

Report of the Task Force on the Arts

TO ALLOW INNOVATION AND IMAGINATION TO THRIVE ON OUR CAMPUS, TO EDUCATE AND EMPOWER CREATIVE MINDS ACROSS ALL DISCIPLINES, TO HELP SHAPE THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY, HARVARD MUST MAKE THE ARTS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE COGNITIVE LIFE OF THE UNIVERSITY: FOR ALONG WITH THE SCIENCES AND THE HUMANITIES, THE ARTS—AS THEY ARE BOTH EXPERIENCED AND PRACTICED—ARE IRREPLACEABLE INSTRUMENTS OF KNOWLEDGE.



[December 2008]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. A VISION FOR THE ARTS AT HARVARD 1

2. DETAIL AND POTENTIAL STAGING OF RECOMMENDATIONS. 20

Summary Of Recommendations – Visual Index.20

Enhanced Presence of the Arts in the Curriculum.21

 Undergraduate Curriculum21

 Graduate Programs28

 Practicing Artists31

Enhanced Presence of the Arts on Campus33

 Programs and Initiatives33

 Space-related Recommendations38

 Structural Elements Needed to Support Other Recommendations43

3. AREAS OF DEBATE AND ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS 45

Undergraduate Curriculum.45

Graduate Programs.45

Physical Spaces47

Structural Elements47

Final Notes.48

4. APPENDICES 49

Appendix 1: Task Force Charge49

Appendix 2: Task Force Membership.52

Appendix 3: Internal and External Meetings and Consultations.53

Appendix 4: Landscape of the Arts at Harvard58

Appendix 5: Mission and Activities of the Office for the Arts.60



TASK FORCE
ON THE ARTS

A Vision for The Arts At Harvard

A Vision for the Arts at Harvard

This report calls for far-reaching changes in the undergraduate curriculum, for the creation of new graduate programs, and for the construction of major new facilities to give the arts a greater presence at Harvard. Our recommendations are the fruits of a year-long effort by the members and staff of the Task Force on the Arts in response to President Drew Faust's request for "an ambitious rethinking of the place of arts practice at Harvard." The vision we have is serious, time-consuming, and, in some cases, costly—and we are well aware that this report emerges at a time of grave economic hardship in our own community and throughout the world—but the measures we propose are, in our view, necessary. To allow innovation and imagination to thrive on our campus, to educate and empower creative minds across all disciplines, to help shape the twenty-first century, Harvard must make the arts an integral part of the cognitive life of the university: for along with the sciences and the humanities, the arts—as they are both experienced and practiced—are irreplaceable instruments of knowledge.

To make the arts an integral part of the cognitive life of the university will mean finding new places for art-making—a term which includes performance as well as the fashioning of material and textual objects—within the undergraduate and graduate curricula. It will mean forging new, productive relations between artistic creativity and the creative work of the sciences and engineering. It will mean making contemporary arts a subject of vital attention and intellectual interest. It will mean building adventurous new spaces where art can be exhibited, made, and performed, as well as refurbishing, renewing, and expanding existing spaces. It will mean placing the museums in a much more dynamic relation to the university as a teaching institution. It will mean bringing many more artists to campus, both as short and long-term visitors and as regular faculty. It will mean supporting the performing arts more energetically and insisting that they play a stronger pedagogical role in the university community. In short, it will mean taking the arts seriously at Harvard.

We do not begin with a blank slate. As President Faust remarks in the opening of the charge she gave the Task Force, the arts abound across Harvard. The university is home to a cluster of museums unsurpassed by those at any other institution of higher learning and comparable to the great collections of the world. Astonishing treasuries of paintings and sculpture from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century; a massive and important archive of prints, drawings, and photographs; unique collections of Chinese bronzes, porcelain, and paintings, of modernist art from Weimar Germany, of the art—ancient to modern—of Japan and Korea; awesome assemblages of Native American artifacts—the inventory extends almost indefinitely. Comparably abundant are the performing arts, from the professional productions of the American Repertory Theatre on the mainstage of the Loeb Drama Center to the ambitious offerings of the Harvard-Radcliffe Dramatic Club and the experimental student-authored shows at the recently constructed New College Theatre, from fully staged operas to adventurous events in ballet and modern dance sponsored by the Harvard Dance Program. In music Harvard has long been known for its excellence, with an exuberant array of orchestras, chamber music ensembles, choruses, and groups such as the Kuumba Singers who perform music of the African diaspora, and Off the Top, Harvard's all-female barbershop quartet, to the Han Ma-Eum Korean Drum Troupe and the mariachi performance band, Mariachi Veritas. The Harvard Film Archive, with its great wealth of

historical and contemporary films, regularly schedules many screenings, often with the presence of directors and producers; the celebrated Morris Gray Lecture is only one of innumerable readings that take place in locations around the campus; the Charles Eliot Norton Lectures regularly bring to the university distinguished individuals whose work illuminates the enlightened collaboration between art-making and humanistic scholarship. Student writers produce broadsides, pamphlets, magazines; student dancers eagerly attend extracurricular master classes and participate in performances of new works by student choreographers; installations of student-made art are mounted in Le Corbusier's Carpenter Center; the residential houses, many of which have dedicated spaces for art-making, are sites not only of scheduled arts events but also of improvised performances and shows. A disused swimming pool, a dungeon-like basement chamber, an oak-lined common room, a grassy courtyard with an overhanging balcony – Harvard artists routinely make ingenious use of every space they can find. And for some magical days every spring—the Arts First Week—the campus blossoms with art-making of every kind.

“A DISUSED SWIMMING POOL, A DUNGEON-LIKE BASEMENT CHAMBER, AN OAK-LINED COMMON ROOM, A GRASSY COURTYARD WITH AN OVERHANGING BALCONY – HARVARD ARTISTS ROUTINELY MAKE INGENIOUS USE OF EVERY SPACE THEY CAN FIND.”

In addition to the museums, the theater companies, and the constant, vital, and often spontaneous upsurge of art-making fostered by over 100 undergraduate student arts organizations supported by the Office for the Arts, there are—of course—the world-renowned academic programs dedicated to the historical and critical study of the arts: the core activity of today's Humanities remains the study of literature, music, art and architecture, and a new Ph.D. program in Film Studies has just been unanimously voted into existence. Not only art's analysis but also its practice has a place here, as well. The Graduate School of Design, one of the leading institutions of its kind in the world, is the most obvious and imposing example. The Aga Khan Program enhances knowledge of Islamic art and architecture, urbanism, landscape design and conservation and at the same time brings that knowledge to bear on contemporary design projects. A vigorous Creative Writing program in the English Department attracts both undergraduates and graduate students, fostering prize-winning projects and acclaimed publications. A few courses in the History of Art and Architecture include the study of arts practice with the scholarship of the discipline; a secondary concentration on Dramatic Arts provides undergraduates with a small selection of theater and dance courses; and in Music undergraduates can enroll in a modest number of performance-based courses as well as enroll in the joint Harvard/New England Conservatory Program that provides Harvard undergraduates an opportunity to pursue a liberal arts education and advanced conservatory training simultaneously. A unique undergraduate concentration, Visual and Environmental Studies, offers a predominantly practice-based curriculum in the making of visual art.

Scattered throughout the university curriculum there exist also courses outside the sphere of the arts that incorporate art-making in the work students are assigned. An adventurous course conjoining bioengineering, public health, and entrepreneurship for example, directs students to undertake projects at the interface of science and art, for it is there—participants discover—that

effective “idea translation” begins. Students in literature courses are occasionally asked to perform scenes from the plays they are studying, while in courses focused on sonnets or short stories or first-person memoirs students may be given the opportunity to practice as well as analyze the particular genres. The Media Anthropology Lab, a collaboration between the Departments of Anthropology and Visual and Environmental Studies, supports courses—and now a new practice-based Ph.D. program—predicated on the understanding that the human subject is constituted by imaging as well as by language. Recognizing that film has become a crucial contemporary ethnographic medium, these courses provide rigorous training in both field work and film-making techniques and culminate in the production and screening of students’ work.

“INDEED IN MANY CASES, LONG AFTER THE SUBSTANCE OF THE COURSES HAS DIMMED, AND THE ASSIGNMENTS AND EXAMS HAVE ALL FADED FROM MEMORY, WHAT REMAINS MOST BRIGHT AND INTENSE IN THE MEMORIES OF THESE STUDENTS, AND WHAT ENERGIZES THEM PERSONALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY, ARE THE HOURS THEY SPENT IN CREATIVE PROJECTS.”

It is not surprising then that many distinguished artists—Leonard Bernstein, I.M. Pei, Adrienne Rich, John Updike, Bonnie Raitt, Yo-Yo Ma, Mira Nair, Peter Sellars, Joshua Redman and many others—were once students at Harvard and found inspiration in what they encountered. Current Harvard students, regardless of their career goals, spend a significant amount of time in their years here making art. In the 2007-8 academic year, over 3,175 out of 6,648 undergraduates reported that they were involved in arts activities on our campus. Indeed in many cases, long after the substance of the courses has dimmed, and the assignments and exams have all faded from memory, what remains most bright and intense in the memories of these students, and what energizes them personally and professionally, are the hours they spent in creative projects.

Harvard’s current approach to the arts is the result of long-term student interests conjoined with a blend of institutional benign neglect and uneven, occasionally serendipitous, often idiosyncratic bursts of institutional support and energy. The result is a landscape of surprises: relatively few academic programs fully dedicated to arts practice and the freestanding professional institutions, the museums and the A.R.T., interweave with disparate and somewhat random labors of love passionately performed by hundreds of students in dozens of official and unofficial settings. This situation encourages—for most members of our community—a quite specific view of the arts. Art, in this view, is a thing entirely bound up with pleasure. Purely voluntary, it stands apart from the sphere of obligation, high seriousness, and professional training.

But while such a situation has benefits for the arts at Harvard, its disadvantages are substantial. The arts may be everywhere on campus, but they are also conspicuously marginal. Despite the best efforts of faculty and curators, the great museum collections, while well-known to the general public, play a diminishing role in the life of most students: they have become a place to take one’s visiting parents on a rainy afternoon, being otherwise unused, and largely unknown. Only one half of one percent of the marvelous objects in the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnography is actually on display; and, space issues apart, productive encounters with these treasures are apparently of no urgency to the educational mission of the university today. The gifted theater professionals at the A.R.T., though their stage is on campus, have relatively

little interaction with undergraduates—not even with undergraduates engaged in drama; while A.R.T. performances may receive attention in the national press, they are generally unseen by the vast majority of students and faculty; and, though they offer a two-and-a-half year graduate training program, the actual degree is conferred not by Harvard but by the Moscow Art Theatre School! The exhibitions in the Carpenter Center and elsewhere come and go without much notice on campus – even while distinguished art journals sing their praises. A great number of poetry readings, concerts, and dance performances are under-attended because there is currently no adequate mechanism to avoid the scheduling of conflicting events or simply to inform the Harvard community and the public at large of the many arts events that are taking place. The vitality of artistic activity on campus is rendered nearly invisible to the Harvard and local community by the lack of a centralized listing of readings, performances, screenings, and exhibitions. It is a typical and frequent experience for anyone vitally interested in the arts here to learn a day or a week after the event that something remarkable has occurred and is now over. And, more deeply we have, in relation to the arts, failed to foster a sense of urgency. What is missing—what the university has yet sufficiently to recognize and to broadcast—is a sense that the arts matter, and not just for one’s private pleasure, but for one’s public person and career.

Beyond the confines of the museums and theaters, the arts have little visible or compelling presence in the university. Spaces that might feature the works of Harvard artists or display objects from the rich collections—the Holyoke passageway, for example, or common rooms in the residential houses—are almost never used to do so. Workspaces are blank while the walls of official buildings are adorned—at best—with ancestral portraits (whose sitters, as it happens, resemble the ancestors of only a fraction of our current students and faculty). There are a few notable works of public art—the Henry Moore sculpture in front of the Lamont Library, the massive Chinese stele near Widener. But these were erected long ago, for ours is not a seriously curated campus: one would be astonished to step into a Harvard building and see an exciting installation or a major work by a contemporary artist.

The absence of art from the spaces of everyday life is a painful lost opportunity, not only for the arts at Harvard but also for the university at large and for the greater community in which we occupy a very visible place. It sends a signal that the arts are unimportant to the work of the university; that they remain but a pleasant way to spend some leisure hours: that cognitive life and professional training lie elsewhere.

Because the arts are deemed at Harvard to be extracurricular, many students remain oblivious to the hard work—the careful training, perception, and intelligence—that the arts require. They know that writing essays is a skilled and time-consuming labor. They recognize that problem sets in math and science are meant to be difficult. But ask them to photograph a landscape, compose a short story, or direct a scene rather than write an analytical essay and they will almost universally assume that the exercise will be quickly and easily dispatched. The problem is not that they believe art-making is trivial but rather that they believe that talent alone, and not thought or diligence, will determine the outcome. To teach non-artists to be as thoughtful and diligent in drawing a picture as they are in conducting an experiment or analyzing a complex text would mean not only, or primarily, enhancing their appreciation of art. It would mean teaching them to exercise a quite different kind of diligence, one involving the mind and the body in different ways than analytical writing and computation do.

Instead our blank walls and hoary portraits announce to students where we on the faculty think their serious attention, and the attention of the world they will help to shape, should be focused. And, to judge from the overall pattern of career choices our students make, they generally follow our subliminal advice and avoid careers in the arts. They understand, after all, what it means that we offer graduate degrees in such fields as business, law, and medicine, but that we do not offer a master's degree in fine arts. And yet: the remarkable amount of extracurricular energy expended spent by our students in art making suggests something else, as well. Many students sense their education is missing a piece and what is lacking is not just a matter of fun. On their own, that is, they determine to acquire knowledge, skills, perspective, and experience that can only be had in certain creative activities. And if we do not offer those activities in our curriculum, then they will find ways of acquiring them as best they can outside our offerings and without our serious guidance.

In this endeavor, as in so many others, our students tend to be quite canny. They know that, on graduation, they will be entering a new and rapidly changing economy, one in which fertile imagination, inventiveness, the control of recalcitrant materials, improvisational cunning, empathy, the ability at once to master and to violate conventions will be at least as important as the bodies of knowledge they will acquire in their classes. They grasp that they will be called upon, in almost anything they eventually do, to show a capacity for collaborative creativity. They want to learn how to wed passionate energy to a sense of balance, proportion, grace, and fitness. They crave the understanding that comes with exercising aesthetic control over the stuff of dreams, yoking fantasy to a deepened practical respect for the precise, resistant structures of the material world. These are all forms of knowledge embedded in the making of works of art, and if we do not offer the opportunity to explore them in our classes, then our students are wise enough to look for them elsewhere.

“NO SERIOUS UNIVERSITY WOULD RELEGATE WHAT IT REGARDS AS COGNITIVELY IMPORTANT—LABORATORY SCIENCE, FOR EXAMPLE, OR ECONOMICS—TO A MARGINAL INSTITUTIONAL SPACE WITHOUT REGULAR FACULTY OR ADEQUATE FUNDING OR EXPERT TRAINING OR RIGOROUS EVALUATION.”

But here again we are missing a significant opportunity: we often turn away a significant number of students from the few classes that are taught by practicing artists. Sometimes we justify this on the grounds that most of those turned away are not skilled enough in the medium they wish to pursue. However, offering only a handful of beginning level courses in art making, we provide only pitifully few means for students to acquire those skills, and we act as if aspiring artists should either have come to Harvard already in possession of most of what they need or should be able easily to find what they need outside the classroom. Hence we reinforce the message that a serious curricular engagement with the arts should be reserved for a tiny cohort, and we direct all others to the broad and playful sphere of the extracurricular.

That sphere, let us reiterate, has powerful merits. Nothing this Arts Task Force proposes should be construed as a derogating or downgrading of the fantastic range of voluntary arts activities passionately pursued in free time. But for any university—and for the larger culture that supports

and relies on universities—the curriculum is central. No serious university would relegate what it regards as cognitively important—laboratory science, for example, or economics—to a marginal institutional space without regular faculty or adequate funding or expert training or rigorous evaluation. The directive may sound benign: “Go and have fun. This is not something we can or wish to teach.” But it is in fact an exclusion, a genial sentence of exile. It is high time, the Arts Task Force believes, for Harvard to end this curricular banishment.

Harvard values leadership and originality of mind. It has created a curriculum to foster these qualities, in the hope that its students, in their different pursuits, may change the world for the better and make things new. But by sidelining arts-practice, this university has largely left out of its curriculum the most direct training in imagining the new and in exercising the practical cunning required to bring the new into being. Since the end of the Middle Ages—long before originality became the hallmark of great art—people recognized that, in crafting paintings, writing poems, and composing music, they, uniquely among all creatures, introduced into the world something new. This capacity was what gave art its special promise: hand in hand with science, it could—on occasion—change the world. Even while, over the last few centuries, science gained in prestige, becoming the paradigmatic engine of knowledge and progress, and even while science was therefore granted pride of place within the modern university, scientists themselves continued to recognize the rarity and the mystery of having an original idea. Thus they speak of experiments and proofs as being “beautiful,” and rightly see in artistic creation the closest analogue to what they do.

Curricular change is arguably the most significant kind of change a university can undertake. Historically it has been the occasion for controversy. The introduction of the study of Greek in European universities of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was the focus of fierce debate, and if the debate now seems quaint, it is only because we have lost sight of what was at stake. A whole world was changing, and with it a sense of what it was crucial for educated people to know. Over many centuries, alterations in the curriculum radically transformed not only universities but also the wider culture—witness the effects of the *studia humanitatis* championed by Renaissance humanism and of the introduction of chemistry, biology, and applied sciences into the university after centuries of marginalization. Harvard’s core faculty is an artifact of the gradual, often contested incorporation into the curriculum of disciplines and practices that had hitherto been excluded. Certain disciplines were kept out from the start and are excluded still. If, as we have noted, practice in the visual and performing arts remains, with a few notable exceptions, an extracurricular pursuit at Harvard, it is the consequence of a long-standing and fundamental exclusion. Originally grouped with hand work (the crafts) rather than head work (the liberal arts and sciences), these arts continue at Harvard to be treated as standing outside of the skills and knowledge that the university endeavors centrally to teach.

In relation to its peer institutions Harvard’s relation to arts practice is unusual, if not unique. By 1869, Yale had opened the doors to its School of Art. Yale now confers graduate degrees in arts practice from four separate professional schools—the School of Art, School of Drama, School of Music, and School of Architecture—and it provides as well profound opportunities for mentorship and instruction within the talented undergraduate population. Our peers at Columbia, Princeton, and Stanford all outpace us in their graduate and undergraduate degree offerings

in arts practice and have undertaken recent initiatives in expanding their arts facilities and programming. As these institutions plan for their future, they have come to understand that the arts will be of increasing importance to the universities of tomorrow. Harvard, meanwhile, continues to attract students with astonishing artistic gifts and intense interest in arts practice. But we run the risk of losing to other universities some of the students we would most like to have in our midst.

It is not however for mere competitive advantage that the Arts Task Force is recommending sweeping changes in Harvard's relation to the arts. It is rather for the reasons that our peer institutions have engaged in their own initiatives and indeed for reasons that are implicit in the achievements of many of the great artists and intellectuals who have graduated from this university. To cite only two instances: T. S. Eliot's studies of philosophy, anthropology, and the Vedas richly inform his poetry, a poetry that transforms the scholarly knowledge of discourse and argument into the affective intelligence of verse forms; W. E. B. Du Bois developed his theories of race and culture through a deep study of Hegel, extensive empirical research in the American South, and a profound engagement with African-American spirituals ("the sorrow songs").

"TODAY, MORE THAN EVER, ARTISTIC PRACTICE WILL NEED TO CONTRIBUTE TO INTELLECTUAL INQUIRY AND HELP CONSTRUCT NEW FORMS OF SOCIAL PRACTICE."

Throughout history, the arts have had an immeasurable impact on social, political, and cultural spheres and have been deeply intertwined with scientific development. Today, more than ever, artistic practice will need to contribute to intellectual inquiry and help construct new forms of social practice. The culture of modernity depends upon the collaboration of the art of "making" and the art of "thinking" and is intolerant of any arbitrary and exclusionary division between them. Contemporary art provides further instances of the importance of such collaborations. Conceptual artists are as conversant with theoretical and aesthetic debates as they are consummate in their own creative practices. Feminist artists and film-makers in the 1970-90s were leading scholars in the field of women's history, psychoanalysis, and political philosophy, while at the same time making creative contributions as artists to media and visual culture. The relationship of cognition and creativity is not simply complementary; art-making and scholarship must be placed in an active relation to each other because the contrast as well as the collaboration between them extends the horizons of both.

These quintessential features of modern art and scholarship were already glimpsed fifty years ago in the last full-scale review of the arts at Harvard, the Brown Report of 1956. The report called for the expansion of the study of art at the university, and certain significant developments, including the construction of the Loeb Drama Center and the Carpenter Center, are the direct result of the report's findings and recommendations. But its over-arching vision, even in the fairly cautious and circumscribed form in which it had been articulated, was not fully realized. The arts remained curricularly marginal, institutionally peripheral.

In the half-century that has passed since the Brown Report, the intellectual currents to which its authors were attempting to respond have only intensified. Transformations in the traditional "arts and sciences"—changes both in *what* they teach and *how* they teach—have made Harvard's marginalization of arts practice in university pedagogy less and less tenable. Recent

scholarly research, much of it spearheaded by members of the Harvard faculty, has linked linguistics to poetics, visual perception to art and cinema, auditory perception to music, cognitive and evolutionary psychology to fiction, cognitive neuroscience to philosophy in ways that enrich all of the fields.

There is an urgent need to make Harvard one of the places where new ideas are being created in many different areas. It is not enough to be an institution-in-waiting, waiting patiently for art and science to be made elsewhere, only then for us to come forward to decipher, offer commentary, and extract ideas. Shifts in the understanding of how knowing relates to making, new conceptions of intelligence, a dramatically increased use of visual modeling, and revised understanding of how revolutions occur in the natural and social sciences are just some of the many paradigm shifts that have caused the virtual exclusion of the visual and performing arts from the curriculum to seem ever more unnatural and disabling.

It is increasingly clear that vital and original ideas are generated in the process of physical, material problem-solving. In the sciences, where there was once a strong bias toward the theoretical, Harvard has been building the infrastructure necessary for such problem-solving. Witness the vast underground laboratories built beneath the green space bordered by the music building, the science center and the old Gordon McKay Labs, and the massive building in Allston being constructed for biological research. Witness the steady growth of the School of Engineering & Applied Sciences (SEAS) and the intense collaboration between the faculty of engineering and that of biology, chemistry and physics. Harvard has also begun to place importance on the teaching of problem-solving in the laboratory at the undergraduate level. We have realized that students need to learn to have ideas in the lab, rather than to use the lab as an elucidation of ideas they learn in class. Hence the large project teaching labs for biology, chemistry and bio-engineering in the new Northwest building, labs which enable students to solve real problems themselves, with whatever tools they may need.

“IT IS INCREASINGLY CLEAR THAT VITAL AND ORIGINAL IDEAS ARE GENERATED IN THE PROCESS OF PHYSICAL, MATERIAL PROBLEM-SOLVING.”

Art-making is thus part of a larger claim for the significance of making in general for the generation of new ideas, new methods, and new forms. By trying to solve unfamiliar problems of making, we gain an understanding of the inherent difficulties of the task, along with a heightened appreciation for some of the expert solutions. In science as in art, the mistakes we make are part of the learning process, as are the seemingly random ventures in multiple directions. We may make a conceptual advance, for example, as a result of having created new tools with a higher resolution, not for a particular measurement but simply because we have been able to so. So too in art-making, only by allowing the paint to fall or enacting the play with body movement or actually playing the notes aloud can we begin to create. In some contemporary art practice, the physicality of art may seem elusive, but it is underlying and as seminal as it is in science.

The use of new digital and media technologies—in virtually all forms of inquiry—provides an unprecedented opportunity for our students to take art-making seriously “for itself,” while seeing it

as an enhancement of their own specific scholarly and professional interests. “Making” in the visual arts, for instance, is no longer restricted to the hand-held technologies of pencil, brush, chisel and camera (without prejudice to the importance of any of the above). The availability of computer software for creative purposes allows for a range of artistic practices that may not “train the hand and eye” in the time-honored traditional sense, but whose imaginative and aesthetic possibilities provide the important cognitive and conceptual training of an “art-making” education. Those who were held back because of their lack of manual dexterity or technical expertise can now translate their creative ideas into art-practices with the help of computer technologies.

THE ARTS TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS ESTABLISHING THE ARTS AS A CENTRAL COMPONENT OF THE UNIVERSITY’S EDUCATIONAL MISSION.

These new advances break disciplinary boundaries and extend the closed circle of knowledge communities. The Film Study Center in the Faculty of Arts & Sciences (FAS) promotes the study of the world through film: its fellowships have supported significant works in non-fiction and ethnographic cinema and have brought film/video/new media artists to campus. Similarly, the Media Anthropology Lab, briefly mentioned above, works on bringing together perspectives from the sciences, arts, and humanities to explore multiple dimensions of social experience and identity. Using non-fiction media technologies in conjunction with their scholarship, social scientists are able to address a much wider audience and explore through cinematic imagery issues that have often eluded approaches that are exclusively language-centered. The possibilities for art-making opened up by this initiative exceed the realm of the “illustrative” or the genre of the documentary; at their best, they constitute new research methods that allow them to give their “subjects” new representational forms that emphasize the value of voice, image and narrative.

Changing ideas within the arts—their relation to ideas, their creative deployment of the concepts and resources of science and engineering, their ways of engaging with the environment, the range of techniques available to them, their interplay between making and performance—have likewise made the university a more obvious, welcoming and fruitful arena for the work of artists. The Arts Task Force recommends establishing the arts as a central component of the university’s educational mission.

Doing this does not entail draining the arts of their pleasure by submitting them to a grim, disciplinary academic regime. It acknowledges rather that the arts, practiced well, are *already* disciplined. It admires them as *already* manifestations of carefully acquired skills, conceptual intelligence, and daring. In them stand displayed the patience to work through what Keats called the “innumerable compositions and decompositions which take place between the intellect and its thousand materials.” With its remarkable resources and resourcefulness Harvard can doubtless do something important for the arts. It has, at a bare minimum, the capacity to be a significant patron and discerning collector. We, however, are still more confident that the arts can do something important for Harvard.

The deep pleasures associated with art-making are all pleasures that belong in the curriculum: an ability to heighten vitality and enhance the textures of everyday life, a productive linking of tradition and the individual talent, a willingness to cross the boundaries of space and

time, a conjunction of hard-won skill and conceptual daring. Indeed these are qualities that are already called forth by our best teaching practices in virtually every discipline. The notion that serious intellectual inquiry in mathematics, for example, or engineering or philosophy is devoid of aesthetic pleasure is clearly absurd, as is the corresponding notion that serious art-making is devoid of penetrating intelligence. To know—to experience first-hand—the thought-processes specific to art not only teaches us something fundamental about art; it trains us in the subtler traits of intelligence *per se*. The quarantining of arts practice in the sphere of the extra-curricular creates a false dichotomy. It leads students (and, on occasion, their teachers) to assume falsely that the qualities of successful art-making – the breaking apart of the carapace of routine, the empowerment of the imagination, the careful selection and organization of elements that contribute to an overarching, coherent design, the rigorous elimination of all that does not contribute to this design, the achievement of a deepened intelligibility in the external and internal world – do not belong in the work they are assigned to undertake in the curriculum.

“ART OBJECTS DEMAND TO BE EXPERIENCED, AND THIS EXPERIENCE—THE DIRECT, SENSORY KNOWLEDGE OF FORM, TEMPO, EMPHASIS, EMOTIONAL RANGE, AND A WHOLE WAY OF BEING IN SPACE AND TIME—CONSTITUTES THE MEANING AND THE VALUE OF THE WORK.”

There are serious differences between much art-making and much of the work that is done in the current undergraduate and graduate programs at Harvard. But it is important to grasp these differences clearly, and not to use them as an alibi for exclusion. They do *not* have to do with the presence of free-floating reverie in art, with the relative weight of unconscious and conscious motivations, with the necessity of rigorous training, with the degree of aptitude required to take the first steps, or with the possibility of assessing the results. Unconscious motivations are powerfully at work in creative achievements (and spectacular failures) in virtually all fields of endeavor, and any aesthetic object, to achieve what Shakespeare calls “a local habitation and a name,” must pass from the dream-life of the artist to the realm of objects and shared experiences. Imagination – or the painful lack of imagination – is parceled out with a smiling indifference to the disciplinary boundaries we draw. The enemies of excellence in the making of art are very much like the enemies of excellence in Chemistry or English, Neuroscience or History: inattention, conceit, the impulse to cut corners, a lack of vital engagement, conceptual timidity, a premature settling for routine and conventional answers.

Why then should art-making have been largely cordoned off from pursuits understood to be suitable for academic study and evaluation? In most academic pursuits, it is usually deemed possible to summarize, often in general terms, the core contribution of each particular piece of completed work. This accessibility to summary and assessment is thought to be true not only of the early efforts of undergraduates but also of the advanced work of graduate students and their teachers. Though it would obviously be unwise to confuse the few sentences called the “abstract,” routinely printed in scholarly journals at the beginning or end of the article, with the article itself, few scholars think that the abstract is in principle a travesty. We expect much of our work to submit to a reduced statement of its basic claims or its conclusions. But artistic expression does not generally submit to a comparable reduction. Art objects demand to be experienced, and this experience—the direct, sensory knowledge of form, tempo, emphasis, emotional range, and a whole way of being in space and time—constitutes the meaning and the value of the work.

This difference is significant, altering the expectations that shape an art project, the means that bring it into being, and the norms that govern its impact and assessment. But nothing in this alternative horizon enjoins a strict division between such a project and the cognitive training proper to a research university. On the contrary, the forms of thinking inculcated in art training are valuable both in themselves and in what they help to enhance elsewhere in the curriculum. These include the development of craft, the sharpening of focus and concentration, and the empowerment of the imagination. Art-making is an expressive practice: it nurtures intense alertness to the intellectual and emotional resources of the human means of communication, in all their complexity. It requires both acute observation and critical self-reflection. This self-reflection—this drive to interrogate conventions, displace genres, challenge inherited codes of meaning—encourages risk-taking and an ability to endure repeated failures. It fosters both intelligent imitation and a desire to conceive and bring forth what has hitherto been unimaginable. Most notably, art-making requires empathy not only of its audience, but of the maker as well, who must consider personal expression—imaginatively—in light of public reception. Far from being a thing of the private sphere, the arts, if taken seriously, teach lessons in the public nature of all expression. Surely, these are all qualities we hope an education at Harvard will enhance, just as we hope that our students will go forth into the world with a heightened capacity for joy, a heightened sensitivity to beauty, and a heightened ability to realize their aspirations.

Lest these hopes seem entirely focused on the capacities and pleasures of individual students, we might remind ourselves that the sober, communally-minded revolutionaries of the eighteenth century (many of whom had attended Harvard) included in the founding document of our nation a famous principle: the “pursuit of happiness.” They believed that this pursuit, so deeply associated with the skills and pleasures of the arts, was a worthy goal of an entire culture. Steeped as they were in admiration for ancient Greece and Rome, they understood that a nation’s aesthetic choices constituted a record of its particular forms of happiness, a significant agent of its development, and an ultimate judgment upon the quality of its civilization. The pursuit of happiness is distinct from the securing of the necessities of life and the safeguarding of liberty. It is something more than the acquisition of technical mastery, something beyond the amassing and exchange of information necessary for the advancement of human learning. It entails an intensified participation in the natural and human realms, a vital union of spirit and matter at once facilitated and symbolized by works of art.

Art-making is an experiment in conjuring up the possibilities that are hidden in the habitual and the familiar. The practice of art is for this reason akin to prophecy: however much it is embedded in the past, in rules and conventions and traditions, its deepest commitment is to the future. No doubt great artists are few. But so are too, in equal measure and for similar reasons, great physicists, economists, historians, philosophers, and engineers. Though supreme artistic talent is rare, imagination, wonder, and creative energy are universal—they are qualities that make the pursuit of happiness possible—and can be fostered, along with the ability to reason and to solve problems.

“Perhaps people will soon be persuaded,” Goethe wrote in 1826, toward the end of his long life, “that there is no patriotic art and no patriotic science. Both belong, like everything good, to the whole world and can be promoted only through general, free interaction among all who live at the same time.” Goethe dreamed that this universality of art and science would liberate

human genius from the vicious parochialism of competing communities and nation states. If this prophetic dream by now seems shopworn—its optimism spectacularly disproved by almost two centuries of fathomless hatred and bloodshed—it was nonetheless based upon a canny insight into the ceaseless, resourceful work of culture, and its underlying hope is not dead. Harvard should include art-making in its curriculum for the same reason it includes so many other forms of learning: to enable its students to become citizens of the world, prepared to apprehend what may at first seem only strange and to participate in a human creativity that is not hemmed in by fear and suspicion or tightly bounded in space and time.

It is our hope that Harvard will continue to produce new generations of students that can, in words attributed by some to John F. Kennedy and by others to his brother Robert, “dream of things that never were.” The resonant phrase has a Shakespearean ring and with good reason: from *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* to *The Tempest*, Shakespeare brooded about the power of the imagination to body forth the forms of things unknown and to give to airy nothing a local habitation and a name. It all sounds evanescent and fleeting, but it is only through this power that we can hope to produce, in Shakespeare’s phrase, a “living record,” a legacy that endures.

If it is with a jolt that one turns from these high aspirations to the long list of recommendations that follow—the fruits of a lengthy series of meetings, consultations, site-visits, and discussions—we must remember that all cloud-capped towers must be built from the ground up. And if the number of recommendations seems bewildering, we can summarize what the Task Force thinks should be done in a discrete set of initiatives. What is crucial, from our perspective, is to recognize that these initiatives are linked. Many questions remain to be answered; many details will need to be thrashed out by different committees. But, at least as we conceive the challenge, what we present here is not an array of separable options to be considered for piecemeal adoption but rather an integrated plan for establishing art-making as a vital component in the cognitive life of the university.

“THE MAKING OF ART, WE BELIEVE, SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD TO BE AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT IN THE COGNITIVE TRAINING OF OUR STUDENTS.”

First, the arts should have a greatly enhanced place in the undergraduate curriculum.

That is, students should be actively encouraged to engage in the practice of art, not only as an incidental pleasure but also as an integral part of their formal education at Harvard. To this end, we recommend that an art-making component be incorporated into the General Education curriculum, both in the current “Aesthetic and Interpretive Understanding” category and, where possible, in a wider range of areas. More generally, we urge the integration of arts practice in relevant courses across the undergraduate curriculum. The making of art, we believe, should be understood to be an essential element in the cognitive training of our students.

This goal is facilitated by significant changes, in recent decades, in the broad conception of the disciplines. Many have remarked upon the shared experimental lab-based practices of both art and the sciences, but it is equally germane to draw the lines of affiliation between the practice of the arts and the critical and research methodologies of the humanities. Much current work in painting, for example, begins with an examination of that which exists, taking the history

of an idea or object as its starting point, and then proceeds to examine not only the how and why of an object/idea's existence but the possibility of its re-imagining. Hence, insofar as the project of contemporary art is to imagine the possibilities of the present through the double lens of both past and future, the mode of practice offered by the visual arts is entirely commensurate with the aims of a research institution. Comparable claims can be made for contemporary music, dance, and theater. Through a combination of research, critical examination, problem solving, and imagination, the arts present counter-models, problematize structures, and explore the affective and ethical dimension of human existence. It is these modalities of art that are in keeping with the fundamental core values of critical thinking, self-awareness, and compassion that are central to a liberal arts education.

“HARVARD STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO RECEIVE A FULL AND PROGRESSIVE RANGE OF INSTRUCTION—FROM ELEMENTARY AND INTRODUCTORY CLASSES TO ADVANCED WORKSHOPS—IN A WIDE RANGE OF ARTS PRACTICE.”

To incorporate art-making, broadly understood, into the general education of all of our undergraduates will require substantial changes in staffing, course design, and pedagogical expectations. These changes obviously cannot happen overnight or by administrative fiat: they will depend upon the intellectual commitment and imaginative investment of the faculty, and these in turn will depend upon the example of powerful and successful models. To this end, the Task Force urges the immediate creation and assessment of such models and the promulgation of information about them. We are confident that the faculty will quickly be convinced of the power of a “making” component in the curriculum. A mediocre essay does not physically collapse; it simply does not shine. To try to make a box and find it does not stand is, by contrast, to experience directly the mismatch between thinking and doing and to encounter the stubborn nature of things. Scientists know this as intimately as do artists: the badly-made experiment fails openly, like a botched box.

The broad-based incorporation of arts practice into the curriculum should be accompanied by a significant effort to ensure that those courses specifically dedicated to art-making are readily accessible to interested and qualified undergraduates. Harvard students should be able to receive a full and progressive range of instruction—from elementary and introductory classes to advanced workshops—in a wide range of arts practice.

In addition to this strengthening of the existing undergraduate art-making courses and programs, we also recommend the creation of a new Dramatic Arts Concentration. As befits a serious discipline with a long, distinguished, and complex history, this concentration should, we believe, be fully developed, not simply secondary to another concentration's curriculum. Intellectually serious, rigorous, and systematic, it should, like other Humanities concentrations at Harvard, be part of a liberal arts education, not conservatory training. It should include required courses in theater history, dramatic literature, and theory, as well as practical training in playwriting, directing, acting, and design. The American Repertory Theater (A.R.T.), whose newly appointed Artistic Director has expressed an interest in forging a more vital relationship with the

undergraduate student body, could serve as a major resource for the innovative and powerful synthesis of theoretical and historical study with practice. The Dramatic Arts Concentration at Harvard would, like the History and Literature Concentration, be essentially interdisciplinary: it would draw upon literature (in a range of languages and cultures), history, anthropology, music, design, and other disciplines, and would help to generate the conversations and collaborations that the university needs to foster.

Second, Harvard should create new and innovative graduate degree programs in a range of art practices. The implementation of such programs is critical to any attempt to elevate the presence of art-making on Harvard's campus. Graduate programs have a significant impact on the entire university, beginning with undergraduate programs in FAS. Graduate students, with their commitment to high-level professional practice, will enhance the teaching capacity needed to provide undergraduates with broader access to arts-related courses (including introductory courses in a range of media and disciplines). More importantly, they will serve as role models. Currently at Harvard, the exceptionally strong graduate programs in such fields as business, law, and medicine are a compelling resource for undergraduates contemplating the career paths open to them. The absence—with the significant exception of Architecture and Music Composition—of comparable programs in art-making needlessly restricts the imaginative horizon of our students.

Of course, it is not only for the sake of the undergraduates that we urge the establishment of graduate programs in the arts at Harvard. The fostering of art practice is important, as we have already argued, for its cognitive value and for the long-term contribution to culture. Harvard relishes the opportunity to shape the future – to bring into being what is currently only dimly apprehended or indeed not yet even imagined – in a wide range of disciplines. Why should this ambition not extend to the arts? The human and material resources of the university, its global reputation, its unrivaled museum collections, the scope of its intellectual energies all make it a natural home for advanced training in the arts.

“HARVARD RELISHES THE OPPORTUNITY TO SHAPE THE FUTURE – TO BRING INTO BEING WHAT IS CURRENTLY ONLY DIMLY APPREHENDED OR INDEED NOT YET EVEN IMAGINED – IN A WIDE RANGE OF DISCIPLINES. WHY SHOULD THIS AMBITION NOT EXTEND TO THE ARTS?”

This said, we do not imagine either that the world is waiting breathlessly for the advent of Harvard MFA programs or that we can bring well-conceived programs into being overnight. In certain disciplines – most notably, creative writing – there is already in place a core faculty with a pedagogical vision sufficiently articulated to make it possible to create a small, distinguished MFA program in a relatively short time. Similarly, the resources of the A.R.T. and its experience with graduate training should facilitate the fashioning of a vital MFA in theater at Harvard. In other disciplines—painting, sculpture, digital media, music, filmmaking—different time-frames are needed. A successful outcome will depend not on a blueprint imposed from on high but on the needs and the aspirations, articulated in the course of extended discussions, of the artists who will shape the individual programs.

The success of these programs, we believe, will rely on the consideration of global issues as well as those issues intrinsic to the individual forms of art-practice. The ecological crisis, advances

in neuroscience and physics, startling developments in information systems and nanotechnology, and the new digital media have already radically altered our relationship to the domain of representation. We hope that Harvard will foster new ways of responding to changing conditions in our culture by developing genuinely experimental programs in the arts that will have a decisive and transformative influence on the ways in which we conceive and practice other spheres of intellectual and social activity.

The Arts Task Force recommends the establishment of a committee charged with determining the character, the specific components, and the plausible timing of MFA programs at Harvard. It would be rash to propose answers in advance to the many detailed and complex questions with which this committee will need to grapple. But we have several general principles that we would urge upon this committee and upon the university.

First, we believe that for our programs to be successful the MFA students at Harvard will have to be fully funded. We will not be entering uncharted territory: our success will depend upon our ability to attract the very best students, and to attract those students we must compete against the strongest programs, many of which are developing substantial financial aid, fellowship, and teaching assistantship programs that significantly reduce or eliminate the costs of attending graduate school in arts practice. Full financial support will allow the best students to attend, including students who currently would never consider graduate training because they can neither afford the costs associated with this pursuit nor accept the prospect of launching a risky career under a crushing burden of debt.

Furthermore, we believe that the programs should make innovative use of the intellectual opportunities and resources of the entire university. If we ask ourselves how the new Harvard MFA programs, latecomers in the American scene, will be distinctive and worthy of the institution in which they are part, the answer must lie to a great extent in the overall character of that institution. This means that the MFA programs at Harvard should not be a world set apart, in an isolation of either space or spirit. To be sure, art-making, like any other advanced pursuit in our university, will need its own sphere of autonomy and intense inward focus. But the special appeal of the Harvard programs will lie in their access to the university's astonishing range of creative endeavors. Whatever programs we eventually create should provide vital links to these endeavors, across disciplines, departments, and schools.

And finally, we believe that the MFA programs at Harvard should take full advantage of the possibility of interdisciplinary and collaborative work among the arts. Here again we have the opportunity to turn belatedness into an advantage: walls, both conceptual and material, have not yet been built here that discourage collaboration and creative intermixing. To be sure, the different disciplines in the arts all have their own special skills and norms and pedagogical practices. Certain arts at any given time and place may not interact well with others, and compulsory interdisciplinarity has the chilling quality of Miss Havisham's command to young Pip, "Play!" That said, since many of the most exciting and innovative developments in contemporary art-making occur through the mixing of media and the interplay of distinct skills, what is needed is physical spaces and institutional structures congenial to collaboration.

Both the changes we are calling for in the undergraduate curriculum and the creation of new MFA programs lead to the third principal recommendation of the Arts Task Force: **Harvard should invest in upgrading existing spaces and in building new, innovative arts spaces.** A proposal this ambitious would, given the tight space constraints within which we all function, ordinarily seem a mere fantasy. But here too Harvard has a remarkable opportunity. Serendipitously, the university has the chance to provide its students with the spaces they require both for their exuberant extracurricular arts activities and for the rigorous, challenging, and vitally necessary art-making within the curriculum. The future development of the Allston campus makes it possible to bring into being precisely the architecturally exciting structures that will enable the innovations for which we are calling.

Harvard has the potential to become an important place where the next generation of painters and sculptors, museum curators and video artists are taught; where musicians, playwrights, computer scientists, and physicists collaborate; where scientists and humanists meet to think about how to visualize complex information and ideas; where artists collaborate with faculty and students in such schools as Education, Divinity, Business, Law, Medicine, and Engineering, or in university resources such as the Peabody Museum and the Museum of Natural History. And it will be a site of lively engagement with the immediate community of Allston and Cambridge and the larger community of Greater Boston: public exhibitions and performances of all kinds, art classes, the free screening of movies, after-school programs, events created in conjunction with our neighboring institutions. A vital arts presence at Harvard holds open the possibility of bringing together, in creative excitement, the discrete pieces of our existence, the tubs that currently sit so heavily each on its own bottom.

The new spaces will not replace the dedicated arts facilities that already exist in various locations on the campus: the Carpenter Center, the Loeb Drama Center, the Zero Arrow Theatre, the New College Theater, Paine Hall, the dance center in the Quad. On the contrary, these performance and practice spaces, already heavily in demand, should be maintained, in many cases upgraded, and expanded in the Harvard residential houses and elsewhere on campus. Indeed, if the curricular offerings at Harvard are to be enhanced in arts practice, investments will need to be made in the departments' facilities. The existing facilities of Music and VES—two departments critical to the success of these recommendations—severely limit any effort to expand course offerings and enrollments due to capacity of existing facilities.

The arts provide crucial capillary links, at once intellectual and social, in a university that is too often fragmented and stalled by the administrative arrangement called, in the local parlance, “every tub on its own bottom.” But a strengthening of these links, important though it is, cannot address the pressing need for new, purpose-built studios, rehearsal rooms, performance spaces, offices, and exhibition galleries, a need that will greatly intensify if Harvard takes seriously our call for a new visible as well as virtual presence of the arts and art-making on campus.

This new presence of art-making is closely linked to a further initiative that can be addressed in architecturally innovative spaces for which we are calling. With the notable exceptions of the Busch-Reisinger Museum and the photography collection, the Harvard Art Museum effectively stopped collecting art from the 1960s onward, a decision as problematical for the university's

teaching mission as would have been a comparable decision on the part of the library to stop collecting poetry and fiction after, say, the death of Wallace Stevens and Gabriela Mistral. For students and faculty to remain on the cutting edge of developments in the visual, they need to be exposed to the history and the ongoing creation of the art of our time.

“A VITAL ARTS PRESENCE AT HARVARD HOLDS OPEN THE POSSIBILITY OF BRINGING TOGETHER, IN CREATIVE EXCITEMENT, THE DISCRETE PIECES OF OUR EXISTENCE, THE TUBS THAT CURRENTLY SIT SO HEAVILY EACH ON ITS OWN BOTTOM.”

Harvard finds itself with a unique opportunity: it can build a museum that will collect and display the arts of our time at the same time it embarks upon enhancing undergraduate art-making and creating a MFA program. This means that from its inception the new museum can, and must, be thought of in programmatic reciprocity with the pedagogical aims of the university. Rather than simply imagining this museum to be a repository of treasures, we also envisage it serving the dynamic needs of the burgeoning life of the arts at the university and also forging links with the university’s rich ethnographic and natural history collections, which contain objects as complex and eloquent as any on display in our art museums. An innovative arts and culture complex will provide the space and the impetus to rethink the whole distinction between those works conventionally designated as high art and those collected and stored away for study as traces of material cultures or as interesting specimens of the natural world. That distinction rests on assumptions that have long been called into question by scholars, artists, curators, and the general public, both at Harvard and elsewhere. But our existing physical structures and exhibition spaces reinforce principles in which few if any of us continue to believe. An exciting new architectural initiative at Harvard will not only allow objects that have long been sequestered from public view to be displayed but will also transform the intellectual and aesthetic landscape.

The Task Force sees the university museums as a significantly underutilized resource. The origins of the Harvard Art Museum lie entirely in pedagogical activities. Recognizing that effective teaching in art history required the study of original objects, faculty of the Department of Fine Arts (now the Department of History of Art and Architecture) began to acquire for the university salient artifacts along with the instruments and archival materials required to study them. The concept of an art collection as a teaching tool inspired significant collectors to donate their holdings to the fledgling museum, confident that at Harvard artworks would engage and shape students’ minds. Thus was born a museum designed to be a teaching laboratory—the first of its kind in the world. The Task Force believes that the university museums—not only the Harvard Art Museum but also the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnography, the Museum of Natural History, the Semitic Museum, and other collections—have their center in the cognitive work of the university. We appreciate that the museums will and should have other functions, but we believe that the curators should be encouraged to emphasize pedagogy as well as preservation and scholarship in their mission. A too-sharp division between these activities and responsibilities runs counter to the powerful legacy of Harvard’s collections. And it is counterproductive for the teaching mission of a university museum. In order for the museums and the faculty to remain central resources to each other, interconnections at the level of appointments, curriculum, and spaces must be forged anew. Such a renewal would be significantly aided by new interactions

among the different museums. The sharp division between “artworks” (housed in the Harvard Art Museum) and “ethnographic objects” (gathered in the Peabody Museum) is an artificial one. And it can run counter to the imperative for a more inclusive history of art, one to which, for example, the arts of Africa, Oceania, and Native America certainly belong. Fascinating constellations can be (and in the distant past also have been) formed of artworks and natural specimens and of the intertwined collecting histories of both. The Task Force urges the university to foster new institutional and spatial adjacencies between museums.

As crucial as the museums are to the training of visual artists, we also have the opportunity, from its inception, to create a center open to the needs of arts other than the strictly visual. We can seize upon the museum’s special ability to act as a social site, a place where people gather to experience, discuss, and debate matters of public interest and importance. This social energy is a key component in any attempt to give the arts a more exciting presence on the campus and in the larger community in which the university participates. We recommend then that Harvard create an interdisciplinary art complex where people from across the university can come together in a center of activity that might include galleries and studios, classrooms and cafes, rehearsal rooms and performance spaces.

In addition to these three large-scale recommendations—an undergraduate program in which art-making plays a far greater role than it does at present, new graduate programs, and a meaningful investment in arts spaces—the Arts Task Force has identified additional actions that are necessary to make the core recommendations possible. The major initiatives will require a serious commitment of institutional time, energy, and imagination, a substantial fund-raising effort, the recruitment and retention of new faculty, and the creation of an effective administrative structure. A detailed description of how the various recommendations might be staged follows, but before segueing into the details, the Task Force would like to highlight several additional recommendations that seem to us particularly important in advancing the arts at Harvard.

First, The Task Force recommends the creation of a university-wide center for creative experimentation—provisionally dubbed the “Hothouse”. Stimulating an innovative, cross-disciplinary dialogue in the arts is critical to achieving the Task Force’s overall goals; therefore, we envision the Hothouse as a raw space that can be easily manipulated to accommodate the needs of the different artistic experiments taking place within, and in which students and faculty can investigate new art forms, experiment with exciting opportunities that extend beyond the traditional academic and artistic disciplines found within the university. Much like a laboratory, the Hothouse would provide faculty, students and invited artists-in-residence with the resources to imagine, innovate, and employ new ideas, forms and technologies.

“STIMULATING AN INNOVATIVE, CROSS-DISCIPLINARY DIALOGUE IN THE ARTS IS CRITICAL TO ACHIEVING THE TASK FORCE’S OVERALL GOALS”

Second, the Task Force recommends that the university appointments structures be reviewed to allow the efficient recruitment and effective retention of top practicing artists. By eliminating unnecessary restrictions, ensuring fair and full reviews of professors of the practice, developing fellowship programs, and increasing studio spaces, among other initiatives, Harvard can make its campus much more hospitable to the practicing senior artist.

Third, the Task Force urges the President and Fellows to put in place an advisory coordinating body that supports the growth of the arts on campus. We recommend the immediate appointment of an advisory cross-school committee to coordinate the range of ambitious changes for which we are calling. This committee will meet regularly to develop long-term programs in the arts, raise awareness of the arts on campus, foster fruitful relations with the general public, and encourage innovation. We also propose that the Office for the Arts, which plays so important a role in facilitating extracurricular arts activities throughout Harvard, be given greater visibility, stature, and support.

MORE BROADLY, WE URGE THE HARVARD COMMUNITY TO TREASURE, SUPPORT, AND SAVOR THE REMARKABLE OUTPOURING OF ARTISTIC CREATIVITY IN ITS MIDST.

Many of our overarching goals can be furthered by actively pursuing collaborative projects with neighboring institutions that share our interest in the cognitive power of art practice. Harvard already has a significant ongoing collaboration with the New England Conservatory of Music, one that might well be expanded. Vital programs, such as the Center for Advanced Visual Studies, the List Visual Arts Center, and the Media Lab at MIT, the Creative Writing Program at Boston University, the Department of Performing Arts at Emerson College, and many others, offer opportunities for the mutually advantageous sharing of ideas, resources, and initiatives. Much of this report has necessarily focused on changes internal to the curriculum, spaces, and programs at Harvard, but the enterprise for which we are calling will truly flourish only if it participates actively and generously in a larger community. Institutions like the A.R.T. and the Harvard museums already function as crucial links to this community, and they can spearhead a much broader and richer interaction between the university and the larger world.

We want to end these preliminary remarks by glancing simultaneously at the local and the global – a curious perspectival feat that certain paintings allow us to do. We must cherish the vital extracurricular scene that we sketched at the beginning. It is critically important that nothing in the changes for which we are calling should diminish that vitality. More broadly, we urge the Harvard community to treasure, support, and savor the remarkable outpouring of artistic creativity in its midst. At the same time, we must affirm and strengthen the university's commitment to the world beyond its boundaries. Fostering the arts at Harvard is a key element in our attempt to develop a more cosmopolitan educational experience and to contribute to a dialogue across the cultures and regions of the world. The success of the World Cultures Forum at the Peabody Museum is but a single, striking example of the intense interest in this dialogue on the campus and in the surrounding community. Everywhere we look, as arts biennials, theater and film festivals, world music performances, and other events attest, artistic movements thrive on cultural translation and transmission, on negotiation and exchange. Contemporary art-making – whether in the fine arts or in texts, in performances or in new technologies – encourages forms of cognitive activity and cultural judgment that lead us to extend our imaginative and intellectual reach beyond familiar frames of reference. The world lies all before us.

[2.]

TASK FORCE
ON THE ARTS


Detail and Potential Staging of Recommendations

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS - VISUAL INDEX


The following chart summarizes the recommendations developed by the Arts Task Force. We have divided these recommendations into two main categories—Presence in the Curriculum and Presence on Campus. The statements shaded in orange on the chart below represent the core recommendations of the Task Force while the statements shaded in blue represent enabling factors that the Task Force believes are needed to make the core recommendations possible.

- Core Recommendations
- Enabling Recommendations

Presence in the Curriculum



Presence on Campus



ENHANCED PRESENCE OF THE ARTS IN THE CURRICULUM

Undergraduate

1. Introduce arts-practice into the General Education curriculum of the College and more broadly into the undergraduate curriculum as a whole.
2. Provide more arts-practice courses in arts departments to improve student access.
3. Strengthen links between affiliated arts institutions, students and faculty.
4. Create an undergraduate concentration in Dramatic Arts.

Graduate

5. Design an innovative and exciting MFA program.
6. Fully fund the MFA degree.

Practicing Artists

7. Put in place appropriate structures to recruit and retain top faculty artists (e.g., review appointment terms for faculty artists).

Undergraduate Curriculum

- 1. Introduce arts-practice into the General Education curriculum of the College and more broadly into the undergraduate curriculum as a whole.**

SHORT TERM

Solicit input from FAS departments, faculty, and relevant committees on opportunities to incorporate arts practice in General Education courses and in the undergraduate curriculum as a whole.

The General Education's "Aesthetic and Interpretive Understanding" category mandates the study of art, but does not expect students to engage in the practice of art. Students should be actively encouraged to engage in arts-practice, and they should be provided the knowledge, materials and incentive to create a valuable educational experience.

Arts practice should not be included solely within the "Aesthetic and Interpretive Understanding" category, but in a wide range of the categories provided within the General Education's Curriculum. Activities such as quantitative reasoning, historical analysis, social analysis, expository writing, and laboratory experiment and observation are today self-evidently part of the general curriculum for undergraduates. So too, the activities of arts-practice, such as filmmaking, creative writing, and dramatic performance should be an accepted, pedagogically well-supported component of the curriculum.

Whatever the discipline and however the arts-practice component ends up being defined as part of the course requirements, whether in General Education or beyond, the critical element in the process is that the arts-practice assignment be treated as seriously as any other learning outcome expected of students in a given course. Class time must be devoted to discussion of how students might approach the assignment and how the assignment is to be evaluated.

The extension of arts-practice to non-arts courses opens many opportunities for rich interdisciplinary experience. For example, for students working in visual science studies, the course “Filming Science” (History of Science 152) combines the intensive analysis of cinematic representations of science with rigorous film-making assignments: every student makes a 10-15 minute documentary film grounded in a laboratory or scientific field station.

Consider creating an Arts Fund which, among other things, might encourage: 1) development of arts-practice courses for the General Education curriculum, or 2) development of arts-practice components that could be included in non-arts courses either in General Education or in the undergraduate curriculum more broadly.

An Arts Fund would encourage innovative curricular development for the arts. It might subsidize the cost of developing new arts courses suitable for inclusion in the General Education curriculum, including costs such as summer stipends for faculty, course relief, support for travel and consultation, or the cost of a visiting artist collaborating on a given course. Proposals and requests for funds would be evaluated by a faculty committee [more on this committee in Recommendation 14].

MEDIUM TERM

Develop pilot courses for General Education and evaluate their success through student enrollments and course assessments from faculty and students.

Fully integrating arts practice into the General Education curriculum will require time. Appropriate procedures governing curricular decision-making in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences will need to be followed. To maintain momentum, the Task Force recommends that a small number of pilot courses be developed to “test” this integration of arts-practice into the undergraduate curriculum. Courses developed as part of this pilot could serve to inform the overall decision making process.

If successful, these initial courses, most likely taught collaboratively, e.g., between scholars in non-arts disciplines and arts practitioners, will generate such high levels of excitement, and be so rewarding, that their very existence will make the case for the incorporation of the arts into the General Education curriculum and more broadly into the non-arts curriculum.

In these courses, art-making would be as seriously integrated throughout the semester as other elements—writing assignments, exams, lab work—would be in any non-arts courses that the university currently offers.

Potential Course Examples in General Education:

- The History of Contemporary Art could be team-taught by a professor of Art History, a Fogg curator, and an artist from the VES faculty, who designs studio labs each week. Students encounter the history and discourse surrounding the work of art in lecture, while also creatively exploring the major concepts and themes of contemporary art through the weekly labs, in which they generate art prompted by specific conceptual and technical instruction.
- Shakespearean Drama might incorporate into its requirements that students write their own scenes, employing the concepts and strategies explored in lectures: the use of blank verse, for example, the strategic adaptation of source material, or the subtle balance of self-revelation and collective action. Students thus not only study the dimensions of Shakespeare’s plays, but experience the challenge and excitement of their genesis.

Potential Course Examples in the broader undergraduate curriculum:

- A course on the History of Architecture could be co-taught by an architect and an architectural historian, who would present their disciplinarily different perspectives on the same buildings. Integrating the practice of architecture into the discourse of the lecture would both train students to be critical and rigorous surveyors of the finished building, while also equipping them with the vocabulary, technique and habits of thought to imagine and execute the decisions, constraints, calculations, and principles involved in the construction of such buildings.
- A course on “commemoration” might be co-taught by a historian, a philosopher, and a sculptor – which would include in its structured and supervised assignments that students propose or fabricate some commemorative object or performance.

Integrate arts resources information into teaching orientation for graduate students.

The dedication, energy, and creativity of Harvard’s teaching fellows constitute some of the university’s greatest strengths; any attempt to alter the intellectual culture on campus—in this case, to increase interdisciplinary thinking and foster the integration of the arts throughout the curriculum—must partner with the graduate students who so directly influence the conduct of coursework at Harvard. Teaching fellows should be given instruction, as part of their teaching training both through the Bok Center and within their individual departments, in the wealth of opportunities available to them for integrating archives (such as those available within and through the Harvard Libraries), objects (such as those found in the Peabody Museum, Harvard Art Museum, or Harvard Museum of Natural History), and artistic experiences (such as a performance at the A.R.T.) into their classes. The list of willing collaborators from all these entities is enormous; there is no shortage of professionals from all these segments of the university who wish to further the teaching mission of their libraries, museums, and theater through contact with sections and classes. It is imperative that the graduate students who shape the quotidian—and thereby crucial—culture of courses be introduced to the availability of resources and personnel for leading conversations across disciplines.

Many of the same considerations extend to the faculty, and not only to those new to the university. Even those who have been teaching for years at Harvard often do not know the full range of resources already available to them, if they wish to incorporate arts-practice into their teaching, and those resources will, if our initiatives are successful, greatly increase. Therefore we hope that the faculty will make use of the academic liaisons housed within the museums and affiliated institutions and that these liaisons will, in turn, facilitate links between course offerings, as well as arts events and resources. The Provost’s Office could work with the Bok Center to develop the arts resources component of the graduate students’ teaching orientation session.

LONG TERM

Implement an arts-practice requirement in the General Education Curriculum.

When a sufficient range of courses with an arts-practice component is in place, every undergraduate can reasonably be required to take one such course.

Allow the arts to serve as a powerful medium for dialogue and collaboration across the university.

By introducing arts-practice into the broader curriculum—and therefore, by definition, introducing a growing number of concentrators in the humanities and sciences to arts-practice—the university will foster discussions across disciplinary boundaries and lead to innovation within the arts and in the home fields of these student-artists.

2. Provide more arts-practice courses in arts departments to improve student access.

SHORT TERM

Conduct a rigorous analysis of application and enrollment data, by course, to identify priority areas where shortage of seats in arts courses is most acute. Where this data is not readily available, begin collecting data on a semester basis.

All arts departments, as part of their annual planning process, collect some level of information on the number of students who apply, are admitted and eventually enroll in any given arts course.

Through conversations with departments, faculty and students, the Task Force understands that admittance to courses in VES, music, and creative writing is highly competitive, meaning that a number of students who desire instruction in the arts must be turned away. However, in the process of gathering arts-related data at the department level, the Task Force identified substantial differences in enrollment details of arts courses, which made it difficult to identify precisely which areas were oversubscribed. Some of the data collected, though, can be generalized in a meaningful way. For example, for the Spring 2007 semester in the department of Visual and Environmental Studies, 337 students applied to one of the 12 introductory level courses, though only 146 students could be admitted to the courses. In another example, dozens of students in the Music Department are turned away from introductory musical skills courses (Music 2 and Music 51). In 2007-2008, 30 students were turned away from Music 2 and 20 students were turned away from Music 51.

The Task Force believes that particular attention should be paid to meeting the unsatisfied demand for arts instruction at the introductory level. The current high demand for introductory skills courses in the arts and the subsequent difficulty that students encounter in enrolling in these courses discourages and often prohibits students (who do not wish to pursue an art discipline as a concentration) from pursuing the study of the arts.

MEDIUM to LONG TERM

Increase number of arts courses at all levels to meet student demand and improve student access to the arts.

Over time, as arts departments evaluate and, as necessary, recalibrate, strengthen and formalize their curricula, it is the hope of the Task Force that arts departments will be able to increase the number of arts courses at all levels. Given the importance that our students rightly place on the arts, it is incumbent on the university to provide them the ability to continue to develop expertise in arts fields in which they have become proficient or to develop capacities which they hitherto did not exercise. Access to excellent, supportive training should be easy and universal—all Harvard students should be able to receive a full and progressive range of instruction, from introductory classes to advanced seminars in a wide range of arts-practices.

The Task Force realizes, of course, that any increase in the number of courses may require more faculty to teach the courses, more space in which to teach the courses, and funds to cover the underlying cost of arts courses. Course materials for many types of arts-practice courses can be quite expensive to fund. Depending on the type of media used, from traditional to emerging media, and the type of “equipment” used—ranging from musical instruments to cameras and film to computer equipment—course materials costs for a class of 12 could range from over \$2,000 to fund a drawing course to over \$30,000 to fund a film production course. Harvard must continue to cover the extra costs of these courses for its students.

Develop courses in architecture in conjunction with the Graduate School of Design

Harvard undergraduates are eager for a more comprehensive set of classes in the practice of architecture. The Department of the History of Art and Architecture is in the process of developing a track that will enable students in the College to study the theory, history and practice of architecture more in depth. In the development of this track, the Task Force encourages the HAA faculty to work in collaboration with the faculty of the Graduate School of Design to design a comprehensive liberal arts course of study that would introduce students to both the theoretical and design elements of the study of architecture.

3. Strengthen links between affiliated arts institutions, students and faculty.

SHORT to MEDIUM TERM

Reach out to the American Repertory Theatre (A.R.T.) in order to allow students to benefit from a stronger relationship with the A.R.T.

The Task Force encourages the Committee on Dramatics, department chairs (especially of, but not limited to, humanities and arts departments), and indeed all faculty who are interested in incorporating the arts in some way into their courses, to reach out to the new artistic director of the A.R.T., who is very interested in strengthening ties with the university and its undergraduates.

The Task Force also urges the A.R.T. to begin thinking about various ways of “opening” up the theater to students. Many of the professional A.R.T. staff already teach courses in the Dramatic Arts secondary concentration. Other ways of strengthening links to the curriculum could include: 1) collaborations on specific projects between students and A.R.T. professional staff; 2) inviting students to A.R.T. rehearsals; 3) working with the College or the Office for the Arts to develop lectures, seminars or events involving outside artists invited by the A.R.T. to Cambridge to perform in various plays.

Strengthen curricular links with museums

The Harvard Art Museum, the Peabody Museum, the Museum of Natural History and other collections—all make significant contributions to the teaching and research mission of the university and engage with students and faculty in various departments. For example, the Peabody Museum allows faculty and students to draw upon its collections to enrich both teaching in the class and research. Similarly, through an intensive strategic planning process, the Harvard Art Museum is striving to achieve a larger role in Harvard’s undergraduate curriculum and educational mission (the renovated Fogg will include three study centers that will provide intimate environments in which students and faculty can have direct access to the museums’ original works of art and artifacts).

The Task Force urges the affiliated arts institutions to analyze their current role in the cognitive life of the university and, where appropriate, devise programs or approaches to deepen existing collaborations. In turn, the Task Force also encourages the university to be responsive to any such proposals that may be put forward by the leadership of the affiliated arts institutions.

4. Create an undergraduate concentration in Dramatic Arts.

SHORT TERM

Ask the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to conduct a comprehensive course offering and course enrollment analysis of the Dramatic Arts curriculum.

Currently, the Committee on Dramatics administers a secondary concentration which includes the study and practice of theater and dance. It requires its participants to complete six courses from its curriculum, at least two of which are focused on practice (e.g., acting, directing, dance, choreography) and at least two of which are focused on critical and scholarly approaches.

A very preliminary analysis of enrollment data shows that demand for courses in the current Dramatic Arts curriculum exceeds the current capacity to teach. In the Fall 2008 semester, of the 12 practice-based courses offered, nine were oversubscribed. Of the approximately 325 students that applied to the courses, only 135 were able to enroll.

Following a comprehensive and rigorous analysis of course offerings and course enrollments, the faculty will be able to determine which content areas may require a larger number of course offerings (given student demand) and will also be able to determine whether there are important content areas that are currently missing from the dramatic arts curriculum and should be added in the medium term.

MEDIUM TERM

Expand the number of courses offered in the Dramatic Arts to meet student demand.

The Task Force believes that Harvard students should have a fully articulated, intellectually rigorous curriculum in the Dramatic Arts and hopes that, over time, this will be possible through support from the deans of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the College, and through collaborations with the A.R.T.

With the construction of the New College Theatre, and with a new leader at the A.R.T. committed to forging stronger connections with students within the Loeb Drama Center, this seems a propitious moment for the dramatic arts to gain a more established place within the Harvard College curriculum. The A.R.T. is a major resource for the innovative and powerful synthesis of theoretical and historical study with practice. Its new artistic director is eager to begin working with the faculty to coordinate course planning with A.R.T. season programming, so the study of dramatic literature and theory could be accompanied by the opportunity to witness the texts functioning as actual theater. A stronger partnership between the College and the A.R.T. will enhance both the students' and the theater's experience.

LONG TERM

Implement a concentration in Dramatic Arts.

Students on our campus are eager for serious, well-conceived training in the Dramatic Arts, and with our resources in faculty, in the existing dance program, and in the A.R.T., Harvard could contribute something exciting to the American theater.

There is a desire among Harvard students to pursue a concentration in the Dramatic Arts. Despite the relative small number of course offerings provided, 45 students have forged their own specialized concentration in the Dramatic Arts since 1984.

Harvard's Dramatic Arts curriculum should require courses in theater history, literature, criticism and theory as well as practical courses in acting, directing, playwriting, and design. The concentration should integrate the scholarly perspective of the field with a serious practical training. Harvard should build on its strengths in dramatic literature in many languages and traditions, as well as the strengths of the play and screen writing courses within the English Department's Creative Writing Program. Given our international perspectives on campus, there is an exciting possibility to stage plays in foreign languages using the original text, and the theater's inherently interdisciplinary character will enable meaningful links to many other concentrations.

The most appropriate model, it seems to us, is likely to be History and Literature, that is, a free-standing concentration that draws upon the faculty and the curricular strengths of the relevant existing departments. Obviously, a great deal of thought and care will have to go into the design of the curriculum in order to ensure a proper balance of academic study and training in skills. The FAS will have to decide on the range of those skills, on the infrastructural resources required, and on the possible inclusion of a dance program within the larger concentration. We do not, as we have said, envision a course of study suitable for a conservatory; the concentration will be part of a liberal arts education. But, as with many disciplines in the language arts or in the sciences, the acquisition of certain advanced skills will be crucial to the successful immersion in Dramatic Arts.

Graduate Programs

5. and 6. Design an innovative and exciting MFA program that is fully funded.

SHORT TERM

Form a faculty committee to solicit input from Harvard faculty and students, as well as from external experts, on how best to integrate graduate training in arts-practice into the existing curricular structure of our university.

Though Harvard offers undergraduate courses in the practice of the studio arts, filmmaking, creative writing, and the performing arts, there are no parallel graduate structures in place. The Department of Visual and Environmental Studies was, until this year, the only department within FAS that did not have a graduate program. The newly established Ph.D. program in Film Studies, while a welcome development, is a degree based in scholarship of film, rather than the practice of filmmaking, and it is administered not by VES but the separate Standing Committee on Higher Degrees in Film and Visual Studies. The American Repertory Theatre does offer its students the opportunity to pursue an MFA (through the Institute for Advanced Theatre Training), though the MFA is not awarded by Harvard but instead by the Moscow Art Theatre School. In research conducted by the Task Force of other major research universities that included among others, Yale, Stanford, Columbia, MIT, and the University of Chicago, Harvard was the only institution of its peers that did not offer any MFA programs.

The new faculty committee should include both Harvard faculty and external participants who are experts on the subject of MFA programs.

MEDIUM TERM

Begin to design an innovative and exciting MFA program.

The committee mentioned above should develop a detailed proposal that outlines the objectives of the program, the proposed areas of discipline and the organization of the MFA program. The committee would then submit a formal proposal to the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The usual protocol for such matters would be followed within the FAS to discuss and vet the proposal.

It is worth keeping in mind that in relation to many of its peer institutions, Harvard will be embarking very belatedly on the offering of graduate programs in arts practice. We should turn this belatedness from a disadvantage to an advantage. We need to think creatively about the design of our programs so that they are both distinctive and worthy of the high overall quality of our university. The Task Force has discussed at length two particular features that Harvard might bring to the MFA.

First, we should make it possible for graduate students in the arts to take advantage of our remarkable strengths across a broad range of disciplines and schools. The Business School, the Medical School, the Divinity School, the Law School and others all offer invaluable resources for artists, as do the whole range of academic fields in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The GSD provides a natural home for student artists of all media forms to establish powerful connections within an

academic community focused on areas of creativity and studio based design. We need to think of innovative ways in which artists in the graduate programs here can have access to these resources and in turn bring their own special gifts to bear upon the encounter.

Artists should be encouraged to work across and among the areas of study found on Harvard's campus. Certainly, each artistic discipline should have the autonomy to develop its faculty, curriculum, and admissions process in a way that most suits that discipline. With a strong foundation of disciplinary capacity, vision, and skill, along with encouragement to cross disciplinary boundaries, such as physical adjacencies or team-taught seminars, the very presence of these artists in the midst of each other's production will encourage collaboration and a stimulated thinking.

Second, we should make it possible for individual arts disciplines—painting, three-dimensional art, film, digital art, dramatic arts, musical arts, and so forth—to interact with each other in original and creative ways. Each of these disciplines, of course, has its own particular set of skills, which must be taught at the highest level of distinction. But if we are to facilitate the creation of radically new works of art, we must foster interdisciplinary connections. Hence Harvard MFA programs, for example, could conjoin traditional workshop training in individual arts practices with innovative multi-disciplinary seminars. We do not envisage that all of the disciplines will participate in these seminars: certain arts practices may, for various reasons, decide that work across disciplinary boundaries would only be a distraction, and it would be unwise to insist that they participate against their will. But we anticipate that most of the distinct fields in the Harvard MFA program will welcome the opportunity to design productive links, and, as described below, we urge the creation of spaces that would foster these links.

Harvard should play a significant role in shaping the global arts of the future, just as it currently plays a significant role in shaping the future of other modes of human inquiry. The creative imagination—with its singular capacities for vision and unique uses of deep memory and deep futurity, its radically free time-frames and perspectives—will not only work alongside science but might in the best sense collaborate with other fields to enable the emergence of a radically new perspective on global issues.

A new MFA program at Harvard would distinguish itself by supporting opportunities to interact and work collaboratively with students and faculty in other disciplines, and also by providing a rigorous discipline-specific study of art. The Task Force hopes that the Harvard MFA will rethink how a graduate program for the arts could be structured to provide the ultimate flexibility for students to capitalize upon the intellectual wealth of the university and work collaboratively. The program should recognize that there are many ways in which artists can and will be stimulated, and should encourage them to find that source of inspiration, whether it be within or beyond their artistic discipline.

LONG TERM

Award the MFA degree.

The MFA degree is seen as the terminal degree in the practice of many artistic disciplines. If Harvard is to elevate the practice of arts on our campus, there must be a commitment to educate high level artists on our campus.

The Task Force discussed three general areas in which MFA programs could develop—Creative Writing, Visual Arts, and Performing Arts. There are already existing programs that could be expanded upon to develop first-rate graduate programs in arts practice. VES, The English Department's Creative Writing Program, the GSD, the Music Department, and the A.R.T. Institute all have faculty and facilities that would be integral and important to creating graduate programs in arts practice.

The MFA program need not be large to be successful. It does, however, require a critical mass of artists on campus, depending on what the disciplines represented in the program might be.

Fully fund the MFA degree.

For the Harvard program to be competitive with the most sought after programs in the country, its students must have the tuition expenses fully funded. The program's success will be based on its ability to attract the very best students, and to attract those students we must compete against the strongest programs, all of which already offer considerable or complete reductions on the tuition price through fellowships, research positions and teaching assistantships. The career path of an artist is not one that is either secure or often lucrative. If our program can eliminate or at least reduce a future financial burden on our students, it can enhance their ability to pursue a more adventurous and risk-taking vision for their work upon graduation.

In exchange for this support and as part of their training, graduate students in the MFA programs should be expected to serve as teaching and research fellows. We also anticipate that the faculty of the MFA programs—who should be major artists in their particular fields—will bring their creative gift to bear on our undergraduate curriculum, whether by offering innovative courses or giving guest lectures/ demonstrations.

Practicing Artists

7. Put in place appropriate structures to recruit and retain top faculty artists

SHORT TERM

Increase the presence of faculty artists on campus.

Harvard must ensure that its community is exposed to the most creative minds of its generation. We already are host to many incredibly talented faculty and students, as well as many distinguished visitors brought to campus by the departments, affiliated institutions, and the OFA. Complementing visiting faculty appointments and the Radcliffe Arts Fellows, visits from practicing artists are often of a short duration on our campus—a lecture, a series of workshops, or in rare instances a multi-day residency. Often these visitors are here for such a brief period that many interested members of our community are not even aware that the visit occurred.

The vitality of the campus will be enhanced through more sustained visits from more artists. By creating a regularized program for visiting artists, we will be able to provide a more elevated platform for their creative work to be seen by more members of our community. It will also provide more opportunities for meaningful and sustained interactions for students and faculty within the artist's discipline. A more coordinated program for visiting artists will significantly increase the occasions for university-wide collaboration and for the arts to take a prominent place in the cognitive life of the university.

Broaden the charge of the current FAS committee reviewing non-ladder appointments to include consideration of the Arts Task Force's recommendations with respect to appointments policies for practicing artists.

In consultation with the Office for Faculty Development and Diversity, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences should assess the changes that may need to be made in appointment categories, titles, and terms to support the appointment of excellent teaching practitioners. Where necessary, the FAS should be prepared to consider adjustments to specific restrictions on usage of titles, appointment time and duration, access to leave, conditions for renewal, and other prerogatives granted to practitioners.

The FAS should also be prepared to review its current policies and practices to ensure that there is a sufficient allocation of resources (e.g., work space, housing, administrative support, etc.) to non-tenure-line and visiting arts faculty who are unaffiliated with another academic institution or who maintain off-campus performance or exhibition careers.

MEDIUM TERM

Determine (and implement over time) an appropriate mix of arts faculty lines.

The FAS and other schools likely to make additional arts appointments should determine the appropriate ratios of tenure-track lines, professors of the practice, visiting artists, and joint appointments according to the varying needs of different arts practices. Maximum flexibility should be used in setting and adjusting such ratios, possibly leading to less reliance on or even the discontinuation of certain types of appointments that are not optimally serving the curricular needs of art units. Joint appointments should be judiciously considered given workload and coordination issues and the added complexity of evaluation according to varying standards.

Remove unnecessary restrictions on visiting appointments.

Where applicable, unnecessary or inadvertent restrictions on visiting appointments should be removed (e.g., most visiting practitioners teach no more than one course, but even this part-time teaching schedule counts against the maximum of three years – over a ten year period of time – in the same way that a full-time teaching schedule would). In addition, more attractive incentives for visiting artists to come to Harvard should be offered (e.g., assistance with housing, access to studios, coordinated sponsorship by more than one arts unit). Consideration should be given to how best to involve visiting artists in curricular programs.

Convert part-time practice appointments to full-time, where appropriate.

The FAS should be prepared to consider the conversion of part-time practice appointments in the arts to full-time practice appointments (where the desire on the part of the artists to hold full-time positions also exists), and to modify the terms of practice appointments accordingly. As is the case for full-time professors of the practice in other curricular areas, full-time arts practitioners should be eligible for regular leave and other perquisites accorded to senior faculty (e.g., should have voting rights within their respective departments).

Convert lectureships in arts-making fields to professors of the practice where appropriate and ensure that all professors of the practice are appropriately reviewed.

Reviews of professors of the practice will be full and fair, including substantive outside letters, evaluation of research/artistic production, teaching, and university service.

Develop programs for fellows in the arts

The university should consider how best to host arts fellows who are relatively early in their professional careers and who would come to Harvard to pursue independent as well as collaborative projects with other fellows, with Harvard faculty, and with students. The fellowship program should be structured in such a way as to require appropriate engagement with the university community and to permit pedagogical opportunities. An expanded program for these early career teaching fellows in the arts should be complementary to the existing program for arts fellows at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.

LONG TERM

Add standing and visiting faculty lines, as appropriate

Individual schools should be prepared to add standing and visiting faculty lines, as needed, in response to new curricular needs, to existing and future student demand for certain courses, and to any programmatic initiatives that are launched as a result of the Arts Task Force's recommendations (e.g., an MFA program).

ENHANCED PRESENCE OF THE ARTS ON CAMPUS

<p><i>Programs and Initiatives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Create a Hothouse to encourage arts-related collaborative projects. 9. Enrich the campus experience by developing a public art program. 10. Develop an integrated communications strategy on campus for the arts. 11. Reduce costs for students to participate in the arts. <p><i>Space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Invest in physical spaces dedicated to the arts. 13. Consider opportunities in Allston while continuing to invest in Cambridge. <p><i>Structural Elements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Establish a cross-school advisory committee for the arts 15. Enhance the position of the Office for the Arts at the university
--

Programs and Initiatives

8. Create a Hothouse to encourage arts-related collaborative projects.

SHORT TERM

Establish a mechanism to award grants for collaborative proposals involving faculty and students.

The ultimate aspiration of the concept of a “Hothouse” for the arts at Harvard is a physical space where unusual and exciting projects can blossom in a university setting, unencumbered by administrative boundaries and divisions across schools and disciplines. The Hothouse will be a programmatic and physical home in which faculty, students and artists can work together and separately on arts-related collaborations. The experience should facilitate successful and meaningful translations across arts disciplines or between the arts and non-arts disciplines.

A residency within the Hothouse will depend on the interests of those involved. Faculty and students who wish to work on a proposal within the Hothouse will submit a proposal for review. A successful proposal will give applying faculty members and students the opportunity to pursue for one semester a project of their choosing, with invited faculty, artist, and/or student collaborators.

Incentives to apply for places in the Hothouse are many. Faculty could receive a reprieve from their usual administrative responsibilities, as well as the opportunity to invite colleagues from outside their ordinary circles of disciplinary peers to join them in the development of these projects. Students would have a collaborative and dynamic opportunity to conduct experimental research.

In the short term, the Hothouse will be a virtual rather than physical concept. Faculty and students interested in collaborative projects involving the arts will be able to apply for grants to fund or subsidize these collaborations, but will need to find existing spaces on campus in which to conduct the collaborations.

The Arts Fund (mentioned in the previous section of the report – “Presence in the Curriculum”) should accept proposals for collaborative projects involving the arts. The proposals should be reviewed by a cross-school advisory committee in the arts (described in more detail under Recommendation 14 below). Criteria for selection will need to be developed by the cross-school committee.

MEDIUM to LONG TERM

Investigate potential raw spaces to house the program.

Though the concept of the Hothouse may be launched before the construction of its physical site, the creation of an actual space or building will be important for its long-term success. It should be a minimally defined space that can be easily manipulated to accommodate a changing array of inhabitants. As is suggested below, the proximities to the Hothouse are important: ideally, the Hothouse should be stationed near the offices of diverse disciplines and at least one major venue for the arts (one of Harvard’s museums, for example, or the home of the MFA program). The Hothouse building should include offices for participating faculty, as well as studio, performance, and exhibition spaces. The Hothouse might include a shared infrastructure of wood shop, machine shop, fume hood, projection screen, rehearsal space, film editing equipment, etc.

Put in place a basic administrative structure to manage the program and the space.

The administrative structure and the relationship of the Hothouse to the other arts units and individual schools at Harvard all remain to be determined.

As the sciences have shown us, bringing a collection of scholars at all levels and giving them an opportunity to interact with, collaborate with, and learn from each other can facilitate the conception and development of remarkable ideas. The end purpose of such projects could be the production of a course to be taught by involved faculty, or the production of a performance, exhibit, presentation, installation, or event. These final outcomes will ensure that the scope of these projects reaches a broad audience both within and outside the university.

9. Enrich the campus experience by developing a public art program.

SHORT TERM

Consider buildings, space and landscapes as art pieces in and of themselves and build this into the university’s design guidelines.

The term “Public Art” need not mean only large-scale, municipal works – though these are obviously important. Public art can also incorporate installations, performances, architectural innovations, design features: everything in short that makes art visible, available, and exciting in the spaces in which we live and work.

There is no consistent policy across Harvard’s schools for commissioning architects to design new facilities and to rehabilitate existing ones. The Task Force recommends that the university adopt a more coordinated, transparent and inclusive process for the selection of designs that reflect contemporary aspirations.

The buildings, spaces, and landscapes of the campus should be considered as art pieces in and of themselves. The university should work to imbue our campus with an aesthetic value in addition

to its historic value. Many of our campus's landmark buildings such as Charles Bulfinch's University Hall and H. H. Richardson's Sever Hall, both designed by graduates of Harvard College, were influential buildings of the nineteenth century. The Carpenter Center is Le Corbusier's only North American building. In recent years, however, we have hesitated to choose adventurous or innovative design for our campus buildings.

In addition, the university's commitment to the arts may be made more publicly transparent by re-evaluating its approach to the acquisition and display of public and outdoor art, as well as its approach to the selection of architects for major building renovations or new building construction. The Harvard campus is not only a major tourist destination but a center for community events in the Cambridge area; the overhaul of the university's engagement with public art and buildings would provide a new, visible identity for art on the campus.

MEDIUM TERM

Search for and appoint a curator of public art.

To heighten the presence of the arts on the Harvard campus, the Task Force recommends the creation of a new position, Curator of Public Art. The Curator of Public Art would be responsible for enhancing visual culture on the Harvard campus. Versatile in the public exhibition of all forms of art, while also knowledgeable about the special preservation-requirements of certain works, the Curator would work to enhance the daily experience of art in our walks through the Yard, dorms, classrooms, offices, and even dining halls. The Curator position would likely reside in the Harvard Art Museum.

Energize the role of the arts on campus through the "Common Spaces" program.

The current public spaces on campus are poorly equipped to support arts events and lackluster to serve as social spaces. Revitalized and rethought community spaces on campus would help to energize the role of the arts on campus.

LONG TERM

Develop a successful public arts program.

The goal is to develop a campus suffused with art and to take much fuller advantage both of the astonishing collections of the museums and the excellent work produced by Harvard's students.

10. Develop an integrated communications strategy on campus for the arts

SHORT TERM

Designate a point person within the Harvard News Office who would be responsible for covering the arts.

This person would work closely with public information officers in the schools, and would reach out to faculty in the schools (either in arts departments or involved in courses and projects in the arts or combining the arts with another discipline) and to administrators in the affiliated arts institutions (such as the museums and the American Repertory Theatre). The end result should be a more strategic, comprehensive coverage of the arts on campus.

MEDIUM to LONG TERM

Develop an online arts portal for all academic and extracurricular activities in the arts on campus.

The current university website for the arts contains limited information and an abbreviated sample of arts organizations and events. Moreover, it does not provide a comprehensive overview of the academic programs in the arts. An outside visitor to the university website for the arts could easily assume that the arts at Harvard exist strictly in the extracurricular domain and do not have a place in the undergraduate or graduate curriculum. And even in the case of extracurricular activities and various arts events and exhibitions, the website does not provide a comprehensive view of what is going on in the arts scene at Harvard. Many of the arts organizations and departments on campus are often not aware of each other's activities, and visitors to our campus often have a hard time locating what arts events are happening.

An online arts portal would be a critical piece to an integrated communications strategy for the arts in that it would serve the entire university and provide an entry point to both the academic and non-academic dimensions of the arts on campus. Having a website for the arts would give the university a highly visible place to tell the history of the arts at Harvard to the campus community, prospective students, and the public. What is needed here is not merely a reconfiguration of the existing websites or a supplement that will further complicate an already confusing environment: the Task Force envisages a bold and exciting new interface that will provide clear and timely information on the arts, both from a curricular and extracurricular perspective.

The Provost's Office can take the lead in implementing this effort by organizing a group comprised of faculty, students and key administrators to serve as the "client" to the web services vendor and to agree on site design and content. Based on the Task Force's preliminary discussions, the arts portal might:

- Provide links to the web presence of academic and extracurricular programs in the arts
- Be a repository of information on arts-related events and facilities at Harvard
- Feature various artists (e.g., projects undertaken or classes taught by practicing Harvard faculty members; or feature stories on visiting artists)
- Provide a way to access archived work (past visitors, performers)
- Finally, the website might also provide a centralized directory of available spaces that can be reserved for art practice and performance.

11.Reduce costs for students to participate in the arts.

SHORT TERM

Encourage the College to determine whether there is sufficient student interest in reducing or eliminating costs for students to participate in arts events.

Many arts performances on campus can cost a significant amount of money on a student budget. Given how active Harvard students are on our busy campus, a \$12 ticket price is not sustainable if one wants to attend several concerts and performances a weekend, and it can be prohibitive if there are other, less expensive options available. If arts are to become a larger part of our students' lives, access to those arts must be easy and affordable.

Student groups are often obligated to charge higher ticket prices than they otherwise would because they need to cover rental fees for the performance space and all associated costs, including security. Many activities are free of charge to students—visiting lectures, athletic events, etc. We feel strongly that our arts events should be, if not free, at least made affordable to our students, both those attending and staging these events. Waiving some space, security, and other associated fees for student groups may be one way to reduce the cost of these tickets. Though this will not necessarily mean that there will be a dramatic shift in arts performance attendance, it will allow students to attend arts events without feeling a significant financial burden, and it will allow student groups the opportunity to be less worried about making back the costs of performing high quality art.

The Task Force encourages the College to review this issue and if appropriate, develop a policy on ticket prices for arts events on our campus and at partner institutions with a view toward offering tickets either free of charge or at greatly reduced prices to all Harvard students.

MEDIUM TERM

Depending on outcome of review (above), put in place a policy on ticket prices or consider alternative programs/ideas to assist students interested in attending arts performances.

One possible program rather than policy approach would be to put in place an arts event voucher program to encourage students to attend arts events on campus and in the Boston area by removing the financial burden associated with such attendance. The Task Force urges consideration of a ticket program, which would provide each student at the start of the academic term with a set number of ticket vouchers. Each voucher could be redeemed throughout the year for a ticket at campus arts events or events hosted by partner institutions in the Boston area. The sponsoring organization could then invoice the university for the cost of the redeemed tickets for each event, thus encouraging student attendance at arts events while also protecting student and partner groups from added financial strain.

Space-related Recommendations

12. Invest in physical spaces dedicated to the arts

SHORT TERM

In current and upcoming building projects, ensure that the arts are “at the table.”

The university can provide students with additional arts spaces in part by ensuring that every building project (either renewal of a building or a new building) on campus includes the creation of such spaces. Additionally, careful physical proximities among new and old constructions can foster conversations among the members of the university community stationed within or passing through them. Surrounding students with spaces available for and suited to art making and art showing can help the arts become not just more visible, but also more understood as constituting a viable and serious system of thought and research.

Include the arts in undergraduate house renewal planning.

One of the major renewal projects for which planning is underway is the undergraduate House renewal plan. The Task Force believes that any plan to renovate Harvard’s houses should consider increasing dedicated spaces for arts activities. The Task Force hopes that the House planning committees will examine the value and feasibility of such an increase. The Task Force encourages the planning committees to consider whether creating additional dedicated arts spaces for a “neighborhood” of houses, so to speak, might be feasible. In addition to building and developing these spaces, it will also be important to ensure that they are maintained appropriately and are accessible to all students. Beyond the houses, we hope that there will be additional practice and production spaces that can be provided for students, ideally in locations which encourage interaction among practitioners of different art forms.

Include arts space needs (space for curricular programs, affiliated institutions, practicing artists, extracurricular initiatives) under a coordinated approach to arts planning.

Create an “inventory” of current and future planning projects that involve the arts. To be sure, Harvard already has a wide array of exhibition, studio, and performance spaces in the “arts corridor” that extends from Paine Hall and the Sackler Museum, down Quincy Street, with the Fogg and Busch Reisinger museums and the Carpenter Center. But a simple adjustment or expansion of these facilities will most likely not meet the needs identified by the Arts Task Force. Some examples which should be included in the larger arts space inventory include:

- Certain arts-practice courses (or arts-practice components in non-arts courses) have more intensive space demands than others. For example, visual arts students need access to studio space; dramatic arts students need access to rehearsal and performance spaces; dance students need spaces equipped with mirrors and special floors; musicians need access to music practice rooms.
- Though many arts spaces on campus, such as the Quad Dance Studio, and the New College Theatre are beautiful, there are many spaces that are insufficient or decrepit. Rooms that are dedicated as dance spaces often do not have sprung floors.
- The Carpenter Center is barely adequate for the studio art component of the VES concentration, let alone for expanded undergraduate art-making and for new MFA programs. Students who are not enrolled in studio arts courses are not given a studio.

- The Music Department recently completed a space planning analysis and identified a number of issues including: 1) shortage of practice rooms (which are open only for limited hours) in the Music Building; 2) shortage of instrument storage; and 3) music rehearsal spaces are not soundproofed.
- Even with the extensive renovations of the Harvard Art Museum, there will still not be adequate space for the display of modern and contemporary art at 32 Quincy Street.
- The Peabody Museum and the Museum of Natural History are both housed in facilities that restrict their institutional mission.
- The Loeb Theater is in need of structural and technical renovations.

Any expansion of course offerings or enrollment (discussed in the previous section “Presence of the Arts in the Curriculum”) will place additional pressure on spaces that are already tightly scheduled and occupied. Any increase in the number of faculty to accommodate larger teaching demands will also increase demand for space. Any increase in the number of practicing visual artists (visiting or permanent) will increase demand for studio space.

Prioritize the needs in view of financial constraints. Space implications need to be considered carefully when making decisions related to curriculum and teaching. Just as we construct laboratories for new scientific experiments, we must equally understand the need for work spaces for artists and art objects.

Current space needs as well as future space needs (implied by any changes to the curriculum) need to be carefully inventoried and prioritized. The Task Force believes that a cross-school advisory committee, described in Recommendation 14, can assist the president and the university in this effort.

MEDIUM TERM

Integrate ongoing museum planning efforts

Through extensive consultative processes and comparisons with peer institutions, the Harvard Art Museum, the Peabody Museum, and the Museum of Natural History have recently undergone strategic planning processes. By examining their missions, outlining their visions in the context of the cognitive and cultural life of the university, and providing detailed analyses of the physical spaces and resources, the museums now understand what will be needed to be vital in a 21st century global society. The museums have an extraordinary opportunity to educate and engage the Harvard student and community by combining the museums’ extraordinary collections with ground-breaking faculty, curatorial and student research.

Together with faculty, it is important that the leaders of all the museums of Harvard University embark upon a serious dialogue about the role of the university museum at Harvard. In these conversations it will be important to consider the collection and thoughtful presentation of contemporary arts and world culture . By exploring opportunities to strengthen links between the collections and the academic life of the university and studying the museums’ potential for communicating Harvard’s research to the public, Harvard’s museums can exemplify the university’s tri-partite role of education, research and service.

Investigate opportunities to secure studio and/or housing space for practicing faculty artists in proximity to campus.

For many part-time faculty in the arts, standing or visiting, the cost of securing a studio, unless one is provided free of charge by the department, can be prohibitive given compensation levels. This may lead to situations where the artist either sacrifices the opportunity to create works of art while on the Harvard campus, or spends a disproportionate amount of his/her income on studio space. FAS as a school, or at least individual departments, should consider whether there is a strong argument to be made for either subsidizing rent for studio space or providing it rent free. During our interviews, we heard many analogies to scientists, economists, historians, writers, etc. Just as scientists have labs for conducting experiments, and just as economists, writers and other scholars have offices for conducting research, so should artists have access to the performance, practice, and studio spaces which are vital to their work.

A key element in attracting faculty who are also practitioners to campus, besides ensuring that appointments terms are sufficiently flexible, is providing access to studio spaces and housing options. For many visual artists, securing studio space is critical: it provides artists with the ability to continue their own work in a studio setting while on campus, and it provides spaces where artists can potentially teach and interact with their students.

There should be a focused effort (e.g., by the Harvard Real Estate Services office working in collaboration with key administrators in the faculties) to determine whether there are any spaces in the Cambridge area that would be suitable for studios and rehearsal spaces which could be leased by the university and then “rented out” to either departments or individual faculty members hired by the departments.

Finding short-term and “off-cycle” housing in the greater Boston area (situations where leases are shorter than one year or where start dates do not coincide with the real estate market’s July-to-June fiscal year) can be a real roadblock to recruiting visiting artists and can turn into a significant administrative burden for any single department that is trying to recruit a visitor to campus.

The Task Force recommends that efforts be launched to investigate whether any arrangements could be made with the FAS to set aside some housing spaces for faculty-artists in either the undergraduate houses or in graduate student housing. (This is not a new idea; there are already faculty and tutors residing in houses.) Having artists be part of the residential fabric of students’ lives would create natural opportunities for students and artists to interact with one another outside the classroom and would greatly enrich the experience of students and artists alike.

If none of these options is viable, the university should also consider the feasibility of leasing some number of housing units in the open housing market, and renting them out to visiting faculty. This option would not be limited to artists. The stock of housing units held by the university would be open to visiting faculty across all disciplines, with allocation criteria (including any preferential treatment for artists, for example), to be determined.

Finally, the development of the Allston part of Harvard’s campus also offers an opportunity to include studio space and housing for artists; such deliberations ought to be considered in the current planning efforts.

13. Consider opportunities in Allston while continuing to invest in Cambridge.

LONG TERM

Consider opportunities to build innovative spaces for the arts in Allston.

Allston presents a unique opportunity to expand the presence of the arts on campus and create new spaces that enable collaboration across and beyond arts disciplines. As the campus continues to expand, we must not see the distance across the river as preventing new adjacencies on campus, but rather as an opportunity to more fully integrate the life of the campus with the arts. As science cannot be contained simply to the North Yard, instead finding opportunities for collaboration between Cambridge, Allston, and Longwood, so too should the arts explore the realm of possibilities on campus to establish an integrated physical presence and also have room to grow.

The university can use this new space to think creatively about opportunities for cross-disciplinary conversations. Creating a cluster of dedicated arts buildings in Allston will allow the arts to integrate the campus and will provide members of our community with spaces appropriate for and suited to art-making, display, and performance. New spaces constructed for and dedicated to the arts should have a vibrant social energy and allow people the opportunity to experience, to consider, and to discuss matters of public interest and importance.

The Task Force has envisioned spaces for the arts in Allston that will provide venues for art-making, display, and performance, spaces which may incorporate museums (including contemporary arts galleries), classrooms, student galleries, performance spaces, a theater for film and video screenings, studio spaces, rehearsal spaces, and practice spaces, in addition to commercial venues (such as a café and bookstore) which will help to drive traffic through this hub. All these components are geared to making the arts in Allston a dynamic, social location which invites and spurs discussion. To this end, programming in these spaces should be strong and deep, with the arts facilities here described in use for as many hours in the day as possible. If the campus is to be suffused by the arts, then its hub must be a destination—and origin—for arts making, display, and performance—throughout the day and night.

Develop a careful strategy for decisions pertaining to the placement of each arts facility on campus.

The Task Force has also found that the physical adjacencies of buildings can inhibit or facilitate meaningful collaborations between the parties associated with each structure. Though the placement of one discipline's offices near the studios of another is no guarantee of generative or creative dialogue, such adjacencies can be important ways of opening avenues of communication and collaboration. The placement of arts facilities must, therefore, take into account the structures surrounding such facilities. Items like the Hothouse may operate best when placed near artists' studios and scientific laboratories, whereas new black box theaters may thrive near humanities or language departments. A careful strategy ought to be crafted for decisions pertaining to the placement of each arts facility on campus.

Certain of the MFA programs—Creative Writing, preeminently—could be created with the existing campus facilities, but others will require new, purpose-built studios, laboratories, and performance spaces. Ultimately, most of the MFA programs should be located together in a vital, architecturally innovative new center. The MFA students will benefit greatly from physical adjacencies in workspaces. Proximity provides the potential to give rise to natural, collaborative interests between students who are profoundly influenced by the exposure to varied creative and intellectual processes.

We must, however, be careful not to isolate arts-practice in a single site. These graduate students must interact with undergraduates, as well as with other graduate students and faculty in disparate disciplines. The entire Harvard campus, containing both Cambridge and Allston, must provide exciting opportunities to create new and improved spaces for the arts, ranging from art practice spaces to residential artist communities.

Structural Elements Needed to Support Other Recommendations

14. Establish a cross-school advisory committee for the arts

SHORT TERM

Establish a cross-school advisory committee for the arts

The Task Force recommends the immediate establishment of the Harvard University Committee on the Arts (HUCA). The committee should not be prohibitively large—it must be nimble enough to advance a decision making processes. Rotating membership on the committee should include arts faculty and key staff, and at a minimum representation from the Faculty of Arts and Science, the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, and the Graduate School of Design. The HUCA would work at the university level on issues related to collaborative interdisciplinary and interschool art. The functions of HUCA might include:

- Developing long-term programs in the arts, including theater, museums, visual arts, music, and educational programs (e.g., the MFA).
- Bolstering support for those structures that would produce the shorter-term arts events so necessary for the university’s cultural life.
- Advocacy for the arts on campus;
- Coordinating artist visits across departments and schools;
- Ensuring a diversity and balance of artistic genres and cultural representation;
- Generating ideas about potential visiting artists in collaboration with faculty;
- Encouraging interdisciplinary and inter-school collaborations and initiatives;
- Representing the arts in current and future physical planning processes and fundraising campaigns;
- Reviewing arts proposals and advising on funding disbursements
- Coordinating communication around arts programs and events;
- Assisting with implementation of Arts Task Force recommendations;
- Nurturing university relations with the outside arts world (at local, national and international levels);
- Reviewing proposals to work in the Hothouse.

HUCA might also create standing “subcommittees” or groups dedicated to overseeing the implementation of a specific area of Task Force recommendations. In its initial phase, the committee would be chaired by a committee faculty member, appointed by the president for a term of three to five years.

15. Enhance the position of the Office for the Arts at the university

SHORT TERM

Engage the Office for the Arts (OFA) in a strategic planning process.

The OFA offers a platform for connecting art making and performance to the classroom, both within FAS and in the university as a whole. Its instructional programs serve a large constituency.

The OFA dance program, for instance, engages 800 students from across all of the schools. Its artist residency programs—Learning From Performers, the Jazz Master Residency, and Public Art Program—bring creative leaders to campus to work not only with undergraduates, but with students and faculty from Harvard’s other schools. Several of its spheres of activity—most notably, the eleven affiliated choruses and orchestras—extend well beyond the boundary of the university to reach the Greater Boston community as a whole. The OFA’s range of services, its many collaborations, and its public profile give it a vital role in any attempt to heighten the presence of arts-practice at Harvard and to foster interdisciplinary and inter-school initiatives. For more details about the mission and activities of the OFA, please see Appendix 5.

The Task Force strongly recommends that the OFA Director actively participate on HUCA.

The Task Force also strongly recommends that the OFA undertake a strategic planning process to assess the Office’s functions and organizational placement within the university and to consider a possible expansion of its mission, programs, and resources—in view of the role the OFA will play in the implementation of the Task Force’s various recommendations.

MEDIUM TERM

Align the reporting structure of the OFA with the role and functions of the Office.

At present, the OFA reports to the Associate Dean of Student Life in the College and plays an important role in connecting faculty, students and staff (primarily from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences) with local, national, and international artists, and also in connecting extracurricular activities and performances to curricular efforts. Though much of OFA’s work focuses on undergraduates, it is a platform that could be leveraged across a much broader population – in schools other than FAS and in stand-alone arts units.

The Task Force urges that the current reporting structure of the OFA be examined in the context of the strategic plan and, if appropriate, that the OFA be given higher visibility and stature at the university.

[3.]

TASK FORCE
ON THE ARTS

Areas of Debate and Additional Considerations

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

Dramatic Arts Concentration Development. The Task Force is aware that views on this subject are divided in the College. Alongside students and faculty who strongly support a concentration in Dramatic Arts are those who fear that creating this concentration might disrupt the health and vigor of current undergraduate extracurricular activities on campus, through concentrators gaining a structural priority in accessing already crowded courses, theatre and rehearsal spaces, and production resources. Also, students fear they might lose the freedom that they have in selecting plays, organizing their production teams, and deciding their castings.

The Task Force acknowledges these concerns. But we believe that, if appropriate measures are put in place, the concerns can be addressed and managed. If—as students pursuing music, dance, theater, and other arts practices attest—facilities are overstretched, in the houses and in the university as a whole, Harvard can move to rectify the problem by making fundraising for new and upgraded facilities a high priority. The concentrators who would enroll in many of Dramatic Arts classes are the students who already dominate course enrollments and the allocation process for space and resources. Also, by creating opportunities to work with faculty, the concentration can only expand and enhance students' art practice. Students should have the opportunity to do what they do in the arts for credit, or to have access to courses in parallel to their extracurricular projects (e.g., courses that can give them a deeper understanding of techniques that they use in extracurricular projects). Changes to the current arrangements should not be detrimental to the vital Harvard dramatic arts scene, but instead enhance and further support the activities of students passionately dedicated to the theater.

The Task Force also discussed in its curricular conversations what role dance might play within the Dramatic Arts concentration. A limited number of liberal arts courses on dance, taught by a vital and dedicated staff, are currently offered by the Committee on Dramatics within FAS. Given the level of interest within the undergraduate community for this art form, a significant place for dance history, theory, and practice should be considered when developing the curriculum for a new concentration.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

The Task Force hopes that any future committee that is constituted to develop a detailed proposal for an MFA program at Harvard can benefit from the many discussions that the Task Force had about graduate programs. The Task Force did not reach agreement on these points; therefore we summarize the main threads of these deliberations below

Programmatic Considerations

Objective of the Program. A new MFA program at Harvard would distinguish itself by supporting opportunities to interact and work collaboratively with students and faculty in other disciplines, and also by providing a rigorous discipline-specific study of art. The Task Force hopes that the MFA will rethink how a graduate program for the arts could be structured to provide the ultimate flexibility for students to capitalize upon the intellectual wealth of the university and work

collaboratively. The program should recognize that there are many ways in which artists can and will be stimulated, and should encourage them to find that source of inspiration, whether it be within or beyond their artistic discipline.

Artists should be encouraged to work across and among the areas of study found on Harvard's campus. Certainly, each artistic discipline should have the autonomy to develop its faculty, curriculum, and admissions process in a way that most suits that discipline. With a strong foundation of disciplinary capacity, vision, and skill, along with encouragement to cross disciplinary boundaries, such as physical adjacencies or team-taught seminars, the very presence of these artists in the midst of each other's production will encourage collaboration and stimulate thinking.

Faculty Considerations

To have the new program be successfully developed, it will be critical to bring new perspectives and visions for the arts at Harvard to ensure that a diversity of voices can be heard in what is currently a relatively small faculty. Faculty artists in all disciplines will need to be expanded in number in order to satisfy the teaching demands of the program. They must be allowed to have flexible appointments to ensure that the greatest quality in artist and instructor can be brought to campus. Faculty members should be well-qualified teachers who have received significant professional recognition in their fields. The faculty must be large enough in size to provide technical, discipline based instruction and a diversity in artistic perspectives. Visiting artists and lecturers should be regularly brought to campus in order to broaden the horizon of the perspectives found within the existing faculty.

Student Considerations

Admissions. Depending on the nature of the MFA program, how it would be administered, and what its objectives would be, there might be one admissions portal for students if they were to apply to a completely interdisciplinary program or, multiple portals if applicants apply to discipline-specific programs.

Program Size. The MFA program need not be large to be successful. The Task Force did not identify a critical mass.

Program Length. The Task Force discussed the following options: 1) a two-year program; 2) a three-year program; and 3) a two year program with an optional additional semester or third year for honors work.

Graduate Student Teaching. Students within the program will be available to serve as teaching fellows for undergraduate courses. Though their first year on campus should be focused on their own work, teaching might be allowed in the second year of study. This would expand the opportunities to develop more introductory level courses in the arts as well as an arts program for General Education in the College.

PHYSICAL SPACES

Distribution of physical facilities across campus.

While the Task Force strongly maintains that new construction and the renovation of existing spaces are crucial to elevating the physical and perceived presence of the arts on campus, and that Allston presents a unique and valuable opportunity to anchor a major arts hub at the heart of the expanded Harvard University campus, there remain several matters which invite careful and rigorous discussion. Among these matters is the precise shape of the distribution of arts facilities across the campus. The Task Force has weighed the advantages of corridor, constellation, and cluster arrangements of dedicated and arts-accessible facilities additional to the arts center proposed above, and recommends that the university incorporate its plans for arts construction/renovation into its other physical planning processes already underway (such as those of the Harvard Museums, for example), those newly begun (the Common Spaces planning), and those to be launched. By taking into account the space and facility needs of the entire campus, a structural ecology of utility and accessibility may be cultivated for the arts on campus.

The Task Force also considered the types of performances spaces that would be important to incorporate in new campus construction. Though across the university, many groups have expressed interest in adding to the number of spaces that can accommodate performance for theater, music, and dance, it is unclear what spaces can best accommodate the campus's needs. Many student groups thought an additional theater that could seat 500-750 would alleviate the scheduling pressures. Others expressed an interest in having multiple flexible smaller spaces that could be reconfigured to accommodate the appropriate audience for the event being held within. Some academic departments and visiting artists expressed their interest in a large performance space that could seat 1,600 to 2,000 people. Having a larger space on campus would allow major visiting artists on campus to reach a wider audience. It would provide faculty and students the opportunity to mount much larger-scale performances that possible currently. However, though this space might be host to exciting programming, it would be expensive to construct and maintain. It was unclear to the Task Force if a space that could accommodate a 2,000 seat audience might also be programmed as a multi-use facility that has the capacity to host world-class artistic performances. If the Harvard and local communities could see a place for a large performance space, the arts would certainly want to be featured within. However, without partners elsewhere, it is harder to see this space taking precedence over smaller, more manageable spaces for performance.

STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS

Consider establishing a Vice Provost for the Arts position.

There was much debate about what kind coordinating body at the university level would be best suited to advance the arts agenda university-wide. The Task Force was unanimous in recommending a cross-school advisory committee which we have referred to in earlier sections of the reports as the Harvard University Committee on the arts (HUCA).

The Task Force was divided on the issue of whether it would also be beneficial to create the position of the Vice Provost for the Arts. The Vice Provost for the Arts would be a senior faculty member and artist recognized for his or her work in the arts, and would be a visionary champion

for the arts at Harvard. The Vice Provost's primary responsibility would be to advocate for the advancement of the arts throughout the university and to facilitate arts-related collaborations that cross curricular, departmental and school boundaries. Finally, the Vice Provost would also chair HUCA.

In the end, the Task Force decided that we should begin with the Harvard University Committee on the Arts which would have a rotating faculty chair (for a term of three to five years). The Task Force agreed that the question of a Vice Provost for the Arts position could be taken up again in the future, after HUCA had some time to work on the recommendations of the Task Force. After a suitable period, the issue of arts leadership should be revisited and consideration should be given to whether the arts at Harvard are best served through a rotating chair and committee, or whether a permanent position (such as a Vice Provost for the Arts) might be more beneficial to advance the arts agenda at the university.

FINAL NOTES

The recommendations of the Task Force on the Arts will certainly require significant consideration before they might be implemented. To make the arts a true priority for this institution will require a considerable effort on behalf of the faculty and administration to ensure that our students and the greater community feel the impact of these changes to the strongest degree. The vision for the arts cannot be one that is championed only by our Task Force; it must resonate within the Harvard community.

Responsibility for many of the recommendations listed in this report—notably the recommendations related to reviewing appointments categories and policies—resides with the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, where the arts departments are located and the appointments are made. Other recommendations—efforts related to securing additional studio spaces or housing units—can commence immediately.

Many of our recommendations may take a generation to see the true benefits for our community, but we hope that at least a subset of these recommendations can begin to take shape with the momentum of this report and be implemented quickly.

[4.]

TASK FORCE
ON THE ARTS

Appendices

Appendix 1: Task Force Charge

The arts abound across Harvard — in nearly 150 undergraduate student organizations, in countless instrumental and choral groups, in the collections of Harvard’s museums, in studios in the Carpenter Center and the Department of Visual and Environmental Studies (VES), in the Harvard Film Archive, at the American Repertory Theatre (A.R.T.), in the Office for the Arts, in the New College Theatre, in the fellowship program at Radcliffe, in poetry and creative writing classes in the Department of English, in the teaching and scholarship of the Graduate School of Design (GSD), in the lives of faculty, students, and staff. We confront ever increasing demand for opportunities for artistic expression, both within and beyond the curriculum. We anticipate a significant place for the arts as a central component of our growth in Allston.

Yet Harvard has not, in many years, thought comprehensively about its relationship to the arts or defined its aspirations or opportunities in a systematic way. Our extraordinary strengths in the arts remain fragmented, less well-understood, less well-supported, and less integrated than their importance warrants. Demand exceeds supply in many areas — class slots in film and creative writing; professional direction and support in theater; practice facilities for music; rehearsal space for drama; studios for the plastic arts. Cross-School and cross-unit collaborations are underdeveloped, and resources have not kept pace with changing needs. Many of our peer institutions have, in recent years, undertaken serious expansion in arts programming, offering us both models to consider and a challenge to act. The arts play a central role in the lives of so many students and faculty at Harvard, yet their role in the life of the University remains uncertain and undefined. I hope that this task force will attempt such a definition, beginning with a consideration of the fundamental question of the role of the arts in a research university and in a liberal arts education.

As early as the Brown Committee Report in 1956, Harvard began explicitly to explore its traditionally uneasy relationship to the arts, acknowledging that the University had long viewed the practice of the arts as most appropriately located outside the curriculum. This has in some measure changed, and numbers of classes — in music performance, painting, sculpture, writing, photography, film production, for example — now can be taken for credit. Yet such classes are never adequate for the number of students who wish to take them, and we retain vestiges of earlier attitudes in our treatment of the creative arts as subjects for academic credit in the undergraduate curriculum. Recognizing that any alteration in the undergraduate curriculum rests with the faculty of the FAS [Faculty of Arts and Sciences] and the resource decisions of its dean, I hope that this committee, generously peopled with FAS representatives, will consider the principles that might guide our approach to the performance and practice of the arts for undergraduate credit.

This moment — a time of beginnings, with new deans in the FAS and the GSD, a new undergraduate curriculum, and a new campus emerging across the river — seems propitious for an ambitious rethinking of the place of arts practice at Harvard. Recent developments in the humanities and sciences, in digital technology, and in the arts themselves have called into question traditional distinctions between making and understanding. We have a historic opportunity to

rethink our teaching and learning, to foster the talents of our very gifted students, to forge new interdisciplinary links across the University's far-flung programs, and to invigorate the arts at Harvard for the 21st century.

Specifically, I ask that this committee consider and develop responses to the following questions:

- What should be the role of the arts in a research university?
- What should be the role of the arts in a liberal arts education?
- How should we think about the role of the arts within the curriculum? Except in the GSD and the Department of Visual and Environmental Studies, we have few practicing artists on our faculty. Is this a result of principle, resources, or accident? Should we be thinking differently about the role of writers, painters, filmmakers at Harvard? Are different sorts of faculty appointments necessary or advisable to bring more artists into permanent positions in our community? Are there cross-School collaborations that would encourage broader engagement of those already present?
- How should we think about the relationship of arts within and beyond the curriculum? As we work to strengthen the place of the arts, how do we ensure that we preserve the improvisational and entrepreneurial energy that has enriched the experience of so many students in our arts organizations?
- How could institutions across campus like the A.R.T. or the Harvard University Art Museums that are not explicitly tied to core academic or student programs be more fully integrated into a newly vibrant arts culture at Harvard?
- What role might the GSD, centrally focused like no other School at Harvard on questions of creativity and design, play beyond its own boundaries in building and supporting the arts across the University?
- What relationships could and should arts activities create with initiatives in science, technology, humanities, and other related fields? What structured connections would encourage and enable these?

In undertaking its work, I ask that the committee consider what we can learn — both to enrich the inquiry and inform an overall approach and specific recommendations — from the experience and programs of other institutions who have undertaken arts initiatives. It will be important to examine not only the universities we ordinarily consider our peers, but also other institutions that may have distinctive programs or approaches in specific areas. I would encourage the committee to think expansively about consultation on a range of issues, both with students, faculty, and others on campus, and with our broad external network of alumni and others who are engaged in the arts at a very sophisticated level. I would urge the committee to consult as well with practicing artists in a wide range of fields.

Finally, I ask that the committee give some thought to the practical implications of recommendations that emerge from its deliberations. Specifically, it would be useful to have the committee's views on the following issues:

- What type of administrative arrangements or innovations would best support the arts at Harvard?
- What physical structures are needed to advance our goals? What implications do our aspirations for the arts have for our consideration of physical spaces in Cambridge and Allston?
- What implications do our aspirations for the arts hold for a coming University campaign?

My framing of the issues and the related questions is meant to define a starting place, not an end point, for the work of the task force. I take it for granted that the talent, experience, and creativity represented in the membership of the committee will enrich both the framing of the issues and the conceptualization of answers and specific recommendations. It is my hope that the task force will complete the bulk of its work during the 2007-08 academic year, with a final report to be submitted by the early fall of 2008.

I am grateful for Stephen Greenblatt's generosity in agreeing to lead this effort and for the willingness of all of you to serve on the committee. This is important and exciting work, and I very much look forward to engaging with you throughout the process.

Drew Gilpin Faust

November 1, 2007

Appendix 2: Task Force Membership

- Stephen Greenblatt** chair, Cogan University Professor of the Humanities
- Homi Bhabha** Anne F. Rothenberg Professor of the Humanities, director of the Humanities Center, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Melissa Franklin**. Mallinckrodt Professor of Physics, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Peter Galison** Joseph Pellegrino University Professor, director of the Collection of the Historical Scientific Instruments
- Jorie Graham** Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Alfred Guzzetti**. Osgood Hooker Professor of Visual Arts, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Madelyn Ho '08** dancer, Taylor 2; chemical and physical biology, Harvard College
- Joseph Koerner** professor of history of art and architecture, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot** Emily Hargroves Fisher Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education
- Jack Megan** director, Office for the Arts, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Helen Mirra**. assistant professor of visual and environmental studies, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Helen Molesworth** Maisie K. and James R. Houghton Curator of Contemporary Art, Harvard Art Museum
- Ingrid Monson** Quincy Jones Professor of African-American Music, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Mohsen Mostafavi**. Alexander and Victoria Wiley Professor of Design; dean, Graduate School of Design
- Dan Pecci '09** English and American literature and language, secondary field in drama, recipient of 2006 Phyllis Anderson Prize in Playwriting, Harvard College
- Hashim Sarkis** Aga Khan Professor of Landscape Architecture and Urbanism in Muslim Societies, Graduate School of Design
- Diana Sorensen** James F. Rothenberg Professor of Romance Languages & Literatures and of Comparative Literature, dean for the Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
- Marcus Stern**. associate director, lecturer on dramatic arts, American Repertory Theatre and the A.R.T./MXAT Institute for Advanced Theatre Training
- Damian Woetzel MPA '07** former dancer, New York City Ballet, 2008 Harman-Eisner Artist-in-Residence, The Aspen Institute; director, Vail International Dance Festival; Harvard Kennedy School

Appendix 3: Internal and External Meetings and Consultations

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Agrela, Ramona	Assistant Dean, Trevor School of the Arts, UC Irvine
Allen, Stanley	Dean, School of Architecture; George Dutton '27 Professor of Architecture, Princeton University
Aronson, Arnold	Professor, Division of Theatre, School of the Arts, Columbia University
Berger, Jonathan	Co-Executive Director of the Stanford Institute for Creativity and the Arts (SiCa); Billie Bennett Achilles Professor in Performance, Stanford University
Blocker, Robert	Henry & Luch Moses Dean of Music, Yale School of Music
Branker, Anthony	Senior Lecturer in Music; Associate Director, Program in Musical Performance, Princeton University
Bundy, James	Dean, Yale School of Drama; Artistic Director, Yale Repertory Theatre
Burnham, Scott	Chair, Department of Music; Professor of Music, Princeton University
Cadden, Michael	Senior Lecturer in Theater and Dance, Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts; Director, Program in Theater and Dance, Princeton University
Chouinard, Fanny	Associate Director, Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts, Princeton University
Cohen, Ze'eva	Professor of Theater and Dance, Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts, Princeton University
Cruickshank, Laura	Director, University Planning Construction & Renovation Facilities, Yale University
Dakin, Mary	Associate Director of SiCa, Stanford University
d'Aprile-Smith, Marguerite	Director, Public Relations and Communications, Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts, Princeton University
Dan, Joseph	Gershom Scholem Professor of Kabbalah, Department of Jewish Thought, Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Davis, Peter	Documentary Filmmaker, Author
Donoghue, Michael	Director, Peabody Museum; Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Yale University
Elam, Harry	Senior Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; Professor of Drama, Stanford University
Eustis, Oskar	Artistic Director, The Public Theater
Fitzgerald, Deborah	Dean, School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, MIT
Frumkin, Jeffrey	Assistant Provost, University of Michigan
Gelb, Peter	General Manager, Metropolitan Opera
Gibbons, Arthur	Professor of Studio Arts; Director of the Milton Avery Graduate School of the Arts, Bard College
Goellner, Ellen	Associate Director, Princeton Atelier, Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts, Princeton University

Gopnik, Adam	Author
Guillermoprieto, Alma	Tinker Visiting Professor, Center for Latin American Studies, University of Chicago
Harrison, Daniel	Professor of Music Theory; Chair, Department of Music, Yale University
Harrist, Robert	Chair, Department of Art History and Archaeology; Jane and Leopold Swergold Professor of Chinese Art History, Columbia University
Hereaus, Stefanie	Curator, Bielefelder Kunstverein
Hinton, Stephen	Senior Associate Dean in the School of Humanities and Sciences; Professor of Music, Stanford University
James, Susan	Professor, School of Philosophy, Birkbeck, University of London
Jean, Martin	Director, Institute of Sacred Music; Professor of Organ, Yale School of Music
Joselit, David	Professor, History of Art; Chair, Department of History of Art, Yale University
Jussen, Bernhard	Professor, Faculty of History, Philosophy and Theology, Universität Beilefeld
Katz, Roberta	Associate Vice President for Strategic Planning, Stanford University
Khoury, Philip	Associate Provost and Ford International Professor of History, MIT
Killackey, Herbert	Vice Provost, Academic Personnel, UC Irvine
Kramer, Sybille	Professor of Philosophy, Frei Universität Berlin
Kushner, Tony	Playwright
Lesser, Wendy	Founding Editor, The Threepenny Review
Lewis, Paul	Assistant Professor of Architecture, Princeton University
Ma, Yo-Yo	Musician
Machover, Tod	Professor, Program in Media Arts and Sciences, MIT
Messer, Samuel	Associate Dean, Yale School of Art
Meyers, Amy	Director, British Art Center, Yale University
Meyers, Jack	Assistant to the President, Yale University
Mosher, Gregory	Director, Arts Initiative, Columbia University
Muldoon, Paul	Chair, Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts; Howard G.B. Clark '21 University Professor in the Humanities, Princeton University
Nagy, Kären	Assistant Vice President for the Arts, Stanford University
Nauzyciel, Arthur	Artistic Director, Centre Dramatique National/Orléans-Loiret-Centre
Pellizzi, Francesco	Editor and Co-Founder, RES Journal of Anthropology and Aesthetics
Pinsky, Robert	Poet; Professor, English Department, Boston University
Poggi, Gregory	Chair and Professor of Theatre and Drama, School of Music, Theatre & Dance, University of Michigan
Reardon, Colleen	Associate Dean, Trevor School of the Arts, UC Irvine
Reynolds, Jock	Henry J. Heinz II Director, Yale University Art Gallery
Rice, Timothy	Professor, Ethnomusicology; Director, UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music

Richardson, James	Acting Director, Program in Creative Writing; Professor of English and Creative Writing, Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts, Princeton University
Roach, Joseph	Dilley Professor of Theater and English, Yale University
Rohrer, Kathy	Vice Provost for Academic Programs, Princeton University
Rogers, Bryan	Dean, School of Art and Design; Professor of Art, University of Michigan
Rubin, Lisa	Director, Academic Personnel, UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture
Safdie, Moshe	Architect, Moshe Safdie and Associates, Inc.
Santos, Adèle Naudé	Dean, School of Architecture & Planning; Professor of Architecture, MIT
Scanlan, Joseph	Assistant Professor of Sculpture, School of Art, Yale University
Schorr, David	Professor of Art, Art and Art History Department, Wesleyan University
Siemon, James	Professor, English Department, Boston University
Sitney, P. Adams	Professor of Visual Arts in the Peter B. Lewis Center for the Arts; Director, Program in Visual Arts, Princeton University
Shailor, Barbara	Deputy Provost for the Arts, Yale University
Skinner, Quentin	Barber Beaumont Professor of the Humanities, Queen Mary, University of London
Skotnes, Pippa	Professor of Fine Art, Michaelis School for Fine Art
Sonenberg, Janet	Professor, Chairman of Music and Theater Arts, MIT
Soskin, Eileen	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Peabody Institute, Johns Hopkins University
Stern, Robert A.M.	Dean, Yale School of Architecture
Storr, Robert	Dean, Yale School of Art; Professor of Painting
Townsent, Allen	Director, Arts Library, Yale University
Tucker, Ara	Special Assistant, Office of the Provost, Princeton University
Uchida, Mitsuko	Musician
Varmus, Harold	President, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center
Waterman, Christopher	Dean, UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture
Wolf, Bryan	Co-Executive Director of SiCa; Jeanette and William Hayden Jones Professor in American Art and Culture

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Andrien, Ruth	Visiting Lecturer, Dramatic Arts
Anstead, Alicia	Nieman Fellow in Arts and Culture
Beattie, Drew	Lecturer, Visual and Environmental Studies
Bergman, Elizabeth	Director, Dance Program; Lecturer, Dramatic Arts
Castaing-Taylor, Lucien	Assistant Professor of Visual and Environmental Studies and of Anthropology; Associate Director, Film Study Center
Dakin, Christine	Evelyn Green Davis Fellow, Radcliffe Institute; Dancer
Edwards, David	Gordon McKay Professor of the Practice of Biomedical Engineering

Engell, James	Gurney Professor of English Literature and Professor of Comparative Literature; Chair, Department of English
Fash, William	Bowditch Professor of Central American and Mexican Archaeology and Ethnology; Howells Director of the Peabody Museum
Fitzsimmons, William	Dean, Harvard College Admissions and Financial Aid
Frey, Darcy	Briggs Copeland Lecturer on English
Garber, Marjorie	William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of English and American Literature and of Visual and Environmental Studies
Gardner, Howard	The John H and Elisabeth A Hobbs Professor of Cognition and Education
Griggs, J. Michael	Technical Director, Loeb Drama Center; Lecturer on Dramatic Arts
Grosz, Barbara	Dean of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies; Higgins Professor of Natural Sciences
Guest, Haden	Director, Harvard Film Archive
Guillermoprieto, Alma	Rita E. and Gustav M. Hauser Fund Fellow, Radcliffe Institute; Writer
Harper, Sharon	Assistant Professor, Visual and Environmental Studies
Herbert, Walter	Professor Emeritus of English, Southwestern University
Houfek, Nancy	Head of Voice and Speech, A.R.T.; Lecturer on Dramatic Arts
Krukowski, Damon	Visiting Lecturer, Visual and Environmental Studies
Lemieux, Annette	Professor of the Practice of Studio Arts, Visual and Environmental Studies
Lentz, Thomas	Elizabeth and John Moors Cabot Director, Harvard Art Museum
Lester, Gideon	Director, 08/09 Season, American Repertory Theatre
Levin, Robert	Dwight P. Robinson, Jr. Professor of Music
Lingford, Ruth	Professor of the Practice of Animation; Film Study Center Fellow
Lipper, Joanna	Sheila Biddle Ford Foundation Fellow, W.E.B Du Bois Institute
Lord, Catherine	Shirley Carter Burden Visiting Professor of Photography
Lord, Gail	Co-President, Lord Cultural Resources
Marvin, Jameson	Director of Choral Activities at Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges; Senior Lecturer on Music
McElwee, Ross	Professor of the Practice of Filmmaking; Film Study Center Fellow;
McGrath, Marlyn	Director, Harvard College Admissions
Menand, Louis	Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of English
Miel, Persephone	Fellow, Berkman Center for Internet & Society
Moss, Robb	Rudolf Arnheim Lecturer on Filmmaking
Narayanamurti, Venkatesh	John A. and Elizabeth S. Armstrong Professor of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Professor of Physics
New, Elisa	Professor of English
Oja, Carol	William Powell Mason Professor of Music
Paulus, Diane	Artistic Director, American Repertory Theatre
Perkins, David	Professor of Education
Prina, Stephen	Professor of Visual and Environmental Studies
Randall, Lisa	Professor of Physics
Rehding, Alexander	Professor of Music
Rodowick, David	Professor of Visual and Environmental Studies

Rubin, Daniel	Briggs-Copeland Lecturer on English
Scanlan, Robert	Professor of the Practice of Theatre, English Department, FAS
Shelemay, Kay Kaufman	G. Gordon Watts Professor of Music and Professor of African and African American Studies
Shell, Marc	Irving Babbitt Professor of Comparative Literature and Professor of English
Seidel, Steven	Patricia Bauman and John Landrum Bryant Lecturer on Arts in Education; Director, Arts in Education Program
Sekler, Eduard	Osgood Hooker Professor of Visual Art Emeritus; Professor of Architecture Emeritus
Shreffler, Anne	James Edward Ditson Professor of Music; Department Chair of Music
Simmons, Alison	Samuel H. Wolcott Professor of Philosophy
Sommer, Doris	Ira Jewell Williams, Jr. Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures and of African and African American Studies; Director of the Cultural Agents Initiative
Tishman, Shari	Lecturer on Education, Arts in Education Program; Research Associate in Education, Project Zero
Tutschku, Hans	Professor of Music; Director, Harvard University Studio for Electroacoustic Composition
Vines, Nicholas	Lecturer on Music
Werby, Elizabeth	Executive Director, Harvard Museum of Natural History
Yannatos, James	Senior Lecturer on Music
Zigler, Scott	Director, A.R.T. Institute for Advanced Theatre Training; Lecturer on Dramatic Arts
Zuckerman, Ethan	Fellow, Berkman Center for Internet & Society

STUDENT CONSULTATIONS

March 3, 2008	Eliot House, Memorial Dining Room
March 5, 2008	Mather House, Junior Common Room
March 12, 2008	Adams House, Conservatory
April 2, 2008	Cabot House, Cabot Hall Living Room
April 7, 2008	Freshmen, Straus Common Room
April 10, 2008	Dudley Co-op
April 24, 2008	Graduate Students, Piper Auditorium
March 14, 2008	Harvard-Radcliffe Dramatic Club
April 4, 2008	Dance Program

EMAIL SOLICITATIONS

November 1, 2007	Campus-wide announcement of Task Force, solicitation for input
September 22, 2008	Email to Student and Faculty, solicitation for input

UNDERGRADUATE CONTEXT

The Departments of Music, History of Art and Architecture (HAA), Visual and Environmental Studies (VES), and English, as well as the Committee on Dramatics all boast robust programs in the practice and study of the arts. Arts courses are, however, relatively underrepresented within the full catalog offerings, and they are not as accessible to students as courses within other fields of inquiry. Introductory-level courses in arts practice, in such areas as film, studio art, and creative writing, have a very high demand among undergraduates but are only able to enroll a number of students. In many introductory courses, only 10% of the students who have applied are able to enroll. In some cases, courses have been discontinued because the supply has fallen so short of the demand it is able to meet.

The Harvard arts curricula are focused primarily on theory, rather than on practice. Within the four FAS departments that study the arts, History of Art & Architecture (HAA), Music, Visual & Environmental Studies (VES), and the Committee on Dramatics, only 39% of the courses offered are practice-based. The only concentration that provides a predominantly practice-based curriculum is VES. The Committee on Dramatics provides College students the opportunity to pursue a six course secondary concentration in Dramatic Arts and the English Department's Creative Writing Program provides approximately 12 workshops a semester, in addition to providing an option to pursue a creative senior thesis. Harvard and the New England Conservatory (NEC) offer a five-year joint program where students can earn an A.B. from Harvard and an M.M. from NEC.

EXTRACURRICULAR CONTEXT

Harvard boasts a thriving extracurricular environment. In the 2007-2008 academic year, there were 60 dance performances, over 40 dramatic performances, 450 musical concerts, ten literary publications, and 50 visual art exhibitions, screenings, and events.

Over 3,000 students on campus are engaged in ongoing arts practice. Student activity in the arts is growing at a rapid pace. Since 1980, the number of arts groups has grown nearly 130% rising from 39 groups to the current count of 102. The Office for the Arts, which is a part of FAS, actively supports undergraduate student engagement in the arts. Please see Appendix 5 for a more detailed description of its mission and activities.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Within the Faculty of Arts of Sciences, Harvard provides graduate education for students in the History of Art and Architecture (Ph.D.), Music (Ph.D. in Musicology, Ethnomusicology, Music Theory, Music Composition, A.M. in Historical Performance Practice), Literature (Ph.D. in English, Comparative Literature), and Film and Visual Studies (Ph.D.).

The Graduate School of Design provides professional training in a range of design areas, including architecture (MArch I, MArch II), Landscape Architecture (MLA I, MLA II), Urban Planning and Design (MUP, MAUD, MLAUD), Design Studies (MDes in History and Philosophy of Design, Real Estate and Project Management, Sustainable Design, Technology, Urbanization and Housing), and Advanced Studies (DDes). An interfaculty Ph.D. Program in Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning is administered jointly between GSAS and the GSD.

The Graduate School of Education develops educators focused on the role of the arts through its Arts in Education program.

The American Repertory Theatre, affiliated with Harvard, prepares young actors and dramaturgs in its Institute for Advanced Theatre Training. Its students, however, receive their degrees from the Moscow Art Theatre School.

Many disciplines found within the undergraduate curriculum are not represented at the graduate level or awarded a Harvard degree. Creative Writing, Studio Art, and Dramatic Arts are all areas that offer undergraduate instruction in practice, but not at the graduate level.

AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS

Harvard is host to a number of affiliated units that highlight the arts, including: Harvard Art Museum, Peabody Museum and the American Repertory Theatre. These are professional institutions housed on our campus with links to the undergraduate student population. The organizations are leaders within their fields.

The Radcliffe Institute allows its Arts Fellows an opportunity to pursue creative new works. In the 2008-2009 year, Radcliffe is host to 12 Arts Fellows.

MISSION

The Office for the Arts at Harvard (OFA) supports student engagement in the arts and serves the University in its commitment to the arts. Through its programs and services, the OFA fosters student art making, connects students to accomplished artists, integrates the arts into university life, and partners with local, national and international constituencies.

ACTIVITIES

At its essence, the Office for the Arts champions artists—whether first-year Harvard undergraduates or master innovators. Forty-five regular employees and fifty professional instructors comprise the staff of specialists across arts disciplines. Traditional and contemporary aesthetics are integrated into the teaching of co-curricular courses, as well as in the artistic direction of our ensembles, exhibitions and guest artist programs. The OFA creates connections among practice, theory and history. It also strives for state-of-the-art practices in the management of many Harvard arts venues.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

Ceramics Program

The OFA Ceramics Program provides a creative studio environment for Harvard, greater Boston, and international constituents. This studio/study center provides excellent courses and instructors, innovative interdisciplinary symposia, unlimited studio access for independent study, and an expansive, well-equipped facility. The Program provides three semesters each year of courses at all levels, as well as master classes and workshops with visiting artists. More than 1,000 people, including Harvard undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, and staff, as well as professional artists and members of the public, are enrolled annually.

Dance Program

The OFA Dance Program is characterized by a history of connecting students to dance pioneers. It offers professional instruction in a wide range of styles during the academic year to undergraduates, graduate students, staff faculty, and alumni/ae at the Harvard Dance Center and the Director's Studio. Professional mentoring for student choreographers and the opportunity to learn professional repertoire are a focus. Students perform in two Dance Program concerts each year. In addition to hosting artist residencies, master classes, seminars, and workshops each year, the Dance Program has been influential in the development of FAS courses in dance history, choreography, technique and repertory, offered through the Committee on Dramatic Arts.

Orchestras and Choruses

Harvard has a large and gifted student music community which participates in 11 professionally led choruses and orchestras supported by and affiliated with the OFA. Many of these undertake annual tours domestically and overseas. They vary in size and mission, and are a complement to the many student-led groups. Collectively, the professional and student-led ensembles produce upwards of 500 concerts annually.

Professionally-Led Orchestras

Harvard Baroque Chamber Orchestra

Harvard Jazz Bands

Harvard Pops Orchestra

Harvard-Radcliffe Orchestra

Mozart Society Orchestra

Harvard University Wind Ensemble

Professionally-Led Choruses

Harvard Glee Club

Harvard-Radcliffe Collegium Musicum

Radcliffe Choral Society

Harvard-Radcliffe Chorus

The Kuumba Singers of Harvard College

GUEST ARTIST PROGRAMS

Jazz Program

The OFA Jazz Program brings masters of this uniquely American art form to Harvard, honoring and connecting them to students through clinics, rehearsals, and performance. While at Harvard, artists are encouraged to pursue musical ideas that stretch beyond their usual interests and share this process with Harvard students. The goal of the program is to provide an opportunity for undergraduates to work directly with classic repertoire and masters of the art form; to honor artists who have made a significant contribution to American music; and to increase public awareness of the artist's music.

Learning from Performers

The Learning from Performers (LFP) program was established to facilitate direct engagement between Harvard students and gifted artists. The program hosts 15 to 20 artists annually in music, dance, theater, film/television, visual arts, and interdisciplinary arts. These artists lead workshops, master classes, seminars, and informal discussions, and also engage in longer-term residencies that sometimes culminate in performances, exhibitions, and new works. LFP artists have been increasingly involved with students and faculty as part of FAS courses. All artist residencies are planned in close consultation with the artist and most are open to the general public. Over 900 artists have participated in the program.

Public Art Program

Through its Public Art Program, the Office for the Arts pursues explorations of public spaces by commissioning emerging or established artists to develop new work at Harvard. Together students and the artist explore the meaning of and possibilities for art and civic engagement. The resulting temporary works often interpret spaces that may be owned by Harvard but are used publicly. These long-term residencies allow visiting artists to know Harvard's places, staff, students, faculty, and public. Artists visit FAS and professional school courses and meet with undergraduates in the College Houses.

DRAMA

The OFA programs and manages the New College Theatre and the Agassiz Theatre, and provides production, design, and technical support for approximately 25 student plays each year, including in the Adams House Pool Theatre, Leverett Old Library Theatre and for the Dunster and Lowell House Operas. The OFA provides production funding to Agassiz and New College Theatre shows, apart from its grant program. The OFA's theater staff advises students in all areas of theater administration and production including design, effective and safe use of shop and stage equipment, and stage and house management. The OFA brings to campus two to three theater directors annually to lead student productions.

ARTIST SUPPORT AND RECOGNITION

Fellowships and Grants

The OFA provides financial support for student artists through Artist Development Fellowships, Project Grants, and the Music Lesson Subsidy Program. Its fellowship program supports twelve to twenty artists annually who have demonstrated unusual promise or capabilities. Its Project Grants partially underwrite approximately 100 student performances or exhibitions annually involving 2,500 undergraduates. The Music Lesson Subsidy Program facilitates private vocal and instrumental study for 100 students each year.

Awards

Each year, Harvard University recognizes accomplished professional and student artists with awards administered by the Office for the Arts. These awards include: the Harvard Arts Medal, given to an alumnus/a who has done extraordinary work as a practicing artist; the Luise Vosgerchian Teaching Award in Music, the Louis Sudler Prize for Outstanding Artistry in the Undergraduate Student Body, the Council Prize in Visual Art, the Louise Donovan Award for Behind the Scenes Work, the Suzanne Farrell Dance Prize, the Jonathan Levy Award for Acting, and the Radcliffe Doris Cohen Levi Prize for Musical Theater.

VENUE MANAGEMENT AND HARVARD BOX OFFICE

Memorial and Lowell Halls

In addition to Agassiz Theatre, the New College Theatre, the Harvard Dance Studio, and the Director's Studio, the OFA is responsible for oversight, scheduling and production support for all rehearsal and performance activity in Sanders Theatre and Lowell Hall. In a typical year, the schedules for Sanders and Lowell include 100 student rehearsals, 78 student performances, and 90 non-affiliated performances.

The Harvard Box Office

The OFA manages the Harvard Box Office, a full-service agency that distributes over 100,000 tickets to approximately 500 performances annually, including presentations by Harvard students, administrative and academic departments, and a variety of external organizations presenting in Harvard-owned venues.

ARTS FIRST – HARVARD'S ANNUAL ARTS FESTIVAL

The OFA produces a four-day student arts festival each year during the first weekend of May, which is the culmination of a year's worth of student arts activity. This festival is sponsored by Harvard's Board of Overseers and features the work of over 2,000 students in hundreds of concerts, plays, dance performances, and exhibitions. It is one of the largest student arts festivals in the United States.

Report of the Task Force on the Arts

The Task Force On The Arts would like to thank the following people for their help with this report:

Christine Barrett, Dawn Brancati, Max Freeman, Christopher Gordon, Lori Gross, Tanya Iatridis, Sandy Lacey, Kasia Lundy, Merrill Meadow, Gary Roberts, Clayton Spencer, and Julia Topalian.