quarter) must be approved by both advisor and chair.

Academic Standards. The usual grade in graduate courses will range between "A" and "B." To be in good standing, students must maintain a "B" (3.0) grade point average in all courses taken in graduate status at the University. Courses in the 500 series (directed individual study or research), which are taken on an S/U (Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory), basis do not count towards the fulfillment of course requirements for the MA and PhD programs. The grade of S shall be awarded only for work which would otherwise receive a grade of "B" or better.

Students are considered in probationary status and subject to dismissal if the cumulative scholarship in all work falls below a "B," or if students' work in any two consecutive terms falls below a "B" average. The Dean of the Graduate Division determines students' eligibility to continue graduate study. If allowed to continue in probationary status, students must make expeditious progress. For additional information on probationary status, dismissal and the appeals process, students may consult *Standards and Procedures for Graduate Study at UCLA*.

Normative Time to Degree. The normative time to degree is the number of quarters established for students to complete the program from the time of matriculation. In the Slavic Department normative progress is defined as follows: six academic quarters from the onset of graduate study to the awarding of the MA degree; six academic quarters from the awarding of the MA degree to advancement to candidacy; that is, to passing the PhD qualifying examinations, and six academic quarters from advancement to candidacy to the completion of the dissertation. The PhD qualifying examinations must be taken within two years of admission to the Doctoral program, and the dissertation must be completed within three calendar years of the date when the qualifying examinations are passed. Students should be aware that time to degree is one of the factors that will play a role in determining the level of financial support they receive. Study

abroad or certain circumstances of a personal nature may require leaves of absence and extend normative time to degree without affecting decisions concerning support.

Study Abroad. Several intramural and extramural opportunities exist for study abroad. The Department encourages students to take advantage of these opportunities and will provide academic and financial support to the fullest extent possible.

11. COURSE WORK

Assignments. Students are expected to keep up with course assignments, submit course papers on time, and negotiate necessary absences from class before the fact. All assigned work is to be carried out in accordance with the University's Code of Conduct. Plagiarism in any form constitutes grounds for disciplinary action and possible dismissal from the graduate programs.

Students may expect instructors not only to carry out instruction at the highest professional level but also to make themselves available on a regular basis (a minimum of two hours a week) for academic consultation. Grading is the exclusive prerogative of the instructor; it is to be exercised impartially and based solely on academic performance. At the beginning of each course instructors will specify all course requirements and the criteria on which the final course grade will be assigned. They will also provide adequate feedback on papers in either written or oral form.

Independent Study. Independent study courses include the following: 596: Independent Study; 597: Preparation for MA or PhD Examinations, and 599: Dissertation Research. They are taught on a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U) basis. The number of credits assigned to such courses may range from 2 to 12, as outlined in the UCLA Course Catalogue. Independent study courses (596), as well as Exam Preparation courses (597), are optional offerings: they are not required of students, nor are faculty obliged to teach them. They are arranged through mutual agreement of instructor and student, who together determine the course of study. They are meant to supplement, not replace, course offerings and cannot satisfy course or unit requirements. Students who have been advanced to candidacy are expected to register for 12 units of 599.

Incompletes. The grade "I" (Incomplete) is assigned when students' work is of passing quality but incomplete for good cause. Students are entitled to remove the Incomplete and to receive credit and grade points provided they satisfactorily complete the work of the course by the next full quarter that they are in academic residence. They need not be registered at the time the course work is completed.

If the work is not completed by the end of the next quarter of residence, the "I" grade will automatically be replaced with the grade "F" or "U" as appropriate. The work for a course for

which the "I" grade has lapsed to an "F" or "U" may, with the permission of the instructor, be completed in a subsequent quarter and the appropriate earned grade assigned. Until that time, however, the "F" or "U" grade appears on the record and the "F" is calculated in the grade-point average. Once a grade has been assigned, it will appear on the transcript for the quarter in which the change was made, but the "I" remains on the transcript for the quarter in which it was initially incurred. Students are strongly urged to avoid accumulating "I" grades, as they will diminish the impact of a otherwise excellent transcript.

III. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MA DEGREE

Candidates for the MA degree should choose a specialization in either literature or linguistics, with Russian as the principal language in literature.

Foreign Language Requirement (Literature and Linguistic Specializations). Proficiency in Russian and in either French or German is required for the MA. Proficiency must be demonstrated by means of departmental translation examinations.

1. Students must pass a departmental Russian language proficiency examination which tests the ability to translate from Russian to English and vice versa. The MA comprehensive examination may not be scheduled until this examination has been passed. The examination is offered at the beginning of each quarter and may be retaken each quarter until a pass grade is achieved.
2. Students must demonstrate an ability to read scholarly literature in either French or German by translating a passage from either language. The use of a dictionary is permitted. Students in literature will be asked to translate a passage of literary criticism; students in linguistics will be asked to translate a passage from a scholarly work on Slavic linguistics. Although students may defer the examination until after passing the MA examinations, they will not receive the MA degree until they have passed it. Since normative progress is defined in terms of the awarding of degrees, students are strongly urged to begin studying either French or German as early as possible. Examinations in French and German are offered at the beginning of each quarter.

Course Requirements for the MA Program in Russian Literature. A minimum of 36 units is required for students in literature. The following courses (30 units) are required:

- Slavic 200: Proseminar
- Russian 211A: Literature of Medieval Rus'
- Russian 211B: Eighteenth-Century Russian Literature
- Russian 212A: The Golden Age
- Russian 212B: The Age of Realism
- Russian 213: Twentieth-Century Russia2 Literature (Modernism)

- Russian 215: Post-War Twentieth-Century Russian Literature
- Slavic 201: Introduction to Old Church Slavic

The remaining 6 course units are electives and may be drawn from any departmental offering in Russian literature: Russian 215 (Contemporary Literature); Russian 219 (Movements and Genres); C- 240 (Russian Folklore); Russian 270 (Russian Poetics), etc. Courses in the 500 series may not be applied towards the MA course requirements.

Course Requirements for the MA Program in Slavic Linguistics. The following courses (42 units) are required:

- Slavic 200: Proseminar
- Slavic 201: Old Church Slavic
- Slavic 202: Introduction to Comparative Slavic Linguistics
- Russian 204: Introduction to the History of the Russian Language
- Russian 212A: The Golden Age
- Russian 220A: Structure of Modern Russian: Phonology and Morphology
- Russian 220B: Structure of Modern Russian: Morphosyntax

One additional course from the following four is required:

- Russian 211A: Literature of Medieval Rus'
- Russian 211B: Eighteenth-Century Russian Literature
- Russian 212B: Age of Realism
- Russian 213: Twentieth-Century Russian Literature (1890-1945)

Three additional courses, one from each of the following clusters, are required:

Cluster 1: Russian 241: Topics in Russian Phonology; Russian 242: Topics in Russian Morphology; Russian 265: Topics in Russian Syntax.

Cluster 2: Russian 243: Topics in Historical Grammar; Russian 264: History of the Russian Literary Language.

Cluster 3: Russian 210: Readings in Old Russian Texts; Slavic 241A: Advanced Old Church Slavic- Advanced Readings in Canonical Texts; Slavic 241B: Advanced Old Church Slavic—East, West and South Slavic Recensions of Church Slavic.

Students are also encouraged to take courses that will help to provide them with a solid background in general linguistics, such as Linguistics 103, 110, 120A and 120B.

Comprehensive Examinations for the MA Degree: General Procedures. Students may request MA examinations at the beginning of the academic year as well as the end of each academic quarter. Applications to take the MA examination at the beginning of an academic year must be submitted to the SAO no later than the end of the previous academic year. Applications to take the MA examination at the end of any given quarter must be submitted to the SAO no later than the second week of the quarter in which they are to be taken. In both cases, applications are accepted only if students have passed the Russian language proficiency examination (see above) and have completed (i.e., have been assigned a final grade) or are enrolled to complete all remaining course requirements for the degree. Students should prepare to be tested on material covered by the required courses and any additional materials designated as required MA reading on the departmental reading lists (appended). In the quarter in which the examinations are to be taken, students may sign up for Slavic 597: Preparation for Comprehensive Examinations. This course is optional. Like every independent study course, it is arranged through the mutual agreement of individual instructors and students, and is not mandated by the department. After a student's application to take the examinations has been approved, the chair will appoint a committee consisting of three members of the faculty. The MA oral examination shall be open to observation by faculty members other than those constituting the examination committee should the examinee so desire.

The examination for both literature and linguistics consists of two parts: a written examination and an oral examination, which may be conducted partially in Russian. The oral examination is scheduled for the week following the written examination. No grade is assigned to the examination until both parts have been completed. A student's combined performance in the written and oral examinations is graded "high pass," "pass" or "fail." Students shall be given written notice of the results of the MA examination one hour after the conclusion of the oral portion of the examination and a written evaluation of their performance within one week.

Students who do not receive a high pass may repeat the MA examination once: there is a six month limit on retaking examinations graded "pass" and a one-year limit on retaking examinations graded "fail."

The Format of MA Examinations in Russian Literature. The MA written examination in Russian literature consists of three two-hour examinations, spaced one day apart over the course of a week. The first is devoted to medieval and eighteenth-century Russian literature, the second to nineteenth-century Russian literature, and the third to twentieth-century Russian literature. In

the oral examination, one to two hours in duration, students will be asked not only about their answers on the written examination but will also be given questions on other required material.

The Format of MA Examinations in Slavic Linguistics. The MA written examination in Russian linguistics consists of- one three-hour written examination, taken at one sitting, and a two-hour oral examination scheduled for the following week. In the oral examination, students will be asked not only about their answers on the written examination but will also be given questions on other required material.

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PHD DEGREE

Students preparing to enter the doctoral program choose a specialization in either literature or linguistics, with Russian usually as the principal language and literature. By special arrangement doctoral students may specialize in a language or literature other than Russian.

Students are formally admitted to the PhD program after passing all the departments requirements for the MA degree (see above). Students with MA degrees from other institutions must have passed the MA comprehensive examination with a high pass and satisfied the MA foreign language requirements for admission to the doctoral program. Students whose degree is in Slavic Languages and Literatures and who are continuing in the same area of specialization (literature or linguistics) should take the MA examination within three quarters after matriculation. Courses should be selected to fill in lacunae as determined by the requirements of the MA programs in either literature or linguistics. Students with MA degrees in disciplines other than that of their planned specialization, or students who do not have an MA but have taken graduate level courses equivalent to those required in our department at UCLA for an MA degree, must complete the required number of course units; course substitutions may be made with the permission -of the student's advisor.

Foreign Language Requirements for the PhD Program (Literature and Linguistics Specializations). Proficiency in both French and German are required for the PhD. Proficiency in one of these languages will have been formally tested prior to the awarding of the MA degree; proficiency in the second language is to demonstrated by the inclusion of texts in that language on the bibliographies prepared for the PhD examinations. Familiarity with said texts is to be attested to by the chair of the doctoral committee, who must submit a language examination report to the Graduate Division concurrent with the nomination of the doctoral committee. With departmental consent students specializing in linguistics may substitute a language important to the study of Slavic linguistics (Finnish, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Romanian, or a Turkic language).

Students must demonstrate proficiency in a modern Slavic language other than Russian, either by completing one year of the language or by demonstrating through written and oral examinations that they have sufficient mastery of the language to access literary and scholarly work.

Course Requirements for the PhD Program in Russian Literature. A minimum of 28 units beyond those used to satisfy the MA is required from students in literature. These must include the following courses:

- Russian 204: Introduction to the History of the Russian Language
- Russian 220A: Structure of Modern Russian: Phonology and Morphology

Two courses from the following cluster:

- Slavic 230A: Topics in Comparative Slavic Literature: Middle Ages Through the Baroque
- Slavic 230B: Topics in Comparative Slavic Literature: Classicism to Romanticism
- Slavic 230C: Topics in Comparative Slavic Literature: Realism to Modernism

Three advanced courses or seminars in Russian or Slavic literature.

Students are also encouraged to acquire a sound general knowledge of non-Slavic literary theory, and literary traditions by availing themselves of offerings in other departments.

Russian 203 is required of all PhD students for two quarters a year.

Course Requirements for the PhD Program in Slavic Linguistics. A minimum of 20 units beyond those used to satisfy the MA is required from students in linguistics. The following courses are required:

- Slavic 221: Introduction to East Slavic Languages
- Slavic 222: Introduction to West Slavic Languages
- Slavic 223: Introduction to South Slavic Languages

Three advanced courses or seminars in Slavic linguistics.

Cluster 3: Russian 210: Readings in Old Russian Texts; Slavic 241A: Advanced Old Church Slavic—Advanced Readings in Canonical Texts; Slavic 241B: Advanced Old Church Slavic—East, West and South Slavic Recensions of Church Slavic.

Russian 203 is required of all PhD students for two quarters a year.

Sub-Specialization. Students have the option of choosing a sub-specialization at the PhD level, which consists of at least four courses selected by the student and approved by the student's advisor. The courses may be selected from graduate offerings in one or more UCLA departments

or programs (for example, Anthropology, Applied Linguistics, Art History, Classics, Comparative Literature, English, Film, Folklore and Mythology, French, Germanic, History, Indo-European Studies, Linguistics, Music, Philosophy, Psychology, Theater, Women's Studies and others) and may include courses from within the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures (students in linguistics choosing from courses in literature and students in literature choosing from courses in linguistics).

Qualifying Examinations for the PhD Degree: General Procedures. Qualifying examinations are to be taken within two years of the date of admission to the doctoral program. Students should start preparing for the examinations at least one year before they plan to take them. Students making normative progress will therefore start at the beginning of their fourth year.

The first step is to set up the doctoral examination committee, which consists of a minimum of four UCLA faculty members in the professorial ranks, three of whom must come from the Department and one of whom must come from outside the Department. Two of the four committee members must hold the rank of professor or associate professor. The chair of the committee must come from the Department. For further details on exceptions-the inclusion of non-UCLA professors, for example-see *Standards and Procedures for Graduate Study at UCLA*.

Students consult with the Chair about the prospective membership of the committee and the choice of the committee chair, who typically becomes the dissertation advisor. With the Chair's approval, the student secures the agreement of the prospective committee members to serve. The Chair then nominates the examination committee for approval by the Dean of the Graduate Division. Once the committee has been approved, students work closely with the chair of the examination committee to prepare for the qualifying examinations in their areas of specialization.

The qualifying examinations may be scheduled for any time mutually agreeable to all members of the examination committee. Students must be registered to take the examinations. If the examinations are scheduled for the summer, students must be registered in the immediately preceding spring term. In the period immediately preceding the examinations students may sign up for Slavic 597: Preparation for MA Comprehensive Examination and PhD Qualifying Examinations. This course is optional and arranged by mutual agreement of individual instructors and students.

No grade is assigned to the examination until both parts, written and oral, have been completed. A student's combined performance in the written and oral examinations is graded "high pass", "pass" or "fail." Students receive written notice of the results of the PhD examination one hour after the conclusion of the oral portion of the examination and a written evaluation of their performance within one week.

The doctoral oral examination is open only to the committee members. All members of the committee must be present at the examination. It is the duty of the chair to see that all members of the committee are present. Each member of the committee must report the examination as "passed" or "not passed." A student may not be advanced to candidacy if more than one member votes "not passed," regardless of the size of the committee. Upon majority vote of the doctoral committee a student receiving a "not pass" may repeat the examination or any portion thereof once within one calendar year of the first attempt.

Format of the PhD Qualifying Examination in Literature. The PhD qualifying examination in literature consists of seven one-hour written examinations, taken over the course of two weeks, followed by a one to two hour oral examination.

The seven written examinations are structured around seven general fields: 1) the literature of medieval Rus'; 2) eighteenth-century Russian literature; 3) nineteenth-century Russian literature; 4) twentieth-century Russian literature; 5) literary theory; 6) the literature of another Slavic culture; 7) the provisional dissertation topic. Working with the all members of the doctoral committee,

students select specific topics in each field and compile bibliographies on each topic. When selecting topics, students should give priority to areas that will both be useful for writing the dissertation and provide sufficient breadth for entering the job market. All topics and bibliographies must be approved by all members of the doctoral committee.

Students are also responsible for all asterisked items on the Reading List in the subgroup most closely related to the dissertation proposal. The subgroups include: 1) the literature of medieval Rus'; 2) eighteenth-century Russian literature; 3) nineteenth-century Russian literature: Romanticism; 4) nineteenth-century Russian literature: Realism; 5) twentieth-century Russian literature: pre-war; 6) twentieth-century Russian literature: post-war; 7) Slavic literary theory.

The following is a sample examination scheme:

- 1) Medieval: Colonialism and the lives of missionary saints
- 2) Eighteenth-century: Enlightenment prose
- 3) Nineteenth-century: Romantic utopian fiction
- 4) Twentieth-century: Russian Futurism
- 5) Literary theory: Phenomenology and Russian Formalism
- 6) Slavic: Czech modernist fiction
- 7) Dissertation topic: "The Rise of Science Fiction and the Development of Science *infin de siècle* Russia"

Since the dissertation topic is based on material from the first half of the twentieth century, the

student would be responsible for all asterisked items on the Reading List in pre-war twentieth century Russian literature.

Format of PhD Qualifying Examination in Linguistics. The PhD qualifying examination in linguistics consists of two three-hour written examinations and a two-hour oral examination. In the first of the written examinations, students are tested on the general area of the proposed dissertation research; in the second written examination, students are tested on comparative Slavic linguistics, the history and structure of Russian and the history and structure of a second Slavic language. The proposed area of dissertation research must have the approval of all members of the doctoral committee.

V. ADVANCEMENT TO CANDIDACY

Students are advanced to candidacy and awarded the Candidate in Philosophy (Phil) degree upon passing the written and oral qualifying examinations.

Formal Lecture. Students are required to deliver a formal lecture at the California Slavic Colloquium or at a major professional convention (AATSEEL, AAASS, MLA) or conference no later than two calendar years after advancement to candidacy.

VI. THE DISSERTATION

Immediately following the examinations the examining committee selects from its membership, by unanimous agreement, the certifying members whose duty it is to read, approve, and certify the dissertation. A minimum of three members must be certifying members, two of whom are from the students' department and one from an "outside" department. The chair of the doctoral committee must serve as one of the certifying members.

The Dissertation Prospectus. Within two quarters (or one quarter and a summer) after passing the qualifying examinations, students are to submit a prospectus to the certifying committee. A prospectus typically ranges from twenty-five to fifty pages. Its purpose is to outline a preliminary structure for the dissertation and establish a core bibliography of works to be consulted. Once it is approved by the committee, students can commence writing the dissertation.

Writing the Dissertation. The dissertation is to be completed within three calendar years of the date when the qualifying examinations are passed. Students should submit their work chapter by chapter to the chair of the certifying committee, who as the primary reader must be the first to approve it. Students may expect chapters to be critiqued in a timely manner, usually within one month of receipt. The chair of the certifying committee is the primary reader and therefore must

be the first to approve chapters. The chapters are then submitted for review, commentary and approval by the other- certifying members. As members of the certifying committee may not be able to commit themselves to reading dissertation chapters in the summer months, students are well advised to schedule of chapter submissions well in advance.

Approval of the dissertation by the certifying committee must be unanimous.

Preparing the Final Manuscript. The length, content and arrangement of materials and certain aspects of style and format (such as footnote form and placement, transliteration, and the manner in which references are cited and listed) are to be determined by the student in consultation with the certifying committee. Students are urged to consult with the committee regarding stylistic preferences early in the preparation of the manuscript. They would do well to adopt one of the two common style manuals: the *Chicago Manual of Style* or the *MLA Style Sheet* as a standard. More specific aspects of format, including manuscript arrangement, the organization of specific preliminary pages, spacing, type face, margins, page number order, page number placement, the inclusion of a vita and abstract, and the requirement for permission to reproduce copyrighted material, are dictated by the UCLA Graduate Division. Students should consult the official *Policies and Procedures for Thesis and Dissertation Preparation and Filing*, accessible in hard copy or on the Graduate Division web site.

Filing Procedures. The deadline for filing the approved dissertation in final form is ten days to two weeks before the "degree date." The exact degree date for each quarter is printed in the *General Catalogue* calendar. Students are encouraged to file as early in the quarter as possible. The manuscript must be filed in person, either by the student or a representative. Filing procedures, including the forms that must be filled out and signatures that must be obtained, are set forth in *Policies and Procedures for Thesis and Dissertation Preparation and Filing*.

Defense of the Dissertation. The Graduate Division does not require a formal dissertation defense. The decision as to whether an informal defense will take place is made by the certifying committee. Normally this will entail a public presentation and defense of the dissertation thesis followed by members of the certifying committee and general discussion.

VII. STUDENT SUPPORT

All students are eligible for financial support. It is Department policy to offer newly admitted students four-year packages contingent upon timely progress. Such support will be equivalent in monetary terms to a 50% teaching assistantship on the assistant level. The package may consist of fellowships, grants, unrestricted aid, research assistantships, teaching assistantships, or any combination of the above. Most favorable consideration for funding beyond four years will be

given to students who maintain normative progress beyond advancement to candidacy.

Extramural Support. Every year a considerable number of extramural agencies such as the Ford Foundation, Fulbright-Hays, the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council offer funds for graduate study. Students are required to determine their eligibility for such extramural funds and to apply for them in a timely manner. The faculty pledges full support for such applications. If eligible students fail to apply for extramural grants, and fellowships, the Graduate Division could curtail allocations to the Department, which would have a negative impact on funding for all students. Information on available extramural fellowships can be found in *Graduate and Postdoctoral Extramural Support (GRAPES)* and the Graduate Division web site.

Intramural Support. Support for graduate students from within the University may originate outside or inside the Department. The major sources for support outside the Department are research assistantships, teaching assistantships and consulting positions offered by: 1) the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies (CMRS); 2) the Center for Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Studies; 3) the Center for European and Russian Studies (CERS); 4) other language departments and the Department of Linguistics; 5) the Department of English; 6) the Center for Digital Humanities (CDH). Other departments may also periodically open the door to applications. Students can find information about TAs in all departments on the Graduate Division web site.

Departmentally Nominated and Funded Awards. The Department is directly involved in the allocation of support in two ways. First, it nominates candidates for certain awards that originate outside the department. These include NDEA fellowships from CERS, FLAS fellowships for summer language study from CERS, CERS RAships, the Chancellor's Fellowship, divisional RAships and GSRships, research mentorships, and dissertation year fellowships. Nominations and rankings made by the entire faculty, though in the case of research mentorships and dissertation year fellowships the Chair ranks applications after consulting with students' advisors. The Department also has direct control over certain resources it receives from the Graduate Division, the Humanities Division and philanthropic sources. These include TAs, GSRships, summer mentorships, restricted funds (advanced-to-candidacy funds, monies restricted to the recruitment of incoming students, multiple year grants, etc.) and unrestricted funds.

Procedures for Applying for Aid. Students wishing to apply for special fellowships should note the deadlines published in the *Graduate Student Support for Continuing Students* handbook. Faculty members asked for recommendations should be provided with full information several weeks ahead of time.

Applications for Departmental funding must be submitted to the SAO by February 15. The

application consists of a self-evaluation statement that include the following information:

1. a list of all courses taken in graduate school and grades received
2. a) a statement of progress to degree to date, and b) information on circumstances adversely affecting that progress
3. a) a list of the TAs and RAs the student wishes to apply for, and b) any special qualifications for the positions the student may have
4. a) a statement of academic plans for the coming year, b) an outline of projected progress to degree, and c) a brief statement of long-term professional goals
5. a list of talks given, papers published, awards or honors received

Departmental Procedures for Allocating Financial Aid. Each spring the Support Coordinators calculate and make public to faculty and students the kinds and amounts of student funding the Department has at its disposal, and each fall they calculate and make public the number of students supported in category of aid, while observing the demands of confidentiality.

Both admissions and graduate support are decided by a committee of the whole: all faculty members review all candidates and rank them. They then report their rankings openly at a faculty meeting, where the results are tallied to form a ranking list, and the list is fine-tuned on the basis of an open discussion.

The Department has two Support Coordinators, one representing literature, the other representing linguistics. They perform the technical function of implementing the faculty's decisions, that is, dealing with programmatic concerns (for example, the suitability of students for specific TAs and RAs) and making the necessary adjustments as circumstances change (for example, if students learn that they have been awarded TAs or other kinds of funding outside the Department). The Graduate Student Support Coordinators work closely with the SAO and the Chair in determining such adjustments. The Department will make every effort to inform students of final decisions on funding by May 15. In some cases, however, the Department will not know what funds are available by then (for example, if funds offered as part of a recruitment package are not accepted and revert to the department for distribution to other students or if the administration is late in informing the Department of allocations and the results of competitions).

Criteria Considered in Allocating Aid to Continuing Students:

Level of Academic Performance. This will be evaluated on the basis of successful completion of departmental courses as indicated by grades as well as on the basis of evaluations of faculty members familiar with the student's work. Owing to the narrow range of grades given graduate students, the GPA alone is not compelling evidence of academic success. The number and variety of courses completed are at least as important as the GPA.

Timely Progress to Degree. Progress to degree is measured by successful completion of course requirements, language examinations (Russian and French/German), and the MA and PhD examinations. (See Normative Time to Degree above.)

Support History. Since it is departmental policy to provide support for the first four years of all students' graduate careers and to make certain all students have the opportunity to serve as teaching assistants, funds will be allotted accordingly. Students in good standing beyond the fourth year - that is, student who have already received this guaranteed support - are eligible for support should funds be available.

Teaching Assistantships:

Funds for teaching assistantships are provided to the Department by the Dean of Humanities and may vary from year to year depending on enrollments. Although teaching assistantships constitute a major form of student support, their primary function is to provide relevant training experience for academic and academic-related careers in teaching and research. It is the policy of the Department to offer all students the opportunity to -teach for a full year once they have received the MA degree, contingent upon their meeting the eligibility criteria stipulated below.

Eligibility. Graduate students who are recipients of teaching assistantships must meet all registration and enrollment criteria established by the Department and must also maintain satisfactory academic progress throughout their appointments. Students become eligible for teaching assistantships once they receive the MA degree. Exceptions are made only in cases of extraordinary need on the part of the Department and/or extraordinary background on the part of the student. The University requires non-native speakers of English to pass an oral proficiency examination (the Speak Examination, which is administered by the Office of Instructional Development) before they begin service as teaching assistants.

Selection Criteria. The selection process for teaching assistantships follows the basic procedures outlined above for all forms of support assigned by the Department. However, two other criteria are also relevant and will play an important role: 1) a student's degree of mastery of the target language or subject to be taught, and 2) a student's ability to communicate effectively in English with undergraduates.

The Department is likewise governed by a number of other considerations. The first is the goal of providing every qualified student with the opportunity to teach. The second is to give all students exposure to language teaching, and where possible to give literature and linguistic students teaching experience in their respective disciplines. Finally, the Department must consider the needs of the undergraduate program served by teaching assistants.

Types of Teaching Assistantships. Teaching opportunities are available both inside and outside the Department. In the Department students have the opportunity to teach two types of courses: 1) language courses, primarily elementary and intermediate Russian, but occasionally other Slavic languages as well, and 2) lower-division literature courses, where they usually serve as assistants to the primary instructor and to lead discussion sections, although on rare occasions a qualified student may be given some responsibility for preparing lectures.

Training. Graduate students who have fulfilled the criteria for appointment to teaching assistantships are provided with training experience and guidance through both University and departmental venues.

A Campus-Wide Foreign Language TA Orientation, which all departmental TAs are required to attend, is held before the start of each fall quarter. It features half-day workshops on the pedagogy of language instruction (for example, on teaching grammar, vocabulary, or listening and reading comprehension, on using visual aids and technology in language instruction, etc.). The Language Resource Program organizes workshops and symposia on topics relevant to language teachers throughout the year, and TAs are encouraged to attend. Updated information can be found on the web site: <http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/flr>.

The Department offers a variety of training sessions and courses required for its TAs. At the beginning of the fall quarter it holds an orientation meeting to instruct TAs in Department-specific issues. Two pedagogical courses, both graded S/U, are required of all TAs:

- Russian 375, "Teaching Apprentice Practicum" (I to 4 units). Preparation for teaching apprenticeship, providing instruction in teaching skills, supervision (visits to classes, weekly meetings to discuss methodology and the latest pedagogical techniques) by the Russian Language Coordinator.
- Russian 495, "Teaching Slavic Languages at College Level" (4 units). An introduction to the theory and practice of language teaching methodology as well as to problems of pedagogical grammar.

EXTRA-CURRICULAR DEPARTMENTAL ACTIVITIES

GRADUATE STUDENT COLLOQUIUM

The California Slavic Colloquium brings together graduate students from the four major Slavic Departments in California: UCLA, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Southern California, and Stanford University. The Colloquium venue alternates yearly between Northern and Southern California. It is typically held toward the end of April, on a Saturday and

Sunday. The Colloquium provides an ideal opportunity for students to fulfill a major requirement of the PhD program: delivering a formal paper in public. All students are encouraged to participate by preparing papers (with a delivery time of no more than twenty minutes) reporting on original research for delivery at the Colloquium. To do so, they first work with a faculty sponsor—generally the instructor under whose auspices the paper has been written—who must approve the paper for presentation. The paper topic, a one-page abstract and note of approval from the faculty sponsor should be given to the Colloquium Coordinator (see "Departmental Officers and Standing Committees" below) no later than the end of February.

LECTURE SERIES

The Department sponsors lectures by noted scholars in the field. There are usually two or three per quarter, and they take place on Wednesdays at 3:00 pm, when no classes are scheduled. Students are strongly urged to attend these lectures, which are designed not only to familiarize our academic community with research developments in Slavic studies but also to facilitate personal contacts between students and visitors and begin the "networking" process crucial to success in academic life.

Any faculty member or student is welcome to recommend lecturers and possible topics for lectures. The Department is committed to providing the graduate student body with at least \$300 a year to support honoraria for speakers. In combination with funds available from the Graduate Student Association students may sponsor several lectures per year for speakers of their choice.

MEDIEVAL SLAVIC WINTER WORKSHOP

During the winter quarter, it has become a departmental tradition to organize an annual interdisciplinary medieval Slavic workshop. Co-sponsored by the Department, the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies (CMRS) and the Center for European and Russian Studies (CERS), the workshop is usually held on the Friday before the last week of the quarter in the Herbert Morris Seminar Room (306 Royce Hall). All fields of medieval Slavic are represented, including literature, history, art history and linguistics. Presentations are limited to ten minutes, followed by twenty minutes of group discussion. These workshops offer UCLA faculty members and advanced graduate students working on medieval topics the opportunity to discuss their fields with a distinguished roster of scholars. Inquiries are welcome at: lenhoff@humnet.ucla.edu.

CONFERENCES

The Department in cooperation with CERS sponsors regular mini-conferences on a wide variety

of topics relating to the literature, language and culture of the Slavic area. Past conferences have included "Textual Intersections," a conference devoted to intertextuality in Russian nineteenth and twentieth century literature; "Russian Literature and European History," devoted to the impact and reception of major historical events in nineteenth-century Europe on Russian literature; and "Russia and the Russians through Russian Eyes," which explored the ways Russians regard themselves in terms of language and literature. These conferences bring together specialists from leading research universities as well as local faculty, and students who have conducted research in the thematic area of the conference are invited to participate as well.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Officers:

- The Chair conducts the Department's business in accordance with decisions of the faculty; represents the Department and its faculty to the Dean of Humanities and other departments; appoints faculty members to all standing committees in July of the new academic year; organizes the election of graduate student representatives; and acts as a liaison between students and faculty in cases that demand special attention and/or confidentiality (see also "Grievance Procedures" below).
- The Undergraduate Advisor counsels students regarding their course work and assists the Chair in finalizing the schedule of undergraduate courses.
- Two Support Coordinators, one representing literature and the other linguistics, work closely with the SAO and the Chair to administer support allocations to graduate students (see "Departmental Procedures for Allocating Aid" above).
- Two Recruitment Officers, one representing literature and the other linguistics, coordinate the recruitment of new students and promote diversity.

Faculty Committees:

- The Executive Committee, usually consisting of three members, advises the Chair on policy issues, organizational matters and long-range planning of personnel and programmatic issues. It also assists in the planning and preparation of faculty meetings.
- The Russian Language Committee, usually consisting of two members, administers the department's language proficiency tests in Russian.
- The Foreign Language Committee, usually consisting of two members, prepares and administers the department's foreign language examinations for graduate students (MA and PhD) in French and German. Its members also make recommendations to the Chair in those exceptional instances where a graduate student applies for permission to substitute another foreign language for French or German.
- The Committee on Teaching, usually consisting of two members, offers advice to faculty

whose teaching quality is deemed to be below departmental standards. It is available for consultation regarding grading policies and instructional improvement.

- The Computer Committee, usually consisting of two members, oversees the department's computer equipment and facilities, coordinates the maintenance, upgrading, and updating of hardware, software and electronic media, and oversees the Department's web site.
- The Curriculum Committee, usually consisting of two or three members, serves as a clearing house for proposals regarding the Department's undergraduate and graduate instructional programs, including the introduction or deletion of courses and modifications in the status and content of existing courses.
- The Library Committee, usually consisting of two members, supervises the management (student staffing, hours, rules) of the departmental Reading Room and the acquisition of books; it also acts as a liaison between the Department and the Slavic bibliographer at the Young Research Library.
- The Colloquium Committee, usually a committee of one, is responsible for helping to organize the yearly California Slavic Colloquium, assisting the Department's students to prepare colloquium papers (together with individual members of the faculty in their respective disciplines); and acting as a liaison among the coordinators from Stanford, USC and Berkeley to select the venue and date.

Student-Faculty and Student Committees:

- The Student- Faculty Liaison Committee consists of two graduate student representatives elected by the department's graduate students (see below) and two faculty members appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee. The Committee is co- chaired by one faculty member and one student chosen by the Committee at the beginning of the academic year meets at least once a quarter to consider matters of concern to students and/or faculty and reports on its deliberations to the Chair and, when appropriate, to the department.
- Graduate Student Representatives, consisting of one linguistics student and one literature student, are elected by the graduate students at a meeting at the beginning of each academic year. Their responsibilities are: 1) to represent students at faculty meetings (except those conducted in executive session, for example, during personnel actions) and to report the substance of such meetings to all students; 2) to serve on the Student-Faculty Liaison Committee (see above).

Departmental Officers and Standing Committees,. 2001-02:

Chair: Michael Heini

Undergraduate Advisor: Olga Kagan

Support Coordinators: Ronald Vroon, Olga Kagan

Recruitment Officers: Ronald Vroon, Olga Yokoyama

Computers and Web Site: Gail Lenhoff, Olga Kagan

Reading Room: Ronald Vroon

Teaching: Michael Heim, Vyacheslav Ivanov
Legislative Assembly: Ronald Vroon
Curriculum: Emily Klenin, Alexandr Ospovat
Foreign Language: Michael Heim, Emily Klenin
Executive: Gail Lenhoff, Chair; Vyacheslav Ivanov, Olga Yokoyama
Student-Faculty: Alexandr Ospovat, Olga Yokoyama
Russian Language: Olga Kagan, Susan Kresin
Alumni Relations: Michael Heim, Olga Yokoyama
Colloquium: Roman Koropecjy

CODES OF CONDUCT AND MEDIATION OF GRIEVANCES

The Department wishes to promote an atmosphere of collegiality and cooperation conducive to the fulfillment of its academic mission. It will therefore address any concerns or grievances immediately, vigorously and in a nonpartisan spirit.

Codes of Conduct. Information on the code of conduct for students may be -found in *University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students* at <http://www.edu.ucophome/uwnews/aospol/toc.html> and UCLA Student Conduct Code at <http://www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/SCC-Table%20oP/oContents.htm>. Information on the code of conduct for faculty may be found in the *UCLA Faculty Handbook* available at the Academic Personnel Office in 3109 Murphy Hall and also accessible on the Internet at <http://www.apo.ucla.edu/apoweb/facultyhandbook/9.htm#9c>.

Mediation of Grievances. Students believing they have a grievance involving a Faculty member, another student or administrator should first attempt to resolve the matter with the party involved. If the grievance remains unresolved or if students feel hesitant about confronting the other party, they should bring the matter to the attention of the Chair and request the Chair's mediation.

Students, faculty, and administrators may at any point avail themselves of the services of the Campus Ombuds Office. Acting impartially, ombuds officers may investigate unresolved conflicts or facilitate the resolution of problems for which there may be no established guidelines, and may also, where possible and when requested, assist in resolving an issue through mediation. The Ombuds Office is also a designated Sexual Harassment Information Center for students, faculty and staff as well as a campus Harassment Information Center (HIC) available to all UCLA students. The Ombuds Office is located in 105 Strathmore Building. For further details, see their web site at <http://www.saonet.ucla.edu> or phone 825-7627.

Other courts of resort include the Graduate Division and the Office of the Dean of Humanities. In cases of grievances involving a potential violation of the faculty code of conduct, students may consult with a member of the Academic Senate Grievance and Discipline Procedures Committee (3125 Murphy Hall, 825-3891) for help in deciding on an appropriate course of action. For further details see the *UCLA General Catalogue*, Appendix A: "Charges of Violation."

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

Section IV-I: Departmental Internal Report

INTERNAL REPORT

THE DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES & LITERATURES

NOVEMBER 2001

1. A Status Report on Faculty Recruitment

In the Fall Quarter, the Department announced a search for a candidate in Russian literature with specialization in either nineteenth-century Russian prose or twentieth century postwar Russian literature and culture. Seventy applications were received and reviewed by all members of the Department. At the recommendation of an ad hoc committee, appointed by the Chair, the faculty selected twelve candidates to be interviewed at a national convention. Of these, five (three men and two women) were invited to UCLA; one withdrew. After hearing the four candidates' presentations, interviewing them extensively, and polling the students, the Department voted to hire David MacFadyen, who specializes in postwar twentieth-century Russian literature, at the rank of associate professor. While the appointment is under review according to University procedure, Professor MacFadyen is teaching in the Department as a Visiting Associate Professor.

The Department is continuing to lobby with the Dean for two FTEs it considers vital to supporting its academic mission and maintaining its pre-eminence in the field: a position in South Slavic and a position in nineteenth-century Russian prose.

2. Procedures for Admissions and Graduate Student support allocations

The Department has created a mechanism for enhancing graduate student recruitment. It consists of two officers, one representing literature and the other representing linguistics. Their mandate is to contact major departments for promising undergraduates, to review application requests and respond personally to the most interesting of them, and to hold telephone interviews with the best applicants.

The Department has committed itself to a policy of offering newly admitted students four-year packages, contingent upon timely progress. Such support will be equivalent in monetary terms to a 50% teaching assistantship (TAship) on the assistant level. This package may consist of fellowships, grants, unrestricted aid, research assistantships, teaching assistantships or any combination of the above. Most favorable consideration for funding beyond four years will be given to students who maintain normative progress beyond advancement to candidacy.

Both admissions and graduate support are decided by a committee of the whole: all faculty members review all applications and vote on admission. Continuing students are ranked at a faculty meeting, where the results are tallied to form a ranking list and the list is fine-tuned on the basis of an open discussion.

The department has two Graduate Student Support Coordinators, one representing literature, the other representing linguistics. They perform the technical function of implementing the faculty's decisions, that is, dealing with programmatic concerns (for example, the suitability of students for specific TAs and RAs) and making the necessary adjustments as circumstances change (for example, if students learn that they have been awarded TAs or other kinds of funding outside the Department). The Graduate Student Support Coordinators work closely with the SAO, the MSO, and the Chair in determining such adjustments.

The Department allocates support in two ways. First, it nominates candidates for certain awards that originate outside the department. These include NDEA fellowships from CERS, FLAS fellowships for summer language study from CERS, CERS RAs, the Chancellor's Fellowship, divisional RAs and GSAs, research mentorships, and dissertation year fellowships. Second, the department has direct control over certain resources it receives from the Graduate Division, the Humanities Division and philanthropic sources. These include TAs, GSAs, summer mentorships, restricted funds (for example, monies restricted to recruitment of incoming students, or multiple year grants) and unrestricted funds. Nominations, rankings and primary allocations are made by the entire faculty as described above except in the case of research mentorships and dissertation year fellowship, where the Chair, in accordance with Graduate Division directives, ranks applications after consulting with students' advisors.

Students who wish to apply for departmentally nominated funding are required to turn in a Self-Evaluation statement with the following information:

1. a list of all courses taken in graduate school and grades received
2. a) a statement of progress to degree to date, and b) information on circumstances adversely affecting that progress
3. a) a list of the TAs and RAs the student wishes to apply for, and b) any special qualifications for the positions the student may have
4. a) a statement of academic plans for the coming year, b) an outline of projected progress to degree, and c) a brief statement of long-term professional goals
5. a list of talks given, papers published, awards or honors received

The department has two Graduate Student Support Coordinators, one representing literature and the other linguistics. They perform the technical function of implementing the faculty's decisions, that is, dealing with programmatic concerns (for example, the suitability of students for specific

TAships and RAships) and making the necessary adjustments as circumstances change (for example, if students learn that they have been awarded TAships or other kinds of funding outside the Department). The Graduate Student Support Coordinators work closely with the SAO and the Chair in determining such adjustments. The department will make every effort to inform students of final decisions on funding by May 15. However, in some cases this may be too early for the department to know exactly what funds will be available (for example, if funds offered as part of a recruitment package are not accepted and revert to the Department for distribution to other students). For that reason, additional announcements about aid may come after May 15.

Each spring the Graduate Students and Support Coordinators shall calculate and make public to faculty and students the kinds and amounts of student funding it has or recommends for distribution, and each fall they shall calculate and make public the number of students supported in category of aid, while observing the demands of confidentiality.

Criteria for funding include:

- Level of academic performance. This will be evaluated on the basis of the student's successful completion of department course offerings as indicated by grades, as well as on the basis of opinions of faculty members familiar with the student's work. Because of the narrow range of grades for graduate students, the GPA alone is not compelling evidence of academic success. The number and variety of courses completed are at least as important as the GPA.
- Timely progress to the degree. This is measured by successful completion of course requirements, language examinations (Russian and French/German), and the MA and PhD examinations. Normative progress is defined as follows: six academic quarters from the onset of graduate study to the awarding of the MA degree; six academic quarters from the awarding of the MA degree to advancement to candidacy; that is, to passing the PhD qualifying examinations, and six academic quarters from advancement to candidacy, to the completion of the dissertation. The PhD qualifying examinations must be taken within two years of admission to the Doctoral program, and the dissertation must be completed within three calendar years of the date when the qualifying examinations are passed. Study abroad or certain circumstances of a personal nature may require leaves of absence and extend normative time to degree, and will not affect decisions concerning support.
- Support history. It is departmental policy to provide support for the first four years of a student's graduate career and to make certain that all students have the opportunity to teach. These are our first priorities. Students in good standing who have received this guaranteed support have second priority and are encouraged to take advantage of what seems to be an increasing number of opportunities for TAships and GSRships outside the department.

Funds for teaching assistantships are provided to the department by the Dean of Humanities and may vary from year to year depending on enrollments. Although teaching assistantships constitute a major form of student support, their primary function is to provide relevant training experience for academic and academic-related careers in teaching and research. It is the policy of the department to offer all students the opportunity to teach for one full year.

Graduate students who are recipients of teaching assistantships must meet all registration and enrollment criteria established by the department and must also maintain satisfactory progress throughout their appointments. Students become eligible for teaching assistantships when they are awarded the M.A. degree. Exceptions are made only in cases of extraordinary departmental need or in cases where a student has already had considerable teaching experience and/ has exceptional language skills.

The selection process for teaching assistantships follows the basic procedures outlined above for all forms of support assigned by the department. However, two other criteria are also relevant and will play an important role. These are 1) a student's degree of mastery of the target language and or subject to be taught, and 2) a student's ability to communicate effectively in English with undergraduate students.

While taking into account all these criteria, the Department is also governed by a number of other important considerations. The first of these is the ideal of providing every qualified student with the opportunity to teach. The second is to give all students exposure to language teaching, and where possible to give literature and linguistic students teaching experience in their respective disciplines. Finally, the Department must also take into consideration the needs of the Undergraduate program served by teaching assistants.

3. Structure and Procedures for Appointment and Supervision of Master's and Doctoral Committees

After a student's application to take the master's examination has been approved, the Chair appoints a committee consisting of three members of the faculty. The masters oral examination is open to observation by faculty members other than those constituting the examination committee should the examinee so desire.

The doctoral examination committee consists of a minimum of four UCLA faculty in the professorial ranks, three of whom must hold appointments in the Slavic Department and one of whom must be from outside the Department. Two of the four committee members must hold the rank of professor or associate professor. The chair of the committee must be

from the Slavic Department. For further details on exceptions—for example the inclusion of non-UCLA professors—see the Graduate Division's *Standards and Procedures for Graduate Study at UCLA*.

Students should consult with the Department Chair about the prospective membership of the committee and the choice of the committee chair, who in all likelihood will be the dissertation advisor. With the Chair's approval the student secures the agreement of the prospective committee members to serve. The Chair then nominates the examination committee for approval by the Dean of the Graduate Division. Once the committee has been approved, students work closely with the chair of the examination committee to prepare for the qualifying examinations in their areas of specialization.

4. Modifications of the Academic Programs

Modifications Affecting the Programs in Literature and Linguistics

- a) An optional sub-specialty at the PhD level has been instituted. It consists of at least four courses selected by the student and approved by the student's chosen advisor. The courses will come from graduate offerings in one or more UCLA departments or programs (see the *Handbook* for a detailed list) and including courses from within the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures (students in linguistics choosing from courses in literature and students in literature choosing from courses in linguistics).
- b) A proseminar consisting of 2-4 units has been reinstated as a required course for the MA.
- c) Proficiency in either French or German shall be required for the MA. Proficiency must be demonstrated by passing a departmental proficiency examination. Although the examination may be deferred until after the MA examinations, the degree will not be awarded until it has been passed. Students are therefore urged to demonstrate proficiency as soon as possible after matriculation.
- d) Proficiency in both French and German are required for the PhD. Proficiency in one of these languages will have been formally tested prior to the awarding of the MA degree; proficiency in the second language is to be demonstrated by the inclusion of texts in that language on the bibliographies prepared for the PhD examinations. Familiarity with said texts is to be attested to by the chair of the doctoral committee, who must submit a language examination report to the Graduate Division concurrent with the nomination of the doctoral committee. With departmental consent students specializing in linguistics may substitute a language important to the study of Slavic linguistics (Finnish, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Romanian, or a Turkic language).

- e) Students will be given written notice of the results of the MA and PhD examination one hour after the conclusion of the oral portion of the examination and a written evaluation of their performance within one week.
- f) Students may request MA or PhD examinations at the beginning of the academic year as well as at the end of each academic quarter.
- g) The qualifying paper has been abolished.

Modifications Affecting the Program in Linguistics

The areas covered in the two three-hour written examinations are redefined as follows: in the first of the exams the student is examined in the general area of the proposed dissertation research, in the other in comparative Slavic linguistics, the history of Russian and the history and structure of a second Slavic language.

Modifications Affecting the Program in Literature

- a) Russian 215 (Contemporary Russian Literature) has been made an MA requirement.
- b) Russian 220A (Structure of Modern Russian: Phonology and Morphology) and Russian 204 (Introduction to the History of Modern Russian) and Russian 219 (Movements and Genres in Russian Literature) have been eliminated as MA requirements for students specializing in Russian literature; Russian 220A and Russian 204 have been added to the PhD requirements.
- c) The MA written examination for literature now consists of three 2-hour examinations, spaced one day apart over the course of a week, the first devoted to medieval and eighteenth-century Russian literature, the second to nineteenth-century Russian literature, and the third to twentieth-century Russian literature.
- d) The number of seminars required for the PhD in literature has been reduced from 4 to 3.
- e) The PhD written examinations for literature consist of seven 1-hour examinations spaced over the course of two weeks devoted to topics distributed as follows: 1) the medieval period; 2) the eighteenth century; 3) the nineteenth century; 4) the twentieth century; 5) literary theory; 6) a second Slavic literature; 7) the provisional dissertation topic. The specific topics and the accompanying bibliographies are to be developed by the student in consultation with and the approval of the members of the examination committee.

f) A course is currently under development in which students at the dissertation stage will give regular reports on the progress of their research. The course may be conflated with regular meetings of the faculty devoted to the discussion of ongoing faculty research.

5. Student Welfare and Internal Resolution Policies

The Department has adopted a number of measures in response to student concerns:

- A *Graduate Student Handbook* setting forth departmental academic policies and procedures in detail has been compiled. It has been vetted by faculty and students. The *Handbook* addresses the issues listed below in detail and should be referred to for more information.
- Reading lists for the MA and PhD programs in literature and linguistics have been updated and distributed to all students. The lists will be reviewed and updated, if necessary, every two years.
- Students now choose their own advisors beginning in their second year (see the *Handbook* for details).
- All faculty members now teach undergraduate courses.
- All students have been issued keys to the Department Reading Room.
- Faculty have been directed to provide timely responses on dissertation chapters, generally within one month of submission.
- Specific grievance procedures have been set up and tested over the course of the past three quarters. Students believing they have a grievance involving a faculty member, another student or administrator are advised to attempt to resolve the matter with the other party involved. If the grievance remains unresolved or if students feel hesitant about confronting the other party, they should bring the matter to the attention of the Chair and request the Chair's mediation. Students, faculty and administrators may at any point avail themselves of the services of the Campus Ombuds Office. Acting impartially, ombuds officers may investigate unresolved conflicts or facilitate the resolution of problems for which there may be no established guidelines, and may also, where possible and when requested, assist in resolving an issue through mediation. The Ombuds Office is also a designated Sexual Harassment Information Center for students, faculty and staff, as well as a campus Harassment Information Center (HIC) available to all *UCLA* students. The Ombuds Office is in the Strathmore Building. For further details, see their web site at <http://www.saonet.ucla.edu> (tel. 310-825-7627).

• Other options include the Graduate Division and the Office of the Dean of Humanities. In cases of grievances involving a potential violation of the faculty code of conduct, students may consult with a member of the Academic Senate Grievance and Discipline Procedures Committee (3125 Murphy Hall, tel. 310-825-3891) for help in deciding on an appropriate course of action. For further details see the *UCLA General Catalogue*, appendix A: "Charges of Violation."

6. Staff Participation in Departmental Meetings

The Department voted to invite the MSO of the Kinsey Humanities Group and the Student Affairs Officer to faculty meetings. They have attended and participated actively since the Winter Quarter 2000.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

Section IV-J: Copy of Resolution Passed by the Graduate Students Association in Light of the Eight-Year Review Involving the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures

Proposed resolution on graduate input vis-a-vis eight year departmental reviews:

WHEREAS, the Graduate Students Association appointees to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate are permitted to join the departmental eight-year review committees to a limited extent for the purpose of mediating between students and the committee, and reporting on graduate student issues, and

WHEREAS, the review process has revealed on occasion dysfunctional departments in which serious and persistent problems exist, and

WHEREAS, many of these problems involved the interaction between faculty members and graduate students to the disadvantage of those -students, suggesting abuse of power on the part of faculty:

BE IT RE SOLVED THAT

The GSA Forum calls upon the incoming GSA officers and the Academic Affairs Commissioner to make representations to the Academic Senate and Graduate Division regarding the following issues:

1. The efficacy of the eight-year review system in highlighting and reforming major problems in terms of the time gap between reviews and the procedures for taking action to address issues;
2. The resources available to the review committee in respect of interviewing not only current but also former graduate and professional students;
3. The protection afforded to students who wish to speak out regarding what they perceive as abuse of power within a department;
4. The necessity for objective standards in the review process;
5. Unhindered access to the graduate student body for the student member(s) of the review committee

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)

www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

Section V: Michael Heim and the Consequences of His Actions

In the second section of this report special emphasis was placed on the fact that the single most important point in the entire review process was when Michael Heim, as the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, refused repeated requests from graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department, from the graduate student representative within the UCLA Slavic Department, and from the internal review committee itself, to cease and desist from speaking to graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department about the results of the Eight-Year Review. So important was this that the section bears repeating here as preface:

Single Most Crucial Point in the Review:

Once the University had promised, explicitly, to protect cooperating graduate students, only to prove itself unable and/or unwilling to prevent faculty members from asking students about the review, the true nature of the power structure at the UCLA became clear to all concerned, and especially to the graduate students who had believed the university's many promises of protection. While the process of investigation into the Slavic Department continued after this point, the credibility of any promise made to graduate students concerning protection evaporated with these incidents (faculty members threatening the university with legal action/Heim's refusal to leave off questioning graduate students about the review.) What also evaporates, as an extension of this, is the ability to question graduate students in an open and candid manner: not only can graduate students never again trust the promises of the university administration with regard to issues such as protection and lack of retaliation at the hands of faculty, but from this point onward, student responses themselves have to be seen as potentially compromised. *Why would any student, in response to an inquiry concerning the department and faculty on which he/she is so dependent, give a frank and detailed response in light of what has happened? To do so would be tantamount to professional suicide.*

Once this point was reached—once the UCLA Administration backed down and the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department saw that their threats had an immediate effect—at that point, the UCLA Slavic Department knew that the tide had begun to turn. The Department, although still bruised and chastised, knew then that their tenured colleagues who comprise the

UCLA Administration were not going to throw them to the wolves. From this point on the Department became ever more emboldened. Those of you who have read this far have already read the description of the UCLA Slavic Department and the actions of its faculty—both the abuses alleged by students and staff, and the abuses of which there can be no doubt (e.g. the lies on the part of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, which were documented and enumerated by the internal committee, the lies concerning the percentage of UCLA graduates who get tenure track positions [very easily verifiable], and the out-and-out breaking of state and federal law by distributing to other students the grades from one student's transcript without the permission of that student.) Given that the faculty was caught in one outrageous lie after the other, how, one is tempted to ask, how could it even conceive of the idea of going to the Academic Senate in the Fall of 2000 and asking that graduate student admissions be restored, eight months after they were suspended?

The answer lies in the signal that was sent by the UCLA Administration's failure to adhere to its own publicly articulated line, its failure to meet the UCLA Slavic Department faculty's threat to legally challenge the prohibition, its failure to live up to the solemn promise that it gave time after time after time to the graduate students of the UCLA Slavic Department, a promise which stated that, in exchange for the students' cooperation with the Eight-Year Review investigating committee, these students would be protected by the UCLA Administration from retaliation and interrogation by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty. Once the faculty of this department saw that they could in fact threaten the UCLA Administration with legal action, and that such threats were effective in getting the UCLA Administration to back down on what had before been a directive issued to these same faculty members, all bets were off. This is not to say that the Administration would not go through the motions of "reform" with the UCLA Slavic Department. Of course, there was always the need to keep up a proper façade of oversight, lest the facts ever, G-d forbid, come to light and the public see exactly the sort of system that their tax dollars are funding. But the faculty of the Slavic Department was sent a clear message at this point, and that message was this: you may have made a mess of things, you may have handled things clumsily, you may have told a few lies, but you are not going to be held accountable for this. Just do what it takes to get your house in order, and we in the UCLA Administration are prepared to overlook this 'unpleasantness' and get things back to normal as soon as possible."

In a following section of this report, each entity involved in this Eight-Year Review process will be discussed as to the role it played with regard to the Slavic Department review. The internal review team will be included in this discussion, but it is important here to say a few words about the internal review team with regard to the decision on the part of the UCLA Administration to back down in the face of legal threats coming from the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department. In general, one thing that most of the students involved in the review agreed upon was that, of all the entities representing the University in this process, the internal review team was the most fair and the most committed to students' welfare. This might have been a

function of the pre-review questionnaires, where it was made clear how serious the problems were in the Slavic Department, or it may have been a function of the information provided to the internal review team prior to the actual onset of the review, in which detailed and verifiable examples were made available to the internal review team (but not to the external review team because of the presence on it of UC Berkeley's Alan Timberlake, himself a former tenured linguist in the UCLA Slavic Department). In these pre-review communications, UCLA Slavic Department students made it very, very clear that they were not going to accept the sort of cover-up and farce that the last Slavic Department Eight-Year Review had been in 1992, so this might have factored into the internal review team's willingness to be objective. Or perhaps not, it is impossible to say. What can be said is what was said above, that most students felt that the internal review committee was sincere in its efforts to help students and that it, for whatever reason, approached the faculty's arguments and reasoning with a degree of skepticism appropriate for a committee charged with investigating an entity against which such serious charges had been made.

That said, it must also be said that this issue of keeping the faculty from interrogating Slavic Department graduate students was one area in which the internal review committee's decisions were not in keeping, at least not in retrospect, with its stated commitment to fairness and protection of the graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department. When the then-Chair of the Slavic Department, Michael Heim, and other faculty members began asking students about the Eight-Year Review shortly after its release, students immediately went to the head of the internal review team, which triggered his consultation with the UCLA Administration and led to the memo from the UCLA Administration to the Slavic Department faculty, directing the faculty not to ask Slavic Department graduate students about the results of the Eight-Year Review.

When it became clear that the UCLA Administration, in the face of legal threats on the part of the Slavic Department faculty to sue the University for abridgement of what the faculty perceived to be their First Amendment rights, was going to back down, again the head of the internal committee was contacted, and again the request was made to do something, anything, to protect those Slavic Department graduate students who had acceded to the request of the UCLA Administration to cooperate fully with the investigating committee after having received assurances that, were they to do so, they would be protected from interrogation and retaliation.

This was a crucial point. Unless this promise made by the UCLA Administration to the graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department could be kept, then there could be no further meaningful exploration of abuses going on within that Department, since students would now, once again, be intimidated in openly cooperating with investigators, and if there could be no such open and free cooperation by the graduate students, then any result from any investigation coming after this point would be tainted. Intense pressure was exerted on the head of the internal committee to do something. At this point, the head of the internal committee responded to the

effect that this issue was being discussed at the very highest levels of the University, and that the situation was very delicate. The head of the internal committee felt that by placing too much pressure on these unnamed powers-that-be to engage the UCLA Slavic Department faculty on this point, he would alienate some of those within the power structure at UCLA whose support he felt was essential to bringing about change. He warned against any one student trying to "micromanage" the investigation, and "begged" (his term) that no student push him to the mat on this one particular point, given the delicacy of the situation. He also said, if anything were to occur that would further indicate that there might be an imminent interrogation of graduate students, he would then immediately jump back in and press the UCLA Administration to make good on its promises of providing protection to graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department who agreed to the UCLA Administration's request to cooperate fully with the investigating committees.

As has been stated above, it didn't take long for such a threatening scenario to arrive, in the form of Michael Heim's email to graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department in which he continued the smear campaign against XX (the former student who allowed her story to be told) and in which he illegally released grades from her undergraduate transcript, and, most importantly, in which he tried to amend his previous inquiry as to who the dissatisfied students were: In this second email to graduate students, Heim tries to characterize this inquiry— "Who are 'the students' here?" — as purely rhetorical, and then states the following: "I am not asking which students came forth: I do not need to ask who the offended students are because I know who they are." It was this, in conjunction with the content of this message, that led to the head of the internal review team being again contacted and asked to demand of the UCLA Administration that it fulfill its stated commitments to the graduate students of the Slavic Department of protection from retaliation and interrogation.

Unfortunately, it appears that this never took place as the topic was never again broached. Indeed, in the letter sent by the head of the internal committee to graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department, they are explicitly encouraged to engage in discussion with the faculty that had just used threats of legal action to force the UCLA Administration into a state of submission. From the letter: "We also encourage you to participate in the departmental discussions of the report so that the chair may prepare the departmental response." (See [Section IV-C.](#))

The rest is self-evident. The UCLA Slavic Department faculty saw that their threats had worked, and that, however painful the experience had been, they had reached the bottom and were in a position to do what they so very desperately wanted to do, and that was to regain control. To repeat what was said above, this was the single most important point in the review. Graduate students, for the most part, did not then, and do not now, doubt that the chair of the

internal committee had their best interests at heart when he made the decision not to press the UCLA Administration to keep its promises and demand that it not back down in the face of legal threats from the Slavic Department faculty. For him, this seemed like a logical decision at the time based on the framework within which he was operating and the presuppositions on his part which supported that framework.

What was that framework and what were the presuppositions? The chair of the internal committee, based on his comments on the delicacy of the situation, approached the UCLA Administration within a framework of negotiation, of prodding the UCLA Administration to do the right thing, but with the full knowledge that he could not force anything to happen, could not force the UCLA Administration to act one way or the other. Hence this tentative (at least in this instance) approach to the problem of Slavic Department faculty contacting Slavic Department graduate students. The presupposition which underlies this approach is that, although such a careful approach might not bring about everything that is needed, might not bring about everything that has to be done to change the system, it will nonetheless bring about some positive change, which is better than nothing, and it seems as though "nothing" was exactly what the head of the internal committee was afraid he would wind up with were he to push the UCLA Administration too hard on the question of keeping the promise made to graduate students to protect them from retaliation and interrogation at the hands of the Slavic Department faculty.

It cannot be emphasized enough that, of all the investigating bodies and all the bodies which represented the University in these investigations, the internal review team was the one body that acted in a conscientious way, with almost all of its actions consistent with what was best for the beleaguered graduate student body in the UCLA Slavic Department. This one particular decision, however, turns out not to have been correct. The head of the internal review team should have insisted that the UCLA Administration come through on its promises to protect graduate students. If this meant that the UCLA Administration would have, because of repeated pressure by the chair of the internal review team, ceased to take him seriously, then so be it. In other words, the "negotiations framework" was not the best framework to use, at least not when it came to the issue of the UCLA Administration fulfilling its promise of protecting graduate students. A better solution, at least from the point of view of some of the graduate students, would have been for the head of the internal review team to stand his ground, and had he continued to be rebuffed, to resign and go public with the reasons for his resignation.

This was one of the few mistakes made by the internal review committee in what was an enormously complex and difficult task, especially given the fact that it had nowhere near the needed administrative and investigative support required for a task so large. And yet, the consequences of this mistake cannot be denied. It allowed the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department to get back up on its feet and begin the process of re-acquiring power. It sent a message to the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department that they could indeed threaten the UCLA

Administration and do so effectively. Most of all, it was the beginning of the process to bring graduate students to heel and to re-instituting a system that allowed the faculty to influence, and to varying degrees control, the graduate student body, a group of students that was still heady from the experience of seeing the abuses of the UCLA Slavic Department finally brought to light. With the failure of the UCLA Administration to enforce its directive that Slavic Department faculty not speak with Slavic Department graduate students about the Eight-Year Review, a process was set into motion: order was being restored.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)

www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

Section VI: System "Breakdowns"; Actions of Various Players and Entities

Part 1: System "Breakdowns"

This section focuses on the players and academic entities that were active in this Eight-Year Review process, the role they played, and on the effect that their actions had in how the process eventually played itself out. The first part concentrates on the individual faculty, reviewers, administrators, investigating bodies, etc. involved in the process and to an extent on the process itself. The second part looks to evaluate the process as an organic whole to see just how it broke down and why it failed to bring about substantive change and substantive remedy, and what the consequences of that failure are.

1. The Previous Eight-Year Review

The Eight-Year Review prior to the 1999-2000 Eight-Year Review, as was described above, was a farce. The entire review seemed controlled from the beginning. Students were made to understand the importance of the Department doing well in this review and some were actually coached by faculty members as to what they should say in response to questions. These extra measures did indeed pay off, since during the 1992 review, the outside review team did ask probing questions. The fact that the previous Eight-Year Review was so ineffective did not bode well for the 1999-2000 review.

2. The Initial Questionnaire Sent to Slavic Department Graduate Students

Students were already suspicious when the time came for the 1999-2000 review. The review began with a questionnaire sent out to all graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department. This questionnaire consisted of two parts, the first being a series of questions that could be answered by choosing from one of a number of possible answers, the second being a space for students to add additional comments. It did not help the situation when those who were administering this section of the review gave the graduate students in the Slavic Department different answers as to who exactly would see their written comments. Given the absolute need for anonymity, this was a not unimportant question. Unfortunately, one official said that

nothing that was actually written would be seen by the Slavic Department faculty, while another official said that it might be the case that Slavic Department faculty would read the comments. This marked an inauspicious beginning for the entire process, as paranoia among graduate students was already quite high.

3. Attempt by the Department to Put Off the Review

Again, given that paranoia among Slavic Department graduate students was already so high, it was not particularly comforting to know that the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department was trying to put off the review. This just made it that much harder for graduate students in the Slavic Department to take the stand that they eventually did by agreeing to the request by the UCLA Administration that they fully cooperate with the investigating committees.

4. Not Enough Administrative and Investigative Support Staff for the Review Committees

This was a problem that continually came up throughout the review. No doubt the internal review committee had no idea what it was getting into when it started this process. While there were strong indications that something was very, very wrong, it became immediately clear that the internal review committee was not prepared to handle the amount of data and documentation that had been supplied to it. Because of these manpower restrictions, there were areas of abuse that were not covered. It was because of this lack of manpower that the internal review committee originally had no plans to interview former graduate students of the UCLA Slavic Department, i.e. graduate students who had been driven out or crushed out prior to the attainment of their degrees. It was only at the insistence of current graduate students that the internal committee agreed to talk to former graduate students, and even then, only a small number were interviewed. The importance of interviewing former graduate students was immediately evident, as this is where some of the most damning information in the internal review committee's report comes from, but it was only the tip of the iceberg in terms of the sort of information and insight that could have been made available by former graduate students.

The lack of administrative and investigative support meant that the picture that arose from the internal report, as bad as it was, was not complete and perhaps not even representative of the worst abuses that went on in the UCLA Slavic Department.

5. Alan Timberlake's Presence on the External Committee

For anyone interested in comprising an investigating committee free of conflict or interest or (to give Timberlake the benefit of the doubt) potential conflict of interest, the placing of Alan Timberlake on the External Committee was a colossal blunder. Timberlake is a former tenured

member of the UCLA Slavic Department, and even worse, he is a former linguist in the UCLA Slavic Department, with close ties to linguistic component of that department's faculty. Even if he had turned out to be evenhanded and trustworthy (which, in retrospect, quite clearly was not the case), he would have been the wrong person for that position, simply because of his past history with the UCLA Slavic Department.

6. Michael Heim's Pattern of Deception: Denying What was Painfully Obvious until the Evidence Became Overwhelming

To the extent that the faculty of the department being examined cooperates and is truthful with the investigating committee, it is to that extent that much easier for the investigation to proceed. Obviously, that did not happen here. Denial and deception started at the top, with the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, and spread outward from there. Had Michael Heim not lied to the reviewers, had he not lied to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate in his Errors of Fact statement, had he not tried during the Eight-Year Review to cover up the systematic abuse of graduate students by faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department, then this would have saved the reviewers much time and effort, time and effort that could have been devoted to other areas of abuse not even touched upon by the Eight-Year Review report. In addition, Michael Heim's willingness to dissemble and prevaricate, even in matters when the truth was obvious, sent yet another chill down the spine of graduate students in the Department, many of whom had hoped that Heim would be more sympathetic to the cause of letting the truth come to light, especially given his history of being a fairly sympathetic shoulder on which graduate students could cry whenever they were battered about by the more abusive faculty in the Department. By his actions, Michael Heim was making very clear that whatever the role it was that he had played in the past with regard to the Department's graduate students, when it came to defending the party line, he was a democratic centralist of the first order.

7. Bethea/Timberlake: The Failure of the External Committee to Challenge the Information Being Provided to Them by the UCLA Slavic Department, and the Consequences of that Failure for the External Review Report

As was shown in detail in the annotated version of the External Review Report, the external reviewers main flaw was that they appeared to accept at face value the information provided to them by the department which they were supposedly investigating, e.g. the preposterous claim that seven out of the last seven UCLA Ph.D.s received tenure track positions. This failure to delve into the facts may have blinded them to some of the realities of the Department. And yet, there are instances in which the external reviewers do get it right, and those instances are noted time and again in the annotated version of their report. This then begs the question, if they were right on that, why couldn't they have done the necessary work to verify the statements being fed to them by the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department and by the rest of

that department's faculty?

One is tempted to surmise that this failure to investigate to the level necessary in a department such as the UCLA Slavic Department might be the cause for their subsequent failure to comprehend the role being played by Michael Heim, and hence also the reason behind their statement "it seemed obvious to us that the current chair, Michael Heim, with his patience, good will, sensitivity, and the respect he universally enjoys, has done an admirable job of bringing the department out of a situation of potential crisis; he is the right chair for the department at this time." Indeed, they even went so far as to characterize Michael Heim's leadership as "enlightened". What argues against the fact that this drastically flawed view of Michael Heim's leadership came about as a result of insufficient information is the fact that both of these two reviewers, Alan Timberlake and David Bethea, continued to heap praise upon Michael Heim, even after they had seen the full report in which Michael Heim's systematic pattern of deceptions, including point-by-point rebuttals of his claims, were made clear for all to see. This strongly suggests that they had, from the very beginning, abandoned any pretense of being objective reviewers and were instead quite willing to do whatever was necessary in order to mitigate the findings of the internal review. Their willingness to turn a blind eye to the facts in an attempt to sanitize Michael Heim's actions and the reputation of the Department mark one of the major breakdowns in the overall review process.

8. Refusal Of Michael Heim To Honor Repeated Requests By Student Representatives Not To Talk To Graduate Students About The Eight-Year Review

This point has been addressed numerous times, so it will not be repeated here other than to say that this stand by Michael Heim was the beginning of the end in terms the University being able to have confidence in its ability to solicit candid and frank commentary from its graduate students regarding the state of this department or any department. While some students might nonetheless agree to cooperate, others would not, and even the commentary of those who would agree would be tainted, since they would be agreeing to provide this commentary with the full knowledge that they might be latter quizzed or interrogated over the results of their comments, thereby leaving open the real possibility that they would tone down what they had to say, or even pass over some items all together.

9. Michael Heim's Email to Graduate Students

This point has also been covered in detail in the annotated copy of the Eight-Year Review report. Heim's determination to continue to the smear campaign against XX, his assertion that he already knows who the offended students are, his assertion that retaliation has never occurred against students in the UCLA Slavic Department, and his assertion that the abuse of graduate students had somehow been blown out of proportion—these points, along with others in this

email, combined to act as a further impediment to investigating the abuse of graduate students in that department.

10. Refusal Of The Graduate Council To Send Copies Of The Review By Email To Students Who Had Received Michael Heim's Email But Who Were Not In Residence At That Time

A review process of this type should, ideally, be conducted by neutral investigators dedicated to the principles of equity and determined not to show favoritism toward either faculty or students. At this point in the investigation, when so much of what had been alleged with regard to abuse of graduate students had been shown to be true, the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate should have been bending over backwards to show fairness and even-handedness. Instead, knowing that Michael Heim was sending out propaganda concerning the Eight-Year Review report via email, the Graduate Council refused to send the Eight-Year Review report itself out via email, no doubt fearful of the consequences of a digitized version of such devastating review floating about cyberspace. Still, these fears notwithstanding, the obligation that rested upon the shoulders of the Graduate Council was to be fair and evenhanded. The Graduate Council's failure to meet that obligation in this regard led to a further lack of confidence among graduate students in the system that they had been encouraged to trust and cooperate with.

11. Bethea/Timberlake's Post-Review Revisionist Letter in Which They Attempt to Soften the Impact of Their Report and Show Support for Michael Heim, This Despite the Fact that Michael Heim Had Been Shown to Have Been Consistently Untruthful

Just as Michael Heim's email to students was threatening and ominous because of his insinuations of insider knowledge as to which students had complaints and which students did not, so too was the revisionist letter from Bethea/Timberlake ominous. That they were so willing to completely ignore what they themselves had written in their original External Review report, and that they were so willing to join in this smear campaign against XX, the one student who courageously allowed her story to be told, did not inspire confidence in graduate students as to the effectiveness of the entire review process. In-depth commentary on their revisionist letter is included in the annotated copy of the Eight-Year Review report. ([Section IV-B](#))

12. The UCLA Administration Backing Down on It's Directive Instructing the Faculty Not to Talk to Students about the Eight-Year Review in the Face of Threatened Legal Action by the Slavic Department Faculty

Obviously, this was a devastating blow to the entire process. If the UCLA Administration, which had promised Slavic Department graduate students protection against retaliation and interrogation, cannot back up its own promises, then the legitimacy of the entire

process is completely undermined.

13. The Internal Committee's Failure to Insist that the UCLA Administration Not Back Down with Regard to its Directive to Michael Heim and the Rest of the Slavic Department Faculty

Whenever offering up criticism of the Internal Review Committee, it can not be emphasized enough that this was the one part of the review process apparatus that seemed to be genuinely concerned about graduate student welfare and about bringing the truth to light. Still, this was a major mistake on the part of the Internal Review Committee and cannot be characterized as anything but a mistake, regardless of the intent behind this decision not to insist that the UCLA Administration stand by its word regarding protection of graduate students.

14. The Graduate Council's Lifting of the Ban on Graduate Student Admissions in the Fall of 2000 Against the Recommendation of the Head of the Internal Committee

This was an equally devastating blow, perhaps even more so given that the Graduate Council knew of Michael Heim's continuing pattern of denial and falsehoods, and had been informed of the fact that Michael Heim had committed illegal acts in his attempts to cover-up and deny the abuses that occurred within the UCLA Slavic Department. It shocks the conscience that, knowing what they knew, the members of the Graduate Council would allow a department such as this to continue to admit and enroll students.

15. The Failure Of The Dean Of The Humanities To Remove Michael Heim As The Chair Of The Slavic Department Once It Had Been Established That He Had Continually Lied

At this point, it had become abundantly clear that the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, Michael Heim, had lied time and time again when confronted with investigators delving into the issue of abuse of that department's graduate students. It should have been equally clear that Michael Heim was an impediment to the investigative process, not an asset. He should have been removed immediately from his position as Chair pending investigation into his activities and to the charges that he had violated state and federal law. He was not removed, thereby weakening the investigative process that much further.

16. The Failure Of The UCLA Administration To Contact Law Enforcement Once They Had Been Informed That Michael Heim Had Broken State And Federal Law By Illegally Releasing Grades From The Undergraduate Transcript Of XX Without XX's Permission

Once it had become absolutely clear that Michael Heim had broken state and federal law by illegally releasing grades from an undergraduate transcript without the consent of the student

(in this case, XX, the student who had allowed her story to be told), officials in the UCLA Administration had the moral obligation to inform law enforcement that laws had been broken. They failed to do so, which cemented further in the minds of graduate students the idea that the entire process was nothing more than a farce and that no matter what the faculty did, be it moral, be it immoral, be it legal, be it illegal, there was no way that the UCLA Administration was going to confront or do anything to endanger tenured faculty at UCLA.

17. The Failure of the Dean of the Humanities to Implement the Recommendation of the Internal Review Committee that the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures Be Put into Receivership.

The same reasoning applies here: the true nature of the UCLA Slavic Department was abundantly clear to anyone who wanted to see it. The failure of the Dean of the Humanities to immediately place this department into receivership dealt yet another blow to the process itself, although it must be said that by the time it became clear that this entire "Co-Chair" ruse was exactly that, a ruse, the whole process had been so discredited in the eyes of graduate students that this came as no great surprise. It was seen as just one more example of a system put in place by the tenured professoriate bending over backwards to protect tenured colleagues.

18. The Failure Of The UCLA Administration To Have In Place Any Sort Of System For Disciplining Faculty Wherein It Is Publicly Acknowledged That The Faculty Member Has Been Disciplined

The system in place for disciplining faculty, and the weaknesses therein, have been discussed in detail in the annotated version of the Eight-Year Review report. Since this system is so weak and so opaque (even if a faculty member has abused a student, and even if there is some sort of punishment involved, neither the abused student nor anyone else will know the disposition of the case because it is all done in secret), it really has very little effect in terms of sending a message to other faculty that abuse will not be tolerated. Moreover, as has been touched upon above, rarely is the punishment ever so great as to extend to dismissal, at least not for tenured faculty. This weak-to-non-existent system of faculty discipline no doubt emboldened the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department to take the stands that they did, even in the face of overwhelming evidence of wrong doing and abuse of graduate students.

19. The Failure Of The Internal Review Committee, Which Conducted The Follow Up Review, To Insist That Its Original Recommendations, i.e. Suspension Of Graduate Student Admissions And Receivership, Be Implemented.

No doubt the Internal Review Committee, which had seen its main recommendations (1. Suspension of Graduate Student Admissions; 2. Placement of the UCLA Slavic Department into

receivership) rejected by the Graduate Council of Academic Senate and by the Dean of the Humanities, respectively, entered into the follow-up review of the Slavic Department with a high degree of frustration. They had provided what was perhaps one of the most damning reports in the history of UCLA only to see their recommendations minimized or rejected outright. Perhaps this is why they did not recommend that these same sanctions be imposed after the follow-up review. But regardless of what their thinking was in this regard, they should not have backed down in the follow-up review from their original suggestions, as this leaves the impression that the conditions that brought about the situation in the UCLA Slavic Department in the first place no longer existed, when in fact, an official investigation of the UCLA Slavic Department was never instigated and none of the abusive members of that department had been disciplined or even charged with abusing graduate students.

Summation

This series of "breakdowns", assuming that is what they actually were, are appended below in tabular form. These breakdowns, as they were manifested in the review of the UCLA Slavic Department, will be addressed again from a new perspective later on in this exposé. For now, they exemplify well the problems inherent in the system that serve to hinder any true investigation of faculty misconduct and which serve to deflect any real punishment from being imposed.

System "Breakdown" By Steps

1. The previous eight-year review
2. The initial questionnaire sent to Slavic department graduate students
3. Attempt by the Department to put off the review
4. Not enough administrative and investigative support staff for the review committees
5. Alan Timberlake's presence on the external committee
6. Michael Heim's pattern of deception: denying what was painfully obvious until the evidence became overwhelming
7. Bethea/Timberlake: The failure of the External Committee to challenge the information being provided to them by the UCLA Slavic Department, and the consequences of that failure for the External Review report

8. Refusal of Michael Heim to honor repeated requests by student representatives not to talk to graduate students about the Eight-Year Review
9. Michael Heim's email to graduate students
10. Refusal of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate to send copies of the review by email to students who had received Michael Heim's email but who were not in residence at that time
11. Bethea/Timberlake's post-review revisionist letter in which they attempt to soften the impact of their own report and show support for Michael Heim, this despite the fact that Michael Heim had been shown to have been consistently untruthful
12. The UCLA Administration backing down on its directive instructing the faculty not to talk to students about the Eight-Year Review in the face of threatened legal action by the Slavic Department faculty
13. The Internal Committee's failure to insist that the UCLA Administration not back down with regard to its directive to Michael Heim and the rest of the Slavic Department faculty
14. The Graduate Council's lifting of the ban on graduate student admissions in the Fall of 2000 against the recommendation of the head of the Internal Committee
15. The failure of the Dean of the Humanities to remove Michael Heim as the chair of the Slavic department once it had been established that he had continually lied
16. The failure of the UCLA Administration to contact law enforcement once they had been informed that Michael Heim had broken state and federal law by illegally releasing grades from the undergraduate transcript of XX without XX's permission
17. The failure of the Dean of the Humanities to implement the recommendation of the Internal Review committee that the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures be put into receivership.
18. The failure of the UCLA administration to have in place any sort of system for disciplining faculty wherein it is publicly acknowledged that the faculty member has been disciplined
19. The failure of the internal review committee, which conducted the follow up review, to insist that its original recommendations, i.e. suspension of graduate student admissions and receivership, be implemented.

Part 2: Individual Actions of Various Players and Entities in This Review Process

This section focuses on the individual actions of those who played important roles in this investigation, both single individuals and groups as entities or as a whole.

1. Slavic Department Faculty

As has been described above, at least some of the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department did not even want the review to take place. This did not mean, however, that all faculty were opposed to it. Some of the non-tenure track faculty welcomed it because it was one of the few means available of possibly putting some sort of a check on the faculty. Even some of the tenured faculty welcomed it for the same reason. But as a whole, the faculty was not at all favorably disposed towards the review.

The actions of some of the faculty in response to the review itself can only be termed shameful. From storming in and actually shouting at students to threatening to bring suit against the University itself when told that they should not ask graduate students questions about the Eight-Year Review report, the behavior of some of these faculty shocks the conscience. The Eight-Year Review Report ([Section IV-A](#)) and the annotated Eight-Year Review ([Section IV-B](#)) report go into detail with regard to faculty prevarication and failure to interact in an open and honest fashion with the reviewers, so that point will not be belabored here.

This was a faculty that could not believe that it was being challenged. Even more astounding was the fact that so much of the ammunition that was being used against it was provided by its own graduate students, a group which, as a body, had been cowed and fearful for years and years. The anger that welled up in some of these faculty was barely containable, and in at least one instance, wasn't contained at all. It is all too easy a simile to liken people and institutions to wounded animals, but in this case, it fits. The fury among the faculty that someone, anyone, would challenge them was not universal, but it was widespread, especially among the linguists, with two exceptions. Those graduate students that had to teach that summer had no choice but to be present in the actual Slavic Department office at that time, but many others laid low, waiting for cooler heads to prevail.

The performance of the faculty was as one might have expected. Obviously, the non-tenured faculty and the tenure-track faculty that had yet to receive tenure were limited to what they could say or do. Some of the tenured faculty recognized that abuse was going on, including the above-mentioned two exceptions among the linguists. The abusive faculty themselves, however, and those other tenured members of the faculty who had tried to cover up for them,

reacted in various ways, from outright denial, to passive resistance, to out-and-out denial of the truth, misrepresentation of facts, smearing of former graduate students and outright illegal activity.

2. Administrators of the Eight-Year Review

By "administrators", what is meant here is those who were responsible for setting up the logistics of the review process, e.g. passing out of pre-review student surveys, setting up of the process, etc. Given the level of abuse and fear within the UCLA Slavic Department, this was no easy task, and the administrators, by and large, did an admirable job. The only slip up was that which was mentioned above, the providing of contradictory statements as to who would and would not be able to see the students' written responses to the survey questions.

3. The Internal Review Team

Of all the investigative bodies involved in the Eight-Year Review process, none performed more admirably or with greater concern for students' welfare than the internal review team. Early on it had become clear to the UCLA Administration that there were problems of a magnitude rarely seen even at a high-powered research institution such as UCLA. The word among graduate students was that when the UCLA Administration finally came to understand how serious the problems were, they actually rearranged the composition of the internal review committee, placing at its head a professor who had been in similar positions in the past. The head of the internal committee, when asked about this by graduate students in the Slavic Department, refused to either confirm or deny it. If true, however, it was in fact a good choice, at least from the point of view of the Slavic Department graduate students, as he set the tone for the way in which the internal review team would interact with these graduate students.

As was pointed out above, there were some problems with the approach taken by the internal review team. At the outset, the internal review team knew that there were major problems, but it is doubtful that they knew the extent or severity of those problems. Some of the graduate students who had been around for a while had heard from others about the last Eight-Year Review, and were aware of the shortcomings in the process, even for a regular department, much less a department like the UCLA Slavic Department. It was clear from the outset that, in order to get a comprehensive picture of what had been going on in the UCLA Slavic Department for all these years, not only present graduate students but also former graduate students needed to be interviewed. This was something that the internal review team hesitated in doing. Nonetheless, graduate students pointed out that a failure to do so would result in an incomplete picture of the abuses that had occurred within the Department, since some of the most glaring examples of abuse would come from students who had, in one way or the other, been driven from the Department. To the credit of the internal review team, they showed the ability to receive

input from graduate students and adjust their strategies accordingly, finally agreeing to contact former graduate students (although it must be said, not that many, certainly not nearly enough to paint a completely accurate picture of all the abuse that had taken place within the UCLA Slavic Department).

In a similar vein, the position that the head of the internal review committee took towards the UCLA Administration when it came to the question of protecting Slavic Department graduate students from retaliation and interrogation from the Slavic Department faculty, while no doubt well intentioned, turned out to be, in the end, incorrect. Still, this was, at least so far as graduate students could tell, an error in tactics and not in intent. These errors notwithstanding, the internal review team was the one faculty-associated body in the review process that consistently did its job and which made the protection of graduate students and their welfare its prime concern. Had it not been for the efforts of the internal review committee, the path to resolution of problems dealing with the abuse of graduate students by faculty might have by-passed the UCLA Administration entirely and gone directly to fora designed to redress these issues judicially.

4. The External Review Team

The report of the external review team, in combination with their after-the-fact revisionist letter trying to save the UCLA Slavic Department, is one of the low points in this entire process, as it exemplified well the "you-wash-my-back-and-I'll-wash-yours" attitude that exists among tenured colleagues, even extending to tenured colleagues at other universities. Why they thought they would be able to simply turn on a dime and take a situation that they had previously described negatively and then sing its praises, no one but they can know for sure.

To be clear, not everything that the external review team suggested was wrong. As can be seen from the annotated version of the Eight-Year Review report above, some graduate students agreed with quite a number of the points that they made. When the external review committee got things wrong, it was usually for one of two reasons:

1. The external review team did not have access to all the graduate students that the internal review team had due to the presence of Alan Timberlake on the external review team and students' fears (since confirmed) that he could not be trusted to be an objective reviewer of the Department. Mistakes made by the external reviewers because of a lack of candid input from graduate students cannot be laid at the doorstep of the external reviewers.
2. There were times when the external reviewers simply made statements without having done the work to back up these statements (e.g. when they said that the training in the UCLA Slavic Department is "excellent") and there were times when they drew false conclusions based on incorrect data fed to them by the UCLA Slavic Department itself (e.g. the ridiculous claims made

regarding the number of UCLA grads who received tenure track positions), data that they failed to investigate and corroborate on their own.

The great failure, of course, had nothing to do with any lack of or misinterpretation of data. By the time the two external reviewers had sat down to write their external report, they undoubtedly knew that there were major problems in the UCLA Slavic Department, and they come out and openly acknowledge much of this, noting especially the climate of fear and paranoia among the graduate students. By the time Bethea/Timberlake got around to writing their revisionist letter, they had of course seen the devastating internal report issued by the internal review team. Even if they somehow managed to convince themselves that they had received essentially the same input from graduate students as the internal review team (they hadn't) and even if they had somehow managed to convince themselves that the internal review team had simply put an overly negative spin on the picture that emerged (it hadn't), this still does not change the fact that it was crystal clear that the Chair of the Slavic Department, Michael Heim, had lied again and again throughout the review.

And yet, how do Bethea/Timberlake react to that reality? They ignore it. Even worse, not only do they ignore it, but also they argue fiercely that Michael Heim is somehow, for some reason, the only person who can save the Department! They praise his leadership and his sensibilities, even after having read of how he tried, time and time again, to deceive the investigating committees. Without question the most shocking and most abhorrent act on their part was when they tried to characterize the UCLA Slavic Department faculty as somehow a victim of some sort of Stalinist oppression that emanated from either the UCLA Administration or the internal review team. This was a faculty that for years had operated with undertones of fear and intimidation, never missing an opportunity to make clear to graduate students the nature of the power relationship that existed in the Department between faculty and students, and the consequences that would ensue to anyone so unwise as to challenge that relationship.

To understand fully how loathsome this comparison was, one must keep in mind that the department in question is a Slavic department. Few issues are more deeply felt in such a department than the issue of Soviet-era repression and the vice-grip that such repression had on both the Russian and other Slavic peoples as well as on their literatures. The irony here, of course, is that no one had perfected the Stalinist art of intimidation more than the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department, and no one was more willing to use institutionalized power to their advantage than this faculty, be it against students, administrators, or other faculty. The abuses of power within the Soviet system depended upon the willingness of the bureaucracy to cooperate, the willingness of those in positions of privilege to go along, the willingness of those in charge to make whatever claim was needed, in whatever form was needed, in order to keep the existing system in place, regardless of how close those claims were to reality. By the time they had

written their revisionist letter to the Academic Senate, Bethea/Timberlake had seen exactly this system in place at UCLA, and indeed, it was the same system that was in place during Timberlake's tenure here as a professor. And yet, instead of exposing this system, they proved that they were a part of it, as they were more than willing to do whatever it took to help their tenured brethren in the UCLA Slavic Department, including overlooking evidence, including failure to check on information being fed to them, including showing a willingness to join in Michael Heim's campaign to smear the one student who was willing to stand up and let her story be told, the student with a 3.9 GPA out of UC Riverside who, according to Michael Heim, received her high grades in Russian only because of "grade inflation" at UC Riverside.

The performance of Bethea/Timberlake was, in short, disgraceful. When confronted with the choice of fulfilling their responsibilities as objective outside reviewers or protecting their tenured colleagues, they chose the latter.

5. The Slavic Department Chair, Michael Heim

In order to understand Michael Heim's performance in this Eight-Year Review, it is necessary to know his history in the UCLA Slavic Department. Although he came very much from the Harvard tradition of many of his colleagues, he seemed to arrive at UCLA without the ego that characterized so many of his colleagues in the Slavic Department. In this sense, he was not all that different from many of the literary scholars who were in the UCLA Slavic Department at that time, few of whom had the same tortured sense of injured pride that seemed to define so many of their colleagues on the linguistic side of the house. Michael Heim, perhaps more so than any of his colleagues, seemed to aspire to the ideal—at least in theory. He became known for his translations of major Central European authors, and to the surprise of many, announced at some point after he had received tenure that he wasn't going to publish any more, since there were others who were better at this than he, and that to pretend otherwise would be dishonest.

This might not be seen as all that earthshaking a declaration, but in the environment that existed in the UCLA Slavic Department, an environment which was very much that associated with a high-powered research-oriented department, this was practically a counterculture-like manifesto of defiance. And yet, as much as it vexed senior faculty that Heim would take this position, it was to that same extent that it was appreciated by many of the graduate students, most of whom had had their fill of the "high powered, research-oriented" attitudes of the senior faculty. When combined with the fact that Heim did not appear to be ego-driven, and that one could talk to Heim without worrying about him exploding into anger, and without worrying about him plotting to take some sort of vengeance against a student who would question his positions, he quickly became the sort of faculty member to whom students could go when things got rough, if for no other reason than to have a sympathetic audience. Many were the UCLA Slavic students who used Michael Heim's shoulder to cry on when the going *did* get rough, which was not an

uncommon state for students in that department.

For Michael Heim, there was never a problem that couldn't somehow be solved. Of course, this optimism was rarely born out, as can be seen in the painfully low rate of graduation among UCLA graduate students over the years. Still, to find an optimist anywhere, much less in the UCLA Slavic Department, was generally seen as a good thing, and if this was the worst thing one could say about Michael Heim, then that was certainly something that graduate students could live with.

The other piece of background information essential to understanding (or trying to understand) Michael Heim's performance in this most recent this Eight-Year Review is the situation that he stepped into prior to the commencement of the review itself. As was alluded to in the Response to the Eight-Year Review above, Michael Heim was a sort of "emergency chairperson". His predecessor, a relatively new addition to the Slavic Department at UCLA, had just stepped into the job, and had served less than a year when she tendered her resignation as the chair. This is itself a long story, but briefly what had happened was that this professor, in her short tenure here, had quickly come to realize how deep the problems were in the UCLA Slavic Department and, upon taking the helm of the Department, had set out to bring about much needed changes. The response to this from most of the faculty, including even a good number of literature faculty, was decidedly lukewarm, and in many cases, outright hostile. After less than a year of trying to bring about some change in the Department and being met at almost every turn by the Department's inertia, this chairperson came to the conclusion that she was fighting a battle of diminishing returns and as a consequence resigned as chair.

This proved to be a Pyrrhic victory of sorts for the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department. On the one hand, the immediate problem of having their infrastructure challenged had been solved for the time being. The linguistic faculty, with two exceptions, were for obvious reasons not in the least bit receptive to changing a system that had been shaped over decades to ensure their place in the Department's hierarchy. And the literature faculty (again, with a few exceptions) were also not all that saddened by the departure of the chairperson and her innovative ideas. As bad as it was for the literature faculty being under the harsh thumb of the senior linguists, the one thing that can be said is that, because there was such a high drop-out rate among graduate students in linguistics, that much more funding was left over for graduate students in literature. This was not always the case in every year, but in general this held to be true, and it seemed, at least from the point of view of graduate students outside looking in, that this was the compromise that had been effected between linguistic and literary faculty: linguists rule the roost in whatever way they see fit, and the literature faculty, in return for their cooperation, get to have a larger percentage of support go to their graduate students. This worked for a number of reasons: the linguistic faculty could always explain away the high washout rate among linguistic students as something not surprising when one is dealing with the best department for Slavic

linguistics in the country (indeed, in perverse sort of way, this high washout rate was used to backup their claim as to the quality of the linguistics program.) In addition, the fate of Slavic linguistics as a discipline inadvertently fit into this system. Although an appalling small number of students who set out to get a Ph.D. in Slavic linguistics from UCLA ever actually wound up with such a degree, this small number served the Department well when it came to placing students, since those who did manage to survive could be held up as the cream of the crop. It is much easier to place a small number of students in tenure track jobs than it is to place a large number, so if UCLA was only graduating one PhD in Slavic linguistics every year and a half to two years or so, this small number was offset by the fact those who did graduate could sometimes be placed in tenure track positions, which seemed to satisfy the UCLA Administration that the Slavic Department was indeed doing a good job, since the Department could point to their graduates in Slavic linguistics and truthfully say that they had placed a large percentage of them (i.e. of those who had *graduated*, not of those who had started out in the Department) in tenure track jobs. That this large percentage was generated from a very small number of graduate students who had managed to survive the UCLA Slavic Department was then conveniently overlooked.

Thus, the system in place, while probably not deemed optimal by the literature faculty, nonetheless seemed acceptable, and the attitude taken toward this new chairperson seemed more or less to be, "better the devil you know than the devil you don't know." Her departure then required that the Department find a new chairperson, and it is here where Michael Heim's optimism and generally pleasant demeanor seemed to fit the bill as to what was needed. Linguistic faculty felt that he was compliant, literature faculty felt that he was definitely sensitive to their needs, and graduate students, for the reasons discussed above, at least did not feel especially threatened by Michael Heim. This is not to say, however, that this change of chairs went down well with all graduate students. Many of the graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department had for years seen the sort of abuse that had gone on there, and were thrilled when Michael Heim's predecessor took over as chair, thinking that this might indeed be the dawn of a new day, and that substantive change really might be possible within the academic system itself. While few graduate students had specific bones to pick with Michael Heim, a great many felt that this coup d'état was the last straw, and began to explore other options to redress their grievances, explorations which eventually led to the results of the most recent Eight-Year Review.

Still, even though no one had any faith that Michael Heim would bring about change in the Slavic Department—after all, he was one of the faculty who continually tried to explain away or outright ignore the abuses visited upon graduate students by the Slavic Department linguistics faculty—some still held out hope that, once these abuses had been highlighted by students willing to push the Eight-Year Review to do what it claimed it was going to do, at that point Michael Heim would see the writing on the wall and would feel relieved of the need to defend the

Department against charges that were so widespread and so outrageous and thus would perhaps—perhaps—become part of an eventual solution to the problem. Sadly, this was not the case. As can be seen from everything that has come before in this exposé, not only did Michael Heim do nothing to further the process, he in fact did everything he could to hinder it, up to and including lying to the Internal Committee, lying to the Academic Senate, and going so far as to break the law in his attempt to smear the one student who dared to speak out on record as to her treatment at the hands of the UCLA Slavic Department.

There is no question that Michael Heim did these things. The internal committee made clear that he would opt for the "lie and deny" strategy when confronted with the realities of the UCLA Slavic Department and would abandon it only when confronted with overwhelming evidence to the contrary. His lies to the Academic Senate as to the placement record of the Department are easily documented. And his illegal release of grades from the undergraduate transcripts of the student he was attempting to smear is as clear as the email in which he released those grades. There is no question about any of these things. The question is, why would Michael Heim do this? This leads to the realm of speculation, but the answer that makes the most sense would be that Michael Heim had a misguided sense of duty to the UCLA Slavic Department, a sense of loyalty so warped that he must have felt that protecting the UCLA Slavic Department, no matter how well documented the charge against it, was somehow the lesser evil than allowing the Department to be closed. If that meant lying time and again, and if that meant releasing grades illegally from students' transcripts in order to smear them, and if that meant ignoring the law, then somehow, in his mind, that must have been seen as being justified when juxtaposed against the possibility of closing the Department.

And yet, even with all the unshakeable documentation of his lies and his behavior, it is still difficult to believe that Michael Heim would go to this extent and would do such heinous things. In many ways, his actions stand in stark juxtaposition to the principles he espoused in his classes. To be in a class on Central European literature taught by Michael Heim was to see a professor who fiercely defended the rights of the individual. To hear Michael Heim discuss Havel or Milosz or Kundera or any other dissident writer was to hear an impassioned defense of the right to dissent. Heim's knowledge of dissident writing and the conditions under which Eastern Bloc writers would labor is deep and sophisticated. He understood that, while expulsions and jailings and beatings were the actions by totalitarian authorities that made the news, the greater burden was often not these individual acts of thuggery, but rather the day-to-day conditions under which these writers worked. He understood that much of the battle against dissent was not comprised of swift individual acts of repression against this or that writer, but rather the maintenance of a system that would, more often than not, rely not on brute force, but on low-intensity oppression backed up with the threat of brute force to discourage dissent. This institutionalized, systemic oppression, backed up with the threat of brute force, was the greater retardant to the free expression of ideas. Michael Heim understood this very, very well.

And yet, when the time came to choose, when the time came for Michael Heim to make the choice in his own life between siding with students who were desperately trying to defend themselves, on the one hand, or with, on the other hand, the faculty which for years and years had visited abuse upon its own students, Michael Heim faltered. For whatever reason, Michael Heim threw in his lot not with the victims of institutionalized oppression, but rather with its perpetrators. Time and time and time and time again. There was no lie too outrageous to be told, no truth so clear that it couldn't be obfuscated, no deed too atrocious to be overlooked, no moral too sacred to be circumvented, no student too talented to be smeared, and no law too threatening that it could not be broken. It may well have been the case that Heim had deluded himself into thinking that by throwing in his lot with the abusive faculty, he was somehow doing the right thing; that in some way the preservation of the Slavic Department, however flawed it may be, outweighed the protection of that department's students. It may have been the case that Heim was ashamed of all the years that he and his fellow faculty members had looked the other way when graduate students were being crushed left and right by his linguistic colleagues.

One can speculate endlessly as to why Michael Heim acted in the manner in which he did. What is beyond question is that his performance in the Eight-Year Review was disgraceful and shameful. From his lies to his shading of the truth to his smearing of students to his refusal not to question students to his breaking of the law, Michael Heim fell short in every way.

6. The Slavic Department Graduate Student Representative

If Michael Heim's performance can be said to be completely devoid of moral courage, then that of the Slavic Department's graduate student representative can only be said to have been the polar opposite. This student, who had agreed to take on the unenviable job of acting as the official go-between in the UCLA Slavic Department between its faculty and its students, could not have been more squarely placed in the eye of the storm. She knew very well what the reputation of the UCLA Slavic Department was, and she knew what happened to those who dared to voice even timid objections, much less stand up outright to the sort of behavior practiced by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty. Her own position was at that time extremely vulnerable as she had yet to take her PhD comprehensives, and yet time and again she challenged the chairman of the Department, the senior literary scholar Michael Heim, on issues relating to the Eight-Year Review and the protection of students who had heeded the request of the UCLA Administration to voluntarily participate. Unlike Michael Heim, she had no academic tenure to protect her, yet when faced with the question of doing the right thing versus protecting her own future in the Department (and by extension in academia) she always opted for the first choice. When it became clear that the faculty would go to any lengths to preserve their "right" to interrogate students about the details of the Eight-Year Review, she was not only unyielding in insisting that this not happen, but actually volunteered to act as an intermediary between faculty and students

so that there could be communication between the two groups that did not threaten individual students. Of course, this solution was rejected as the promises of the UCLA Administration to protect students began to crumble, but the offer was made. She worked untold hours of unpaid labor to defend the graduate students of the UCLA Slavic Department, and she never backed down in the face of threat or intimidation. Whatever eventually happens to the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, her role in trying to protect graduate students who had been betrayed by the UCLA Administration and who were under threat of interrogation by the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department should not soon be forgotten.

7. The Graduate Student Representative on the Internal Committee

As has been explained above, the Internal Review Team of every Eight-Year Review is supposed to contain a graduate student from UCLA, with the thought being that students reluctant to talk to faculty members might be more comfortable and more willing to speak with one of their fellow graduate students. This allows them to speak on the record if they wish but through the graduate student representative. Off the record, of course, it does give the internal review team a view of the department that might not otherwise be available, which is why the idea of having a graduate student on the internal review team is a good one. As was the case with the graduate student representative from the Slavic Department, the graduate student representative on the Internal Committee served without compensation, unlike all the faculty members involved. While this position is often pro forma, especially in cases where the academic department being examined is relatively healthy with a faculty that fosters good relationships with its graduate students, in this case, the role played by the internal committee's grad student representative was crucial. Students who wouldn't talk to the faculty members on either the internal or the external committee were willing to speak with him, and some who were willing to speak to a limited extent with the internal and/or external committee were willing to talk in an even more open manner with a fellow graduate student. Moreover, his relationship with the head of the internal committee was a good one and he provided much information to the committee and corroborated other such reports that had been received, perhaps to a lesser degree, by the internal committee.

The graduate student representative on the internal committee took his responsibilities seriously and, in the face of a UCLA Administration reluctant to protect graduate students whom it had persuaded to participate in the review, the grad student representative was tireless and dogged in his continued insistence that the UCLA Administration live up to the promises that it made to them. When it became clear that the UCLA Administration had decided to back down in the face of legal threats from the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, he was relentless in communicating to the internal committee, to the Dean of the Humanities, and to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate as to what needed to be done. It would have been easy to send one email and then back off. As can be seen from the emails included in [Section IV-E](#) of this

report, the graduate student representative of the internal committee instead sent at least four communications to the officials named above, each communication more insistent and more detailed than the one before it, trying to highlight the looming danger of allowing the UCLA Slavic Department faculty to interrogate its graduate students on the Eight-Year Review. The graduate student representative to the internal committee came to the position with considerable experience in graduate student government (the Graduate Students Association-GSA) at UCLA, and was an invaluable source of information to graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department, informing them of their options and rights as students. He also made them aware of the potential for the GSA to assist and advise them as to possible courses of action in the face of the decision of the UCLA Administration not to follow through on its promise to protect the graduate students of this department. In addition, he had ties with members of the Graduate Council itself and thus was able to make appeals directly to certain individuals associated with the Graduate Council.

Had it not been for the graduate student representative on the internal committee, many of the abuses that occurred in the UCLA Slavic Department might not have been exposed. His service was selfless and extensive, and should be so recognized. What should also be recognized is that this person's status as a graduate student. Even though he was a student in a department that, by all accounts, was relatively reasonable in its treatment of its graduate students, there was still risk involved. Other than the graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department themselves, no one had greater insight to the abuses that were going on there, and, more frighteningly, the unfolding story of the UCLA Administration's unwillingness/inability to control this department and the actions of its faculty than the graduate student representative of the internal review team. If the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department in 2000 has shown one thing above all things to be true, it is that tenured academics will go to very great lengths to protect one another and how little protection the system itself affords to those students who might be characterized as troublemakers. If the graduate student representative didn't know this before, he certainly knew it by the time he was deeply entwined in the Eight-Year Review process, and yet he pressed ahead, advocating forcefully and eloquently for the graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department.

Both he and the graduate student representative in the Slavic Department have shown, at risk to themselves, the conviction and the character to stand firm in defense of their fellow graduated students regardless of this risk. The juxtaposition of their actions, taken in spite of the precarious nature of their position as graduate students, to those of Michael Heim and Bethea/Timberlake, tenured academics whose jobs were not at any risk whatsoever, reveals a contrast that could not be starker.

8. Dean of the Humanities

The Dean of the Humanities initially appeared to be sympathetic to the situation of the

Slavic Department graduate students. As was noted above in Section II of this report, the Dean of the Humanities had actively solicited responses from graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department and indicated an awareness of the possibility of repercussions. When the Dean of the Humanities proposed, after being approached by several graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department, that this problem would be best resolved through the process of the Eight-Year Review, graduate students were willing to give her the benefit of the doubt, this in spite of the fact that the previous Eight-Year Review in 1992 had been little more than a sham designed to conceal the real nature of what was happening in the Slavic Department at that time.

The role played by the Dean of the Humanities was covered extensively in Section II, so it won't be detailed here. Briefly stated, the Dean of the Humanities actively encouraged participation and downplayed the risk of retaliation. (See [snippet of the message sent by the Dean of the Humanities](#) to a Slavic Department graduate student in Section II.) The Dean of the Humanities had been informed in person by a number of graduate students as to what was happening in that Department. She also had access to the final report, in which the scope and extent of Michael Heim's mendacity had been made clear to all. In spite of all the evidence of wrongdoing in the UCLA Slavic Department, in spite of the fact that even *after* the review came out the UCLA Slavic Department faculty continued to deny wrongdoing, in spite of the fact that the UCLA Slavic Department faculty directly challenged her order not to talk to Slavic Department graduate students about the Eight-Year Review—in spite of all of this, the Dean of the Humanities *still* refused to put the Department into receivership as per the recommendations of the internal committee. To add insult to injury, she then asks the Slavic Department graduate students, who had been lied to about being protected from the faculty, to actively cooperate with the same chair who had not only lied repeatedly, but had actually broken the law in his attempts to smear the one graduate student who had enough courage to allow her story to be told openly.

When the Dean of the Humanities announced that she was going to become the "Co-Chair" of the Slavic Department, along with the chair who had told one falsehood after the other, it became very clear that her purpose was not to bring about positive change to the UCLA Slavic Department, but rather to do everything she could to keep this scandal contained, to keep the current power structure in place until tempers cooled and the whole "unfortunate incident" could blow over. The strategy of the Dean of the Humanities appears to have been to stay, as much as was possible, "above the fray", and only exercise real power when it appeared that the existing power structure inside the Slavic Department might be in real danger of falling. It is as good an example as could be desired for the phenomenon of the tenured elite protecting their own, this time through the formal structure of the University itself.

9. The Graduate Council of the Academic Senate

At the beginning of this report, the Academic Senate of the University was represented as a sort of [de facto union for the faculty](#). It was further pointed out that because the Academic Senate of the University in many respects runs the University, this would suggest that the idea of the Academic Senate policing the conduct of its own members (that is to say, the idea of the Academic Senate policing itself) is fraught with the potential for very real conflict of interest to arise. That this might have been the case was hinted at by the reluctance of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate to send out digitized (emailed) copies of the Eight-Year Review report to graduate students in response to Michael Heim's emails to these same students in which he attempted to deny the substance of the report itself. What confirmed this view in the eyes of many of the graduate students was the Graduate Council's quick acceding to of Michael Heim's request in the Fall Quarter of 2000 that the Graduate Council lift the ban on the graduate student admissions after only a few months. The arguments against lifting the ban, a ban that was recommended by the internal review committee and which the internal review committee recommended stay in place, have been detailed elsewhere in this report, especially in sections [II](#) and [IV \(B\)](#), the annotated copy of the Eight-Year Review report, but they merit a quick review here.

The Academic Senate, through the Graduate Council, had been informed, in exquisite detail, of the severity and scope of the charges leveled against the UCLA Slavic Department by its own graduate students. The Graduate Council read first hand of the numerous denials and attempts to deceive on the part of the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, to include lies told to, and reported by, the internal review committee, and lies in the report itself, e.g. the falsely reported rate at which UCLA Slavic Department graduates received tenure track positions. It knew of the promises that had been made to graduate students in this department who had agreed to participate in the review to protect them from their own faculty, and it knew of the abrogation of that promise. The Graduate Council was informed of the attempt by the outside reviewers to soften their initial report and their attempt to back up the Chair of the Slavic Department, going so far as to joining in his smear campaign against the one student who allowed her story to be told and who had grades from her undergraduate transcripts illegally disseminated by the Slavic Department Chair as part of this smear campaign.

Finally, it is worthwhile revisiting the phrase in the internal review report that dealt with graduate students' fear of reprisal:

"It goes without saying that the willingness of numerous students to speak with the review team (but not to be quoted) was critical in arriving at the decision to take the above actions. Let it, therefore, be clearly understood that the slightest indication of retaliation by faculty against students will be aggressively investigated by the Graduate Council to determine whether charges should be filed with the appropriate Senate Committee for violations of the Faculty Code of

Conduct, not only for recent but also for any past offences."

It should be made clear that the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate endorsed these strong words, and indeed, they were very strong: at the *slightest indication* of retaliation, we are told, there will be *aggressive investigations* by the Graduate Council. And yet, when Slavic Department graduate students were begging the UCLA Administration not to allow the UCLA Slavic Department faculty to interrogate them about the Eight-Year Review, when the Slavic Department graduate student representative made multiple requests of the Chair of the Slavic Department that he not talk directly with graduate students concerning the review, when the graduate student representative on the internal committee sent message after message, each one more urgent than the one before, requesting that the faculty be prohibited from contacting graduate students about the Eight-Year Review, when the Chair of the Slavic Department Michael Heim went so far as to claim he *knew* who the offended students were, and when the Slavic Department faculty threatened legal action against the University and thus forced it to back down from its order to them that they not discuss the Eight-Year Review with graduate students—even when all this had happened and all this had been reported to the Graduate Council—what did the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate do? Did it "investigate aggressively" as it pledged to do by ratifying the report?

Or did the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate do nothing?

The performance of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate was clearly in keeping with the description of the Academic Senate in [Section II](#), namely a representative of the tenured faculty that holds the interests of this tenured faculty at its center, first and foremost among its concerns, with the obvious conflict of interest that this implies with regard to the Academic Senate's responsibilities and duties in the area of investigating and disciplining fellow faculty members. Just as was the case with the Chair of the Slavic Department Michael Heim, and the members of the external committee Bethea/Timberlake, and the Dean of the Humanities Pauline Yu, the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate wanted nothing more than to find a way out for the Slavic Department faculty, to find some method by which the situation could be salvaged without actually officially investigating the faculty for wrongdoing or even going on record as having made an accusation of wrongdoing. The chasm between the Academic Senate's noble words concerning the protection of graduate students and its actions in allowing young students to once again enter this department's graduate program, a department with *the very same chair* who had lied and been caught lying and had actually broken the law in an attempt to smear a former student, is telling.

10. The UCLA Administration

From Day One, the UCLA Administration said all the right things and made all the right moves to leave the impression that it was truly interested in effecting change for the better in the UCLA Slavic Department. Those graduate students who had found the courage to actually go outside the traditional (and ineffectual) avenues of redress available in the Slavic Department and to go straight up the academic hierarchy (for example, those who secretly went to the Dean of the Humanities for help) were pointed to the upcoming Eight-Year Review and told that this would be the best avenue for change. And why would graduate students doubt the word of University officials? It was a relief to find out that there were officials in academia who seemed to be not only rational, but also sympathetic to the concerns of these graduate students.

What in retrospect seemed to be an attempt to draw out this process and in effect wear down graduate students at the time seemed to be simply an academic administration concerned with taking all the proper steps and proceeding cautiously but steadily forward. Bit by bit the UCLA Administration would back off its commitment to bring about real change, but never in one fell swoop, never all at once in a way that would be evident to all that this is what was being done. The internal review committee recommends a ban on graduate student admissions for the Slavic Department: the Academic Senate agrees, but only for a few months. The internal committee recommends that the Slavic Department be put into receivership: the Dean of the Humanities delays and delays implementing this suggestion, and then finally announces that she would be the "Co-Chair" of the Department, strangely allowing the Slavic Department Chair to stay on as a "Co-Chair", this in spite of overwhelming and undeniable evidence of prevarication and other wrongdoing on his part. Students frantically beg the Administration to honor its pledge to protect them from interrogation by Slavic Department faculty. In response, the UCLA Administration backs down in the face of legal threats from the Slavic Department faculty and tries to recharacterize this contact between Slavic Department faculty and Slavic Department graduate students as "participation in departmental discussions of the report" or as "solicitation of student response".

At one point in this process, when confronted with the (arguably) harsh recommendations of the internal committee as to what should be done with the UCLA Slavic Department, the Provost of the College of Letters and Sciences was said to have been taken aback and to have remarked something to the effect of (paraphrasing) "Are you sure about this? After all, the Slavic Department is a small but shining jewel in UCLA's crown and something like this will devastate the department." That this would be a concern of the Provost (assuming that this is in fact what he said) would certainly be consistent with what happened at every other level in this investigation (with the exception of the internal committee): minimize the bad and try to salvage as much as can be saved while causing as little a stir as is possible. It is noteworthy that this comment focused not on a concern for the students who had been left and hung out to dry, but rather on the reputation of the University.

The ultimate goal of the UCLA Administration was not to bring about substantive change in the UCLA Slavic Department or to protect the graduate students who had risked everything to comply with the request by the UCLA Administration that they comply fully with the Eight-Year Review teams. If change were to occur and if students did wind up coming out of the process relatively unscathed, then that was all to the good, but that was not the main concern of the UCLA Administration. The main concern was that the reputation of the University not be unduly harmed and to that end, the goal was to minimize the damage done to the Slavic Department. If graduate students had to be betrayed and crushed in order to make this happen, well, it wouldn't be the first time.

Thus, every action taken by the UCLA Administration seems to be, with regard to achieving these specific goals, in harmony with the actions and suggestions of the UCLA Academic Senate, the Dean of the Humanities, the Bethea/Timberlake external review team, and the Chair of the Slavic Department, Michael Heim.

Part 3: The System "Breakdown" Seen from a Different Perspective.

To the uninitiated reader, the question that inevitably comes to mind when reading the preceding two parts of Section VI, along with the relevant portions of the previous sections, is the following: how could a system designed to investigate the University's departments and to ensure both the quality of its programs and the welfare of its graduate students have broken down so completely and at so many levels, all at the same time no less? After all, the review process consisted of numerous layers of authority, any one of which could have sounded the alarm and demanded that students be protected and substantive change be effected. (Whether or not such change would have actually come about, of course, is a different matter, but what is without question was the ability of these various layers of authority to call for such change.)

And yet, nothing. All we see is breakdown after breakdown after breakdown, from the tenured faculty themselves who visited abuse upon the graduate students, to their tenured colleagues who looked the other way or actively attempted to cover up these abuses, to the Chair of the Slavic Department who consistently lied and went so far as to step outside the law in his attempt to smear a graduate student, to the Bethea/Timberlake external review team's attempts to downplay the abuses found in the Department, to the UCLA Administration's giving in to the legal threats from the Slavic Department faculty and thus reneging on the pledge to protect graduate students, to the Dean of the Humanities first failing to remove Michael Heim as the Slavic Department Chair and then failing to put the Slavic Department into receivership, to the

internal committee's atypical and ill-advised decision to capitulate on the question of allowing graduate students to be questioned, to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate assenting to Michael Heim's request that the ban on graduate student admissions be lifted after having been in place for just a few months, etc. etc. etc. What is crystal clear is that, as a series of procedures "designed to investigate the University's departments and to ensure both the quality of its programs and the welfare of its graduate students", this system could not have been worse, could not have been less efficient, and could not have been less firm in its purpose and less coordinated in its actions.

Back, then, to the original question: how could this system fail so badly? The answer has in reality nothing to do with the actions described and everything to do with the supposition that underlies the system, namely that it in point of fact is designed to investigate university departments, ensure the quality of University programs, and ensure the welfare of graduate students. These are, no doubt, the *stated* purposes of this system. Part B of Section II of this report speaks of the abhorrence with which tenured academics look upon the task of disciplining their fellow academics, and then remarks as follows: "This abhorrence notwithstanding, UCLA, as a public institution financially supported by and nominally beholden to the public at large, is obliged to have in place some sort of system by which it evaluates the performance of its tenured faculty and through which, in theory anyway, it can bring about the dismissal of tenured professors who abuse their authority or who fail to conduct themselves in accordance with university regulations (or, in extreme cases, in accordance with state and federal law)." Thus, the Eight-Year Review and all the processes that are associated with it are, ostensibly, there for the reasons stated above, and if one takes at face value the stated purpose of the system currently in place, then one can only conclude that it failed and failed miserably.

If, however, one challenges the stated supposition that is said to underlie this system, the supposition that identifies the investigation of academic programs and ensuring their quality and the welfare of graduate students as the goal of the system, then the picture begins to change very quickly. If, instead of this, one looks at the system as one designed to be a multiply redundant fail-safe system designed to allow some small degree of dissent to air, not unlike a safety valve designed to let out steam, while stifling the larger swells of discontent and downplaying the nature and severity of any abuse or wrongdoing that might have resulted from the actions of the faculty, then the picture starts coming into clearer focus. When seen from this new perspective, what was previously characterized as a grotesque failure can now be seen as a notable success. Like every bureaucratic entity, the University very much wants to control the intensity and direction of any self-investigation, and the system in place during the investigation of the UCLA Slavic Department did just that. Thus, what at first glance seems like a series of failures in fact turns out to be a series of successful damping stages. The table in Part 1 of this section that lists 19 separate "breakdowns" was in reality 19 different examples of the University delaying and

deflecting and twisting and doing everything in its power to absorb and diffuse the devastating impact of the Eight-Year Review report.

Such an interpretation of the process would, of course, be vehemently denied by the UCLA Administration. Whether or not such a system was put in place deliberately, or whether or not it developed as a result of the material conditions that predominate in academe, is difficult to say. What is not difficult to see, however, is that regardless of intent, this is how the system works in effect. Whatever happens in the course of an investigation of an academic department at UCLA, certain core principles cannot be violated: no investigation of any department shall be allowed to reach a point where official investigations of individual faculty members are initiated. No department shall be deprived of the "right" to run itself. Investigations of abuses against students should be done with care and should always be conducted in such a manner to make clear that the purpose of the investigation is the correction of the problem, NOT a truly exhaustive exploration of the damage suffered by any individual graduate student or groups of graduate students, since such an investigation would veer dangerously close to the logical corollary of actions needed to remedy such damage and thus to all the financial and legal overtones associated with such remedy.

When seen from this radically different perspective, the "breakdowns" in the system are seen for what they are, circuit breakers that keep the currency of dissent from shorting out the entire system, a system that is heavily skewed toward the interests and power of the tenured professoriate. In this framework, the decision of the Dean of the Humanities to keep Michael Heim on as the Chair of the Slavic Department and the decision of the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate to allow this department to again admit graduate students makes perfect sense. To the uninitiated, these actions (or, in some cases, "non-actions") were at the least outrageous acts of negligence, at the worst collusion and complicity. But within this new framework, these actions make perfect sense. For those tasked with keeping the system in place, Michael Heim's acts of lying and deception and misleading and denial were not the acts of an immoral and uncaring academic. They were the acts of a "team player", of someone who was willing to "take a hit for the team", and this he did indeed do. In their eyes, his behavior was not only not disgraceful, it was gutsy, it was a selfless act, as he managed to persevere, even while taking hit after hit after hit to what remained of his credibility.

For the UCLA Administration, Michael Heim wasn't a liar and an accomplice and a justifier of thuggery and a criminal. Far from it. For them, Michael Heim was a hero, and if there is any doubt about this, one need only look at how the UCLA Administration treated Michael Heim after the Eight-Year Review. Was he chided for his deceptions and his prevarication and his failure to stand up and protect graduate students and his breaking of the law by releasing grades from the undergraduate transcript of a former graduate student he was trying to smear? Far from it. Michael Heim, after all of this, after every one of his actions had been made crystal clear to

the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate, was not terminated. He was not suspended. He was not publicly held to account for his actions. No, no. Quite to the contrary.

Quite, quite to the contrary. For Michael Heim was promoted. And not only was he promoted, but he was promoted two steps, not just one. Say what you will about the UCLA Administration, when their interests are threatened, UCLA pays cash, and that is exactly what they did in this instance, both literally and figuratively. And again, why not? From their perspective Michael Heim, the scholar and translator of Czech literature, did in fact become the Good Soldier Schweik. Michael Heim did yeoman's work and, in their eyes, deserved to be compensated accordingly. And he was. And so, not only did the system not "break down", it worked surprisingly well, even under tremendous duress, at least as far as the UCLA Administration was concerned. No faculty member was rebuked, no reports of illegal activity were made to law enforcement, no official investigation into the conduct of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty was ever launched, no graduate students were ever compensated for what they had undergone, no readily accessible paper trail had been left to embarrass the University. With time, as tempers cooled and graduate students moved away or were failed out of the program or somehow became disassociated with the program (so went the thinking) so too would the danger posed by this particular "unfortunate incident" and soon the status quo would once again reign supreme in Westwood.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)

www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

VII. Conclusions: What the Documents Reveal About the System and Academe

The preceding sections contain a great deal of documentation and explication specific to that documentation. The details of individual arguments by the UCLA Slavic Department Faculty, and those agencies which are in a position to investigate and exercise putative oversight over the this department, e.g. the external committee of the Eight-Year Review team, the Dean of the Humanities, the UCLA Administration, etc, have been examined in detail. The question that remains at this point is how to best interpret that information and place it in a larger overall context.

How to View the System Currently in Place

As can be seen from the material in the previous section, one cannot say that there is any sort of real oversight in place to ensure that tenured academics are not engaging in abusive behavior, and there seems to be no system in place that has the will and the ability to discipline tenured colleagues who have participated in such abuse, or who have attempted to cover it up, or even those who have out and out broken state and federal law. Not a single member of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty was disciplined for the abuses that were uncovered by the Internal Review team, and not a single member of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty was punished for covering up this abuse. Indeed, the one member of the Slavic Department who went so far as to break the law in his attempts to smear the one graduate student who had enough courage to speak up was not only not disciplined—this faculty member was promoted—two steps, not one.

The question that must be answered is how can this state of affairs have gone on for so long? The answer is complex, but there are certain core issues that must be addressed before any substantive change can be brought about. One of the reasons that the current system was able to defend the abusive faculty members of the UCLA Slavic Department and cover up what had happened has to do with the culture of secrecy and opaqueness that permeates academe, certainly when it comes to dealing with the tenured professoriate. At every turn, students, lawmakers, and taxpayers are told that decisions made in academe affecting the tenured professoriate must be made in confidence, in the dark, in secret. Decisions on tenure and decisions on the disciplining of faculty are all done out of sight. Further, the public is told that this is the way it *must* be, lest

those tasked with making these decisions be intimidated into making a decision against their conscience.

This is untrue. If those tasked with making those decisions are so easily intimidated that their decision would be influenced by embarrassment or intimidation, then 1. These individuals should not be assigned to these tasks, or 2. These tasks (e.g. granting of tenure, disciplining of faculty) should not be handled by fellow professors, but by powers external to the University itself. What should not be allowed to remain, however, is the opacity that characterizes the University's dealings with its tenured faculty. The conflict of interest that is associated with the tenured professoriate policing its own is so obvious that it cannot even be termed a "potential" conflict of interest. As the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department has shown, such a conflict of interest is almost inevitable. The opacity of the various procedures dealing with the tenured professoriate, however, makes it almost impossible for anyone external to this group, e.g. to students, trustees, lawmakers, taxpayers, and the public at large, to know what is actually transpiring within the University itself.

This fact has been born out in recent years in other large, top-heavy bureaucratic institutions. At about the same time that the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures was undergoing review in 2000-2001, California was experiencing periodic energy shortages, now known to have been planned and manipulated by various energy companies. Around this same time Texas energy giant Enron, thought at the time to be a rock solid company, went bankrupt, and it became known with time that the corporate leaders of Enron knew all along that there were problems, but by keeping up a united front, and by keeping the inner workings of the company private and non-accessible to the employees and shareholders, they were able to keep these problems from coming to light, at least until the entire house of cards finally collapsed on them and everyone else associated with them. (Including, coincidentally, the University of California itself, which lost untold millions in investments in Enron.) This same story played out not long after with the collapse of WorldCom, with the same story line: those in charge kept the reality of the situation from those who were employed by the firm and from the firm's own shareholders. Lies, cover-up, and deception were the watchwords of the day at both Enron and WorldCom.

The points of comparison between the present world of academe, at least in so far as it is represented by the UC system (and, if the actions of David Bethea are taken into account, presumably by the University of Wisconsin as well) and firms such as Enron and WorldCom are many: in both cases one sees self-evaluations in which the offending entities paint themselves as successful and at the top of their game, in both cases one sees an initial denial of wrongdoing, in both cases this denial of wrong-doing continues well past the point where it would make any sense at all, in both cases one sees attempts at cover-up on the part of the principal players involved. One point of contrast, however, is that with Enron and WorldCom, the façade would

eventually have to be dropped if for no other reason than the fact that what the top officials in these companies were engaged in was the building of a pyramid scheme that, like all pyramid schemes, was doomed by the logic of mathematics to eventually collapse. In other words, there was a real-world criterion by which to judge the success or failure of the executives directing Enron and WorldCom operations, and that criterion was the bottom-line. One could talk until one is blue in the face but that would not hide the fact that both of these firms were eventually going to go broke.

In this respect, the University is somewhat different than the business world. After all, it is not the job of the University to make money, but rather to teach and to train scholars, to send out new blood into the academic world. This is a much harder task to judge, simply because it is more difficult to come up with quantifiable criteria that can be used to determine success or failure. For instance, an academic institution can, at the expense of quality, churn out a great many graduates, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, but then the question becomes how well trained are these graduates and what kind of contribution will they be able to make to society at their current level of training? On the other hand, a university department can be so rigorous that only a few of those who start ever wind up finishing, which in turn raises the questions of efficiency and fairness to the students themselves. If questioned about the quality of its program, a University department can point to the former case and claim that it is quantitatively extremely successful, a virtual Stakhanovite department. If its numbers of graduates are small, however, then this same program can point to the latter scenario (as the UCLA Slavic Department often did) and claim that so small a number of successful graduates is indicative of the difficulty of the program and thus, presumably, indicative of its high quality.

This inability to define clearly what success actually is for an academic department is precisely one of the systemic flaws that needs to be addressed. In this sense, what happened specifically in the UCLA Slavic Department and what in general happens all over academe is perhaps better compared to the Catholic Church sex scandal than to the Enron or WorldCom debacles. Enron and WorldCom had indicators for success which could be covered up and denied for a while, but a company runs on money, and when it is seen that the company is no longer creating as much money as it is consuming, then it is clear that this particular company is not succeeding. The main criterion for business success is profit: without profit, there can be no success. The Catholic Church, however, is quite different: while it has many worthy goals, few would argue with the proposition that the main objective of the Catholic Church is to save souls, a markedly more challenging standard to quantify than making money. Who's to say if a soul has been saved? Here the parallels with academe are strong. Because the process of graduate education is so opaque, it is difficult to quantify the success of a program. A program can choose to reduce its standards to the point of a diploma mill, thereby guaranteeing that everyone who enters the program will finish it. Or it can make the standards so high that no one can finish. Or, it can ignore standards and just pass people through at its will, claiming that those

who have fallen by the wayside just didn't "have what it takes", whatever that might have been.

Like Enron and WorldCom, the abusive system in place at UCLA (and, presumably, elsewhere) depended on the dark and the fog of the academic bureaucracy to function, but like the Catholic Church, it was largely free of any obligation to show any quantifiable evidence of its success and thus has been able to avoid suspicion. And when questions are raised by those not intimately familiar with academe, it was always possible to come up with some set of "facts" designed to show how well this or that department was doing: the percentage of entering students who get their graduate degrees was high (or not high, thereby showing the rigor—and thus, it is presumed, quality—of the program in question), the aggregate grade point average of their students was high (never mind that GPA means almost nothing in graduate school), or the number of graduates a given program placed in tenure-track positions was high (and if that number were not high, then never mind—one can always make up a number and present it as fact, as happened with the UCLA Slavic Department—after all, who's going to check?)

Even more so than companies such as Enron and WorldCom, institutions such as the Catholic Church and academe are dependent upon the good will, honesty, and integrity of those charged with running the system to ensure that abuses do not occur. Barbara Blaine, the founder and president of *The Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests* (SNAP), rejected attempts by the Catholic Church to minimize the damage caused by abuse within the Church, attempts designed to make it appear as though these problems were in the past, and to excuse those who were in positions of power who did nothing to stop the abuse. To quote Ms. Blaine:

It's about the bishops, not the priests.
It's about the enablers, not the abusers.
It's about the cover up, not the crime.
It's about the present, not the past.

(Taken from the SNAP webpage http://www.snapnetwork.org/snap_statements/2004_statements/022704_john_jay_numbers.htm)

This holds true for academe and higher education as well. The exposure by Ms. Blaine of the bureaucracy and its attempts to paint the problem in a less severe light are instructive, as the academic bureaucracy makes many of the same attempts to cover many of the same problems. There are those who could have spoken up, but who, for any number of reasons, chose not to. It was not possible to have been in the UCLA Slavic Department and not known of how abusive the situation was, and it was not possible for the UCLA Administration not to have known how abusive it was, certainly not after the results of the Eight-Year Review and the feedback provided to the UCLA Administration by graduate students at great risk to themselves.

This is a system in which, either by design or happenstance, there is very little centralized authority. Whether the failure of the UCLA Administration to discipline the faculty of the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures was a result of fear or the desire to protect tenured colleagues, or both, the fact remains that the system as it currently exists is unable to discipline faculty effectively, and thus is utterly incapable of protecting graduate students. This is not to say, of course, that the UCLA Administration isn't capable of making statements *claiming* that they will protect graduate students. This they do very well. As can be seen from the details of this report, however, when it comes to backing up those claims, the UCLA Administration has no credibility left. The result of this is a system that exists to perpetuate itself for the benefit of a single group within that system, namely the tenured faculty. Of course, the tenured faculty have nothing against others benefiting from this system as well, as long as it doesn't infringe upon their abilities to do almost whatever they please in the University, and to so without serious challenge from the University itself, regardless of how odious or foul the conduct.

The Results of Having Such a System As Seen in the Case of the UCLA Slavic Department, the Review, and Cover Up

The repercussions of having a system in place that would allow a department like the UCLA Slavic Department to escape without faculty sanction, and without losing its graduate program (to say nothing of losing the Department altogether), are felt at many different levels.

At the student level, it has been made abundantly clear that, whatever hopes might have been raised in the initial stages of the investigation, there is no substantive protection that will be provided to students in the future. The system in place that was putatively designed to protect them from retaliation is in fact designed to protect the faculty. Students have been cowed and the old guard is still in place. Of course, some students/ex-students might still have the courage to speak out, but given the results of the last "promise of protection" by the UCLA administration, how could any student once again bring himself/herself to believe such a promise coming from the UCLA Administration? This in turn calls into question the results of any student survey that is distributed and which seeks honest feedback from the students. These surveys "might" result in honest feedback, or, as in the case of some of the class evaluations for Slavic Department classes, they might simply result in telling the Department/Administration/University what it wants to hear.

Also worth noting is that many of these students who did speak up were linguistics students and had been told by those running the review and by the UCLA Administration that the only way to improve the linguistics component of the program, which was seriously deficient in modern linguistic theory, was to cooperate fully with the investigating committees. Many (not

all) of the linguistics students took the UCLA Administration at its word and did do exactly that. The result was not only that their trust was betrayed when the UCLA Administration reneged on the promises given earlier of protection from faculty retaliation, but that the linguistics component of the Slavic Department, far from being improved, has now all but been disbanded. Two of the main abusers have retired, one is deceased, but one is still active within the UCLA Slavic Department. Even with this individual still active (and presumably immovable because of tenure—more on that topic below) it would have still been possible to resurrect the linguistics program. The two senior linguists who remained are world renowned for their work in a wide variety of fields, not just in linguistics but in literature as well. Had the UCLA Slavic Department and the Humanities Division followed through on the initial recommendations of the Eight-Year Review and hired a South Slavic linguist, the program could have gone on in spite of the remaining abusive faculty member. Instead emphasis was quietly shifted from a South Slavist and from a 19th century specialist to the an area that would allow the Department to hire someone who would fit in more with the literature faculty and be sensitive of the "situation" in which this faculty now finds itself.

As for the linguistics program, it now exists in name only. One of the two remaining linguistics members, one of world renown and who personally knew (unlike, apparently, Timberlake/Bethea) the rigors of being an academic in a Stalinist environment, and a second faculty member, the one who was specifically excepted from culpability by the Internal Review, a scholar who has been lauded continually and often by colleagues, not only for scholarship, but for dedication to principles of fairness and for "rigorous personal integrity... concern for justice and for the emotional as well as intellectual well-being of others" (February 2002 Vol. 45, Issue 1 AATSEEL NEWSLETTER, page 21 <http://aatseel.org/AATSEEL/Feb2002.pdf>). It was the same individual whose attempts during her brief tenure as the chairperson of the Slavic Department to bring about even modest change in a department sorely in need of change resulted in her being crushed by the inertia of the Department, thus ending both her brief stint as the nominal head of the Department, and the Prague Spring that had accompanied it.

These two individuals, in combination with a well-chosen South Slavist, would have been in an optimal position to move forward in the linguistics program, bringing it up to date and removing from it the element of academic and scholarly thuggery that had characterized it for years. This would have been an appropriate result for those linguistics students in the UCLA Slavic Department who had put it all on the line and had agreed to talk with the investigating committees at the behest of the UCLA Administration. And yet, none of this happened. Given the nature of academic tenure, it cannot be seen as too surprising that the one abusive faculty member still remains in the Department. What is unfortunate is that there were not even any serious attempts at disciplining this individual for her conduct. Even so, in the proposed "caucus" system which artificially divided the Department into linguists and literature faculty, this

individual would still have been easily isolated and thus been unable to wreak havoc on students' lives any longer.

Nothing like this, however, happened. As has been discussed above, the focus of many of the senior literary members of the faculty was not only *not* on rewarding the linguistic students for having the courage to accede to the repeated requests of the UCLA Administration and participate fully in the Eight-Year Review process ("Remember, the only way you as a graduate student are going to change the linguistics part of the program is to participate in this review") by trying to rebuild and reshape the linguistics side of the house, but quite the contrary: the idea was floated among some faculty of actually shutting down the linguistics portion of the program altogether. *That* was the reward the linguistics students received for their efforts.

The fact that the UCLA Administration avoided conducting an official investigation into the faculty, i.e. the fact that there was never any official investigation intended "to conduct a fact-finding mission or to determine the guilt or innocence of particular individuals" (from the Eight-Year Review, Internal Report) had ramifications throughout and beyond the UCLA Slavic Department itself. To give but one example: as a result of the cover up, one of the worst abusers and least stable personalities in the Slavic Department itself not only was not disciplined, not only was not demoted or terminated, but to the contrary, was allowed to continue without censure. This was the same faculty member whose behavior is mentioned specifically in the Internal Report ("physical displays of faculty anger including frequent yelling and even slamming a chair on the floor", insulting and yelling at students, the same faculty member that caused XX to leave the program, and so forth.) It had reached the point that no one—no one—among the tenured Slavic Department faculty itself, relatives excepted, would deny that this individual was in desperate need of some sort of psychological counseling/treatment. This fact notwithstanding, this individual, because there was no official inquiry as to the conduct of the faculty "designed to determine guilt or innocence," not only went unpunished, even worse, she was allowed to serve on one of the most important committees in the University, the so-called "CAP" committee (University Committee on Academic Personnel), the committee which, among other things, recommends whether or not to give tenure to tenure track assistant professors on campus.

Thus, this abusive faculty member who was considered psychologically unstable by all of the colleagues in the UCLA Slavic Department (relatives excepted) was actually allowed to be a part of the mechanism that to a very great extent determines who is allowed to remain at UCLA and who must go. It is shocking that a person in this condition would be allowed to determine the fate of so many others in the University, but this is what happens when there is no system in place to discipline faculty members at UCLA. It is not just students in the UCLA Slavic Department that are hurt, but the entire University.

The University's actions in this instance hurt UCLA in an even more sensitive area, that

being its reputation. Every year UCLA is the recipient of hundreds of millions of dollars of grant money coming from various sources: federal, state, private foundations and institutions, and individual donors. One of the things that make governments, people, and institutions so willing to donate to UCLA is their belief that their contribution will be not only appreciated, but also well used. In this respect, the University's reputation is everything to the donation process. No potential donors would want to donate to an institution that they feel is lying to them, or covering up misdeeds on the part of its employees, especially if that institution is a public institution run with the public's money, authorized and funded by the taxpayers themselves. One expects that such an institution will conduct itself—or at least attempt to conduct itself—according to the highest of moral and ethical standards. What then do the actions of the UCLA Administration and the Academic Senate say about their commitment to such high standards, about their commitment to the truth? If UCLA is willing to go to such incredible lengths in order to lie and cover-up concerning a small academic program such as seen in the UCLA Slavic Department, then to what extent would they be willing to lie and cover up about larger issues, e.g. the cadaver scandal (Willed Body Program) that recently hit UCLA? Not too long ago media mogul and UCLA-aficionado David Geffen donated an astonishing \$200 million to the UCLA Medical School. No doubt crucial to his decision to do so was his belief in the credibility and integrity of UCLA as an institution.

If this examination of the UCLA Slavic Department and how UCLA reacted to the results of this examination illustrates one thing beyond question, it is that UCLA is very protective of its reputation and has in place the above-mentioned "fail safe" system designed to keep scandal from getting out of hand. Since every case is different, however, UCLA must maintain a flexible response capability, one ready for different and unexpected events. An example of this flexibility can be seen in UCLA's two-track approach to the disciplinary process as it applies to tenured academics, on the one hand, and officials in the athletic program, on the other. One of the ways UCLA shapes the way it is viewed by the public is through its athletic program, which has been one of the most successful ever at the major college level. UCLA claims to seek not only athletic excellence, but also to shape its scholar-athletes according to elevated standards of honesty, sportsmanship, and academic excellence. Accordingly, UCLA is always quick to highlight those involved in its athletic programs who are emblematic of these proclaimed goals, athletes who are not only gifted in their sport, but who also reflect well on UCLA in terms of their intellectual abilities and the way they present themselves to the public at large. Few universities anywhere can approach UCLA in this regard: Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, Bill Walton, Arthur Ashe, Ann Meyers, Gail Goodrich, Walt Hazzard, Rafer Johnson, Troy Aikman, Florence Griffith-Joyner, Jamaal Wilkes, Jackie Joyner-Kersey, and hovering over these and many more associated with UCLA athletics are Jackie Robinson and Coach John Wooden. These athletes and coaches are the image that UCLA likes to project: not only great athletic ability and knowledge, but also men and women of considerable academic ability and integrity who understand that sport need not be an end unto itself, but rather a means to an end, one influence among the many that shape the

whole person.

Given this attitude that UCLA has taken towards athletics and its athletes, the response of the University to the 1996 scandal involving men's basketball coach Jim Harrick was telling. Ever since the last days of John Wooden, UCLA had been looking for someone to lead UCLA back to an era of greatness in basketball. UCLA had won an unprecedented number of championships under Coach Wooden, but the last had come in 1975. Under Coach Jim Harrick, it looked as though UCLA might finally win another championship, and in 1995 UCLA under Jim Harrick did indeed win the NCAA championship in basketball, its first in twenty years. Several years after this, however, UCLA shocked the sports world by firing Jim Harrick, not for any lack of ability with regard to his coaching, but rather for alleged ethical violations in the recruiting of high school students. According to the November 7th, 1996 issue of the UCLA student newspaper, *The Daily Bruin*, Harrick had lied about the number of basketball players present during a recruitment dinner, a violation of NCAA rules.

What followed was a prime example of how UCLA manipulates the media in order to shore up the image it so desperately wants to project to the public that pays for public education. At first, many were shocked that UCLA would fire a coach who had brought them a long sought after basketball championship. While alumni howled, the UCLA Administration stood firm, claiming that as much as it hurt them to have to do this, their unshakeable commitment to the principles of honesty and integrity allowed them no other option. In the campus news bulletin of November 7th, Chancellor Charles Young wrote that "We have concluded that Coach Harrick conducted himself in a manner that was inconsistent with his position as a *role model to students*, where *ethical behavior* is so important." (Emphasis added.) Gradually, the tide began to turn as praise started to pour in to UCLA for having the moral courage to stand up and do the right thing, regardless of cost. Of course, those who were on the inside of UCLA, those who knew of the special treatment afforded to tenured members of the faculty, those who knew that the system was already set up such that what had happened to Jim Harrick could never have happened to a tenured faculty member, could only smile as Chancellor Young waxed poetic on UCLA's dedication to the principles of honesty and integrity. For while the UCLA Administration shed a public tear that so harsh an action was necessary, in fact this same administration was delighted that it had so public a forum to demonstrate what a deeply moral and ethical public institution it really was. As long as it was not one of the tenured elite being "sacrificed" on the altar of public opinion, but only a basketball coach, then by all means, onward, onward to yet another public relations victory.

The events surrounding the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department only serve to confirm that view. As has been pointed out above, time after time after time the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department lied to investigators, he lied on paper to the Academic Senate (as

was pointed out to the Academic Senate in the graduate students' response to his statements) and he went so far as to break the law in releasing without authorization grades from the undergraduate transcript of the one UCLA Slavic Department graduate student who was brave enough to allow her story to be told in such a way as her identity would be known. If one looks back at Part II of these disclosures (Context of the Problem) one will come upon a *partial* list of [the lies told by Michael Heim](#) during this investigation, from its very inception to the very end, when he lied directly to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate. No doubt he continues to lie about what happened during the Eight-Year Review. Michael Heim, however, was a fellow tenured academic and the UCLA Administration could not allow his lies to result in his termination as had happened with Harrick. Not only would this be bad precedent, but it could lead to Heim breaking ranks with those in the Slavic Department whom his lies were designed to protect.

Once again, the hypocrisy involved here is simply breathtaking. In the article from the *Daily Bruin*, Chancellor Chuck Young explained why he felt it was necessary that Jim Harrick be terminated from his position at UCLA. An excerpt from that article is given below:

--But according to university officials, it was the next couple of weeks that actually cost the second-winningest coach in UCLA history his job. He *repeatedly misinformed members of the athletic department* about the details of the dinner, officials said.

"We might have responded less severely if (the infraction) had been the only violation," Young said. "But the situation was exacerbated by other actions that followed. It would have been treated differently if he been forthright from the beginning."

Although some thought the punishment was too severe, considering it was the first ethical breach by Harrick that the athletic department had been aware of, Young seemed to think otherwise.

"I think Watergate is the analogy - the break-in to the Democratic National Committee Headquarters was not all that big of an act," he said. "But, what followed it brought down the President of the United States."--(Emphasis added) (*Daily Bruin*, November 7th, 1996)

Young continues this tone in the campus news bulletin of November 7th, 1996, stating that "We hope that the firmness with which we dealt with this issue reinforces for prospective students that UCLA is not only a premier academic institution with a rich athletic tradition, but also an *institution of integrity*... But we cannot allow a winning record to cause us to overlook such an *ethical breach*." (Emphasis added.)

The contrast here could not be starker. Jim Harrick lied and then repeatedly lied to cover

up his original lie, thus found himself in violation of his contract and his obligation to serve as "a role model to students" and was consequently fired by UCLA. Michael Heim repeatedly and consistently lied to UCLA over a period of time far in excess of the few weeks involved in the Harrick case. Michael Heim lied to internal investigators and to external investigators. Michael Heim lied to students, Michael Heim lied to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate. Michael Heim betrayed the trust of graduate students not just by these lies, but also by illegally releasing a graduate student's private information in his attempt to defend himself after his on-going prevarication had been exposed in the Internal Report. Was not Michael Heim as much a role model to students as Jim Harrick? After all, Jim Harrick's job as a basketball coach, while high profile, was only peripheral to the functioning of the University, while Michael Heim interacted directly with many, many more students on a daily basis. Were not Michael Heim's ethical breaches many times those of Jim Harrick's? If the University is not going to demand the highest standards of conduct from the professors themselves, then of whom would the University demand adherence to such a high standard? Was Michael Heim's employment with UCLA, in the end, terminated in the same manner as Jim Harrick for what was without question a series of "ethical violations" far exceeding Harrick's in both intensity and scope?

No. Michael Heim was promoted.

Promoted not one step, but two steps.

Thus, the failure of the system to work (and by "work", what is meant here is *not* the system's ability to cover up abuse and suppress dissent, i.e. its *de facto* purpose, but rather to "work" in the sense that the system is publicly promoted, to prevent such abuse and cover up) has set up UCLA for yet another devastating blow to its reputation. The failure of the system to discipline the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department and its complicity in the cover up of abuses that went on there completely undermine the University's credibility, the same credibility that is so crucial in the decision making process of those entities, be they governmental, business, or private, that normally provide grant support and donations to UCLA itself.

How This System Is Able To Perpetuate Itself

The above-described scenario exemplifies one of many ways that the existing system is able to perpetuate itself. As can be seen by the radically different responses to lying in an official capacity that were experienced by the ex-basketball coach Jim Harrick and the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department Michael Heim, there exists a multi-tiered system for standards of conduct, with the greatest leeway being provided to those at the top tier, the tenured professoriate. By providing for different levels of punishment for what is essentially the same offense, the UCLA Administration not only fulfils its obligation to the tenured professors who run the institution, but it also sends a subtle message to those who see the injustices every day, i.

e. administrative personnel, non-tenured academic personal, and most of all graduate students, that there can be consequences for speaking out. It becomes very clear very quickly that non-tenured members of the UCLA community are not playing on a level playing field with their tenured co-workers, but this is usually apparent only to those within the system. The unbalanced nature of the system is shielded from those outside it by the secrecy in which the University operates.

This dark and opaque nature of much of the academic administration is also a pillar that props up the system. The opacity of the University in terms of tenure decisions, disciplinary decisions, investigations, and so forth has already been discussed at length above, but it is worth repeating that this opacity, like the institution of tenure, is fiercely defended by those who run the University, i.e. the tenured professoriate. The University, speaking for its tenured faculty, will present a litany of reasons why decisions must be made in the dark, but few of the reasons given outweigh the benefit of having the University operate in an open and transparent environment. The temptation for corruption is just too strong. There is no strong, central authority in the University setting to cut through the smoke and mirrors used to hide what is truly happening at the University, at least in so far as the tenured faculty are concerned.

To give one example how the University combines the institutionalized secrecy with its use of subtle disinformation in order to confuse those who are outside the system (and, as can be seen in this example, even students themselves within the system) one need look no further than the case of Joshua Muldavin, a popular geography professor who was refused tenure. This in turn set off student protests and even hunger strikes. The Chancellor of UCLA, Albert Carnesale, met with the fasting students and paid lip service to the complaint that the tenure process was too opaque, but would not budge in his refusal to discuss the specifics of the Muldavin case. From the *Daily Bruin*:

"Carnesale made one point clear during the discussion: he was not going to entertain questions regarding Muldavin's tenure case. He insisted questions about the tenure process be generic.

'I am not going to discuss this case,' he said to one student requesting the creation of an external review committee to look over the process by which Muldavin was denied tenure.

'That would be like if someone called me and asked for your grades,' he added." (*The Daily Bruin*-Thursday, May 31, 2001 <http://www.dailybruin.ucla.edu/db/articles.asp?ID=15742>)

It is this last line that is so typical of how the UCLA Administration, in its role as the *de facto* representative of the tenured faculty, tries to obfuscate its motivations for keeping things quiet. Here Carnesale tries to equate talking about the decision process that resulted in a popular

professor being denied tenure to a gross violation of privacy rights, namely releasing a student's grades to a third party without that student's permission. Now, on the surface, if one does not spend much time thinking about it, such a comparison might somehow resonate. It would be Carnesale's hope that the students would buy it (not likely, but maybe), and if not them, then certainly the public at large, those whose taxes pay for the University. Of course, when one subjects such a comparison to scrutiny, the logic behind it quickly breaks down. Carnesale here compares apples and oranges and finds them as one, when in fact this is not so at all. In the case of students having their grades revealed without their consent, this is not only a violation of their privacy rights, it is a violation of the law, on both the state and federal level. Of course they would object. In the case of discussing the details of the decision process that denied tenure to Joshua Muldavin, does Carnesale actually expect people to believe that to do so would violate Muldavin's privacy rights? Muldavin himself asked for this information, only to have it denied him. Whose "rights" is Carnesale protecting here? The answer is that he is protecting the "rights" of the tenured faculty not to be forced to justify the decisions they make in the hiring and firing process. Thus, Carnesale's comparison of the protection of students' privacy rights with the refusal of the University to lift the veil of secrecy on tenure decisions is shown to be weak, if not outright disingenuous.

Still, one might have been able to have taken comfort from Chancellor Carnesale's supposed concern for the privacy rights of students vis-à-vis unauthorized release of their grades were it not for the fact that at the time he made this statement, the UCLA Administration had already been informed about the violation of student privacy rights regarding the unauthorized release of grades from student transcripts in the UCLA Slavic Department. At the time Chancellor Carnesale made this statement, the UCLA Administration had already known for over a half a year that UCLA Slavic Department Chairman Michael Heim had illegally released grades from the transcripts of XX, the one Slavic Department graduate student who had allowed her story to be told. Had Chancellor Carnesale truly been concerned about the privacy rights of students at the time he made this statement, then he would have already taken appropriate action with regard to Michael Heim: he would have directed the UCLA Administration "to conduct a fact-finding mission" to look into whether or not Michael Heim had actually released grades from XX's transcripts without XX's permission. Of course, it wouldn't have been much of an investigation since every graduate student and every faculty member in the UCLA Slavic Department got the email, which can be seen in both the [raw](#) and [annotated](#) versions of the Eight-Year Review report in Section IV of this document, in which Michael Heim does just that, release some of her grades in his attempt to discredit her and to discredit UC Riverside with charges of grade inflation. This hypocrisy notwithstanding, the fact was that in this instance, the University was able to cleverly combine its decentralized nature with subtle acts of disinformation from the University's highest officer in order to keep the veil of secrecy in place.

This decentralized nature of the University Administration also serves well the interests of the tenured professoriate, again in so far as that "interest" is the continuation of a system in which their conduct can go virtually unchallenged and almost certainly unpunished. It is a system in which power is purposely diffuse, thereby providing every so-called "authority figure" at every point on the so-called chain of "command" an excuse not to act. Because the actual lines of authority are so blurred and actually taking action against an abusive faculty member so complex and involved a procedure, and because, as was discussed above, faculty are for the most part loath to be seen as having enforced discipline against one of their tenured colleagues, what is almost built into the system is an element of "plausible deniability" at every level, i.e. the ability to say "Hey, it's not *my* job to do this!" This was seen time and again by those students in the UCLA Slavic Department who tried to bring about change, who tried to alert the UCLA Administration as to what was happening in the UCLA Slavic Department. This practice of "slipping out of responsibility" was a common occurrence. One supposed "authority figure" would listen with a sympathetic ear and then say that only another "authority figure" would be allowed to deal with whatever the particular issue was. While this is of course acceptable to an extent, it soon became the case that whoever was approached to deal with the goings-on in the UCLA Slavic Department almost always looked for an excuse not to act and almost always tried to direct students elsewhere. It was only the Internal Review Committee that accepted responsibility and took charge, and then even this committee was met with resistance and with incidents of University bodies charged with oversight failing to follow through, e.g. the Graduate Council's decision to accede to Michael Heim's request to reopen graduate admissions to the UCLA Slavic Department, this in spite of the Internal Committee's recommendation against it, or the Dean of the Humanities refusal to follow through with the committee recommendation that the UCLA Slavic Department be put into receivership.

Finally, there are times when all the safeguards that the University has in place to keep the true nature of the University from seeping out to the public at large and to the taxpayers who support the University simply are not enough. At these times, when matters threaten to erupt into possible legal action, the University has proven itself quite adept. Rarely does the University address these issues outright, preferring instead to lapse into the convenient "no comment because the case is being litigated" response. Beyond that, the University has various layers surrounding it, various methods by which it responds. In other words, the responses by the University are often muddled and self-contradictory and difficult to follow. Which response is definitive, which response is merely advisory, which response needs to be heeded, which response can be ignored—these are questions that make it extremely difficult for any entity, be it within the University or external to the University, to act to bring about real change. In addition to making it difficult for any potential reformer to know where to focus his energies, this uncertainty also serves to lengthen the process, to draw it out, to delay without seeming to delay, hoping to wait out the accusers while at the same time fogging the picture in an attempt to blunt the accusations leveled against the University. The one advantage that the University has—an

advantage that no single potential reformer has—is that the University is not a single person, or even a group of persons, but rather an institution. Institutions can afford to wait months and months and years and years in terms of investigations and legal litigation. In fact, institutions such as the University would prefer that this be the case. Individual complainants and/or reformers have lives to lead. An institution can afford to give up years and years, but rarely is that the case for individuals or groups of individuals trying to achieve redress or bring about reform or both.

(It should be noted here that this same decentralization of power—or "perceived" decentralization of power, as they case may be—can serve the University in other ways. One of the best descriptions of how the University uses such decentralization can be seen in the description by a University lecturer [non-tenured college teacher] of how the University negotiates with the lecturers' union:

"Bargaining with the UC is an "Alice In Wonderland" experience. All the unions say the same thing; the process is surreal. The reason why is because they don't have their internal act together. They argue among themselves. One representative always has veto power, and the group is paralyzed. They can't give us an answer. There's no back-and-forth bargaining because the representatives are incapable of making decisions among themselves. They've engaged in regressive bargaining, and we've filed a formal grievance for that. Also, it's so decentralized; nobody has any power. The only way to get an agreement is to ask for very little or to use political pressure." [*Daily Bruin*, Thursday, January 23, 2003 <http://www.dailybruin.ucla.edu/news/articles.asp?id=22444>])

When, however, not even stalling for time works, or when the conduct on the part of the offending faculty is simply so egregious that for it to go public would be too great a stain on the University itself, the very last resort is simply to settle out of court, to, in effect, buy the silence of the aggrieved party. This approach, of course, is not unique to educational institutions such as UCLA, but is seen quite commonly outside academe as well, usually in the business world, but also at times in non-secular institutions: witness the current slew of court cases and legal settlements involving the Catholic Church in its attempt to deal with the sexual scandals involving sexual abuse perpetrated by priests. Unlike either the business community or the Catholic Church, however, a public educational institution like UCLA is supported by California taxpayers. The idea behind settling out of court to avoid publicity is rooted in the idea that the offending party feels he/she would be better off simply taking a large financial hit rather than facing the publicity for what was done. This may work as intended when the offending party is an individual or a private corporation: after all, the offending party still has to pay some sort of penalty for the transgression in question, and that same offending party, with full knowledge of the transgression, will (one hopes) learn from this action and take steps to avoid its recurrence,

lest he be forced once again to pay the penalty for his action. This works because the same party that is engaging in the offending action is also the same party that will have to pay the penalty.

When it comes to large public educational institutions such as UCLA, however, this option actually works against the acknowledgement of error and actually serves to discourage reform for the simple reason that the parties who are committing the offending actions, namely the tenured faculty member and those of his colleagues and those in the Administration who are covering up for him, are not the people who wind up paying the price when these matters go to court. Far from it. For in the case of a public university, the offending party, almost always sheltered beyond what most could hope for and protected by tenure, is never the one who ends up paying the bill when his behavior causes the university to be sued. It is the people who support the public university, the government coffers that support it, and ultimately the taxpayers themselves who are the ones that end up footing the bill. Since, however, the public university already has in place excellent spin control and public relations infrastructure designed to deal with incidents such as this, the public is usually kept from knowing just how much the legal judgments against the university are. This information is kept secret from the very people who are actually going to end up paying for the misconduct of this or that university faculty member. The aforementioned spin infrastructure will, after agreeing to a settlement figure, begin the process of trying to convince the public at large, who then end up either paying directly for the settlement or for increased insurance costs as a result of the settlement. The public is told that the university did its level best to win the case, but sometimes things like this just happen, and in order to avoid a blow to the public university's "prestige" it is usually best for all concerned just to settle this issue as soon as possible and thus allow the university to put this "unfortunate incident behind it."

When the university, however, says that something is "usually best for all concerned", one should take this judgment with an enormous grain of salt. What the university usually means when it says something like this is that it is usually best for the tenured professors who run the university, and not for the process of learning and not for the welfare of the students placed in their charge. The university, however, needs to preserve at all costs (literally) in the mind of the taxpaying public the idea that what is best for the tenured professoriate is in fact what is best for the university. If that means paying out large sums of money to buy the silence of those who would sully the reputation of the university with a truthful depiction of how the system operates, then those in charge of the university are more than willing to do so. After all, this money is not coming directly out of their pockets, it is coming from the funding the university receives from the taxpaying public, either directly or from insurance policies paid for by taxpayers.

The problems here are obvious. The public, hoodwinked by the propaganda of the university administration, comes to believe that whatever happened, the reputation of the university must not be sullied, since this would be "bad for the university". The university

administration itself, on the other hand, makes no real effort to bringing about substantive change, since there is no financial incentive for them to do so. From their point of view, this is just how the system works. Every now and again there is an "unfortunate incident" that requires the public to pony up money, and the public does indeed step up to the plate and do so. Thus, the original act of wrongdoing is never brought to the attention of the public, there is no pressure brought upon the university itself to reform itself, the offending tenured faculty members are protected from further investigation into their behavior, and best of all, the university administration can take the view that the money paid out to buy the silence of those who were aggrieved by the university can simply be chalked up as the cost of doing business in an academic environment.

Why doesn't the taxpaying public object? Because the taxpaying public doesn't know, or better put, doesn't realize exactly what is happening with regard to the favored treatment granted by the university administration to its tenured professors. Why doesn't the public know about individual instances of abuse by faculty members when it is the taxpaying public who eventually get stuck with the bill? Because, as a condition of settlement, as a condition of payment, a non-disclosure agreement is mandatory. Because there is a division between those who *commit* the offences and those who *pay* for the offences, those who wind up paying never find out what offence they are paying for. The university system, in effect, tells the taxpayers "Trust us. You need to pay for this. We will make every effort to ensure that this doesn't happen again." This sort of scenario in which the public is forced to pay for the behavior of those in its employ is not unique to the University of California, of course. The California Legislature and state community colleges are among the many other public institutions that employ this strategy when one of their own is in trouble. (See "Taxpayers Finance Settlements and Silence" in the March 19th, 2001 issue of the *Los Angeles Times*.) Still, in order to understand how the university system manages to protect its tenured professoriate from outside investigation and to maintain their privileged position within the university system, it is essential that this relationship between the university and those who pay for the university's mistakes be understood by the public who is actually doing the paying.

The Systemic Problems within the University That Promote Abuse

The above descriptions of how the University works (or doesn't work) begs the question, why does the system work so very badly? In part, this question has been answered repeatedly throughout this tract, and that answer centers on which level of the University system controls the operational, investigative, and disciplinary apparatuses of the University, and the reluctance of those on that level to use the systems in place against colleagues on the same level as themselves. There are other factors, however, which contribute to the culture of abuse, deception, cover-up and inertia that is seen here.

One of the major problems is that of quantifying and measuring success and prestige in academic institutions. When pressed to explain instances of abuse against students, one of the common responses by institutions such as UCLA is the almost obligatory "qualified" statement of regret, e.g. "Should any abusive have occurred, we would of course regret it", followed swiftly by a reminder to the public that whatever instances of abuse may have (or may *not* have!) occurred, the institution involved is still of the highest caliber and that this fact must be taken into account, it must be included in the broader picture of the institution itself.

The problem with this is that it so difficult to know whether or not the high praise the institution is bestowing upon itself is actually true. As can be seen from everything revealed here with regard to just one single problem, that of the abuse of graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department, the University itself will spare no effort to dissemble if it feels that it is in its interest to do so. Call it what you will, disinformation, untruths, out-and-out lies—if the University feels its core values are being attacked—and by "core values" what is meant here is not the pursuit of truth and open discourse, but rather the absolute and unfettered rights of the tenured faculty to do what they please when they please to whom they please—then the University will do whatever it takes to either distract the taxpaying public's attention away from this activity, or to "re-state" the problem in such a way that the bad is offset by all of the "good". It will do so preferably in a way such that it would be difficult for the average Californian taxpayer to understand but would nonetheless say all the right things and touch upon all the right notes that usually resonate with the people outside of academe. The result is a public who is getting two different stories and is not quite sure how to interpret what it is hearing, and even worse, a public that has no objective way to evaluate the claims made by the University and thus is usually forced to make this judgment based on information provided by the University itself.

What is, then, the type of information provided by the University to confirm the claims of its own excellence? How does it prove its "prestige"? The problem is not that there are no quantifiable criteria for success, for there are. One can look at the number of articles published by its faculty, the number of conferences hosted by the institution, the number of patents secured by the faculty, the amount of grant money, the graduation rate of its students, the number of its PhD's who secure tenure track or other high level positions, average test scores of its graduates in standardized exams, and so forth. Given that there are so many different criteria for success, the University is able to pick and chose what it wants to present to the public at large. To give just one example of how this works, one need look no further than the subject of this report, the abuse of graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department. Now that the report is out for everyone to see, no one could seriously advocate against the charges made against the Department and the faculty members in it who abused students and those who worked to cover up this abuse. The report itself was devastating. And yet, there was an attempt by the External Review team to present the situation of the UCLA Slavic Department in a better light, as Bethea/Timberlake not

only outright ignored the instances of lying (documented by the Internal Review team) on the part of Department Chair Michael Heim, but actually took the data fed to them by Heim as fact, without checking on, for example, whether or not the statistics he gave regarding the tenure-track rate of the Department's graduates were accurate. When the UCLA student newspaper, the *Daily Bruin*, got wind that something was amiss in the UCLA Slavic Department, it interviewed the Departmental Chairman, Michael Heim ("Grad Students Contest Treatment", Friday, February 2, 2001; <http://www.dailybruin.com/news/printable.asp?id=2743&date=2/2/2001>). By this point, most Slavic Department students had already seen the system in action and were aware of the fact that faculty members in the UCLA Slavic Department were not going to be held to account for their actions, and no doubt Michael Heim knew that as well. After all, the Graduate Division of the Academic Senate had lifted the ban on new graduate students, the Dean of the Humanities had refused to follow through with the recommendation that the UCLA Slavic Department be put into receivership, and none of the professors had even been officially investigated, much less disciplined. Order had been restored.

Given these developments, Michael Heim no doubt felt emboldened when facing the questions of the *Daily Bruin* reporter assigned to the case. Two points stand out here. One was the pattern of deception that had been described by the Internal Report continued here. From the article: "To preserve the anonymity of the students, Michael Heim, chair of Slavic Languages and Literatures, declined to comment on the specific nature of the situation." (Apparently Michael Heim's sense of dedication to students' privacy had grown markedly since the time he had illegally released grades from the undergraduate transcript of XX, the one graduate student who allowed her story to be told openly, in his attempt to discredit her.) When asked to address the allegations made against the Department, Michael Heim said this: "'The students never expressed any dissatisfaction with the level of education they were being given,' Heim said. 'The external committee of the eight-year review rated the department among the top departments, if not the top, in the country.'"

The first part, of course, is complete nonsense, just another example of the blatant lie being trotted out, probably in the belief that the newly-cowed graduate student body would not call him on it. Slavic Department students did indeed express dissatisfaction with the level of education they were being given, especially those concentrating in linguistics, who were not only not instructed in current linguistic theory, but were at times actively discouraged from pursuing this course in the Linguistics Department proper. The second part of his statement, however, illustrates well the problem of deciding how well an academic entity, be it an academic department or an entire university, approaches the problem of questions regarding its quality. Since there are so many different factors that are used to decide the quality of a given program or institution, the program or institution has the option of picking and choosing those facts associated with that program or institution that best portray it in a positive light. Thus, the

presence of Bethea and Timberlake on the External Review team turned out to be crucial for the UCLA Slavic Department itself, since it gave the Slavic Department faculty something to grab on to, something that they could hold up to the public at large and say, see, we're actually pretty good. Of course, the UCLA Slavic Department and Michael Heim knew very well that neither the public at large nor the *Daily Bruin* had access to the mountain of evidence that suggested otherwise, and not surprisingly, it appears that no graduate student from the Slavic Department was willing at that point to contradict these statements. Michael Heim could just as easily have quoted from that part of the Internal Review report that said "This level of graduate program dysfunction is unprecedented in the collective experience of this review team", but for some reason, he chose not to do so. Instead, he continued as follows: "'The graduate council voted unanimously to lift the sanctions on the department,' he continued. 'They felt the department has dealt with the issue effectively.'" Thus, as far as the press is concerned, the issue is over and done with, a thing of the past, an unfortunate aberration, but certainly nothing more than that. Michael Heim took the power his tenured colleagues on the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate gave to him (by removing the ban on admissions, this against the recommendations of the Internal Review team) and ran with it, parlaying it into a winning hand in the student media.

This type of response is not unique to Michel Heim and the UCLA Slavic Department, but is commonplace in academe. The tenured professoriate chafes at any attempt to hold them to a standard for success that is not their own. In other words, they insist that any standard for judging their success be self-imposed and that to impose such a standard from without would be unacceptable, no doubt a violation of their "academic freedom", at least as they define it. It is this lack of a standardized set of criteria for success, however, that contributes to the ability of academic entities to shape the interpretation of these entities by parties external to them. What Michael Heim did in the *Daily Bruin* article is something that happens in academe quite frequently.

This sort of ability to cloud the true nature of a program is an important tool for the University to have, for the University realizes, even if the public at large does not, that ultimately the University is accountable to the people of California. For all that is said about the independence the University is supposed to have from the legislature that funds it with taxpayer dollars, this independence was never meant to be total. No government entity should be given complete and utter independence from the people who fund it, and none should be allowed to operate unsupervised. Realizing this, the University (both UCLA and the UC system itself) fears bad publicity because this can lead to precisely the sort of questioning of the University's authority, and of its independence from higher authority, that is happening here in this report. Bad publicity has the potential to erode the independence that the University enjoys from the legislature and from the taxpayers who fund it. Of course, if one listens to the proclamations coming from the University itself, one will learn that they value this independence because it protects their ability to do independent research free from political pressure, and there is no doubt

an element of truth in that. The larger truth, however, is that there is much less fear of political pressure than there is a fear of being held accountable for their actions by oversight that is truly effective and not just a façade of supervision meant to satisfy the public while essentially leaving the faculty free to behave in any matter it sees fit.

When the success or failure of a particular academic effort is judged not by clear, concise, quantifiable standards, but rather by the "instinct" and "feel" of a faculty member drawing on "years of experience", the potential for abuse becomes much greater. The difficulty in quantifying success has led to what is in effect an institutionalization of graduate student abuse within the University. This is not to say that every graduate student at UCLA or throughout the UC goes through the same level of graduate student abuse that was seen in the UCLA Slavic Department. Rather, this institutionalization of abuse manifests itself more as an acceptance by the faculty and by the institution at large of the fact that, at times, the abuse of graduate students is simply an "inescapable" part of graduate study, a sadly unavoidable part of the process. The fact is, this is one of the dirty little secrets of graduate school. Not always and not in every program or institution, but it is much more common than someone looking in from the outside would be led to believe. Graduate students are also quick to learn that, if they want to survive and thrive in graduate school, they have to not only absorb the blows that might come their way, but also to look the other way and join in the collective aversion of the eyes as faculty viciously abuse their graduate student colleagues, simply because their own success in finishing graduate school might depend on those same professors, be it in a comprehensive exam, or in seminars, or in getting signatures for the dissertation, or even after graduation, when the all-important recommendation letters can determine years after a graduate student has graduated from a program whether that newly minted PhD will sink or swim in the world of academe. (The negative repercussions associated with inability to quantify success in the world of academe are especially apparent in the practice of recommendations letters, which, as a result, take on tremendous importance. The value of a good letter from a big name in the field, his or her tendencies toward abuse of graduate students notwithstanding, cannot be underestimated. A bad letter from one of these big names can stop careers before they even begin.)

This reality on the ground has led to a culture that permeates the University, a culture that accepts the unstated rule that one should never rock the boat. This affects not only graduate students, but other faculty as well in so far as individual members of the faculty and/or the UCLA Academic Administration will bend over backwards so as not to have to be the one who has to exercise discipline when it comes to one of their fellow faculty members. This contrasts markedly with the way rules are normally interpreted in academe, where they are routinely ignored or stretched or exceptions to them are made, but when it comes to one faculty member or one administrator disciplining a tenured faculty member, then suddenly those rules become rigid: administrators will read word for word (and, in the case of the UCLA Slavic Department, did in fact read word for word) out of a manual in order to prove to students that it is not their job to

actually initiate or carry out a disciplinary procedure against a given faculty member. Because of this extreme reluctance to set in motion disciplinary proceedings against their colleagues, it is just generally accepted that there is nothing that can be done about faculty members who overstep their bounds or who abuse graduate students. This then allows power to grow almost unchecked among the faculty themselves, to the point that they can easily make or break a graduate student's future career. A culture of academic hazing sometimes arises in which, not unlike the thuggish and brutal hazing in the fraternity systems, students are made to go through this ordeal or that, never sure of what they are doing or what they are supposed to be doing. One linguistics professor in the UCLA Slavic Department, one of the worst abusers, commented on the system in place and actually referred to it as "hazing", saying further that this is what he and his colleagues had to go through when they were going through graduate school and that this is what graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department would have to go through as well.

It is important to note that just because this happened in the UCLA Slavic Department does not mean that it happened in every academic department in UCLA. Graduate students in the Slavic Department often spoke with other graduate students in other departments who were aghast at what was happening in Slavic. Nor is it the case that every tenured professor at UCLA fits the profile of a thuggish, abusive academic. Far from it. Many really are dedicated to their field and to the welfare of their graduate students and conduct themselves in an honorable and upright fashion. The problem is that because of the impotence of the system (be it a planned impotence or an evolutionary development) to discipline its own faculty members, these honorable faculty members often feel at a loss as to how to proceed when confronted with colleagues who are abusive. If the whole incident with the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department showed anything at all, it was that no matter how abusive the professor, no matter how egregious his/her actions towards graduate students, the University was going to bend over backwards to keep from actually disciplining the offending faculty. Given this fact, what are the good, honorable faculty members to do? What they should do, of course, is speak up, even knowing in advance that the effort, in this particular instance, would be for naught, for by speaking up they lay the groundwork for eventually changing the system, but that is not always readily apparent to these good faculty.

An example from the case of a UCLA Near Eastern Studies professor Andras Bodrogligeti, involving Dean of the Humanities Pauline Yu and an alleged cheating scandal in Professor Bodrogligeti's class and the University's alleged efforts to cover up the cheating and to discredit Bodrogligeti as a first step in shutting down the Near Eastern Studies program. The specifics of this episode are readily accessible and will not be debated here. (For more information, see "Professor files suit against UC, administrators" *The Daily Bruin*, May 2, 2001 [<http://www.dailybruin.ucla.edu/db/articles.asp?ID=4014>], the accompanying schemata for that story [<http://www.dailybruin.ucla.edu/db/rcissues/01/05.02/images/news.lawsuit.gfxbig.jpg>],

"Why Professors Don't Do More to Stop Students Who Cheat" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 1999 [<http://chronicle.com/colloquy/99/cheat/background.htm>], "Colleague allegedly accosted professor" *The Daily Bruin*, May 22, 2001 [<http://www.dailybruin.ucla.edu/db/archivedarticles.asp?ID=15585&date=5/22/2001>].) What is instructive is the attitude of the head of the Near Eastern Studies program, a perfect example of the duality of thought that can affect academics who want to do the right thing, and yet, because they are skeptical of whether or not true change can be effected, default to the impulse to cover up. The following email is from the chair of the program, Antonio Loprieno, sent to the Dean of the Humanities Pauline Yu on March 12, 1999 concerning the Bodrogligeti case:

"To show evidence of cheating is too legalistically high to be of real value. Needless to say, this is something that should never be divulged to the media or public, but it does show ... the fear of legal consequences often makes UCLA (or perhaps all Universities) reluctant to behave courageously against moral lapses by faculty or students alike."

Here in a single message is captured the conflict of academics operating under the current system: recognizing that a fear of legal action can often stop the University from acting courageously in the face of inappropriate behavior (take, for example, the failure of the University to live up to its promise to protect those Slavic Department students who cooperated and how quickly it backed down from its demand that Slavic Department faculty not question Slavic Department students about the Eight-Year Review report when the Slavic Department faculty threatened legal action), while at the same time fearing the only thing that will ever bring about real change in the system, that being exposure of the problem "to the media or public".

The "Moosa"-ization of the University and What this Portends for the Continued Paralysis of the System.

The one question that always arises when the abusive behavior of tenured faculty is documented is why this behavior is allowed to go on unchecked, which is the same thing as asking the question, why are faculty allowed near unlimited latitude with regard to their behavior? There are two reasons for this. As has been made clear above, an academic administration comprised of tenured academics has no will to impose discipline on their tenured brethren. Beyond the question of will, however, there is also the question of ability. No case illustrates this any better than the case of Suleman Moosa, a professor of finance at California State University, Chico (CSUC).

Moosa, who has been a tenured professor at CSUC since 1980, has a reputation for being a very tough grader and for having an abrasive teaching style. He has also often voiced a common complaint among university professors, namely that students in his classes are often

under-prepared and not schooled in the basics, thus frustrating the learning process in the classes that he teaches. While many other professors have voiced a similar complaint, few have gone to Moosa's lengths in order to prove their point. The Master Plan for the State of California states that the upper 12.5 percent of all graduating seniors will be deemed eligible for admission to a University of California campus, while the upper third of all graduating seniors will be eligible for admission to a California State University campus, with the remainder eligible for admissions to the state's extensive community college system. Thus, regardless of what any individual may think about his or her students preparation or background with regard to the classes taught in that particular university, the state which is paying the professor and subsidizing the students' education has made the determination that the students who do wind up in a UC or Cal State campus have the right to be there and are, *a priori*, qualified. (They may be deficient in one or more academic areas, but the question of their being qualified is one that has already been answered by the state's Master Plan.)

Few academics in these institutions are pleased with this fact, and yet most come to realize that the state that pays them expects them to adjust to the fact that students are being accepted according to these standards. In other words, they realize that their students are not going to be, on the whole, as well prepared as students at one of the top Ivy League or liberal arts schools. Moosa, however, was not inclined to join in this realization, demanding instead that the University either provide him students who met *his* standards of preparedness, or be prepared for him to hand out disproportionately large numbers of D's and F's. The results were predictable. Students, knowing very well that admission to graduate school, business school, or the type of job they land after college could very well depend on their undergraduate grade point average, began dropping out in droves, with classes of thirty students shrinking to classes of three students in just a few days time. At one point, according the Chico State university newspaper *The Orion*, Moosa was scheduled to teach four classes during one marking period with not a single student enrolled. (See "Prof's Empty Classes Under Investigation" in the March 18, 1999 issue of *The Orion*—back issues of *The Orion* are presently being posted at <http://orion.csuchico.edu/Pages/backissue.pl.cgi>). And yet, not surprisingly, Moosa was backed up by a three-member peer review committee, with two agreeing with Moosa that the problem was with the preparation level of the students, and one issuing an minority report, saying that Moosa may or may not be the cause of the low enrollments. (MORE LAW.COM-A Litigation Digest & Directory--<http://www.morelaw.com/verdicts/case.asp?n=C038494&s=CA%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20&d=21474>)

In January of 1998, the chair of Moosa's department in a report to the dean suggested that Moosa “develop a plan that would address . . . the areas of course mechanics, material coverage, testing procedures, and grading practices.” The following month the dean issued a report which stated "Professor Moosa’s performance in the area of instruction continues to be unacceptable,"

and directed Moosa "to develop an improvement plan as suggested by Dr. Van Auken [The chair]. The plan is to address the issues that have been discussed within the areas of course mechanics, material coverage, testing procedures and grading." Moosa then failed to do this, submitting instead merely a copy of the "majority report" noted above.

As a result of this direct refusal to produce the aforementioned improvement plan, the president of the University demoted Moosa (who could not be fired because he has tenure) from the rank of professor to associate professor "for [his] unprofessional conduct and [his] failure or refusal to perform the normal and reasonable duties of [his] position." In June of 1998, the president noted in a separate document that Moosa:

1. had failed to submit the aforementioned improvement plan
2. had treated students in a demeaning manner
3. was unresponsive to student requests for assistance
4. had used class time to discuss his personal educational philosophy
5. had failed to adhere to CSUC's grading policy
6. had exhibited a severe lack of collegiality in the materials he submitted to the peer review committee

According to the president, the first four of these factors contributed to the startlingly low enrollments in Moosa's classes. In March of 2000 an administrative law judge ruled that only two of the allegations had substantial evidence supporting them, the ones concerning his failure to adhere to CSUC's grading policy and his failure to submit an improvement plan covering areas of course mechanics, material coverage, testing procedures and grading.

To those unfamiliar with academe, these demands by the dean and by the president of the University might seem to be relatively modest. After all, what were they asking? That Moosa improve his teaching, the way he tests and grades, how the course is run and that he keep the content of his course relevant to the nature of the course. And yet, for so many in the academic world, this is tantamount to a glaring intrusion into what they define as "academic freedom". Academic tenure, as it was originally conceived, was designed to protect a scholar's right to publish what he wanted to publish, and to teach what he wanted to teach (again, within reason: a French teacher cannot teach chemistry to his students) without fear of losing his job because of controversial views. This freedom, however, has now been, in the eyes of some, extended to all aspects of the teaching process: to grading, to how one teaches, to how one assigns grades.

Certainly that appeared to be Moosa's contention as he continued to appeal his case, all the way up to the Court of Appeals of California, Third Appellate District. While agreeing that the merits of the University's complaints against Professor Moosa might have been valid, the court nonetheless reversed the University's decision, and ordered the University to reinstate

Moosa to his original rank, along with back pay, and to reimburse him for his legal costs. The reasoning used by the court was that, although the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the California Faculty Association allowed the University to *suggest* changes, nowhere was it stated that the University could compel faculty members to go along with these suggestions. The salient point from the decision is reproduced below:

"There is nothing in the collective bargaining agreement authorizing the dean or any other administrator, as part of a periodic performance evaluation, to direct a tenured professor to engage in any activity, whether or not that activity is aimed at improving the professor's performance as a teacher. On the contrary, the applicable provision in the collective bargaining agreement authorizes only a discussion of the professor's strengths and weaknesses, 'along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement.'"

This, then, is what is meant by the [Moosa-ization](#) of the University. The University, at least in this particular instance, finds itself powerless to act, powerless to exercise some sort of oversight in even the most minor of matters. This in effect gives *carte blanche* to the faculty to act in any manner they see fit. No matter how petulant the response, no matter how arrogant the attitude of the offending faculty member, the University is seen to be unable to enforce its own standards with regard to the treatment of students by faculty, and with regard to grading policy and the preservation of acceptable and reasonable teaching practices. Individual faculty members may, with total disdain towards, and disregard for, the academic administration, unilaterally implement policies, regardless of how unfair these policies may be or how much they hurt the University or how ludicrous the situation that results from their unilateral action, e.g. the University paying a tenured professor \$70,000 per year to teach no one. To claim, as many faculty members do, that such a state of affairs is necessary to preserve "academic freedom" strains the credulity of even the most naïve of taxpayers who support the University, and it is an insult to the students who are forced to deal with such conditions.

The term [Moosa-ization](#) is meant to cover not just the events that occurred specifically at California State University, Chico, but rather the phenomenon in general. The faculty at CSUC are unionized, represented by the California Faculty Association, the union whose collective bargaining agreement with CSUC prevented Moosa from being disciplined. The lack of such union representation, however, should not be seen as precluding the process of [Moosa-ization](#) from occurring, and UCLA, which has no official union for tenured faculty, is a case in point. In the second section of this report (*Context of the Problem*) it was stated that at UCLA [the Academic Senate acts as a de facto union](#), and that certainly appears to have been the case with regard to the events surrounding the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department. This can be seen in two specific areas, although it occurs in many others as well.

The first would be the controversy concerning the UCLA Administration's promises of protection that were given to graduate students in return for their voluntary participation in the review. When the UCLA Administration, at the behest of these same students who had been questioned about the results of the Eight-Year Review by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, directed the faculty not to talk to students about the review, professors in the UCLA Slavic Department threatened to bring suit against the University for violating what they claimed were their First Amendment right to free speech. Instead of holding firm, the UCLA Administration immediately folded and buckled under to these threats, in effect abandoning the very students they had promised to protect. Thus, in this instance, we see very clearly that these particular UCLA faculty members had no need of a union, because the UCLA Administration was acting in a dual capacity, both as the overseers of the UCLA Slavic Department, but also as its unofficial union. At least in the Moosa case, the CSUC Administration had the courage to mete out punishment and to stand up to offending faculty when challenged in court. At UCLA, however, the Academic Administration, again working in its dual capacity, in effect issued its order (UCLA Administration as overseer of academic departments) and then turned around and nullified it (UCLA Administration as *de facto* union for the faculty).

The second area in which the Moosa case highlights weakness in the system that would allow abuse such as was seen in the UCLA Slavic Department to occur is the improper inclusion of some aspects of the education process under the rubric of protected academic freedoms. The Moosa case very clearly highlighted how adamant the faculty are about allowing no one other than themselves to determine how tests should be given or how homeworks should be assigned or graded. Normally, these issues are not a problem since many tenured academics adhere to a reasonable standard in this regard, but as the Moosa case shows, there are times when supervising action is not only justified, but required. Much attention was focused in the Eight-Year Review report on the abuses of students by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty. Although this abuse took many forms, one of the most insidious was the abuse of grading or testing procedures. Faculty would freely wield the powers granted to them in the name of "academic freedom" to hone in on those students they wanted to remove from the program. Grading was assigned, in some cases, without regard to the extent to which students had assimilated the assigned material. In other instances, it was never clear what the assigned body of material to be learned really was. If a student does not know what he is supposed to be studying, then there is no way he can protest what was asked of him on exams.

The exam process itself was at times cryptic at best. Unlike undergraduate programs, graduate studies leading to the Ph.D. require students to pass not only exams in individual classes, but also several sets of additional exams, from language exams to comprehensive exams, at both the masters and doctoral levels. These exams are notorious for what can be put on them. The faculty are absolutely adamant when it comes to their right to ask everything and anything that they may see fit. Since there is no set path for some of these exams, there can, as a consequence, be no set

of predetermined right answers. Indeed, some of the questions shy away from the concept of a single "right answer". While this might in some respects be seen as appropriate for an intellectual training regimen which is meant to push the limits of knowledge in a given field, a consequence of this fact is that since there is no set right answer, it is (under the current system, in which testing methodology is utterly off limits to outside inquiry, lest "academic freedom" be threatened) also possible to abuse this subjective power in order to ensure a student's failure or success. If faculty want to blackball certain graduate students, it is easy enough to do, and in fact has been done in the UCLA Slavic Department. There are many cases of students who had done extremely well in their classes and yet not managed to pass their comprehensive exams, and other examples of students who had not done well in classes, but yet passed the exams. The faculty, of course, tries to pass this off as evidence of how rigorous their program is, e.g. "Our program is a quality program—we don't let people slip through just on the basis of good grades alone..." The problem is, there are no independent, verifiable standards by which to judge whether or not the faculty are passing students based on their ability and the extent to which these students have actually absorbed what they were taught. The standards are completely subjective, dependent solely on the opinions of the individual professors who comprise the exam committee. Were the University to demand that the Department come up with a less arbitrary method of testing, again, the hue and cry would arise that the faculty's "academic freedom" is being impinged upon.

The randomness seen in comprehensive exams can also be seen in testing that occurs in individual classes. One of the worst abusers in the UCLA Slavic Department used to prefer writing out testing questions on index cards and then having graduate students come up and pick a question at random and answer it in front of the entire class. He would then, quite subjectively, assign a grade to the student based on that answer. Whether the question was particularly difficult, or particularly easy, didn't matter. If the goal of testing is to determine the extent to which a student has or has not assimilated the totality of material presented during the course of a given class, then this method of testing in reality tests very little. It is more of a raffle than a scientifically valid method of determining a student's success. One thing it does do, however, is make it that much easier for a professor to dole out any grade he sees fit. As is the case with comprehensive exams, if the academic administration were to dare to demand that the professor in question employ a more accurate and less subjective means for testing students in individual classes, the administration would immediately be accused by not just that faculty member, but by the collective faculty, of infringing upon academic freedom, if not something far worse. (See, for example, Bethea/Timerlake's embarrassing comparison of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty with victims of Stalinist oppression.)

Until the UCLA Academic Administration, and every academic administration, for that matter, can lay claim to some ability to control the behavior of its own faculty and to discipline them when the need arises, the attitude and atmosphere that gave rise to the many abuses in the UCLA Slavic Department will continue to be the norm on most campuses.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | Section 8

VIII. Anticipated Reactions and Recommendations

The release of this report has been timed to coincide with the new review of the UCLA Slavic Department that was scheduled to start in 2004 and which is currently either finished or in its last stages. From the point of view of the UCLA Slavic Department and the UCLA Administration, this current review of Slavic Department was meant to be the final act in the faculty's triumphant reestablishment of complete control of the Slavic Department and in the suppressing of challenges to this faculty's authority. As can be seen in the preceding sections of this report, this effort began before the first Eight-Year Review in 1999-2000 had even been completed, continued through the intermediate review in 2002, and was supposed to culminate in this final departmental review, one in which the situation in the UCLA Slavic Department would be deemed acceptable and in which the faculty would be seen as, if not redeemed, then at least reformed. No doubt there has been some actual improvement within the Slavic Department, if for no other reason that three of the four main abusive linguistic faculty are now either retired or dead. Of course, for those students who suffered through the worst of the graduate student abuse visited upon them by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, there has been no recompense, and for those who abused students, and for those who covered up, and conspired to cover up, this abuse, there has been no punishment. Indeed, there hasn't even been an official investigation, and with this final "review" of the UCLA Slavic Department, the Department's faculty and the University's faculty as a whole no doubt hope that the threat of such an official investigation will have been extinguished at last.

In anticipation and preparation for this result, the UCLA Slavic Department and the UCLA Administration have taken a number of steps to ensure that graduate students in the Department are not dissatisfied. Among the steps taken to "sweeten the pot" for these graduate students about to undergo the upcoming Eight-Year Review has been the passing out of Dissertation Year Fellowships (DYF) left and right in the Slavic Department. Dissertation Year Fellowships are prized one-year fellowships that provide the student enough to live on comfortably for one academic year with no obligation other than to finish writing his dissertation, and as such are much sought after. It is not uncommon for a department to have not a single one of its graduate students receive a DYF, and often even large departments only receive one or two DYFs for their entire graduate student body. In the UCLA Slavic Department, one of the University's smallest departments, four graduate students were offered Dissertation Year Fellowships for the 2004-

2005 academic year. (For a list of recipients, see page 26 of the Fall 2004 *UCLA Graduate Student Quarterly* at www.gdnet.ucla.edu/asis/library/gqfall04b.pdf) This on-going review is the opportunity for the UCLA Slavic Department to put this "unfortunate episode" behind it, and now more than ever both the Department and the UCLA Administration want to see Slavic Department students happy. When it comes to doing whatever it takes to maintain their privileges and station within the system, the Academic Administration, in its role as the representative of the University's tenured professoriate, is willing to do whatever it takes to put an end to this "unpleasantness". As they say, UCLA pays cash. Literally.

Anticipated Reactions to the Release of This Report: General Comments

Given the fact that the UCLA Slavic Department and the UCLA Administration were no doubt of the opinion that they had succeeded in "dodging a bullet" with regard to the events that took place in the UCLA Slavic Department, the release of this report will be an unexpected and unwelcome event. One of the more interesting aspects of the release of the report will be how the University and others associated with it—students, the taxpayers and legislators who support it, faculty and administrators—react to it.

What should one expect in terms of reaction to this report? No doubt, everyone in the UCLA Administration, from the Chancellor on down to the individual faculty members of the Slavic Department, will express their "shock" and "disappointment", and perhaps even "sadness" that graduate students feel that they are somehow not being treated well. This is typical. Note the response from the Chair of the UCLA History Department after the situation there boiled over in 2002:

"I'm saddened by the sense of neglect and ill-treatment that our graduate students have expressed. I want to have a departmental environment in which everyone, particularly our graduate students, feels welcomed, respected, appreciated and able to do the important scholarly work that is the driving passion of our lives.

"It was never my intention, nor the intention of other members of the department's administration, to design policies or act in any manner that would jeopardize the well-being of our students or make them feel that we don't care for them. Indeed, one of the central missions of the department is to nurture and train our graduate students; it is a mission we are dedicated to carrying out."

This "Claude Rains"-like reaction of being "shocked, shocked" at such behavior is typical of academe, and indeed, how could it be any other way? If those in authority were to acknowledge that they already knew of the abuse, then the obvious next question is, if they knew of the abuse,

then why didn't they do anything about it? Thus, they are practically forced to adopt the "Claude Rains" approach, regardless of ludicrous such protestations of ignorance might seem in the case of the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures.

What might be unexpected, at least to those unfamiliar with this department and its "cult of denial" is that some members, even in the face of such overwhelming evidence, might still try to insist that they did nothing wrong. From a tactical point of view this might not seem to make sense, since every time the Department or one of its representatives tries to deny the obvious, they only wind up digging themselves in deeper (witness the section of the Eight-Year Review Report titled "[Response to Slavic Chair's 'Errors of Fact' Statement](#)" in which the chair of the internal committee issues a point by point rebuttal of the Slavic Department Chair's arguments, pointing out further the lies that characterized the Slavic Department's approach toward the review committees: "Especially in the beginning, the response was a disavowal of any such problems. At one point an external reviewer was moved to exclaim to a faculty member, '...you are in denial!' The pattern that emerged was consistent denial or minimization of the problem-until confronted with overwhelming evidence.")

And yet, one should not at all be surprised if some members of the Slavic Department faculty choose to continue this pattern. From a legal point of view, the most logical path might be for them to say nothing, but no one ever claimed that logic ruled the day when it came to the decisions made by many of the faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department. No doubt many will continue to struggle in the quicksand of their own lies. One should also not forget that some of these faculty, the same ones who threatened to take legal action against the UCLA Administration when told that they shouldn't speak to Slavic Department graduate students about the Eight-Year Review, might also attempt to take legal action. Against whom would be the question, but again, logic does not necessarily play a role in such decisions.

As for the UCLA Administration itself, one should expect, after the inevitable "Claude Rain" responses of "shock", "surprise", and "sadness" a well orchestrated public relations campaign designed first to staunch the bleeding, secondly to begin the process of outward contrition, thirdly a strenuous effort to convince the public that the UCLA is going to be taking some "real" and "concrete" steps to bring about change and to prevent such abuse from ever happening again. What this will really be, however, is nothing more than an attempt to divert the public's attention, to the extent that this can be done, from the real causes of systemic abuse by the tenured professoriate to superficial "causes". In a sense, the UCLA Administration will attempt to do on a large scale what the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures did on a smaller scale via its attempts to minimize the problems and to place them in a greater overall positive context. This attempt at minimalization by the Department also included attempts divert attention from these problems through various "smoke and mirror" techniques: the artificial

division of the Department into "caucuses" in an attempt to isolate the offending linguistic faculty members, the production of a "quantitatively impressive but qualitatively vacuous" student handbook, and so on.

The intent of the UCLA Slavic Department with all these faux reforms was twofold: 1. to provide those on high bent on defending the Slavic Department with some help, some ammunition with which to make such a defense, some evidence to which to point that would support the false claims that real reform was being made. 2. To confuse and divert those outside of academe (e.g. the taxpayers who pay for the University of California system) with large quantities of alleged "reform", all the while knowing that most of these "outsiders", due to their lack of familiarity with the system, are unable to determine which of these reforms would bring about real change and which are nothing more than window dressing.

One should not be in the least surprised if the UCLA Administration attempts to recreate this on a larger scale. For example, one might see the appointing of a "commission" to investigate these abuses and charges of lying and law breaking on the part of the Slavic Department faculty. But of whom would this commission be comprised? Tenured faculty, no doubt. And no doubt this commission will cluck its tongue and announce how much it disapproves of the type of faculty behavior documented here, and no doubt this commission will make many, many recommendations. But the real question is this: will this commission make any recommendation that will break the near stranglehold on power that the tenured professoriate wields throughout the University of California system? Will it make any recommendations that will allow the University to hold tenured professors to account for their actions? Will it make any recommendations that provide real oversight of the academic process to ensure that abuse does not occur? Will it make recommendations that allow for the meting out of real punishment to abusive faculty? For if not, then this will turn out to have the same effect as the Slavic Department's so-called reform: superficial changes that allow the underlying system to remain fully in place and intact.

Pressure will also be put on graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department. What forms this pressure will take cannot be known, but it would not be surprising to see both subtle and overt pressure employed on the behalf of the UCLA Administration to get existing graduate students to be pliable in response to these revelations. No doubt the Administration and the Slavic Department itself will point out the slew of dissertation year fellowships that have been given out recently to Slavic Department graduate students. It will also be made clear to these graduate students that negative characterizations of their department will also reflect negatively on them when they try to get jobs. Unfortunately, whenever the pigeons come home to roost with regard to the faculty's behavior toward graduate students, it can often be the case that the graduate students themselves suffer more than the faculty, simply because the faculty already have tenure and security. The students will be in a "damned if you do, damned if you don't" situation. Some

students will fear not speaking up in defense of the Department, simply because to refuse to do so will be seen by the Department as a betrayal. Others will fear that speaking up in defense of the Department—regardless of how sincere this defense is—might hurt future job prospects as they would be seen as selling out to a faculty that is obviously and undeniably guilty of repeated and extended gross misconduct. And it must be said that there are current graduate students who are genuinely fond of Michael Heim and will want to defend him. The situation of these students will be addressed below.

Recommendations: What Needs To Be Done And By Whom

This section focuses on what needs to be done in order to change the system as it currently stands, and where specific change needs to take place. As can be seen in [Section VI](#), the weak points (or, depending on your point of view, the strong points) of the system with regard to exposing (or hiding) abuses are found throughout the system, at every level, and it is for this reason that reform must be instituted at every level. There are limits to what change can be accomplished at a given level, and these limits are recognized in the recommendations as they apply to each level or group of individuals. Many of these recommendations are identical to the ["Summary of Main Recommendations" made at the end of the Annotated Eight-Year Review, Section IV-B](#).

UCLA Administration

1. UCLA has an obligation to right the wrongs done to UCLA graduate students in the Slavic Department and to make amends for the financial, professional, and academic damage done to graduate students in this program, both past and present. Any former graduate students who either left the program of their own accord or who were forced out because of the testing procedure in place in the Slavic Department should be given the option to re-enter the program and finish the degree.
2. Faculty members in the UCLA Slavic Department who abused graduate students, and those who lied about such abuse and conspired to cover it up, must be terminated. When UCLA speaks of concepts such as *integrity* and *ethical breaches*, these are concepts that cannot be selectively applied only to basketball coaches and other non-tenured employees of UCLA. The violations here could not possibly be any clearer: if UCLA refuses to terminate tenured faculty members in this instance, then it is simply that much clearer that for UCLA, terms such as *integrity* and *ethical behavior* are not immutable values but simply relative concepts to be employed whenever

it is in the interest of those running the University to do so. Obviously the University of California has no authority over David Bethea, the outside reviewer from the University of Wisconsin who joined in Michael Heim's attempt to smear XX, the one graduate student from the UCLA Slavic Department who allowed her story to be aired publicly, but it does have authority over Alan Timberlake of UC Berkeley. Timberlake should be subjected to the same degree of discipline as that which should be exercised against his former UCLA colleagues with whom he worked to cover up the abuses that took place in the Department. Given Timberlake's willingness to work hand in hand with his former UCLA colleagues in this regard, the UC Regents might also do well to authorize an investigation of graduate student conditions in the UC Berkeley Slavic Department.

3. As was made clear in the sections above, in spite of the overwhelming amount of credible evidence of abusive behavior by UCLA Slavic Department faculty members towards their graduate students, no official fact-finding mission was ever conducted. (From the Internal Report: "The mandate to the review team was not to conduct a fact-finding mission or to determine the guilt or innocence of particular individuals...") Unfortunately, since it is clear that at this point that the UCLA Administration is incapable of conducting such an investigation, it will have to be initiated and directed at higher levels, probably by the UC Regents or possibly even by the State Legislature. Until such time, however, that a true investigation of the UCLA Slavic Department can be carried out, the UCLA Administration should heed the requests and suggestions of the internal review committee in its first report, namely that the Department be put into receivership and that a ban on new graduate students be put into place. Any "improvements" that have occurred in the UCLA Slavic Department since 2000 have occurred not because of any change of heart with regard to the UCLA Slavic Department faculty's attitudes toward graduate students, but rather because of their fear that substantive action might be taken against the Department as a result of the graduate student abuse that occurred.

4. The UCLA Administration needs to provide an official explanation as to why the University was either unable or unwilling to rein in members of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty who insisted on speaking with graduate students concerning the results of the Eight-Year Review. The words in the Eight-Year Review concerning possible retaliation by faculty against students who participated in the Eight-Year Review were stirring and resolute: "Let it, therefore, be clearly understood that the slightest indication of retaliation by faculty against students will be aggressively investigated by the Graduate Council to determine whether charges should be filed with the appropriate Senate Committee for violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct, not only for recent but also for any past offences." The reality was very different, as the UCLA Administration could not back down fast enough in the face of legal threats from the UCLA Slavic Department faculty. The UCLA Administration needs to explain its ignominious actions (and inaction) in this shameful episode, one in which the trust of the students was betrayed and the promises made to them quickly swept under the rug.

5. Because there never was an official investigation into the conduct of individual faculty members of the UCLA Slavic Department to answer the charges made against them of abusing graduate students, none of the individual faculty members ever had charges brought up against them. This was, of course, by design, and was in fact the point of the long, drawn out process that was [documented in Section VI of this report](#), a process which purported to be in place to weed out wrongdoing but in fact was intended to dilute the force of the anger coming from students by elongating the process and thus make this student backlash manageable and, above all, to keep details from leaking out to the public at large.

The result was that one of the worst offenders and abusers among the Slavic Department faculty, a person who the entire faculty (with the exception of this person's spouse) realize is severely in need of psychological counseling, was actually allowed to serve for one year on the promotion and tenure committee, one of the most important committees in the University in that the approval of this committee is one of the last steps in the granting of tenure. This is yet another example of how failing to have a system in place under which faculty could be effectively subjected to discipline may have hurt people who have nothing to do with Slavic. The idea that this individual would be a deciding voice in whether or not a person receives tenure or promotion is frightening. As a result of her having been allowed to serve on this committee, the UCLA Administration should revisit every case that she had a part in deciding to ensure that the right decision was made. In fact, everyone who lost a position or failed to get promotion under this version of the CAP committee should receive a second chance for tenure or promotion.

6. The idea of anonymous course evaluations is a good one in that they provide students with an opportunity to evaluate the level and quality of instruction presented to them in a given course. Naturally, course evaluations must be taken with a certain degree of skepticism, since there will always be students who would choose either to spew vitriol unjustifiably on an instructor whom they did not like or else heap praise on an instructor with whom they were enamored, regardless of the performance of that instructor. Yet, taken as a whole, and with a wide enough sampling base, course evaluations do play an important role and can offer insight. In graduate school, however, the role of these evaluations is more complicated, simply because the courses have many times fewer students enrolled (at the graduate level, these courses are usually seminars), and thus the anonymity of the students filling out the response is much less secure. In other words, in a class of five people, if one student voiced a complaint on a supposedly "anonymous" evaluation form about a specific incident, it would be fairly easy to discern which student wrote that evaluation. A new system is needed for graduate student feedback, but until that comes about, the UCLA Administration must make sure that the option of the old system, however flawed it may be, is still available to graduate students. In the UCLA Slavic Department it was not unheard of for a faculty member to pass out course evaluations and then sit there while the

students filled them out. It should be made clear to all faculty that once these forms have been passed out, the faculty member should leave the room. Students should also be given the option of taking the evaluation form out of the room and dropping it off anonymously later, thus giving them more time to think through their responses.

7. The system in place for comprehensive exams at the masters level needs to change. As it stands now, in most departments that have comprehensive exams for the masters level, there are three possible outcomes: 1. Outright failure of the exams, in which case no degree is given and no admission into the Ph.D. program is allowed; 2. The so-called "low pass" (officially, just a "pass") in which a masters degree is granted but no admission into the Ph.D. program is allowed; 3. The "high pass" in which a masters degree is awarded and admission to the Ph.D. program is granted. While the existence of the "low pass" option might at first glance seem favorable to students, since after all, at least they will have a degree of some sort to show for their time and trouble, it in fact serves a very different purpose. The "low pass" masters degree is merely an additional tool the faculty use to weed out students while at the same time pacifying these students in the hope that they won't cause a fuss. ("Oh well, at last I got a masters degree out of it.") Students who spent two or three years working towards admission to the Ph.D. program via passing the Masters comprehensive exams are much less likely to take lying down an arbitrary failure on the comprehensive exams if they are going to get nothing out of it at all. Beyond this, the existence of two levels of masters degrees calls into question the academic integrity of the institution that grants such a degree. An M.A. should represent the same level of knowledge for every student who earns one. It is absurd for an academic institution to award a student a masters degree, thereby presumably certifying a certain level of expertise, and then rejecting that same student for its Ph.D. program.

There is no such thing as a "low pass" bachelors degree or a "low pass" doctorate degree; nor should there be a "low pass" masters degree.

8. The current system of evaluating departments, the review of a department once every eight years, is inadequate to achieve true oversight of an academic department, but the changes that need to be made in this process will need to be addressed at a higher level. It is obvious from the events surrounding the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department and the cover-up that ensued that the UCLA Administration has neither the will nor (apparently) the ability to take the necessary steps in this regard. One thing that can be done, however, is to make more accessible the results of whatever review process (be it the current Eight-Year Review or whatever replaces it) not only to the students, but also to the public at large. The results of every review of every department should no longer be hidden in the Academic Senate office, nor should they be restricted to a single review copy in the department that was reviewed. UCLA is a public institution, funded by taxpayers, and everyone should have immediate and complete access to these reviews via the Internet. Just as the answer to the Enron/World-Com scandals and the

Catholic Church sexual abuse scandals has been a demand for transparency, so too should transparency be the watchword for the abusive conditions that currently blight UCLA.

The words of J. Robert Oppenheimer here are instructive: "We do not believe any group of men adequate enough or wise enough to operate without scrutiny or without criticism. We know that the only way to avoid error is to detect it, that the only way to detect it is to be free to inquire. We know that in secrecy error undetected will flourish and subvert." Proof of Oppenheimer's claim can all too easily be found in the events surrounding the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department. The results of every review of every department at every UC campus (and ideally at every institution of higher learning) should be made readily available via the Internet to all who would like to view them.

9. Exit interviews should be done for all graduate students. In instances where graduate students have simply stopped attending, UCLA should take the initiative in contacting these graduate students to ascertain why it is they have chosen to leave their program.

University of California/UC Regents

1. There is a need to establish an independent and permanent review apparatus. Clearly the present system, in which tenured UC professors and outside tenured faculty are used to review their tenured brethren, is unsatisfactory. A permanent review apparatus should be completely independent of the University Administration itself, reporting directly to either the Regents or to the State Legislature and the Governor. Reviews of academic departments should occur at least once every three years and in addition, there should be random, unannounced reviews from time to time. Among the rules governing this new process of review would be the following:

- Faculty would be prohibited from discussing such reviews with students
- Faculty would be prohibited from prompting students beforehand as to what they should or should not say to the reviewers.
- The department being reviewed should not be allowed to suggest a list of possible external reviewers. Before the external reviewers are finally selected, their names should be run past the graduate students of that department to prevent situations such as was seen in the most recent Eight-Year Review when it was discovered that Alan Timberlake, himself a former member of the UCLA Slavic Department, was going to be on the external review committee.
- A UC graduate student should be a part of each review, and should be compensated appropriately for his or her efforts. (Under the current system, the only reviewer who is not compensated is the graduate student reviewer.)
- All incoming graduate students should be provided contact numbers/emails/addresses

to this permanent review organization and be instructed in ways to get in touch with that organization should any of these graduate students feel uncomfortable with the way the review is being conducted.

- Again, all review reports should be available in full via the Internet to the public at large.

2. There need to be fundamental changes in the nature and meaning of tenure at the University of California. Tenure as originally conceived was not meant to be a system by which faculty were guaranteed a job for life. Tenure was meant to do two things: A. Protect faculty from being terminated for teaching controversial doctrines; B. Protect faculty from being terminated for publishing articles and books which are perceived by some as controversial. These are worthy aims, and tenure in so far as it means retaining these protections should without question be retained. What tenure was *not* supposed to do, however, was to extend into every nook and cranny of the University teaching experience. When faculty can not be told that their teaching methodology needs to be changed (not the substance of what they are teaching, but how they are teaching it), when faculty cannot be told to keep from discussing sensitive issues regarding the faculty themselves with their graduate students, as happened during the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department, then the [Moosa-ization](#) of the academe will have been completed, in effect giving complete and unchecked power to the faculty. This is what tenure is well on its way to becoming, if it isn't there already. When one segment of the University, or of any organization for that matter, has absolute freedom, then that means every other segment has its rights and freedoms severely curtailed. No faculty member, tenured or otherwise, should have absolute free rein to do whatever he or she pleases. Tenure must be redefined in such a way that faculty, even those with tenure, can be held accountable for the type of behavior seen in the UCLA Slavic Department and elsewhere.

The examples given in this report deal mostly with the personal consequences of what happens when tenure is used as a broad shield for actions which have grave implications for graduate students, e.g. dismissal from the program, failure to receive recommendations for jobs and tenure, etc. This abuse of tenure also has consequences beyond these, however. It in effect creates two different classes of faculty, those who truly have the freedom to speak their mind, i.e. those with tenure, and those who don't have such freedom, i.e. those coming up for tenure or academics without tenure track positions (lecturers, professors-in-residence, etc.) With time, as the "reach" of tenure has expanded, that is to say as the number of areas covered by tenure has grown, there has been an inversely proportional shrinking in the ratio of tenured faculty to non-tenured faculty. One need only look at this ratio fifty years ago and compare it to what it is today. What this means is that an ever larger percentage of faculty members do not enjoy the protections of tenure. As the reach of tenure has expanded to the point where its abuse as seen in the UCLA Slavic Department and the Moosa case at California State University, Chico has become more

and more common, educational institutions are understandably that much more reluctant to open up tenure-track positions. It is much easier for all concerned to have students taught by adjunct faculty or lecturers, academics without tenure who will not rock the boat on University issues out of fear of losing their jobs. Of course, this also means that they will be more cautious in expressing themselves on academic and scholarly issues, exactly the sort of check on intellectual freedom that tenure was supposed to prevent. This is yet another reason that tenure should be redefined to what it was originally meant to be, protection for the scholar to teach and publish what he wants without fear of retribution, and not from what it has become, a broad shield behind which any sort of behavior can be engaged in, irrespective of how odious or hurtful this behavior is to other members of the academic community.

3. The punishment and misdeeds of professors can no longer be considered purely personal matters. In the past, the University would hide behind the excuse of protecting an employee's privacy when questioned about an individual professor's proclivity to abuse graduate students or to abuse other staff and faculty. The protection of an employee's privacy is and should remain a paramount concern of the University. (It's a pity the University did not feel the same way when informed that the Slavic Department Chairman had illegally released grades from the transcripts of the one graduate student who stood up publicly to the Slavic Department, but never mind.) Unlike any other members of the University community, decisions made by faculty members affect students to a disproportionately large extent, and this fact must be taken into account when determining what degree of privacy be granted to them. In purely personal matters, or in matters that have only to do with employee issues between faculty members and the administration, then of course normal privacy rules should apply. But in instances where abuse of students is at issue, then the record of the faculty member in question as it applies to issues of student abuse should be accessible not only to all members of the University community, but also to the taxpayers and public at large who are paying to support this university system.

No doubt the current academic administration will decry this as a violation of privacy and submit that such matters as best handled discretely by the university administration itself, thereby raising the question, "best" for whom? For the tenured faculty that the university administration represents and seeks to protect at every turn? It goes without saying that, for them, it would be better that there be no public record of instances of abuse towards graduate students. But for the greater good of the academic community and the public that supports the university system, it is best that all such confirmed instances of graduate student abuse be made readily available to the public. Just as the results of future departmental reviews should be posted on the Web, so too should prior confirmed instances of graduate student abuse by individual faculty members be readily accessible via the Web. Again, transparency is the watchword.

4. There should be no more confidential settlements by UC. It is the people's money; they have a right to know what is being done with it. Any legal suits brought against UC that are eventually

settled out of court should not be done so with secret settlements, and by this term "secret settlements" is meant not only those settlements in which a legally binding non-disclosure clause is agreed upon, but also those settlements in which such "non-disclosure" is simply understood. In one form or another it is taxpayers' money that is being used to settle these suits. Beyond that, the public has a right to know of the conduct of the University employees whose salaries it pays. In other words, those who offend should not be allowed to buy their way out with the public's money, but rather should be held publicly accountable for their actions. Whenever the University pays off in a legal settlement, regardless of the legal nature of non-disclosure involved, everything about that case, including the amount of money paid out and to whom, should be posted on the Web and be easily accessible to those who pay for the running and upkeep of the University, i.e. the public at large, as well as to those who choose to donate to the University. Transparency.

5. As part of this movement toward transparency, the University needs to make most of its internal documents accessible via the web. As it stands right now, almost all University documentation that is not directly associated with a specific employee's personnel file, is accessible to the public, but often only after cumbersome requests via the Freedom of Information Act, requests which sometimes take weeks and months to process and for which the requester is usually charged a fee, usually somewhere along the lines of ten cents to twenty-five cents a page. Thus, while this information is nominally available to the public, the time and expense involved in prying it free from the various UC administrative units in which the information resides in effect discourages citizens from examining the workings of the university system that their tax dollars support.

The solution to this is to make all information that is legally accessible via the Freedom of Information Act immediately accessible to the public at large without having to go through the Freedom of Information Act, by either placing it permanently on the Web or making it accessible via the Web when it is requested. It may have been the case in the days of typewritten documentation that it was justifiable to charge someone by the page to copy such documents, but in the present day, almost every document is produced on computer and thus is already in digitized form. It would cost next to nothing to place such documents on the Web (either permanently or when requested), and that is precisely what should be done. The UC system, just like the California State University system and the state community college system, belongs to the people of California, the people who authorized it and the people who pay for it, and thus these same people have a right to the maximum insight possible into this system, with a maximum of speed and a minimal amount of cost (if any).

Moreover, statistics involving the graduate program of each department on each of the ten UC campuses should be included on the website of that department. These statistics should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

- Percentage of students that enter the program vs. percentage of students who finish with a Ph.D.
- Percentage of students who are funded in the department by year.
- Percentage of the students who are *fully* funded in the department, that is to say, percentage who receive a livable wage that does not require them to seek outside work while trying to attend graduate school. (Each campus usually has a suggested income level for what is needed to live and study in the locale in which the college or university is located.)
- Of those students who are funded, but not *fully* funded, the average amount provided to each of these students (not including funding used to offset fees and tuition) should be listed.
- To the extent that former graduate students will allow it, their contact information should be provided so that prospective graduate students can contact them and get firsthand information on what it is like to be a graduate student in that department. This list of former graduate students should not include only those who finished the program and are gainfully employed in the field, but should include everyone who was ever in the program. For obvious reasons, it is more beneficial for a prospective student to speak with former students who did not finish the program in order to ask why they didn't finish.

6. The practice of UC paying the legal fees of professors who abuse students, who break the law, or who, by their arbitrary actions, bring about damages of any sort in the lives of their students, should end. If the conduct of tenured faculty member is egregious enough that it motivates a student to go to court, then the professor should pay his own legal fees and not expect the University, funded by taxpayers and public monies, to reach in its pocket to pay fees that result from that professor's own misconduct. In rare cases where it is deemed appropriate for the University to pay the fees of the faculty member, then it should also be willing to pay the legal fees of the student or students who are bringing the charges. The legal playing field between student and faculty must be made level.

In addition, in those rare instances in which the University ends up paying some or all of the legal bills for the misdeeds of a professor, if there is judgment against the Regents, that professor himself should be expected to pay some, if not all, of the judgment from his own pocket. It is only when held accountable for their actions that the faculty will come to appreciate the need to behave appropriately.

7. It must be made clear to the all the faculty of UC that there is no inherent "right to privacy" for messages sent and received on UC emails or stored on UC computers. Computers purchased

either with UC money or with grant money associated with the professor's work at UC are not the personal property of the professor, but rather belong to the University of California. During the 1999-2000 Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department, several of the faculty from this department were under the false impression that they had no obligation to reveal what they had done and what they had written on their computers regarding their attempts to minimize and cover up the abuse of graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department. They have every right to take their case to court (not that the UCLA Academic Administration would let it go that far anyway), but they will lose. While they may maintain the right to whatever intellectual property that is on their computers, they maintain no right to exclusivity of access to those computers. The University of California system needs to make this very clear to its faculty.

8. When the time finally comes that the UC Regents are actually forced to address the issue of what happened with the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department and the cover-up that ensued, it must be understood that there can be no "compromise" on the part of the UC Regents with regard to the interpretation of these events or the reality of the graduate student abuse in the UCLA Slavic Department that was behind these events. Academe can be remarkably Byzantine in these matters, always ready (when pure application of force is no longer effective) to seek out face-saving compromise. Indeed, face-saving solutions are more or less knee-jerk reactions in matters such as this in the world of academe.

But no response from the UC Regents that would allow the UCLA Slavic Department to "save face" would be acceptable, for in order for this department to "save face", one would have to posit a scenario in which there was a "misunderstanding" (or, better yet, an "unfortunate misunderstanding") between faculty and students such that the students somehow mistakenly believed they were being abused. Even worse, it would imply that there might be no pressing need to bring about reform, when in point of fact only the most drastic of reforms are capable of changing this system. Any evaluation of this episode by the UC Regents that fails to openly acknowledge the abuse of graduate students by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, that fails to acknowledge the wrong-doing on the part of those faculty members who abused, and those who lied about such abuse, and those who conspired to cover up such abuse—in short, any evaluation by the UC Regents that does not condemn in the strongest possible terms the events that transpired relating to the UCLA Slavic Department and the Eight-Year Review, can only be seen as an attempt by the University system to continue the cover up of these events. There can be no gray area here: The UC Regents must openly embrace the reformers and openly condemn the abusers, and then husband the political will to make the painful changes needed to bring about reform of the system.

9. Former graduate students from the UCLA Slavic Department must be given the option to finish their degree if they didn't do so before. Students who "failed" comprehensive exams should be given the opportunity to retake a new set of exams, written and supervised by outside

observers. How many students would want to take advantage of such an option cannot be known, but one suspects that these numbers would be small since most of these former graduate students have moved on in their lives. The option, however, should be theirs.

Given the inevitable stain that will blemish the UCLA Slavic Department with the release of this and future reports, current graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department should also be given the option of transferring out of the UCLA Slavic Department and transferring to the UC campus and department of their choice. It is difficult enough to get a job once one leaves graduate school, and although it may not be fair to the graduate students, they will be the ones who suffer as the reputation of the UCLA Slavic Department suffers. They have invested an enormous amount of time and energy in their studies in the UCLA Slavic Department. If they want to take their chances and finish their degree in this department, then that should be their choice, but they should also be offered the alternative of finishing their degree in another department at UCLA, or at another UC campus altogether, if they feel that this will give them the best opportunity to move forward in the field. The department and choice of UC campus should be theirs and theirs alone.

10. If there is one thing that is beyond question with regard to the UCLA Slavic Department and its review, it is that UCLA as an institution is incapable of investigating its own departments in any meaningful or substantive way. Even after abusive behavior was revealed, even after the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department was exposed as a liar and as one who violated the law, even after the risks taken by UCLA graduate students to cooperate with the various review teams, not a single faculty member was fired. Not a single faculty member was reprimanded. Indeed, the Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department, the professor who lied and broke the law in an effort to cover up the abuses of the faculty towards its graduate students, was actually promoted, not one step, but two steps.

What this means is that if there is to be a true investigation of the UCLA Slavic Department, then it cannot be directed at the University level (i.e. it can not be undertaken and directed by UCLA itself), but must be instituted and directed at the University of California system level, at the very least, and must include full investigative powers and it must have the necessary investigative, academic, and administrative manpower to explore in depth the past actions of this department.

California State Legislature

As was discussed above, even though the University of California is a state-financed University that was created by the California State Legislature and developed by the state, it maintains a large degree of independence from the State Legislature. The Regents of the University were created to act in large part as a buffer between the University system and the state, thus insulating

the University from political trends and pressures that emanate from the political body that has ultimate authority over it. The goal of freeing the intellectual and scholarly element of the university system from such pressures is in itself a good one as it allows scholars and researchers to delve freely into every sort of topic and it protects the university system and the individual researcher from any potential political backlash that might come about as a result of what the researcher chooses to teach or publish. In a sense, this distance between the Legislature and the university system is to the university system what tenure was supposed to be for individual faculty members: protection against unjust and unwarranted political interference into the work of the University. But just as tenure can be abused, so too can the independence of the university system from the Legislature that authorizes and financially supports it be abused.

The State Legislature must realize that it is the last representative of the people with regard to how their tax dollars are used by the University of California. While it is good that the State Legislature respects the need for an academic system free from political influence in how it conducts its research, in what it teaches in its courses, and in what it publishes, the Legislature cannot ignore its responsibility to ensure that taxpayers' dollars are not spent on a system that allows the sort of abuse and cover-up that can be seen in this report. One would hope that the UC Regents will recognize the scope and severity of this problem and take real, effective measures to bring about change, but there is no guarantee that this will be the case.

Usually the State Legislature is extremely reluctant to interfere into the specifics of the University of California or California State University systems, preferring instead to allow the Regents of these particular university systems to provide oversight. By allowing the current system to develop the way it has (at least with regard to the University of California system, although as the Moosa case makes clear, the same problem can be found in the California State University system) these state-appointed Regents have shown that they are in need of more direct oversight, at least with regard to this issue. Individual members of the State Legislature prefer not to deal directly with problems in the University of California system, as can be seen clearly in the case of the California state senator who suggested that his/her involvement in this case might somehow constitute a "separation of powers" infringement. The "Separation of Powers" doctrine was designed to protect the government from fusing into a single governmental entity by preserving the system of checks and balances put in place to prevent any one branch of government from acquiring too much power. What it was *not* intended to do, however, was to relieve any one branch of government from addressing issues of wrongdoing. In fact, just the opposite is true—the system of checks and balances supposedly protected by the separation of powers should do just that: it should check unjust behavior and balance out negative actions by other branches of the government.

This is not to say that the State Legislature has to be the governmental entity that forces reform upon the University of California. It may in fact turn out that the Regents of UC will find the

political resolve to rein in a faculty that has run amuck and reform a system of academic administrations that lacks the will and/or power to carry out effective oversight of individual academic departments and faculty members. But should it turn out to be the case that the UC Regents are not capable of doing this, then the State Legislature must overcome its squeamishness and step in to bring about change. One member of the California State Senate who was contacted concerning the events surrounding the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department explained her reluctance to get involved as follows: since some graduate students might take the University of California to state court as a result of the abuse visited upon them by UC faculty and UC administrators who covered up this abuse, the State Legislature should therefore stay out of the fray lest it interfere in the State Judiciary and thereby "somehow" blur the lines of demarcation that define the "Separation of Powers" doctrine. Such a scenario, however, is simply not credible. In order for the system of checks and balances to work at all—in other words, in order for there even to be a possibility of "checking" the inappropriate actions of one branch of government—there must be at least some interface between the various branches of government. Just because two different branches of government find themselves involved in a single incident involving one of the state's university systems is not tantamount to weakening the separation of powers doctrine. Ultimately the University of California and the state's other two systems of higher education derive their power and authority from the people through the people's representatives in the Legislature, thus making it appropriate—in exceptional cases and circumstances—for that same legislature to take action to ensure that the educational system work the way it was originally intended to work. If students are at the same time seeking financial and criminal redress through the use of the judiciary system, then these are not conflicting phenomena, but complementary actions, with each branch of government doing what it is supposed to be doing.

Regardless of what changes are instituted (or not instituted) by the Regents, the Legislature should also conduct open hearings on the inability of the state university systems to practice effective oversight and discipline of their faculties, and on the issue of the abuse of students at the hands of faculty in these particular systems. The public at large has a right to know how their tax-dollars are being spent on these public institutions of higher learning, and anything less than an intensive, extensive, and public investigation of these institutions, along with legislation to correct the situation and ensure transparency in future operations of these institutions, would be a disservice to those who support these institutions financially.

Law Enforcement

In his attempt to deny and cover up the abuse of graduate students at the hands of UCLA Slavic Department faculty, Michael Heim broke both state and federal law by releasing grades from the

undergraduate transcript of student XX to third parties without the consent of student XX. (XX, to refresh memories, was the one student who allowed her story to be told in such a way that she was easily identifiable to those within the UCLA Slavic Department.) Possibly because she was the only student to allow her complaints to be publicly identified with her it was felt by the Department that her story of abuse above all the other stories of abuse must be singled out and attacked, and the smear campaign by Heim, later picked up by the outside reviewers Bethea/Timberlake, was presumably part of that attack, hence the decision to actually release her grades to others without her consent.

The law enforcement agencies responsible for enforcing these laws, both at the state and federal levels, must not be hesitant in bringing charges against Michael Heim for breaking this law. Arguments typically given in situations such as this against bringing charges would be that Michael Heim would be a first time-offender, or that the crime in question—releasing a student's grades without her permission—is a relatively minor crime in the larger scope of things. This is all true as far as it goes: it is doubtful that Michael Heim has ever been charged with a crime, and Michael Heim's failure to adhere to the law in this instance can hardly be equated to other crimes that involve bodily violence and theft.

And yet, the fact cannot be denied that he *did* break the law, and he did so for the most ignominious of reasons, in order to smear a student who had the courage to stand up to the Slavic Department and to report openly on the abuse she suffered at the hands of that department and of that faculty. Just because the nature of the offense was not equal to assault and battery or theft, the law he broke was still a law, and it is a law for a reason, in order to protect the privacy of students at institutions of higher education. If society only enforced laws against more egregious offenses, then there would be no need to have laws against smaller offenses, since by this reasoning, they would never be enforced anyway.

Moreover, if Michael Heim gets away with not being prosecuted for his violation of the law, this sends yet another message to all tenured faculty, namely this: everyone gets one "freebee", one opportunity to break these laws concerning the protection of student privacy without consequence. Ignoring infractions of these laws would have serious consequences for students in review situations such as the one seen in the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department. It is difficult enough to persuade students to participate voluntarily in a review of their own faculty, especially when they get burned as happened in this particular review. It would be that much more difficult to persuade them to participate if they knew that their personal academic information (and any other personal information in the possession of their academic department) can be released to the public with impunity should their home department choose to do so.

The facts here are simple. By releasing XX's grades from her undergraduate transcript to third

parties without her consent, Michael Heim broke several laws. He must be held accountable for his actions. A full accounting of Michael Heim's actions will be provided to the appropriate state and federal law enforcement authorities. Failure by law enforcement officials to do so would simply be an extension of the same type of favoritism we have seen granted to the Slavic Department faculty by the UCLA academic administration and by the UCLA Academic Senate.

Faculty Members: At UCLA and At Other Institutions

The predicted response of faculty members and suggestions for what they should do in reaction to the release of this report is divided into a section on UCLA faculty, including specifically Slavic Department faculty members, and non-UCLA faculty.

UCLA Faculty

The reaction of UCLA faculty who are members of the UCLA Slavic Department will, not surprisingly, depend on the individual faculty member. As was mentioned above, for those who abused students or those who participated in the cover up of this abuse, silence would probably be the prudent option, but as can be seen from the Eight-Year Review report itself, reason does not always guide their actions. They may try to point to the follow up review in 2002 of the UCLA Slavic Department (this was a "mini-review" of the Department, not equal to the original review in depth or in scope and one without a UCLA graduate student as a part of the Internal Review team) in which some improvements were noted. What they will not tell you, of course, is that by the time this review came around, it had been made crystal clear to graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department that there could be no trust in the earlier promises to protect them were they to honestly and openly participate in this follow-up review two years after the original, thereby severely compromising students' ability to criticize openly. Fool us once, shame on you, fool us twice, shame on us. Thus, any attempt by the UCLA Slavic Department faculty to appeal to student opinion elicited since the original review must be seen in that light.

No doubt the knee-jerk reaction of some faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department will be to deny the charges. Others may attempt to attenuate the nature of the charges by adopting the "Mistakes Were Made" defense. Given the overwhelming evidence seen in the Eight-Year Review report itself, both options appear rather pointless, but when one of the reviewers in the 2000 review characterized faculty members of the UCLA Slavic Department of being "in denial", this was not an exaggeration. Still others, especially those who threatened to bring suit against UCLA for prohibiting them from talking with graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department about the Eight-Year Review report, and who even have threatened students at times with legal action, might attempt to strike out legally again. These are people who, regardless of the evidence gathered in support of the charges of abuse, will fight to the end to "defend the honor" of the

Department and the University, by which they really mean they will fight to the end to defend themselves, since they have effectively, in their minds, conflated the two concepts. To them, they *are* the Department, and any failure of the University back them 100% (much less an attempt by the University to reprimand and discipline them) is taken as a personal attack. What these abusive faculty members, and those who tried to cover up the abuse, *should* do, of course, is to admit what they did and to cease this never ending round of denials. The evidence of the wrongdoing and the subsequent cover up attempts is overwhelming, and there is more to come. Whether such an admission will actually be made, however, is doubtful. Some have advocated the creation of a sort of "Truth and Reconciliation" panel, not unlike that which was employed in South Africa after the fall of apartheid, in which faculty would be excused from further punishment if they would agree to be open and honest in their account of what was done to graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department throughout the years. It is doubtful, however, whether this would work, mainly because it is very unlikely that any of the offending faculty would be willing to tell the truth (indeed, after so many years of lying and cover up, it is doubtful that any of these faculty members would even recognize the truth), and beyond that, very few former students who bore the brunt of this treatment have any desire to "reconcile" with this faculty, with this department, or with this university. There are alternative avenues by which to seek redress.

Finally, there is that group of Slavic Department faculty who were not abusive and who did not scheme to minimize and cover up the abuses that were occurring within the UCLA Slavic Department. Part of this group consists of non-tenured lecturers, who of course are limited in what they can and cannot say. Among the group of tenured professors, there were some who saw what was going on and worked to change the system, including the above-mentioned "Prague Spring" chairperson and others who tried to work within the system to bring about change, only to be stymied by the collective will of the old guard and the inertia this old guard represents.

In an early section of this report it was noted that there exists within academia, as is the case within many of the professional vocations, [a strong sense of professional courtesy \(Section II\)](#). This sense of professional courtesy has been more or less codified into a set of rules, one of which dictates that one academic should never criticize another academic publicly. If there is criticism to be handed out, then it should be done so within the system put in place by the University itself. Unfortunately, more often than not this tends simply to mute criticism of faculty misconduct. While the stated reason for such circumspection might be in order for the individual in question to be afforded fair treatment, to keep from disrupting the work of the University, etc. etc., the more probable reason is that, by keeping academics from criticizing other academics, the system itself, a system by which faculty have almost unlimited power, is protected.

While one should acknowledge that this one group of faculty within the UCLA Slavic Department did in fact try to play by the accepted "rules" in their attempts to reform the Department, it is now abundantly clear that such rules no longer serve any purpose, since the word on the abusive nature of the UCLA Slavic Department is already out of the bag. Beyond that, adherence to such a code of professional silence at this point would be tantamount to joining those members of the UCLA Slavic Department who were attempting to minimize and cover up the abuse in the first place. Good faith efforts were made, time and again, to use the system already in place to deal with these instances of abuse, but all this resulted in was more cover up and more denial. The thing for these faculty members to do now is to be open, comprehensive and honest with the public concerning the events that took place within the UCLA Slavic Department. These faculty know who they are. They did nothing wrong, they made no attempt to minimize or deny the abuses that were occurring within the Department, they made no attempt to strategize on how best to keep the Department from avoiding responsibility for its actions, and thus these faculty should have nothing to fear by speaking up openly and truthfully concerning the conditions within the UCLA Slavic Department.

Non-UCLA Faculty

Relationships between faculty members at different institutions but in related fields are usually defined solely in terms of scholarly work, although inevitably it is the case that among these professional relationships personal friendships can and do develop. Just as those members of the UCLA Slavic Department who were abusive and/or covered up such abuse will be tempted to turn to their students for support against the charges that have been made in this report, so also will they be tempted to turn to their fellow academics in the field, soliciting support in terms of attestations as to their character, their devotion to the field and to their students, the high quality of their scholarship, etc.

In a sense, this puts these outside faculty in a situation somewhat akin (although not nearly as perilous) as that of graduate students who are asked to come to the defense of their faculty. Obviously these outside faculty are in no position to say that this abuse has never occurred, since they are not at UCLA, and especially since, given the weight of the evidence already available, it would be pure folly to make this claim. The dangers of trying to minimize abuse committed by faculty members at institutions not your own is that someone else at that institution who is familiar with the abusive behavior can trump you at every point, as was seen in this report's point-by-point rebuttal of Bethea/Timberlake's attempts to overlook the abuses of the UCLA Slavic Department in general and the lies of the UCLA Slavic Department Chair in particular. The probable response of these outside faculty will be to speak truthfully, but in general terms about the faculty in question. One may hear statements from them such as "I have never met an academic so committed to his field and so concerned about graduate students."

Statements such as these sound good, and they would appear to offer support to any UCLA Slavic Department faculty member who was coming under fire, but one should note as well what is not being said in a statement such as this. While the elements that comprise the statement may be true, i.e. while the academic heaping the praise may in fact have never met someone so committed to the field, and may in fact have never known someone so concerned about graduate students, that does not mean that the academic in question always acts in a manner consistent with those principles. As has already been pointed out above, Michael Heim often acted as a shoulder to cry on for graduate students who had just been skewered by one of the abusive faculty members, and often tried, within the very limited system of academe, to address some issues.

That fact does not, however, excuse his attempts to cover up the abuse that took place in the UCLA Slavic Department, and there is nothing in this theoretical statement of support that implies that he did not attempt to cover up this abuse. It does not excuse him for lying to the Eight-Year Review committee, and there is nothing in this theoretical statement of support that implies that he did not lie to the Eight-Year Review committee. It does not excuse him for lying to the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate, it does not excuse him for breaking the law, and there is nothing in this theoretical statement of support that implies that he did not lie to the Graduate Council and that he did not break the law. It is usually possible to find something good to say concerning just about anyone, and such statements will be made by non-UCLA faculty concerning those members of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty who abused students or who attempted to cover up that abuse, but the questions that should be asked about these statements are 1. Do they deny that the abuse took place? and 2., If so, how do those who make such statements denying such abuse (or actions to cover up or minimize such abuse) know this? In other words, what evidence do they have to disprove the accusations of abuse made in this report and elsewhere? Have they spoken with every graduate student who ever went through the program? Anyone who, in an attempt to support the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department, tries to claim that there was no such abuse should be ready to back up his or her statements with the appropriate evidence in support of that claim.

It is important to read such statements of support not only for what they are, but also for what they are not, not only for what they say, but for what they do not say.

Unions at UC

Workers at UCLA are represented by a number of different unions — University Professional and Technical Employees (UPTE), Coalition of University Employees, (CUE), University Council — American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT), Association of Graduate Student Employees (AGSE), the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) and others, each of which must negotiate with the UC Administration not

only for pay and benefit packages, but also for the rules and regulations that govern their conduct within the University setting, and for what the various thresholds and criteria are when it comes to the application of disciplinary action against any of its members, actions up to and including job termination. These unions should demand that the standards for dismissal for unethical behavior be set no higher for their employees than those same standards are set for tenured faculty. Indeed, the standards for ethical behavior—and thus the potential for dismissal for violating those standards—should be set higher for tenured faculty, since they represent the main function of the University (as opposed, say, to the men's basketball coach, whose role with regard to the main function of the University is peripheral at best).

These unions should not allow themselves to fall prey to the "outstretched hand" coming to them from the tenured faculty. For too long the workers unions in the UC system have mistakenly drawn an artificial distinction between the tenured faculty on the one hand, whom they see to be relatively sympathetic to their cause, and the UC Academic Administration on the other hand, which they see as their natural "management" antagonist. In fact, as this report has attempted to show, these two entities are actually one in the same. Even in instances where there is a legally recognized union for the tenured faculty, e.g. the California Faculty Association for the California State University tenured professoriate, this union is less a union in the traditional sense of labor vs. management, but rather more of a guarantee that the tenured faculty's privileged position as the leading force of the University will be preserved. It is only in the most egregious of circumstances (e.g. the situation at California State University, Chico when Professor Moosa refused to comply with any of the demands by those who were putatively above him in the University hierarchy) that brings the faculty into legal confrontation with the academic administration, and as the outcome of the Moosa case showed quite conclusively, the academic administration that is said to "supervise" these tenured faculty often comes to regret its decision to challenge these tenured professors. While these so-called "unions" do at times play a legitimate role in protecting legitimate faculty interests, all too often their efforts are directed at doing whatever is needed to protect their tenured members, regardless of how outlandish the claims of abuse by the tenured professor. (Again, the Moosa case serves as a poster-child for such outlandishness.)

UC unions should bear this in mind when evaluating the contents of this report. Allowing the tenured faculty to run amok and propping up a system that allows faculty malfeasance to occur unchecked and unpunished is not in the interest of the University workers whose welfare these unions are pledged to protect. Rare is the University employee who does not have his or her tale of what happens when conflict breaks out between a tenured faculty member and a non-tenured university employee. Moreover, the double standard between tenured and non-tenured employees with regard to work performance and the consequences for failure to maintain high performance standards, is striking. There is no reason that non-tenured employees should be held to a higher standard of ethical and professional conduct than the tenured faculty while at

the same time enjoying a lower level of job security than these same tenured faculty.

Student Loan Organizations

One of the dirty little secrets of graduate programs, especially those in the humanities and those that are run by a public university, is that it is often not possible to fully fund all graduate students. The topic of funding has been touched upon elsewhere in this report, especially in [Section II](#), but to revisit the issue briefly here, what often happens is that departments which don't have sufficient funding are faced with an unsettling choice: either preside over a smaller program that funds all of its students, or divide up what funding there is between a larger number of students. This is especially problematic for smaller programs, such as Slavic departments. The fact is that it is extremely difficult for humanities programs such as Slavic in public universities to compete with some of the established programs at private institutions. (For a summary of this phenomenon, see the *Los Angeles Times* story "Grad Students Turning Away From UC System" by Jeff Gottlieb, October 21, 2001.) In the most recent announcement (<http://listserv.linguistlist.org/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0310D&L=seelang&P=R1197>) made by Princeton for their program in Slavic Linguistics, incoming students were being offered a five-year fellowship which covered tuition and what was described as a "generous living stipend", as well as summer support and other benefits. Rarely is a state institution able to offer such a package to all of its graduate students.

Unfortunately, some of the financially less fortunate graduate programs at state institutions will attempt to compete with these better funded programs by overadmitting to their graduate programs. At UCLA, a certain amount of money for each graduate student is awarded to the Department, but that money need not go to the student himself. It is thus in the program's interest to have a full-size contingent of graduate students, even if it cannot support that contingent financially. The strategy of the UCLA Slavic Department was to admit students with vague promises of funding, and then when such funding did not appear in sufficient amounts (assuming it appeared at all), encouraging students to take out guaranteed student loans to make up the difference. The Department would then begin its "[healthy selection](#)", i.e. its process of culling out students at the masters level, giving them their "low pass" M.A., and sending them on their way with a masters degree in Russian (not exactly a "money producing" masters degree) and a couple year's worth of student loan debt.

In recent years there has been a move to hold colleges and universities accountable for the quality of the education that they provide to their students. (See Excite News, Canada article "Colleges Required to Prove Learning" Sunday, May 6, 2001; by A.P. national writer Arlene Levinson; See also "White House Seeks to Monitor College Graduation Rates" by Dorothy

Augustyniak in the March 11th, 2002 issue of the *UCLA Daily Bruin* — <http://www.dailybruin.ucla.edu/news/articles.asp?ID=18870>) Establishing whether or not a given institution is doing what it claims to be doing should be a crucial component in deciding whether this same institution is worthy of being a part of the federally guaranteed student loan programs. These student loan programs, in which the government guarantees the loans, are made available to higher education and technical/trade programs that are generally held to be reputable. There are many instances of institutions which appear at first glance to be reputable, but then after several years of operation, are seen to be little more than diploma mills, issuing "degrees" and "certificates" that do not allow their graduates to secure the sort of future that is normally implied by the advertisements for these institutions. What happens is that the students take out massive loans to pay for their "education" at these institutions only to find out afterwards that they have no way of paying back those loans, which then results in default, and eventually in the removal of these institutions from the federally supported student loan programs, but not before these institutions have collected tens of thousands of taxpayers' money in profit. (For a transcript of a recent *60 Minutes* story on how these diploma mills use the federally guaranteed student loan programs to leave their students saddled with worthless degrees and tens of thousands of dollars of student loan debt [*For-Profit College: Costly Lesson*--Jan. 30, 2005], point your browser to <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2005/01/31/60minutes/main670479.shtml>.)

The situation with UCLA in general and with the UCLA Slavic Department in particular is comparable but not identical. One certainly does not normally associate an institution such as UCLA with the sort of diploma mills that, in order to turn a profit, depend on gullible students willing to go into student loan debt. The default rate on such loans is far greater at the diploma mills than at UCLA. Nevertheless, there are some valid points of comparison. Departments such as the UCLA Slavic Department lure potential graduate students into their programs with a subtle mix of half-truths and vague promises. They know they cannot fund every graduate student, but they never make this fact clear to the aspiring graduate student. Indeed, they do everything they can to underplay this fact. As a result, students expecting funding to come their way are instead faced with the prospect of trying to live in a high cost of living area such as Los Angeles with minimal (if any) funding support and attempting to keep their heads above water financially while competing academically with their fully funded graduate student colleagues. In the scenario which has played out in the UCLA Slavic Department for years now, these weaker students, further hampered by the lack of financial support, are judged deficient and dropped from the program via the very subjective testing system. Although they are disappointed in not reaching their goal of obtaining the Ph.D., from the point of view of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty, these weaker students have played their role and served as warm bodies for the program so that the program can compare itself favorably with other, better-funded programs. As one former graduate student from the UCLA Slavic Department recently put it "The Department needs enrollments and the faculty view

graduate students as a renewable resource."

It is in this one respect that UCLA can be justifiably compared to the diploma mills that misuse the federally guaranteed student loan programs. The attrition rate in the UCLA Slavic Department is astounding. Up until the 1999-2000 Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department the ratio of the number of students admitted to the number who actually received their Ph.D. was probably somewhere around 7:1 to 8:1, if not higher. One of the common responses to this ratio was that many of the students who did not get a Ph.D. did end up with a masters degree in Russian from the Department. Of course, what the Department does not say is that very few of these students who wound up getting only a masters degree came into the program with that as their goal. Almost all students who come into a graduate program at an institution such as UCLA do so with the intention of getting a Ph.D. Because of the existence of the aforementioned "low pass" masters degree, however, most of those who are forced out of the program go away with at least a masters degree as a consolation prize. As was discussed above, this "consolation prize" of a masters degree serves to take some of the sting out of 1. being rejected from a program and 2. having gone thousands of dollars into student loan debt just to stay in the program. It actually can serve as a bribe of sorts on the part of the faculty, e.g. "We're going to cut you from the program, but if you don't take it too hard and make too much of a fuss, we'll throw in a 'low pass' masters degree in the bargain. Sure, it's a 'low pass' masters, but no one on the outside will know. You can honestly tell people you have a UCLA graduate degree." While this may be true as far as it goes, having a masters degree in Russian or any of the humanities is not the same as having a masters degree in engineering or chemistry where such a masters degree can actually make a difference in one's jobs prospects. In the humanities it is often the case that even possession of a Ph.D. is not enough to secure employment. And, in addition to having little practical value, these "low pass" masters degrees also serve to mask the high attrition rate in departments such as the UCLA Slavic Department by allowing the faculty to point to these recipients of "low pass" masters degrees as "graduates", i.e. as "success stories", at least in so far as those who are outside the system are concerned.

It is for these reasons that the graduation rates of graduate programs—and by "graduation rate" what is meant here is the true graduation rate, not one masked by the awarding of default "low pass" masters degrees—must be monitored in the same way that graduation rates of undergraduate programs are monitored. Institutions—or, if necessary, individual departments within a given institution—should be held accountable for low graduation rates, and certainly those student loan guarantor organizations should be keeping a watchful eye on those departments and institutions that are failing to achieve an acceptable graduation rate. Any such departments and institutions that display the sort extremely high attrition rates seen in the UCLA Slavic Department should be flagged and students matriculated in such programs prohibited from taking out guaranteed student loans to fund their studies. While this might, on the surface, seem to be punishing the student for the wrongdoings of the department/institution, this is in reality a

protection for the student himself as it keeps him from enrolling in academic programs that could very well be to his financial and professional detriment.

Taxpayers

The University of California is a publicly founded and publicly funded institution. It derives its power and its core funding from the California State Legislature. While it is true that much of its funding comes from outside sources and grants, these outside funding sources look favorably upon the University of California in no small part precisely because the University is a state institution and thus draws much of its legitimacy from this fact. Were the University not to have the full faith and credit of the State of California standing behind it, much of this outside funding would be a good deal harder to come by.

Ultimately, then, it is the taxpayers of California who fund the University and who stand at the base of all three state higher education systems in California: the University of California, the California State University, and the state community college system. For all the talk of outside funding, the University of California belongs to the people of California and thus should, in the final analysis, be answerable to them. If the system is going to change, then the participation of the taxpayers in this change is imperative. Change can happen without input from the people, but it happens much, much faster with their input. If, as a reader of this report, you agree that change needs to come about, then the best thing you can do is voice these concerns directly to the parties most capable of bringing about this change, your representatives in the State Legislature and the Regents of the University of California. (If you are a reader not from California, the method of finding the contact information for your elected representatives described below would work for you as well.)

The process for finding contact information for your elected representatives is very straightforward two-step procedure:

1. First point your browser to <http://zip4.usps.com/zip4/welcome.jsp> and fill in your address and click on SUBMIT. This will give you your nine-digit (zip + 4) zip-code if you won't know it already. (If you already know your nine-digit zip code, skip to step two.)
2. Copy this nine-digit zip code and then point your browser to <http://www.vote-smart.org/>, insert this zip code into the appropriate space and click on GO. This will take you to a page that will give you the contact information for your particular members of the California Senate and California Assembly, or for your own home legislature.

For those who also want to write express their opinions to the UC Regents, their contact information can be found at the following URL: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/contact.html>

It is possible that you will meet some sort of institutionalized resistance from the Legislature to taking a hard stand vis-à-vis the University, the same type of resistance and inertia that was described above. One thing you should make clear is that the argument against interference in the University's affairs, while in most circumstances valid, is not so in this case given the exceptional circumstances that surround it. Alternative methods, the "recommended" methods of redress, have already been tried and found wanting. In such exceptional circumstances, action by the State Legislature does not in any way constitute a "violation of separation of powers", but rather is exactly what is needed and falls very much within the framework of the Legislature's legitimate duties and obligations. Indeed, the State Legislature should hold hearings on the problem of graduate student abuse, and the creation of an oversight mechanism should be discussed and implemented.

Ultimately, the state university and college systems belong to and are in service to the taxpayers and citizens of California, and as such should respond—or be made to respond—to input from the state's citizenry. The above-mentioned institutionalized resistance and reluctance to get involved on the part of the State Legislature is a reality, not for every member of the State Senate and State Assembly, but for many of them. As a taxpayer and as a citizen, you have every right to request that your elected and appointed representatives take action, in exceptional circumstances, to bring about needed change in the state-supported systems of higher education. If the UC Regents and/or the California State Legislature fail to heed the call for reform, taxpayers in California can always turn, as an option of last resort, to the initiative process (i.e. placing issues on the ballot for a direct vote by the people of California) in order to bring about needed change. Certainly it should, one would think, never come to this, but there have been instances in the past when the people's elected or appointed representatives have failed (or simply refused) to implement the will of the people. If attempts to urge the legislators or Regents to bring about needed reform in the state system of higher education in California fall on deaf ears, then the option of bringing about change via the initiative process should be given serious consideration.

Those Considering UCLA

This segment deals with how UCLA should be viewed by those who are considering a relationship with UCLA, be that as one who recommends UCLA to high school students (e.g. a high school counselor), or to undergraduates who are considering UCLA for graduate school (e.g. a faculty mentor), or as a student considering UCLA, or any of the UC campuses for that matter,

for graduate school, or as a potential donor who is considering the bestowal of a financial gift to UCLA or any of the other UC campuses. The purpose of this segment is not to suggest that no one ever recommend UCLA or any other UC campus for undergraduate or graduate study, or that no one ever choose UCLA or one of the UC campuses for graduate study, or that no one ever donate to UCLA or one of the other UC campuses. It is intended, however to make clear to potential students, donors, and those who would recommend UCLA as an institution of higher learning just exactly what the potential is for productive study at UCLA or at any of the UC campuses.

— Counselors, Faculty Mentors and Others Who Might Recommend UCLA and UC to Their Students

Counselors who are considering recommending UCLA, or any of the UC schools, to their students should be aware of what protections are, and more importantly, are not, afforded these students at schools such as UCLA, and their students should be made aware of this as well. This is not to say that every academic department at UCLA or at every UC campus is as abusive as the UCLA Slavic Department, nor is it to say that any student who chooses to matriculate at UCLA or any of the other UC campuses will undergo the abuse experienced by graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department. What this report does show, however, is that if such abuse does occur, then there are very real limits on the choices available to students in terms of responding to that abuse and there are very real limits as to what the University itself is willing to do to stem that abuse and protect its students. Students have a right to know this and then to judge the risk for themselves.

— Students Considering Study at UCLA and UC

Students who are considering applying to UCLA for undergraduate or graduate study need to be aware of the potential for abuse that exists for graduate students at this institution, or at any of the UC campuses. To be fair, most other major institutions of higher education in this country have the same system of tenure and the same lack of faculty accountability, so there is no guarantee that by eschewing UCLA, a potential graduate student would not end up in an equally abusive environment. And, again, it is very important that potential students who are considering UCLA understand that just because the situation in the UCLA Slavic Department was very abusive towards graduate students, not every graduate program at UCLA is like that of the UCLA Slavic Department in this regard. There are programs at UCLA in which the faculty, by and large, is not abusive, and in which graduate students are treated not as indentured servants but rather are valued as future colleagues, and are afforded a level of respect commensurate with that position. To repeat, however, just because some programs are good and some programs are not abusive toward their students does not mean that all the programs are like this. Again, it comes down to

students having the right to know what they are getting into before they make a life-changing decision on which undergraduate or graduate institution to attend. Should these students ultimately choose to attend UCLA or one of the other UC campuses then they will have done so with the full knowledge that there may come a time during their tenure as a member of one of these institutions during which they will have to face the same scenario that graduate students in the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures faced.

— Those Considering Donating to UCLA and UC

Two of the main sources for outside monies to find their way to UCLA and other campuses of the UC system is through alumni and other donations, and by the securing of grant money from various sources. Central to this process is the reputation of the University, and the trust that those who would donate to the University have that their donations will be used properly. Should those who would donate to the University lose trust in those who run the University and in those who will be in charge of the gift that was presented to the University, the consequences are obvious.

The unfortunate fact is that the UCLA Administration has made it clear that, when it comes to University affairs, the quest for truth is not at the top of the agenda. Those who would consider donating to UCLA, and those institutions which are considering the awarding of grant monies to UCLA, would do well to make sure that their donation will be going to the area in which they intended it to go and that it be used in a manner consistent with the conditions under which the grant/gift was bestowed upon UCLA. In addition, potential donors and grant-givers would be well advised to demand some sort of oversight of just exactly how their financial contribution to the University is being used. As was pointed out in [Section VII](#), if UCLA is willing to go to such incredible lengths in order to lie and cover-up abuses within a small academic program such as the UCLA Slavic Department, then to what extent would the UCLA Administration be willing to lie and cover up about larger issues?

Academe in General

Because of the nature of the academic system that is currently in place, i.e. the [Moosa-ization](#) of the higher education system and the lack of faculty accountability in terms of their conduct within the University, certain abuses are almost certain to arise. The rules, conventions, and traditions at that level, both official and unofficial, combine to make such abuse almost an inevitability.

Similar rules and conventions exist at even higher levels of academe; some are official, others are unofficial and simply understood. Such rules and conventions change very slowly, if they change at all, but it is worthwhile pointing them out in the hope that some reform at this level might occur, however incremental that change might be.

- One of the first things that needs to change is the institution of academic tenure. It is among the most prized privileges of the faculty and they will not readily broach change in it, but without change in the nature of tenure, there can never be any guarantee that the sort of abuse that was visited upon the graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department by that department's faculty will not recur.

Just because change in the institution of tenure is being advocated here, this should not be confused with an attempt to do away with the institution of tenure in general. Tenure, defined in the way tenure was originally meant to be—the right to publish what one wishes and the right to teach what one wants without fear of reprisal or termination—is an important and necessary part of the system of higher education. What needs to change is the extent to which tenure has crept into every nook and crevice of the academic system in general, to the point where no part of the academic's behavior is challengeable or punishable by the academic administration that, in theory, is situated above the faculty and charged with ensuring quality work and reasonable behavior on the part of this faculty. When the UCLA Academic Administration, or the California State University, Chico Academic Administration, or any academic administration, is too afraid or too weak to even enforce its own rules, then something is radically and deeply wrong.

- Until such reform does take place in the system of academic tenure currently in place throughout most of academe, there exists the problem of abusive and/or unproductive faculty who, in effect, refuse to leave, even after they have reached retirement age. Since there is no such thing any more as a mandatory retirement age, tenure must be amended such that it no longer extends to those who have reached what used to be the mandatory retirement age. Back when such mandatory retirement ages existed, it may have been unpleasant to have an abusive or unproductive faculty member in a department, but at least everyone knew that at one point this faculty member would be forced into retirement. With the demise of mandatory retirement ages, this in effect allows faculty members to stay on until death if they like, regardless of how badly they teach, how hostile their actions, how egregious their behavior. While it may now be the law that there is no more mandatory retirement, there is nothing that requires academic institutions to extend academic tenure indefinitely. Once a faculty member has reached retirement age, tenure should be removed. If that faculty member is still able to do his job at a high level, then he can be rehired on a year by year basis, but if not, or if that faculty member has been abusive or unproductive, then the University would have the option of not extending his employment. The professor would have his pension and the University would have a chance to start anew.

- Just as was the case with the Enron scandal, WorldCom scandal, etc., where the call went out for maximum transparency, this too must be at the core of reform:

-Transparency in Teaching

One of the main tools that faculty have at their disposal when it comes to weeding out students from their program is the fact that they are rarely challenged as to how they come up with the grades that they give. This is especially true in graduate school, and especially in the humanities. Faculty often reply that for them to detail how they come to decide what grade to award to any given student would be impossible (as one faculty member once said, "How do you quantify a poem?"), and often these same faculty will also point out that forcing them to detail their grading criteria would be a "violation" of their academic freedom. The second response is simply an acknowledgement that the [Moosa-ization](#) of academe has been seized upon by the tenured professoriate and pronounced legitimate, while the appropriate response to the "impossibility" argument, i.e. to the rhetorical question posed by literature faculty "How do you quantify a poem?" is straightforward and simple: "What are the criteria you as a literature professor use to assign grades in a literature class? When you assign grades, you are in every sense quantifying the degree to which you know (or claim to know) your student has/has not mastered the material presented in the course, so use those same criteria to 'quantify' the degree to which your student has succeeded in this task."

Once control is reestablished over faculty—that is to say, once the [Moosa-ization](#) of the University system has been reversed and tenured faculty can be held accountable for their failure to teach and evaluate scholarly work effectively and fairly—much more stringent standards should be put in place for grading, standards by which the grade assigned by the individual faculty member can be quantified and thus justified. In the case of the UCLA Slavic Department, it was precisely this lack of accountability in the grading process that provided so much power to the faculty in question, and which allowed that faculty, at times, to misuse this power by assigning students who fell out of favor greater workloads and by awarding grades in a manner not commensurate with the extent to which a student has mastered the presented material, but rather commensurate with the extent the student has succeeded in pleasing that particular professor.

-Transparency in Comprehensive Exams and Dissertation Defenses

By far the major weapon in the arsenal of the UCLA Slavic Department faculty when it came to culling students from the program is the system of comprehensive exams. As is the case in most comprehensive exams in academe, the exams in the UCLA Slavic Department were wide open. While they would begin on relatively simple topics, there was no telling in which direction they would go after that, something the faculty openly admitted. There were times when students were asked questions that different members of the faculty had different opinions on, leaving the student stuck in the middle, with predictable results. While dissertation defenses in the UCLA Slavic Department were usually pro forma, there were a

few instances where the open-endedness of the process also took off on its own. In other institutions of higher learning, this "open-ended" process can be more concentrated in the thesis defense than in the comprehensive exams, and in still other institutions, it is present in both the exams and the defense.

The problem with these exams is that they are in no way objective. The student, and the public that supports the University, is simply supposed to believe that the faculty, with its "years of expertise" must be able to somehow simply "know" who is ready and who is not and who will never be ready. This opens an enormous door through which subjective opinions can be entered into the equation. When the unfortunate student who has just failed such an exam or defense has the temerity to ask why, he is often told that the particulars of the decision making process can't be revealed, but only that the committee as a whole felt that his performance/thesis just was not up to standards. (Standards that apparently are not written down anywhere but apparently simply exist inside the minds of his examiners, and thus, are accessible only to them. Strangely, these same examiners often cannot verbalize what these standards are, they simply claim to be able to "know" when these ephemeral standards are, or are not, met, and for anyone else to press them too hard on defining these standards is to risk, once again, "violating" their academic freedom.)

Faculty will, of course, dispute this description of the examination process, but the fact is that the more nebulous the criteria for success on exams or dissertation defenses, the greater the ability of the faculty to engage in arbitrary behavior should they choose to do so. To say that the process for documenting the extent to which a given student has or has not mastered a well-defined set of knowledge and facts cannot be made quantifiable is simply not true. Those who say it cannot be in fact really mean that they do not *want* it to be made quantifiable, because then their decisions regarding the passing or failing of an individual candidate could be more easily held up to scrutiny. It is noteworthy that many of those faculty who dismiss the notion of quantifiable exams are the same faculty who, in graduate student application process, place enormous weight on GRE scores (Graduate Record Examination), a sort of SAT for aspiring graduate students. Clearly it is possible to have legitimate quantifiable testing procedures at the graduate level. It is only a matter of the institutions of higher education themselves having the will power to introduce such procedures. The more quantifiable the exams, the less potential for subjective interpretation and subsequent abuse of the process, and the more transparent the process becomes. We do not live in the Middle Ages. Accordingly, medieval methods of instruction and testing should no longer have a legitimate place in higher education.

-Transparency in Funding Decisions

As has been explained above, the distribution of funding is one of the most effective tools that a departmental faculty has at its disposal for use in controlling its graduate student body. Few

graduate students anywhere can hope to complete a doctoral program without funding of some sort, and certainly not in high-cost areas such as Los Angeles, the Bay Area, New York, etc. Transparency in funding must begin before a student even accepts a department's offer of admission. The scenario described above in which a department over-admits students, taking in students without guaranteeing them funding but holding out the possibility of funding in order to get these non-funded students to matriculate, must end. Ideally, no graduate student should ever be without funding. Just to use the UCLA Slavic Department as an example, at the time of the External Review team's visit to UCLA, Bethea/Timberlake's rough estimation of the "Time to Degree" for graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department was over nine years. Students in this department actually grow into middle age while matriculated there, saddled with the sort of funding hardly adequate to live even a semi-normal life, assuming that they are funded at all.

Prospective students may not have a right to funding, but they do have a right to the truth. The practice of waving promises of "possible funding" in front of the face of prospective graduate students must end. If a graduate program is unable to fund its graduate students, then it might be the case that the University needs to take a long, hard look at whether or not such a graduate program is justified. There are cases where students have actually turned down sure funding at one institution in order to pursue graduate studies at departments who over-admit and then try to fill all their slots with promises that cannot be kept. Transparency demands that departments be up-front and aboveboard concerning the funding they claim to provide to students.

Also consistent with this policy of transparency is the public posting of the allocation of funding within a department. In the Eight-Year Review report, the members of the External Review team came out against such posting, claiming that "publicizing the actual ranking of all the students [with regard to graduate student funding] can be divisive and ought to be avoided". The desire to avoid divisiveness and questions of privacy concerns should not, however, be allowed to override the more important issue of preventing faculty abuse vis-à-vis the funding process. If funding is going to be awarded by the faculty to some students and not to others, then the faculty must be ready to explain and justify their decisions in this regard.

-Transparency in Hiring Decisions and in Tenure Decisions

In [Section VII](#) of this report the attitude of academe in general with regard to hiring decisions and tenure decisions was exemplified by the statements of UCLA Chancellor Albert Carnesale, when he said to students upset at the denial of tenure to a popular professor "I am not going to discuss this case...That would be like if someone called me and asked for your

grades." This, of course, is nonsense, an embarrassingly weak attempt to equate two very different things, but this is typical of the sort of excuses the academic establishment will throw out in an attempt to prevent transparency in the hiring and tenure processes. Another common rejoinder to attempts to lift the veil of secrecy behind these decisions is that it is only by keeping these processes secret that the University can ensure that those who make the decisions will freely and openly participate in the discussion and offer up their honest appraisal of the candidate in question. The arguments against this position, already discussed in detail at the [beginning of Section VII](#), essentially boil down to the position that if part of a tenured professor's duties is making hiring and tenure decisions and an individual is unable to make such decisions to the best of his ability in an open setting, then that person should not be hired as a professor. Or, if the educational institution is unwilling to lose the intellectual contribution that these scholars (those who, for whatever reason, are unable to make hiring and tenure decisions openly and on the record) would make to the university or college, then it should remove these duties from the tenured professoriate.

What should not happen, however, is that hiring and tenure decisions continue to be made in the dark, for when there is no light shining on these processes, the potential for abusing them grows rapidly. Contrary to what the tenured professoriate might want the public to believe, there need be no mystical opacity fogging the hiring process and the tenure process. Hiring and tenure committees are not the College of Cardinals and these committees are not choosing a pope. As long as the public is supporting institutions of higher education—and one should note here that even private colleges and universities are the beneficiaries of large amounts of government funding—then these decisions should be made openly so that the public that supports these institutions can see that their tax dollars are being used responsibly. The public has that right.

• **"Prestige" of the University and How Such Prestige is Measured**

One of the main problems with the situation in the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures was that for all the years that this abuse of graduate students was going on, the Department itself was still one of the most prestigious in the country, at least if one were to ask people familiar with academe. Sure, there were whispers in the field about actually going to UCLA to attend graduate school, but the Department itself was, by the usual criteria employed to determine academic prestige, one of the best in the country, and arguably the best in the country when it came to the linguistic side of the house. In spite of its small size, the Department was thought to be, as one high-ranking UCLA official put it, a brightly shining jewel in UCLA's crown.

This can be traced directly to the problem of how the academic world measures

"prestige". For years now, for decades even, the debate has raged in academe between what the primary role of the professor should be. Should the professor be a teacher primarily, or should he primarily be a researcher? This debate usually takes place among competing assertions, namely that professors make better/worse teachers as a result of their research activity. One of the reasons this debate is never concluded is not because it is difficult to judge good scholarship (although sometimes this is a problem), but rather because of the fact that, due to a lack of clear-cut criteria as to what constitutes good teaching, it is next to impossible to rate the teaching ability of individual professors, and thus impossible to settle the debate. Of course, certain academics are so outstanding in terms of their teaching ability that they quickly garner a reputation among students, but not even a reputation is quantifiable.

This is a much more difficult question than most people outside of academe, and even inside of academe, realize. One cannot use the average grade as the class as a whole as a measurement of whether or not the teacher was effective since different teachers have different standards for what constitutes an "A" vs. a "B", a "B" vs. a "C", etc. Even in situations where grading standards are fairly uniform, not every student comes into a given class equally prepared: some have more background and ability, others have less. Thus, if a professor were to have a class of overachievers, they might learn a great deal, although not necessarily because of the pedagogical skill of the professor, and conversely a class of less gifted students might struggle even in spite being exposed to a highly skilled pedagogue. The high number of variables in this equation makes such objective and quantifiable analysis of a professor's teaching ability problematic to say the least.

And yet, such objective and quantifiable analysis of teaching is exactly what is needed, and what should be developed, regardless of how difficult it may prove to be, if for no other reason that absent such analysis, the "default setting" in terms of judging a given professor's "prestige" is to go by his publications. When this happens, the stage is set for the type of abuse that one sees in the UCLA Slavic Department, because when abusive faculty who have impressive publication records are challenged, there is very little on which to consider the challenge other than the publication record, since there is no fair, objective standard by which to challenge the professor. If the student lodging the complaint is protesting a grade, then the faculty member 1. first of all points out that anyone other than he who would attempt to have any say whatsoever in a grade assigned to a student in his class would be violating his "academic freedom" as a professor, 2. would claim that the material is inherently "unquantifiable" ("Who, after all, can quantify a poem?") and go on to imply that the grade he has assigned is the result of X number of years of experience in teaching students as well as a number of other factors all having to do with the knowledge and expertise he has acquired during many years in academe, and thus, anyone who is not privy to his vast knowledge and expertise would simply be unable to assign the correct grade that this particular esteemed scholar was simply able to intuit. What is happening here on an individual scale is the same thing that happened with the UCLA Slavic Department on a

departmental scale, namely the desire to keep all criteria for success as nebulous as possible, for the more nebulous these criteria, the more freedom the person or institution charged with making final decisions has to act in a manner consistent with his own wants and goals, regardless of whether or not such decisions are academically justified. This is the very same problem, on a smaller scale, that occurs with regard to comprehensive exams and dissertation defenses.

The question that arises at this point is as follows: how does all this talk of quantifiable and transparent grading processes tie in with the issue of a given college's or university's prestige? It is relevant in that the most commonly accepted indicators of academic prestige are almost always connected, either directly or indirectly, with the research done by the faculty at that institution. And indeed, what else can those who would speak of academic prestige (and let's not kid ourselves—that number includes just about everyone in academe) use to measure such prestige? The most important task of a university or college, to teach those students in its charge, can only with the greatest of difficulty be measured by outside sources, while the publication record of faculty and all that comes with it—grants, conferences, and sometimes even economic rewards—are much more easily accessible and reviewable. The result of this imbalance is that it is publication and research that always win the day whenever the question of research vs. teaching comes up. Because this imbalance is predicated on the continued opacity of the teaching and grading process, it cannot be addressed until opacity is replaced with transparency, and subjectivity with objectivity and with quantifiable teaching- and grading standards. There are a number of reasons academe rejects such standards: they would be difficult (but not impossible) to articulate and to implement, but even beyond that, they provide no advantage to the ruling class of academe, to the tenured professoriate who runs the university. Indeed, making their decisions challengeable and providing standardized criteria by which those decisions could be challenged would force the tenured professoriate to pay attention to their teaching and would force them to either take responsibility for presenting material and testing it in a fair and quantifiable manner or else face the consequences for failing to do so.

Indeed, such a shift would change the very nature of what is deemed "prestigious" in the world of academe. No longer could an institution, when questioned by the taxpayers who support it, simply wave a list of publications and grant recipients in the face of the public and claim that the institution is performing at the highest level. No longer could a department such as the UCLA Slavic Department point to its many journal articles and books and then contemptuously wave off any criticisms directed at the way it teaches or the way it tests or the way it treats its graduate students. Prestige in academe needs to be defined much, much more on how well it accomplishes the mission of teaching. However important research may or may not be in the overall mission of an academic institution, what should be inviolable is the idea that no matter how important the research, it should always—*always*—play a secondary role to teaching. The following quote from a Los Angeles Times editorial ("Academe's Scuffle for Prestige". November 6, 2004) sums up nicely the current problem with universities' and colleges' conceptions of "prestige":

" Real change would involve mutating the tenure system to reward teaching. It would also require a new measurement of prestige, based on the quality of students' educations rather than the fame of the faculty. Research and scholarship are part of what makes American higher education great, but they shouldn't be allowed to overshadow the mission of teaching the next generation of leaders — or to drive tuition beyond the dreams of most families."

If a professor can both teach at a high level and research at a high level, then fine. If one of the two areas ever has to suffer, however, it should never be his teaching. This should be the foundation of prestige in the academic world. Certainly when the public at large who supports public education is asked what should be the main role of colleges and universities, they always respond in favor of teaching. By keeping standards muddled, however, and by eschewing quantifiable teaching and testing practices, the faculty have slowly been able to move away from this obligation, claiming either that research is equally important, or (much more commonly) that research "complements" teaching, and thus makes it better. (For a recent attempt at this, see the commentary "We Need Professors in the Labs as Well as in Classes" by Marlene Zuk in the December 13, 2004 issue of the *Los Angeles Times*.) By keeping the system as it is, this in effect gives the tenured professoriate a free pass not to work on their teaching. After all, if teaching plays no real role in achieving "prestige" for the university, then how can individual faculty members be faulted for paying only lip-service to questions of teaching, testing, and fairness?

The system of basing an academic institution's prestige on its teaching and research (as opposed to on its teaching or on the way in which the faculty interact with undergraduate and graduate students) has definitely been the system that has been in place at UCLA throughout the years. When the present Chancellor, Albert Carnesale, first came to UCLA to interview for the position after the retirement of long-time chancellor Charles Young, he knew very well the system that predominated at UCLA. After all, this was someone coming from Harvard University, one of the nation's preeminent research institutions. He was being hired, in effect, by the tenured professoriate of the University, and as such he knew that he would be representing their interests first and foremost. As a part of his campaign for the position, the one leitmotif that always ran through Carnesale's pitch to the faculty was not his desire to see UCLA take seriously its teaching duties, and it was not his desire to see graduate students treated fairly and with respect. While he may have paid lip service to these and other worthwhile goals, the one thing that came up over and over again was his desire to see UCLA turn into not only one of the top ten universities in the country, but one of the top ten universities in the world. And how does one turn an academic institution into one of the top ten universities in the world? Through the acquisition of prestige, prestige that is defined by its traditional academic criteria, success in research and funding. By the repeated expressions of his desire to see UCLA move into the top ten universities in the world, Carnesale was sending a message to the faculty: I understand your

desire to see the system of privilege maintained, and if possible strengthened, and I will work with you to achieve that goal. Carnesale was essentially telling the faculty, I am one of you and I will represent your interests. Confirmation of this attitude on Carnesale's part could be seen three years later in the review of the UCLA Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. In spite of overwhelming evidence of abuse and undeniable evidence of lying and illegal activity, Chancellor Carnesale, much like Michael Heim, did the job he was brought here to do: he protected, first and foremost, the interests of the tenured professoriate. There was going to be no official investigation of the UCLA Slavic Department on his watch, no investigation to determine guilt or innocence, no professor was going to be reprimanded, much less terminated. Not on his watch. It is not as if he did not have the facts at his disposal. Graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department were constantly told that this matter was being taken up at the highest level of the University, a euphemism that allows for very little room for interpretation. And yet nothing was done to punish the abusers or to make right the wrongs done to the generations of UCLA graduate students who had suffered at the hands of the abusers. Who knows, perhaps in his own mind Carnesale justified his inertia by saying that publicity would only hurt the reputation of UCLA and thus harm its "prestige". This only Carnesale can know.

Of course, UCLA is far from unique in this regard, especially among major research institutions. However prized this attitude and this approach to measuring prestige are to the tenured faculty, the time has come for academe as a whole to begin the process of moving away from this particular construct and moving towards a definition of prestige which would require institutions of higher education to develop quantifiable and objective standards not only for students' success, but also for the evaluation of the professoriate's teaching ability. The present state of affairs only guarantees more such departments like the UCLA Slavic Department will be seen in the future. Such a change of attitude must start from without, from those whose tax dollars support higher education, since a change such as this will surely not be internally generated: why would tenured professors want to implement a system in which the degree to which they can or cannot teach well can be quantitatively measured? This makes more work for them and takes away their ability to shrug off criticism by claiming that only they have the "experience" to intuit a proper grade. Few tenured faculty members would welcome the prospect of actually being held accountable for their teaching, but in order for the system to change, such accountability must be introduced into the equation. Failure to do so is tantamount to leaving this well-nigh unlimited interpretive power in the hands of the professoriate, a power they can use to promote their agenda in any way they see fit, even if that means unfairly treating some graduate students.

• **The Use of Recommendation Letters in Academe**

The "recommendation letter" has long held a hallowed place in the halls of academe, as well as in other areas as well, such as employment, promotion, etc. The advantages to such

letters are that they give a prospective employer (or academic department considering an applicant to its graduate program) an idea of what another academic thinks of a particular candidate, an academic who, presumably, has had an opportunity to work with this person and is in a better position to assess this individual's potential for either graduate school or for a position in academe. The problem with recommendation letters is that some individuals and institutions in academe rely too much on them, to the point where a single recommendation letter (or worse yet, the failure to secure a recommendation letter from a "prestigious" scholar") can cost a candidate a shot at a job or at the graduate school of his choice. One of the reasons that the faculty in the UCLA Slavic Department held the power that they did was that these individuals could, with a single stroke of their pen, either give flight to, or shoot down, an academic career before it has even begun. The writing of recommendation letters is where so much of the unchecked power of the tenured faculty is preserved. Given the lack of objective criteria by which to judge candidates for graduate school and for outside jobs, letters of recommendations take on disproportionate influence in the acceptance/hiring process, and thus those who write such letters are placed in a position of substantive power.

While it might not be possible to end the practice of using recommendation letters for acceptance to graduate school or as a part of the employment vetting process, their influence should not be as great as it is. Academic departments and their faculties should be well enough versed in their own fields to be able to evaluate the qualifications of candidates for both their graduate programs and for new academic hires without having to fall back on recommendation letters. While academic departments will usually claim that the recommendation letter is merely one component of an overall larger and more comprehensive process, the reality on the ground is that these letters are enormously influential. An otherwise very marginal candidate who had a very strong letter of recommendation from someone like a Noam Chomsky or the late Jacques Derrida of UC Irvine could very well be accepted into the program as a graduate student or receive a position as a result of such a strong letter. While this fact may seem implausible to those outside of academe, those within know that this happens all the time, regardless of how much they might try to downplay the significance of such letters.

The solution to this problem, ideally, is to do away with letters of recommendation all together, and to institute in their stead a vetting process for graduate school acceptance and new hires that is thorough enough and sophisticated enough to judge applicants on their merits, on what it is that these applicants have done, as opposed to on what others claim these applicants have done. This would, of course, mean more work for those who are doing the hiring or acceptance committee work for graduate school candidates, but that is as it should be. Until such time that the use of recommendation letters can be ended, their influence in final decisions should be proportionate to what they really tell the hiring/accepting faculty about the candidate. In addition, what the person writing the recommendation letter says about the candidate should be confirmed, if at all possible, by examination of the candidate's own records, and the hiring/

accepting faculty should not take such recommendations as infallible, but rather should give the candidate a chance to respond to what is said in the recommendations, both for bad and for good. Finally, in the spirit of transparency and openness, the hiring process should itself be quantified. Not only should the votes of each faculty member on a given hire be open to the public, but the decision making process should be formalized as well and the weight of the recommendation letter, if it is to count at all, should be made clear. Five percent? Ten percent? Whatever it is, there should be a precise formula that others outside the department and outside the university can examine. Again, the idea here is that the more open the process, the less able any one individual involved in that process will be able to accrue and use inappropriately a disproportionate amount of influence and power in the process itself.

• **Culture of Professional Courtesy**

In Section II of this report the issue of "professional courtesy" was discussed in connection with the disciplining of faculty members. Because the "oversight" of academics, at least as it is currently configured, allows only other tenured faculty members to enforce discipline on their tenured colleagues, this puts those who would be asked to discipline their colleagues in an unenviable position. This has been [discussed in detail in Section II](#), but the short version is that what is understood under the rubric of "professional courtesy" must change. When an academic feels that his obligation to project solidarity with his fellow academics outweighs his obligation to be honest and to defend those in the academic system who are in no position to defend themselves (e.g. graduate students) from those of his colleagues who are abusive, then he has confused his priorities. This culture of professional courtesy should no longer be interpreted in such a way as would discourage tenured professors from calling their tenured colleagues on matters of abusive behavior towards graduate students. Ideally, of course, there will at some point be a new level of oversight of academics, true oversight, not just tenured colleagues going through the motions with one another. Until that time, however, the only people truly capable of holding tenured faculty members in check are their tenured colleagues. To point to "professional courtesy" as a justification for not doing anything, as a justification for turning one's head while students or others are being subjected to abusive and demeaning behavior, should no longer be tolerated. "Professional courtesy" should not be cipher for "Faculty Code of Silence".

Individual Graduate Students: Past-Present-Future

The question of what graduate students—former, current, and prospective—can do to address the problem of faculty abuse is a complex one, primarily because there are so many factors involved and so many of these factors are tied to the unique situation of each graduate student. Still, there are general guidelines that students can follow, and change can be brought about. See, for example, [Section IV-J](#) for the graduate student "Bill of Rights" passed by the

UCLA Graduate Student Association in response to the abuses that went on in the UCLA Slavic Department.

The fact is that, with the ubiquity of the Internet, abuse of graduate students no longer has to remain the shadows. This report first aired on the Internet, and other students have also exercised the Internet option. (At UCLA, the first example of this was seen with the School of Architecture and Urban Design, when graduate students set up a website several years ago to protest abuses and changes in the program that were deleterious to the graduate students. The website, <http://www.uclaud.org>, is not longer active.) Students are more and more coming to realize that the one thing that their faculty dread more than anything is bad publicity. When graduate students shine a light on abuse, this is the one weapon that cannot be combated by those who perpetrate the abuse. By providing your own first-hand account of what is going on, you tear away the façade of an enlightened and nurturing environment that your department and your institution so desperately want to project to the public who support them with their tax dollars. Because you are right in the thick of things, you have a credibility that few other people have, and you have a perspective that almost no one else has.

If you are a graduate student undergoing abuse at the hands of your faculty, then in today's world the fact is that this state of oppression exists only with your cooperation. There is a socialization process that begins with your first application to graduate school and lasts until your last day in graduate school, one that encourages you not to directly confront oppressive conditions. If you are still in graduate school, you have no doubt internalized the underlying fear that speaking up will ban you forever from the field, i.e. you will never get a tenure track job because you will be seen as a malcontent and a troublemaker. If you are one of the many who were forced to leave graduate school, either because of the system itself or because of a lack of financial funding, you are then encouraged by the system to "go out on a high note." Sure, your "failure" to complete graduate school is an example of your not having the "right stuff" (or so the system will tell you), but at least go out with a modicum of class, don't leave spouting accusation after accusation at a system that you may happen to feel did not treat you fairly. After all, a lot of people do finish—why were they able to finish and not you? The seeds of self-doubt that were planted early on in your grad school experience and which nurtured throughout your trek through graduate school then blossom into full fractious flower, leaving you believing that perhaps it was all your fault after all.

Do not fall prey to this way of thinking. There are a number of options available to you regardless of whether you are a former graduate student, currently a graduate student, or even a prospective graduate student.

Former Graduate Students: Speak up. If you are out of the field and thus can no longer be

threatened, speak up. By virtue of the fact that you were right in the middle of what was happening, you possess a credibility far beyond that possessed by anyone else. In addition, who knows better than you what was happening in your individual department and how students were treated there? If abuse was happening, then expose it and help those who are coming up so that they won't have to go through what you went through. One of the most perverse arguments used by those who justify the retention of this medieval system of scholarly indentured servitude—a characterization of the system that was actually voiced publicly by one of the worst abusers in the UCLA Slavic Department—is that they themselves went through it, so those who are now under their tutelage should also go through it. You are in a position to break this cycle, especially if you are out of the field and can no longer be held hostage to their threats not to write for you, to block your publications, and so forth. Because of the Internet, you do not need large sums of money to expose the abuse going on. In fact, you can do so with a very small expenditure of funds. And do not hesitate to involve the media. If you can tell your story in a coherent and cogent manner, and if you have some documentation to back it up, the media will indeed be interested in your story. Only you, however, are in the position to make clear to the media exactly what is happening and exactly how this abuse occurs and how the system is set up to deflect responsibility for such abuse. Reporters will question and challenge your accounts, and rightly so, but even if your documentation is skimpy, just the fact that you are willing to speak up, and speak up truthfully, will resonate with the media.

If you, in your post-graduate school life, are in a financial position to seek legal redress, then by all means do, but do so in an ethical manner—unless your position allows you no other reasonable alternative, do not bring suit and then allow them to buy your silence with settlement money. The system will change only as more and more abuse comes to light. For years people remained silent about the Enron scandals and for decades silence has protected the abusers of the Catholic Church. Whatever you do, do not become complicit in the cover-up process. Take your knowledge and experience and use it to hold their hands to the fire and force them to tell the truth about the situation that you and your graduate school colleagues underwent while in their charge.

Not all former graduate students are in a position to speak up. Those who finished and have jobs in the field, or former students who have finished but have yet to land a tenure track job or have yet to get tenure, are in a difficult position. You still need the ties you have with some of these faculty members in the UCLA Slavic Department, and there might well be pressure placed upon you by them to counter the facts listed in these this report with regard to individual incidents of abuse and violations of the University regulations and the law itself (or in any other report that details the wrongdoing of any other faculty member).

Early in this report it was made clear that, for all the abuse that was perpetrated against graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department, not even the worst of the abusers were always—at every single moment—abusive. If you as a former student still dependent upon whatever

power/influence these abusers may still retain, e.g. for help with placement, tenure recommendations, etc., are placed in a position where you have to say something positive about either one of the abusers or any of faculty members who worked to cover up or minimize the abuse (Michael Heim, Bethea/Timbelake, etc.), then choose one of those incidents in which they were not abusive, but do not allow yourself to be dragged down with them, e.g. if they ask you to make a statement countering a specific allegation, be very, very sure you can honestly counter it. If not, then simply limiting your comments to incidents where they did act in a non-abusive manner, or simply making a general comment should suffice. The present report has for the most part avoided using names of faculty members whose names were not mentioned specifically in the report, but another report of individual acts of abuse is being prepared, so whatever you do, do not put your credibility on the line with statements of support that are demonstrably false. If you got through the UCLA Slavic Department graduate program, then you are already well practiced in tiptoeing through minefields, so you probably already know how to approach the problem. As was the case when the UCLA Slavic Department attempted to lie its way out of the charges made in the 2000 Eight-Year Review report, every attempt, no matter how small or seemingly inconsequential, to employ the "lie-and-deny" strategy with respect to this report will be similarly rebutted, patiently and in detail, point-by-point. Do not allow yourselves to be caught making demonstrably false statements concerning the abusive behavior of the faculty, lest you subsequently be hung out to dry with them.

Current Graduate Students: You, for obvious reasons, are in the most precarious position of all. Many of you have dedicated years and years of your lives to attaining your Ph.D. and are understandably reluctant to act in a manner now that would jeopardize your receipt of that which you worked so hard to attain. Let us begin with what you should *not* do. Regardless of how bad the current system of academe is, it will not change overnight. If you have hopes of continuing on in your graduate program and in being a viable candidate for a tenure-track job yourself, then you must proceed with great caution. The reality is that a student who demands that his rights be respected and that he be treated in a respectful manner does indeed run the risk of being labeled a trouble-maker and a malcontent, with all that this implies for finishing your program and for getting a job later. The one thing you do not want to do is to make some very public attack on those faculty members in your program who are abusive and disrespectful towards graduate students.

First off, you must accept the possibility that there may be no way for you to bring about change in your department while at the same time remaining a viable candidate for the Ph. D. and for meaningful employment afterwards. If such a possibility does exist, however, then it will be through existing channels, working within whatever oversight apparatus exists in your institution (e.g. for UCLA, the Eight-Year Review process). If you haven't been doing so already, you should be documenting your trek through graduate school, saving all documentation concerning funding, your progress through the program, exams—everything, *especially* email

communications. For those email communications that are especially important to your case, you might consider actually printing them out and placing them in a safe place in case anything happens to your hard-drive. Always, always, *always* document individual instances of abuse of graduate students by faculty members, including time and date. Even little things that might not seem significant can, when taken together with other bits of information, show long-term patterns of behavior.

One of the worst things about graduate school, even in non-abusive departments, is that one often feels that one's options are severely limited. Unlike undergraduate studies when one can usually find a way to avoid the worst professors, this is not always the case in graduate school, especially in small departments such as the UCLA Slavic Department. To the greatest extent possible, current students should seek to keep open all of their options and seek out new ones as well. If, as a graduate student, you can afford legal counsel (and let's face it, not many graduate students can afford it), then retain such counsel, even if you are not planning on proceeding legally at this time. An attorney can advise you on how best to position yourself so that when the time does come you will have the best possible chance of achieving positive results. Another way of keeping options available to you is by keeping open channels of communication with educational institutions to which you applied earlier for graduate school, but then turned down in favor of your present institution. More than one student in the history of the UCLA Slavic Department have gingerly extricated themselves from the program and quietly transferred to other more humane and caring departments.

If you are a graduate student currently matriculated in the UCLA Slavic Department graduate program, then you fall into one of two groups, those who were here before the Eight-Year Review in 2000, and those who have been admitted afterwards. Those who were here before the review in 2000 know more or less what the Department was like and are familiar with the attempts, some sincere, some superficial, to reform it. Those of you who entered the program after this date may or may not be familiar with the details. In spite of the UCLA Slavic Department's best efforts to hush up the results of the 2000 Eight-Year Review, unquestionably word leaked out to the greater academic community as a whole, as graduate applications dropped precipitously even after the Graduate Council of the Academic Senate ignored the recommendations of the Internal Review Committee and acceded to Michael Heim's request to reopen the Department to graduate student applications. At one point the Department was practically forced to beg one of its own undergraduates to apply for the Ph.D. program. Things now have improved somewhat, but these newer students will face the same problem as the longer-term students, and that is how to deal with the loss of prestige in the UCLA Slavic Program after the release of this report.

The fact is that the UCLA Slavic Department, prior to the 2000 Eight-Year Review,

tolerated the abuse of its graduate students, and then attempted to cover up that abuse. After the 2000 Eight-Year Review, the Department actively attempted to cover up its own recent history when interacting with potential graduate students and thus misrepresented itself to these students. It is precisely for these reasons that all students of the UCLA should be afforded the option to transfer, at no cost to them, to any department, be it Slavic, Comparative Literature, or General Linguistics, at any UC campus of their choosing, and be fully funded for the duration of their graduate study. Those of you who are current graduate students in the UCLA Slavic Department should not be shy in demanding this. You are the true victims here, you were the ones who were abused and/or lied to, and you are the ones to whom recompense and flexibility is due.

Prospective Graduate Students: Prospective graduate students to any program should be aware that the sort of scandal documented here with regard to the UCLA Slavic Department might also be possible at the department to which you are applying. Given the wide latitude in behavioral norms that academic tenure (as tenure is currently defined) will allow, there can never be a guarantee that the department you choose would not also be abusive. There are certain questions that you can ask at the outset during your interviews that would help you to discern whether the conditions in the department might be suggestive of possible abuse. During the interview process you should press for details and numbers, including:

- What percentage of incoming graduate students actually leave with a Ph.D. in hand?
- What percentage of incoming graduate students end up getting tenure track positions?
- What percentage of incoming graduate students actually end up getting tenure?
 - What percentage of the program's graduate students are fully funded (i.e. funded to the point that they need don't work outside the University itself)
 - What is the average time to attainment of the PhD?
 - On average, how many years of full support does each graduate student receive?

If you can possibly afford it, engage a lawyer to review any support offers made to you by the department to which you are applying.

Conclusion:

As graduate students, you are in an odd and in some respects contradictory situation when it comes to the question of faculty abuse directed towards those in graduate school. On the one hand, you are about the most vulnerable member of the academic community. You have very little, if any, actual institutionalized power, you are by definition a temporary member of the overall university community where you are doing your graduate work, you have very little money, and your fate as a scholar could very, very well depend on your not alienating some of the very same professors who are visiting the abuse on you and/or your graduate school

colleagues. On the other hand, you above all people have a ground's-eye view on exactly what is happening in the department in question. You have the power to let those outside of academe know what is happening in the universities and colleges that they support, and you should not allow yourself to be fooled into thinking that your professors and academic institutions don't know this as well. They do. It is precisely this reason that an unofficial and yet very real code of behavior prevails in academe, with this code's values being time and again inculcated into the graduate student body. Graduate students who complain about the lack of quantifiable data by which to check their progress and standing in the program are told to "grow up". They are told that they are in graduate school now, not in grade school, where someone holds their hand all day long. When graduate students complain about exams and defenses and tests that list no firm criteria for success beforehand but rather are dependent upon the "expertise" of the professor or professors in charge, they are told that they are adults now, and that they cannot expect to have exam questions hand-fed to them. In effect, they are told that whatever the faculty does or whatever the faculty wants should be considered the equivalent of a reasonable action or a reasonable request in the context of graduate school ("Hey, this is graduate school, not a Sunday school picnic...Don't you think we had to go through the same thing when we were graduate students?"), while any objection to the lack of clarity, accountability, and transparency in the system is met with suggestions, some muted, some overt, that the student or students doing the complaining are somehow lacking in maturity, or that they somehow just "don't have what it takes". (Of course, given this lack of clarity, accountability, quantifiability, and transparency in the testing process, it is impossible for anyone other than the faculty to know who does and who does not "have what it takes" since the criteria exist solely within the minds of the faculty themselves. And remember, you dare not ask them to put these criteria on paper for fear of violating their "academic freedom".)

The old Eleanor Roosevelt quote "No one can make you feel inferior without your consent" is fine as far as it goes and you can listen the whole day long to Bob Marley telling you to free yourselves from mental slavery, but the fact is, when you are around these attitudes day in and day out and when they permeate so much of your lives as graduate students, it is possible to begin, be it consciously or subconsciously, to soak them up by osmosis and to actually start believing in them. When graduate students begin to believe these positions, they find it that much more difficult to object to the conditions under which they are struggling. Given the fact that there are no objective criteria for success, perhaps they think to themselves that they do indeed lack "the right stuff". In low moments it is easy for a graduate student to talk himself into believing that which is being said all around him, especially when such opinions have been "ratified" by senior scholars, the very same scholars that made the student want to study in this particular department in the first place. Working hand in hand with presuppositions concerning the innate "correctness" of the faculty's judgment with regard to worthiness of the student (or lack thereof) are those presuppositions to the effect that protesting against the faculty simply "does no good in the long run." Students are encouraged to believe that this is the way it has always been

and thus, they are told, the logical corollary is that this is the way it will always been. One can throw a hissy fit and try to change the system, students are told, but such efforts really would amount to nothing more than tilting at windmills, thereby confirming the immaturity that lies behind such attempts to change the system.

It is the inculcation of such notions that the faculty and the academic institution in general hope will keep the graduate student from standing up for himself when faced with abusive behavior. The facts, however, are quite different. Not every student protest leads to change, but many do. Not every student who stands up to the University and demands that it right the wrongs committed in its name comes up empty-handed. It may seem that way simply because so many settlements that are reached are predicated on confidentiality agreements regarding the terms of that settlement. While faculty might present a united front in defense of their near unchecked power within the system, the fact is that their power, although usually "unchecked", is not "uncheck"-able, if—and this is a gigantic "if"—if one takes the fight outside of the academic system itself, where all rules and presuppositions are bent in favor of the faculty. The very moment the dissatisfied student moves outside of the established academic system into the realm of public opinion or the legal system, academe reacts very quickly, knowing that failure to do so puts at risk the privileged status enjoyed by all tenured faculty. Imagine walking into a darkened, fetid kitchen and, simply by turning on the lights, setting off a flurry of cockroaches anxiously scurrying to regain the darkness. An odious comparison—perhaps—but accurate in describing academe's utter aversion to light being shined on its inner workings. You, as a graduate student, have the power to flip that light-switch, and make no mistake about it, the faculty and the university know this very well. The aforementioned "serf mentality" (i.e. the idea that serfs and servants count for so little that their masters may openly flaunt society's laws and rules in front of them, since the word of a serf would mean nothing against the word of the master anyway) on the part of some faculty members goes a long way toward giving you incredible access into the inner workings of an academic department. You, above all people, have the credibility because you are right in the midst of the program with close, everyday contact with the faculty, and if there is abuse in the department no one sees it before you do, or with such clarity.

This credibility is your greatest strength, and because of this one must take steps to preserve it. Credibility is easily lost, and once lost, is not easily regained. The examples in the Eight-Year Review report of the UCLA Slavic Department can attest to this fact. As a graduate student who has witnessed abuse or been abused himself, you are no doubt justifiably angry at those who treated you in this fashion. When recounting these events, the temptation will be to paint as bleak a picture as possible. To the extent that you can portray the negatives as accurately and as comprehensively as the facts allow, you should do so, but whenever emotion comes into play, the temptation is often to go beyond what the facts allow. However understandable this temptation, you should not give in to it, for to make accusations that are untrue, or even wildly exaggerated,

will in the long run only hurt your credibility and give ammunition to those against whom your accusations are made, allowing them to posit a rhetorical question to the effect that if *some* of what you allege is demonstrably false, then who is to say that *all* of what you say is not false? Stick to the facts and back them up with as much documentation and eyewitness testimony as you can. (This is the reason that it is so essential that graduate students document each incident of abuse, even if they are not sure that they will actually act on that documentation. Better to have it and not need it than to need it and not have it.)

The frustration that you as an abused graduate student, or as a graduate student in a department in which abuse of graduate student occurs, is very valid and you have every right to be frustrated, but it is much better to do things deliberately and accurately than to go off shooting at the hip. Some graduate students, even when they have decided that enough is enough and that it is time to take action, do so having yet to shake off the inculcated belief that there is nothing that can really be done to transform the system, that the system is invulnerable to real change, and that as a result nothing will ever really improve. Speaking up when you believe that there is absolutely no hope for change (which is rarely the case) is still better than not speaking up at all, but can lead to your approaching this task in an inefficient and haphazard manner. Some students who have adopted the "things will never change" attitude are so despondent and so angry that they actually resort to violence. It seems as though every five or ten years or so one reads of a graduate student who uses violence to strike back at those who he felt were acting abusively toward him. The most famous of these cases is probably that of Theodore Strelski, who in 1978 bludgeoned his Stanford thesis advisor to death, but there are other examples as well, including fatal attacks on faculty Harvard in the mid 1980s and at California State University, San Diego in 1996. While according to the dark humor that defines much of graduate school life, no graduate students accused of such attacks would ever be convicted by a jury of their peers, it goes without saying that any application of physical violence (much less a fatal attack) is wrong and can never be justified. The point of the reference to such attacks here, however, is to exemplify what happens when anger and frustration resulting from the belief that the system will never change are not addressed in a measured and acceptable way. If violence is to be done, then let it be done to the system that allows such rampant abuse of graduate students to occur. Use your mind and your critical thinking and writing skills to bring awareness of such abuses to the public at large.

If you as a graduate student have been abused and are ready to take the steps to put an end to your abuse and to the system that allows it, the best first step (paradoxically) is to use whatever system the University has in place to stop abuse and to discipline errant faculty. As can be seen from the description of this system in the case of the UCLA Slavic Department, it is doubtful that this alone will bring about the desired change, but what it will do is show to the outside world, i.e. to the public at large, that you made every effort to work within the existing system in order to bring about change. In addition, by working within whatever oversight system does exist you can make clear your determination not to allow it to be hijacked and actually used to camouflage an

abusive department with a façade of collegiality. The 2000 Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department is a case in point. It was made clear to the investigating committee from the very beginning that graduate students in this department were not going to allow that review process to be gutted and turned into the sham of a review that happened eight years earlier in 1992, when Slavic Department graduate students were actually told how they should respond and what they should and should not say to the reviewers. When you, as a graduate student, tell the reviewers that you will not go along with attempts to minimize and cover up abuse, when you demand anonymity as your right and as the price for your participation in the process, you will force whatever oversight process that is in place to take seriously your charges and to conduct a real investigation. When you demand that those who are investigating apply the same degree of skepticism to the responses from the faculty as they do to the responses from the graduate students, when you demand that these investigators, probably tenured faculty themselves, approach their investigation without the presuppositions that tend to favor tenured faculty in disputes with students, you will force them to take the process seriously.

This, of course, is no guarantee that the process itself will work as it is supposed to work. In fact, as we have seen in the process involving the UCLA Slavic Department, even if the initial investigative process were to uncover abuse and cover-up of that abuse, there will probably be many layers above the initial investigative level that would serve to muffle and diffuse dissent by drawing out the process and paying lip service to change while in fact doing everything to preserve the system as it exists. What one gains by forcing the those who run the oversight apparatus to seriously examine the department and its faculty is that it can often force the department and its faculty into making statements that are put on the public record, and as one sees in the Eight-Year Review of the UCLA Slavic Department, when the faculty starts to panic, they begin to say anything and everything in their attempts to preserve the status quo. As one falsehood after the other is rebutted, the faculty eventually begins to struggle in the quicksand of its own lies.

When this happens, you as a graduate student should be ready to afford such contradictions maximum exposure. Obviously, if you restrict your avenues of exposure to those which are more or less tacitly "approved" by academe this will have the effect of eventually consigning your observations of the abuse that has transpired to the ash heap. To the extent that you can do so and not put too great a risk on yourself, you should seek to disseminate this information as widely as possible. Take this report as an example: its dissemination will be primarily through the Internet, through various list-serves and by email notification to the UC Regents, to every member of the California State Senate and Assembly, to various literary, linguistic, and Slavic programs, to taxpayer advocacy groups, and most importantly to the print and airwave media, among others. The last point is especially significant, since the media represent one of the two forces (the other being the aforementioned legal option) that has the greatest power to bring about change, since it is these media that have the widest possible

connection to the public at large. As a graduate student you might think that any sort of public exposure of the type of behavior described here would be enough to bring about instantaneous change, and perhaps that should be the case, but unfortunately it is not. Just because the abusive behavior of one department at UCLA has been partially exposed, and just because the attempts to cover this abuse up have also been partially exposed, and just because the apparatus in place at UCLA that was putatively there to ensure that abusive behavior would not escape detection was in fact shown to be an apparatus used to cover up abuse, none of these facts means that a simple act of exposure will force the institution to be shamed into bringing about change.

For one thing, as has been pointed out above, many of the institutions are incapable of changing policies even if the leadership wished to, since so much of this behavior is predicated on an interpretation of tenure as being both complete freedom from legitimate oversight in matters such as teaching, testing, and grading, and also virtual *carte blanche* to act in any manner an individual faculty member sees fit, without repercussion. Any attempt by an academic administration to curb such abuse would immediately be rejected as an infringement of this expanded definition of academic freedom. As for an academic institution responding to shame, well...academe is amazingly durable when it comes to facing up to issues which would shame other institutions. To expect others in academe to actually stand up and criticize the UCLA Slavic Department and its faculty, the UCLA Academic Administration, or those who are abusive or accepting of abuse at your particular institution is to be unjustifiably optimistic. There is a well known Dostoyevsky story in which a high government official, under the influence of drink, tries to disprove the claims of his equally highly placed colleagues to the effect that the upper classes could never, contrary to his own liberal beliefs, mix comfortably with the lower classes. Walking home in his alcohol-lightened state, he stumbles across the wedding of one of his underlings, crashes the wedding party thinking he is both proving his point and honoring them with his presence, but in fact only serves to make everyone uncomfortable because of the large difference in rank and ends up more drunk than before, ruining the wedding for everyone. Thoroughly embarrassed, this official absents himself from work for weeks, too abashed to face his colleagues at work, only to find out that when he does work up the courage to return, everyone treats him as though nothing had happened. And why do his colleagues not upbraid and criticize him for his hypocrisy? Because to do so would mean leaving themselves open to having the hypocrisy of their own lives examined, since both he and they were all a part of the same system, based on the same set of presuppositions and thus vulnerable to the same sort of criticisms.

The same situation predominates in academe. Most institutions of higher education offer the same type of tenure that is found at UCLA and thus have the same potential for abusive behavior on the part of their tenured faculty toward graduate students. While individual faculty members might take the suggestions given in this report to heart and begin to stand up to those of

their tenured colleagues whose behavior toward graduate students is inappropriate, most will not. While there might be some general comments on how it is a shame that these things happen from time to time, and how such behavior is unfortunate but hopefully an aberration, etc. etc., the fact is that most academics will look upon what is happening to the faculty of the UCLA Slavic Department and academic administration at UCLA and cast a sigh of relief that such investigations are not going on in their department or on their campus. In other words, most will look upon what has been happening here and, instead of feeling righteous indignation and becoming motivated to bring about change in their own department, will simply say a little prayer and think to themselves "There but for the grace of G-d go I."

This is precisely why simply exposing abusive behavior on the part of faculty is not enough to bring about change. The nature of this abuse and the nature of the system that fosters this abuse must be exposed not only to other academics, but to those who ultimately support higher education, to taxpayers and friends and potential students and college counselors; to state legislators and college and university regents, to alumni, to incoming students, to graduate student advocacy organizations, to media outlets; to Internet sites and to chat rooms and to wherever else such information might be relevant and appropriate. In short, the only way things will change is if pressure is brought on academe from the outside. As a graduate student or ex-graduate student, you are not only in a position to bring these abuses into a public forum where they can be seen and discussed, but almost equally as important, you are able to put them into a context, to show the outside world what is actually happening to graduate students, and to thwart attempts by faculty and academic administrations to spin the facts and manipulate them in such a way as to downplay the significance of what has been revealed. The wider the exposure, the greater the potential for real change. If you have indeed been truthful and gone out of your way to present a balanced account of what has happened to you and/or your graduate student colleagues, the results will speak for themselves. The most difficult step that you as a graduate student will have to take, as is the case with many things in life, will be the first one.

This is a difficult step for all the reasons that have been discussed above. Many of those who are the most abusive towards graduate students may also be the same scholars whose presence in your department influenced your decision to matriculate there. If you for years have endured abuse at the hands of those same faculty members whom you at the same time have admired for their scholarly and intellectual abilities, you know the psychological difficulties involved in standing up to such abuse. In most abusive relationships, there is always a perverse element of dependency that the abused feels vis-à-vis the abuser. Many of those victimized in the Catholic Church sex scandals would say that one of the reasons that they were so torn is that the very people who were abusing them were the same people in whom they had put so much trust, and for whom they had such great respect. Moreover, these same figures were so well respected, and situated so high in the mental hierarchy of those abused that the very thought of doing anything to protect themselves by challenging those on high seemed an almost impossible task.

And yet, the truth is, nothing is easier. If you have the truth on your side, simply by standing up and showing those who abuse that you are no longer cowed by them or by their pretenses of power, you completely undercut the illusions on which their power rests. In his essay "On Getting Along" (accessible at a number of websites, including http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/1999-03/mar7_1999.htm), Howard Zinn, professor emeritus at Boston University and a columnist for *The Progressive*, makes the following observations how our belief in the near limitlessness of a given person's or institution's power can often contrast radically with the reality and limits of that same power. Although he is speaking here of overtly political activity, the same principles apply when challenging an institution as established and venerated as higher education. Among the points he makes are the following:

- **First, don't let "those who have power" intimidate you. No matter how much power they have they cannot prevent you from living your life, speaking your mind, thinking independently, having relationships with people as you like.**
- **Understand that the major media will not tell you of all the acts of resistance taking place every day in the society, the strikes, the protests, the individual acts of courage in the face of authority. Look around (and you will certainly find it) for the evidence of these unreported acts. And for the little you find, extrapolate from that and assume there must be a thousand times as much as what you've found.**
- **Note that throughout history people have felt powerless before authority, but that at certain times these powerless people, by organizing, acting, risking, persisting, have created enough power to change the world around them, even if a little.**
- **Remember, that those who have power, and who seem invulnerable are in fact quite vulnerable, that their power depends on the obedience of others, and when those others begin withholding that obedience, begin defying authority, that power at the top turns out to be very fragile.**
- **When we forget the fragility of that power at the top we become astounded when it crumbles in the face of rebellion. We have had many such surprises in our time, both in the United States and in other countries.**

Zinn's comments here, meant to apply to political issues, also are relevant to the struggle confronting graduate students. As was pointed out above, however, if you are currently a graduate student, you should not be so inspired that you throw away any chance of finishing your degree program in your attempt to bring about change. It is also important to point out at this juncture that however much the tenured professoriate or anyone else may try to paint this effort to

regain control of an academic institution gone out of control as a right-wing coup of sorts for attacking academe and its academic freedom, or as a left-wing coup of sorts designed to topple the privileged and powerful and seize power for those at the bottom, it is in fact nothing of the sort. Every movement that wants to succeed usually attempts to label itself as neither left nor right, but in this instance, that is truly the case. This is not an instance of forcing professors to teach right-wing dogmas such as the evils of affirmative action or left-wing dogmas such as the inviolability of *Roe v. Wade*. Academics have and should continue to have the right to teach whatever they feel is the truth as they see it, free from outside interference and threats of termination associated with what they teach and publish. This is purely and simply about demanding that these tenured professors adhere to basic instructional, testing, and grading norms, and demanding that they do the job that they are hired to do and do so in a fair, equitable, transparent, and open way. It is about setting reasonable limits to the power of the tenured professoriate such that the abuses that often occur in graduate school, for example in the UCLA Slavic Department, could actually be brought to check. It is about establishing real oversight of the teaching and mentoring aspects of university academic programs, the same sort of oversight that any employee of any institution should expect.

There are some who will accuse you as graduate students of political betrayal for participating in an exposé of the abuse of your fellow graduate students, but the question that needs to be asked in the face of such accusations is as follows: what actual political position or principle is being betrayed by exposing abusive behavior, and how exactly does this hurt either conservatives or liberals? If the answer is that it hurts neither, then the next question is, what was the real intent behind the accusation? A genuine concern that a given political philosophy or movement may be harmed, or something less sincere? The reality is that you as a graduate student are in the position to bring about change, but change does not just happen, it is made to happen. When you are in an abusive relationship, you can and should do whatever is possible to expose this abuse. The very fact that you are in graduate school attests to your ability to express yourself in a cogent and rational manner and to make a logical argument. Mark Twain, when asked to define the purpose of writing and the writing profession, gave the following response:

"Ours is a useful trade, a worthy calling: with all its lightness and frivolity it has one serious purpose, one aim, one specialty, and it is constant to it--the deriding of shams, the exposure of pretentious falsities, the laughing of stupid superstitions out of existence; and that who so is by instinct engaged in this sort of warfare is the natural enemy of royalties, nobilities, privileges and all kindred swindles, and the natural friend of human rights and human liberties."

Now, it may be hard for you as graduate students to imagine academe as a place of "shames, pretentious falsities and stupid superstitions"...then again, maybe not. What should *not* be hard for you to imagine, however, is you using your own abilities to shine light upon the abuses that you have either seen or undergone personally. Regardless of whether or not you are a

graduate student, you, like everyone, are deserving of respect and decent treatment. The problem with the current system, the problem with the current attitudes that faculty (*some* faculty, not all faculty) hold toward their graduate students is that the current attitudes are exactly the same as attitudes held in the distant past, with the exact same repercussions on students' psyches and welfare. In 1903, over a century ago, William James wrote the following in *The Ph.D. Octopus*: "We dangle our three magic letters (Ph.D.) before the eyes of these predestined victims, and they swarm to us like moths to an electric light. They come at a time of life when failure can no longer be repaired easily and when the wounds it leaves are permanent." For those who say that graduate students should, instead of taking action, bide their time and wait for others to change the system, the obvious response to that suggestion is to ask just exactly how long should graduate students wait? Five years? Ten years? Another hundred years?

The time to act is now. If you are severely restricted in your current situation (e.g. if you are a graduate student with minor children and thus dependent upon university housing for yourself and your children), then of course you must be maximally circumspect in whatever actions you choose to take. Every student must decide for himself what degree of involvement is appropriate given his own circumstances. Even if a student is not in a position to come out and openly advocate in favor of reform, there are still things that can be done. Just making sure that that others in academe are aware of this particular website (<http://www.graduatestudentabuse.org>) will help to spread the word. If nothing else, pass the URL around to the widest possible array of friends, acquaintances and (anonymously, via a Yahoo or Hotmail address, if need be) to officials, employees, faculty and administrators of your educational establishment, to media, to whatever organization or individual you think would be interested and/or capable of exerting influence on the system as it presently exists. (The same two-step process that was described in the section on taxpayers above can be used to find out who the political representatives are who represent your political area, namely 1. First point your browser to <http://zip4.usps.com/zip4/welcome.jsp> and fill in your address and click on SUBMIT. This will give you your nine-digit (zip + 4) zip-code if you don't know it already. 2. Copy this nine-digit zip code and then point your browser to <http://www.vote-smart.org/>, insert this zip code into the appropriate space and click on GO. This will take you to a page that will give you the contact information for your particular elected representatives.)

Change cannot come about until people realize that change needs to come about, and the more the word gets out, the quicker that change will be realized. Those who defend the current system will come out and ferociously attack this report, claiming that it exaggerates and paints an overly bleak picture. It is your response as graduate students that will make a difference. If you see your professors quoted in the media giving a defense that you think is unjustified, contact the writer of the story or the editor of the paper and ask if you can give a dissenting opinion without

being identified. Newspapers and other media understand that you as a graduate student are not in the same position as those in power, as those with tenure who cannot be fired and thus have the freedom to speak up publicly whenever they want. By challenging those who would defend the system and the abuse it engenders, you make the most important contribution that you can make, you help to keep the spotlight on the problem. And even once changes are made, transparency has no meaning if there is no light shining on the system, if there is not a continual oversight of the way that the system treats those students entrusted to its care. Even if you do not have solid evidence in support of what you are claiming, if your claim is the truth, then by all means say so. Who knows, in the court of public opinion those who are defending the old system might still win the debate, but that is the very point: there can be no debate in the court of public opinion if the public has no idea of what is going on in our institutions of higher learning. If the type of abuse that was meted out in the UCLA Slavic Department remains a dirty little secret, along with the cover-up apparatus in place at UCLA and other institutions like UCLA, then there is no way that the public can reasonably be expected to debate, since one cannot debate topics about which one has no knowledge, and this is *exactly* the way the academic establishment at UCLA and elsewhere wants the situation to remain.

The power to bring about change that you as a graduate student have is far greater than most of you realize. In spite of the academic establishment's efforts to make it seem as though the system as it exists today is eternal and unchanging, those who hold the power, the tenured professoriate, know very well the power that you have. It is precisely because they realize this that they will go to such lengths to ensure the stability of the system and to cover up the sort of abuse that was seen in the UCLA Slavic Department. The very last thing in the world that this academic establishment wants is for you as graduate students to know just how powerful you are. The old story often cited by literary scholar Terry Eagleton about why people like to go see lions at the circus applies here. When it comes to a power balance between the lion tamers and the lions, the audience certainly knows which of the two groups is more powerful. So do the lion-tamers. The only real unknown, the very question that creates the show's tension and anticipation, is whether or not the lions themselves know.

Silence only appeases the sort of abuse seen in the UCLA Slavic Department. You, as graduate students, have the power with your candor and with your insight and with your writing and analytic abilities to shake this system to its core. Whatever you can do—be it outright confrontation via as many media as possible or be it simply getting the word out anonymously about this report or be it anything in between—the greatest contribution you can make to your fellow graduate students and to future graduate students is to take action. Graduate students are not serfs, they are not servants, they are not academic pack animals, they are not incidental to the educational process, they are not a "renewable resource" there only for the benefit of the tenured faculty, they are not cogs to be used by a larger corporate academic industry. We are human beings, and we deserve to be treated as such, and to the extent that graduate students stand up and

demand to be treated with fairness and dignity, to that same extent we will finally begin to liberate ourselves from this archaic system of scholarly servitude and from the emotional abuse and thuggery that accompany it.

[<-- Previous Section](#) | [Next Section -->](#)

[Section 1](#) | [Section 2](#) | [Section 3](#) | [Section 4a](#) | [Section 4b](#) | [Section 4c](#) | [Section 4d](#) | [Section 4e](#) | [Section 4f](#) | [Section 4g](#) | [Section 4h](#) | [Section 4i](#) | [Section 4j](#) | [Section 5](#) | [Section 6](#) | [Section 7](#) | [Section 8](#)
www.graduatestudentabuse.org