

Response to the Report of the Review Committee
Comparative History of Ideas Program
October 2005

The students, faculty and staff of the CHID program were very favorably impressed by the intensity and thoroughness with which the Review Committee did its work. We thought that they came to understand many aspects of the program extraordinarily well within the short span of a two-day visit. We were also, of course, pleased by their favorable assessment of the innovative, creative elements of the program within a comparative national context. The challenges of success and loss that the report articulates so well had already been very much on our minds, with the report reinforcing and confirming our own perceptions of the major issues we need to address as we move forward.

Our quibbles with the report as a whole are minor—perhaps there was a little too much emphasis on the international curriculum as the core of CHID. In fact our international programs emerged within the last ten years as a direct outgrowth of the CHID campus curriculum—and that is an important part of their innovation and creativity. We also noted that the whirlwind of interviews missed a few key players—most particularly Dr. Douglass Merrell, a CHID instructor who has been a critical contributor to CHID for at least a decade, teaching our highest enrollment class (CHID 110) and working creatively in the development of our international programs since their inception in Spring 1995. Doug is only on campus Fall term and was in Rome at the time of the Committee’s visit. The inability of Karen Rosenberg, our senior thesis project coordinator, to meet with the Committee may also be related to the absence of comment on this important part of the curriculum in the Report, even though all members of the CHID community see it as a major object of current curricular concern and reform.

A: Response to Recommendations Regarding Administrative structure and Faculty Lines

Transformation into a “line-bearing unit.” All of the groups within the CHID program agree that if CHID is to continue to fulfill its academic mission and provide adequate stability and continuity for the numbers of students now enrolled in the program it will need to be transformed into a “line-bearing unit.” At the same time we would like to see CHID assume the structure of a line-bearing unit in a fashion that will allow it to sustain its interdisciplinary focus and cross-campus collaborations, to continue innovation through a problem-oriented curriculum, to prevent calcification and preclude overly specialized niche appointments. Although we agree in principle with the Committee’s recommendations our own specific recommendations place a greater emphasis on protection of the CHID intellectual community from rigidification and self-isolation.

Proposed Faculty Appointments. We envision CHID ultimately having a core tenure-track faculty of 4 or 5 positions. These would include the recently filled position (via History) in the humanistic study of the biological sciences and digital technology, and the currently approved search for an assistant professor in Transnational Post-Conflict Studies (in collaboration with International Studies [JSIS] and the Law Societies and Justice Program).

In contrast to the recommendation of the report, however, the participants in a recent CHID retreat agreed that the other two positions recommended by the Committee—in Gender and Sexuality Studies and Post-Colonial Theory and Critical Race Studies—were too particular to specific themes and overlapped too much with recent and planned appointments in other Humanities Units. We would rather have these positions defined in a more interdisciplinary and open-ended manner, i.e.:

- 1) a faculty member who is a literary scholar with a strong interest in the textual traditions of non-Western cultures. (*a “literature” person*)
- 2) a faculty member who is centrally interested in the arts—visual or musical—and preferably is herself a practitioner in an artistic field. Again we would seek for a person with international interests and strong tendencies toward interdisciplinary collaborations. (*an “art” person*)

Moreover, it is critical for the continued health of the CHID program that we find faculty who are dedicated to the idea of a learning community and have a demonstrated commitment to mentoring creative research by undergraduates in the Humanities, and thus in making their own scholarship or aesthetic production integral to their teaching.

The so-called “Rotating” position. We agree with the principle but have a different conception of how that principle might be put into practice. What we imagine is permanent funding for at least two “open” senior lectureships. Some of this funding (say, 3 quarters) could be used to actually fund senior lecturers (like Douglass Merrell, or the recently departed Kari Tupper) for specific quarters. The 2nd lectureship would be used to buy out regular faculty from other departments for limited time periods—from one quarter to 2 years—in order to develop a particular thematic focus or disciplinary

direction in CHID at the appropriate time. These lectureships would allow CHID to retain its current curricular flexibility and encourage rather than inhibit cross-campus collaborations and networking.

Part-Time cross appointments. Once CHID is a line-bearing unit we imagine that some faculty (such as the current Director) will petition to have part of their line moved into CHID. The issue of split appointments has already arisen in CHID's current search and we imagine it will inevitably arise again because of our cross-disciplinary curriculum and collaborative projects. We in CHID hope to use cross appointments to further the recent initiatives in the university toward interdisciplinarity. We will choose faculty based on the merit of their interdisciplinary teaching and research record.

Transformation of the Current CHID Advisory Faculty Board into an Executive Committee with powers to make recommendations for appointment, merit and promotion. This Executive Committee would consist of all CHID faculty whose lines are completely or partially in the unit. The Executive Committee would initially include tenured faculty who teach regularly in the CHID program or have other long standing commitments to the program due to the need for appropriate numbers in various ranks (such as Leroy Searle in English/Comparative Literature or James Antony of the School of Education).

B: Faculty Appointments and Curricular Innovation and Reform

CHID is characterized by a constant process of curricular expansion and creation. (Our brochures can not always keep up with these changes, but that is a different problem, and is related to the critical importance of advising in the program.) Many of our curricular innovations originate in student initiatives, often articulated in the first stages as C/NC focus groups organized by both undergraduate majors and graduate Teaching Assistants. The high number of new focus groups scheduled for this year includes several specifically devoted to course development, and indicate that this dimension of the process of curricular change is about as robust as we can manage.

The other source of curricular innovation of course originates in the participation of new faculty members in the program. Phillip Thurtle's appointment last year has already expanded CHID's interdisciplinary reach and pedagogical innovations in a number of directions. We expect that the appointment in Transnational Post-Conflict Studies will have a similar impact on curricular themes and cross-campus collaborations, and especially on our ongoing effort to integrate foreign study programs into the general CHID curriculum.

C: Space

We couldn't agree more with the Committee's recommendation that something has to be done about CHID's "extraordinarily cramped" space in Padelford. (I might note that the Director currently shares his faculty office with three Teaching Assistants, that housing our new appointment this year will force us to relinquish the last remaining office designated for the use CHID's numerous and very active Teaching Assistants, and

that we have already transformed the so-called CHID “lounge” into a multi-purpose space that houses a computer lab, an advising/consultation space, a meeting room for staff and faculty, a writing center and a classroom that is booked virtually every hour of the week). Our negotiations over the past few years about the available space on the Third Floor of the Art Building have led us to think more seriously about the kind of space we need, but they do not seem to have brought us much closer to an actual move into a new space. We also agree with the Committee that the issue of new space for CHID is a complex one because it involves not only more space but the development and design of a space that is suited to the particular nature of the program. We are very eager to move forward in this area.

D. Integrating Writing Instruction within CHID

The challenges CHID faces with respect to providing students with the opportunity to develop writing skills commensurate to their critical thinking skills can be addressed in two ways. First, CHID currently shares a writing center with two other programs. An expanded writing center would enable instructors to integrate the use of the writing center into their curriculum rather than sending students to the writing center only in cases of serious writing problems. Second, by setting up “writing links” for CHID’s lecture courses, students new to the program would immediately have the opportunity to begin developing a writing practice to supplement their critical thinking skills. There is currently a writing links program in place and the use of this program has enjoyed some success, however, too often the effectiveness of these linked courses is limited by the fact that the instructors are not familiar with the philosophy and goals of the CHID program. If the CHID program were granted one additional TA appointment for each lecture course, we could establish writing links closely coordinated with the curriculum and philosophy of the CHID program.

E. The International Programs: Organization and Curriculum

In response to the review committee’s overall assessment of the CHID program’s expanding focus on international study, we acknowledge the committee’s concern about our rapid growth in international study sites, the need for an ongoing evaluation of how these programs are aligned with our core pedagogical principles, and the need for maintaining adequate oversight of these programs. In response to the review committee’s specific recommendations concerning international study, we offer the following points:

While we appreciate the need to be aware of the relation of each of the study-abroad programs to the central educational objectives of the program as a whole, we would prefer to maintain a more fluid conception of their relative value rather than establishing a fixed differentiation between “core” and “auxiliary” programs. For the most part, we would regard all of the quarter-long programs as central to our educational mission. And this is the case regardless of the number of CHID students participating because of our emphasis on interdisciplinary outreach. The month-long exploration seminars, by comparison, could be considered auxiliary although they also serve as an excellent means for developing quarter-long programs at new sites. Through these two types of study

abroad offerings, we would like to continue to pursue an organic model for the development of our focus on international study by taking advantage of the opportunities, and working within the constraints, that are presented to us. At the same time we recognize the need to be clear about our guiding principles, and to constantly investigate ways that our programs can adapt to better fulfill our mission—bearing in mind that any program that sends more students abroad is a step in the right direction. Through these two modes of growth, we can respond to the changing circumstances of contemporary society, the evolving needs of students, and the interests and availability of faculty.

Concerning the recommendation for “closer oversight” of our international programs, the committee notes the service provided to the broader university community in developing and coordinating study abroad through the efforts of the CHID International Program Coordinator, Theron Stevenson, but also a concern about how these demands may be affecting the oversight of particular programs considered to be more central to our educational mission. In response, we would call attention to the oversight mechanisms already in place that were not specified in the report. Students submit a mandatory program assessment to the Office of International Programs. These assessments are reviewed by the Director of International Programs, David Fenner, and copies are distributed to Theron Stevenson and the instructors. The instructors also typically meet with David Fenner and Theron Stevenson after the program to discuss the student assessments. The particular concerns cited in the report about deficiencies in “core” programs were, in comparison, very limited in scope due to their secondhand, anecdotal character which can be attributed to the time constraints of the review process. A much broader body of assessment information is already part of the oversight function. However, we appreciate the committee’s attention to the need for an ongoing means of oversight and assessment of the study-abroad programs. In response to the concern about how the rapid expansion of the study abroad programs, in particular the exploration seminars, might be distracting from the oversight function, we would like to mention that the funds derived from the great expansion of the exploration seminars has actually made it possible to expand our oversight capabilities by funding, in part, the Program Assistant position held by Sylvia Kurinsky, and by allowing more time for Theron or other CHID representatives to travel and evaluate particular programs.

In response to the recommendation for “more development of institutionalized reflexivity” in relation to the study-abroad programs, we are, in fact, actively pursuing more possibilities for linking the students’ study-abroad experience with particular courses and the local community. As examples, we would cite a Curriculum Development grant of \$9,000 obtained by Lydia Ruddy, a graduate student, to integrate the curricula and work of our foreign study programs into the curriculum of the CHID program and other University of Washington units. Another example would be the course co-taught by Phillip Thurtle entitled “Becoming Strangers: Travel, Trust and the Everyday” which offers theoretical tools for integrating the experience of the “exotic” with one’s experience of the local and familiar. In addition, we are actively considering plans for a CHID 498 “re-entry program” with students engaged in exchanging narrative accounts of their international study experience. More broadly, we are attempting to honor the legacy of Jim Clowes and his conception of the “Local Global Network” which attempts to link community engagement programs at study abroad sites with similar organizations in the local community. For example, students participating in the Cape

Town program are asked to anticipate the type of organization they would like to volunteer with in Cape Town and to make contact with a similar local organization prior to the program as part of the preparatory course. Upon their return, they are also encouraged to bring their experience in South Africa back to the local organization. In support of these efforts, we are considering the potential for hiring student hourly workers to compile a database of NGO contacts for future study and work by our students. Concerning the committee's recommendation that a tenured appointment in transnational post-conflict studies could build curricula and general interest in international issues among CHID students and in partnering departments, we strongly agree and are hoping to implement this recommendation as soon as possible. We can envision, for example, that running the Dialogue Project and other efforts to develop ongoing projects for students who have been abroad could be a full-time position, or part of a faculty member's responsibilities.

CHID should continually reinvigorate our goal of community involvement. This could take the form of Engaged Community Learning (ECL) requirements on programs such as Cape Town, Belfast, Auroville and Baja. Or, on programs where language barriers, time constraints or other programmatic constraints don't allow us to require an ECL for all students, we will encourage joint classes or meetings with local groups, presentations by local organizations, with an emphasis on potential sites for further study or internships for our students, and exchanges between institutions and organizations in Seattle and abroad.

While keeping our programs accessible to a wide range of students with different language skills, we will continue to highlight the potential problems of cross-cultural interactions conducted solely in English. It would be worthwhile to encourage language instruction for any program in a non-English speaking country, but other programmatic concerns will prevent this from being a requirement. For example, the Berlin program does have a language prerequisite. In others, such as the Rome program, we have encouraged and attempted to include language study before and during the program, but student time constraints tend to diminish the effectiveness of these efforts. And, in order to allow broad access to study abroad, we have been reluctant to require language study as a prerequisite for participation.

We have focused our resource-sharing efforts towards on-the-ground work by our students and staff, and modest donations of equipment and material resources in exchange for services provided by our international partners. State law prevents us from using our budgets to buy gifts for our partners. We support the idea of working with faculty or students from biotech, engineering or medicine, who could integrate or piggy-back with one of our programs, but working out the logistics of this has not been a priority for Theron. Establishing such relationships with the science departments at the University may fall under the purview of a yet-to-be-appointed faculty member in transnational post-conflict studies as well as with current Assistant Professor Phillip Thurtle.

Concerning the committee's recommendation for "generating a sustainable 'learning institution' model" by pursuing the above listed recommendations, we will certainly strive to again honor the legacy of Jim Clowes in establishing and maintaining self-sustaining local/global links that integrate the study abroad experience with the broader pedagogical objective of reflecting on the relation between individual identity and

community development.

F. CHID Teaching Assistants and the Creation of a Graduate Certificate Program

We in CHID feel it is time that we recognize the important contributions that graduate students make to our program. We agree with the review committee that the best first step for accomplishing this would be to establish CHID as a graduate certificate program. Initially this could take the form of targeting faculty active in CHID wishing more graduate student contact and negotiating with their home departments on the possibility of adding CHID as a secondary field of competency. This would help identify an interdisciplinary pool of students sympathetic to the aims and content of a CHID education for possible teaching and research assistantships. It would also provide an administrative mechanism to regularize our TA appointments and a platform for growing our unique graduate student culture.

As currently envisioned there would be five components to this program:

- 1) Specific graduate courses designed with the needs of CHID graduate students in mind. Since the “core” of graduate student expertise would be derived from the students’ home departments, these classes would be free to address a number of emergent topics in interdisciplinary scholarship, as defined by graduate students in consultation with faculty. Each of these classes would include a “practicum,” where graduate students would participate in CHID curricular self-study and reform.
- 2) CHID would then augment the designed curriculum by identifying graduate classes offered by other departments with themes and methodologies sympathetic to the interdisciplinary mission of CHID. This would expose students to other disciplinary approaches as well as increase discussions between students in other disciplines. It would also give faculty interested in participating in CHID a means of doing so.
- 3) Provide a mechanism for the administration of CHID TA appointments. As designated participants in CHID, these graduate students would then be available for teaching and research assistantships only available to CHID. Currently the work of hiring and distributing TA tasks has fallen on the shoulders of Director John Toews and Assistant Director Amy Peloff. Formalizing these relationships would help distribute the tasks currently performed by these members to interested faculty on the revitalized Executive Board.
- 4) Provide support for TAs as they help mentor undergraduates. Many of our graduate students currently help oversee undergraduate research projects. A graduate program would give these graduate student mentors help with overseeing projects and writing letters for accomplished undergraduates and a means for recognizing this important contribution to an enquiry based education.

- 5) Provide a platform for pursuing interdisciplinary graduate research. Although disciplinary affiliations are useful for developing methodological rigor and defining specific content, most problems are inherently interdisciplinary. The recent success of university interdisciplinary projects testifies to this. The proposed structure supports a core group of individuals interested in the comparative studies of culture (through an emphasis on intellectual inquiry) who can mount further collaborative efforts. These could be in class offerings (graduate and undergraduate), panels for meetings, publications, grants, and more informal avenues of scholarly exchange. Again, this already happens at the graduate student and faculty level in CHID, thus the structure would just help these efforts in their initiation, carry through, and recognition.

Existing Programs: Models without Redundancy

The interdisciplinary “Critical Theory Program” offered in the College of Arts and Sciences at the UW, shares some features with the proposed structure: students can choose it as an interdisciplinary secondary field to supplement their studies in their home department. We propose instituting a certificate program in CHID structured in much the same way as the “Critical Theory Program.”

Still, the proposed structure is unique in content, culture, and construction. The content of the “Critical Theory Program” is circumscribed to contemporary critical theory. Although certainly including theoretical topics, the content of the CHID secondary field would be in “Intellectual Cultures” that necessitates an examination of culture in context. Also, another major difference is that the curriculum of the Critical Theory Program is specified in advance. For instance, a student chooses from classes pre-listed on a program brochure. The CHID secondary field requirement would be more dynamic, with the students having a stronger voice in identifying topics for the CHID curriculum. Finally, there is no parallel undergraduate track in “Critical Theory” that would draw off the expertise of the graduate students while adding undergraduate enthusiasm and interest to a common intellectual culture.

G. Response to the Administrative Challenges of Success: Issues of Staffing and Advising

The Review Committee identified one of CHID’s primary concerns: our rapidly increasing number of students and the impact that more students will have on our ability to retain our unique character. Community has always been, and will always be, the core of the CHID Program. Restricting access to the CHID Program would be adverse to the program’s core philosophies, but we recognize the need to thoughtfully prepare for growth.

In terms of addressing the exponentially expanding student base, we have decided to return to an earlier requirement—a personal essay outlining the student’s educational values and personal goals. We are currently in the process of applying to be a “selective major,” a major that will accept every student once basic entrance requirements have been fulfilled—in this case, the personal essay. This essay may slow down the growth of our student-base without excluding anyone on the basis of grades or other selection criteria. More importantly, we will eliminate our “ghost majors,” students who declare

the major as entering students. These “ghost majors” often never walk into the CHID office. While we gladly welcome any interest in the CHID program, it is imperative that all CHID students meet with the adviser to thoughtfully prepare their coursework plans. We want to emphasize that any student who completes the personal essay will be admitted to the CHID program, regardless of the essay’s perceived quality.

All this said, we are not convinced that the increasing number of CHID majors is the threat to the CHID program that the review committee perceived it to be. As CHID grows, we have found that students develop organic smaller communities (or as we like to call them, “rhizomatic nodules”) within the larger CHID community. These smaller communities, such as service initiatives, focus groups, etc., effectively fulfill CHID’s core value of the learning community while accommodating larger numbers of majors. These smaller communities are constantly appearing and changing; thus, we want to institutionalize the *opportunity* for the development of these smaller communities without inhibiting change and innovation. With growth, it will be increasingly important to create and maintain a strong infrastructure to support these student projects.

Staff support

CHID has already adapted some existing positions to meet our changing needs, often without the permanent funding or basic office structure to support these changes. These changes are fine short-term solutions, but we want to emphasize that they will not be feasible long-term solutions—we need permanent budgetary support for the adjustments we have had to make as well as supplemental funding for 40 hrs/week work-study positions (2 students working 20hrs/week).

Full-Time Advising. One of the major staffing changes we have had to make in response to our recent growth, we have converted our 20 hrs/week GSA undergraduate advising position into a full-time, professional staff position, despite the fact that we have not received permanent funding for this change. To fund this position we are using not only the original graduate student position funds, but we have to supplement those funds with some of our teaching budget. This was necessary because the advising position in CHID is far more complex than just filing paperwork and helping students identify remaining graduation requirements. Rather, the CHID advisor operates as the first introduction to the CHID community, identifying classes, projects, and volunteer opportunities that may help the student realize their intellectual potential and integrate them into the CHID learning community. Most students meet with the advisor *at least* once a quarter, although many meet with her much more frequently. She also runs the New Major Focus Group, a small, 2-credit class that introduces new students to their peers as well as the program as a whole. This quarter (Autumn 2005) she is offering two sections of the class, due to the recent increase in majors. Additionally, many students come to her for advice on developing ideas and identifying potential faculty advisors for the senior thesis. This type of intellectual advising pushes this position far beyond the institutional view of the advisor as administrative liaison. As detailed above, converting our advisor into a permanent, full-time professional staff position was an urgent need, and one that needs permanent University budgetary support.

Increased staffing. The duties covered by our program assistant have similarly expanded. Created initially as a 20hrs/week position to support the program administrator and the international programs coordinator, she is currently working 35 hrs/week and taking a much more independent role within the operation of the program. As the number of students has increased, so too has our need for more coordination of the multiple projects that have grown up around student, faculty, and staff interests. Currently, our program assistant has stepped in to fill this need, acting as program liaison to the student-directed Dialogue Project, coordinating an internship program, maintaining our relationship with the Roosevelt High School-based Hands for a Bridge program, and facilitating a videoconferencing project that will bring together CHID students and different community groups. We feel strongly that these components are central to the development and maintenance of our learning community and are deserving of the resources we have to offer. Unfortunately, retasking the program assistant to cover these projects has taken away from the basic office support needed for maintaining the office—photocopying, answering telephones, delivering mail, responding to walk-in inquiries, and so on.

Our ideal solution is to redefine the program assistant position into something more focused on project support and community outreach. Her position would be supplemented with 40 hours a week of work-study student employees. We have encountered two impediments to realizing this ideal. The first is financial—we do not have the money to cover the cost of the work study students. The second is physical—we do not have the office space to add an additional body to our current office set-up. Both of these problems should be fairly simple to resolve. We need \$4,500 in work study salary to pay the additional office support staff and we need an additional office, preferably B101 across the hall.

Information Architect. As all aspects of CHID have grown, we have been trying to develop strategies for organizing the information we have accumulated and using different technologies to maintain and expand the CHID learning community beyond the boundaries of the UW campus. Some current plans and initiatives include—

1. Digitizing senior theses. We are currently working with the UW libraries to utilize their dSpace project to create a digital repository of student work. We are imaging this as the first step in creating a dynamic, interactive CHID community space which our current students, alumni, and community friends can use to share projects, ideas, and information.

2. Creating an integrated database for international programs. We would like to create a database that would be partially created from information entered by students using an online application for our international programs (similar to the database-driven applications currently used by the Latin American Studies Program and, to a lesser extent, the Exploration Seminars). This database would be used to track student applications, collect statistical data on our international programs, simplify the international program accounting, and enable us to make long-term developmental projections based on programmatic trends.

We imagine the role of an Information Architect to be a contract and not a permanent position in CHID. In the past we have tried to make do with the skills found among our current students and staff, but to realize these more complex needs and goals, we need to hire someone with significant programming skills and experience. The cost for this will be roughly \$10,000.

Summary of Staff/Administrative Support Requests:

1. Permanent funding for a full-time professional advisor
2. Funds for 40 hours/week of work study
3. One additional staff office
4. \$10,000 for an Information Architect.

H. Addressing Diversity

For the 2005-2006 year, CHID was awarded a \$28,1000 grant from the UW Diversity Appraisal Implementation Fund to develop, teach, and evaluate a new introductory course for both CHID and other university students. Tentatively titled “A Comparative Exploration of Diversity: Interdisciplinary Knowledges and Personal Engagements,” this course will study the idea “diversity” in ways that are similar to how other CHID introductory courses approach “human nature” or “higher education.” Currently, 20 students of diverse backgrounds and majors are participating in a colloquium to develop the new course that will first be taught Winter 2006. For better or for worse, the institution operates within systems of representational politics. With an annual offering of the new course that will incorporate up to eight ‘diverse’ UW faculty as guest lecturers and co-leaders of the course, we anticipate that CHID will attract a greater variety of students, just as the colloquium to develop the course has done.

Additionally, the CHID program is currently collaborating with Laurie Sears and Francisco Benitez on a grant proposal for a program entitled “Difficult Dialogues” which would initially focus on attempting to facilitate an awareness and active exchange of perspectives on the emerging, complex, and often conflicting identity roles among Asian American students. The grant proposal would draw upon the CHID program’s longstanding use of student Peer Facilitators for creating a forum for considering these identity issues, and the use of CHID focus groups to pursue them in more detail. This model could then be expanded to consider other potential conflicts in identity formation in contemporary society.

I. Developing Development

We agree with the report writers that CHID is well-positioned to attract grants and donations in terms of its multi-disciplinary orientation towards international education and its focus on issues of conflict and dialogue. Similarly, CHID’s role at the forefront of undergraduate educational innovation can be highlighted to individual donors and funding agencies. We also believe that the more recent emphasis on bridging the humanities and science provides access to a completely different set of funding opportunities which need to be carefully explored. What we are lacking, as correctly noted by the review committee, is a pool of wealthy alums who can support these

programs and initiatives. Instead, we rely on a combination community outreach and grant applications to bring in the small amounts of money that make up our development budget. The specific recommendations about how to “develop development” provided by the review committee will be addressed in turn below:

Assessment and outcome studies: As already mentioned in the section on international study, some efforts on self-assessment and outcome studies are already underway. Students who are returning from abroad are required to complete reports to David Fenner, head of international study for the entire university. The value of these reports became increasingly evident as we worked with development staff at the University and the Office of Educational Assessment as part of our grant applications last year to develop evaluation and self-review strategies for many of our programs, not just the international ones. Of course, the evaluations are not expense-free, so we have started including them as part of our grant applications. We are currently searching for funding to take these outcome studies to the next-level beyond questionnaires by tracking issues like number of participants and level of participation by various groups in different programs, events and activities.

The review committee also suggested creating an **oral history archive** modeled on the Anthology Project’s publication *Elusive Horizons*. Because this publication was the direct outcome of the CHID international program, we are not sure how we could make it different (or more “ours” as the report seems to suggest). Instead, we propose that we focus on making sure that the anthologies keep being created annually while increasing their circulation amongst potential donors and funding agencies.

Educate UW Development Staff: The review committee emphasized the need to “highlight CHID’s achievements as a flagship program” to the top echelon of UW development. We recognize the great potential in following this suggestion and propose that CHID faculty, board members, staff and students spend time educating UW development staff about what CHID is and does. The richness and complexity of the program does not allow for easy description and we fear that perhaps it is skipped over in discussions between development staff and donors as a result. CHID would like to host an annual event to educate relevant UW staff about what we do and who we are. This could be in the form of a lunch-time presentation by the CHID director, faculty, program leaders and students about current classes and projects. In this way we hope to familiarize development staff with CHID in a way that helps them both to recognize potential funding sources and enable them to feel comfortable describing the program.

Other development efforts currently underway include working with our new major gifts officer, Molly Purrington as well as with the grants and funding office overseen by Gael Tarleton. We are also public events like the salon series and the Conflict and Dialogue Speakers Series which was funded this year by a College of Arts and Sciences Exchange Program grant. Finally, we will work with our faculty board and alumni to identify potential members for a development advisory board.

Recommendations for Programmatic Reform

UW Administrative Support

Transform CHID into line-bearing unit	
Transfer Phillip Thurtle's position to CHID	
Create tenure line faculty position relating to transnational post-conflict studies	
Create 3rd tenure line faculty position	
Create 4th tenure line faculty position	
Create rotating faculty position or two open senior lectureships	
Prepare to allow transfers and cross appointments to CHID	
Increase and commit TA funding	
As part of development program, promote CHID as one of UW's "signature offerings of excellence in undergrad education"	Dean has appointed Molly Purrington as major gifts officer
Give CHID a larger physical space on campus	
Give CHID permanent funding for a full-time professional advisor	
Give CHID funds for 40 hours/week of work study	
\$10,000 for an Information Architect	

Recommendations for changes within CHID

Compose job description for each faculty position	
Conduct search for transnational position	
Recompose CHID Advisory Board more as an executive committee	
Prepare to manage cross-appointments and transfers.	
Develop more ties between core international programs and CHID curriculum	Part of curriculum redevelopment.
Reinforce the goal of community involvement within international programs	
Determine ways to bring UW resources to communities where we have programs	Part of curriculum redevelopment.
Reform writing instruction	
Create graduate certificate program	
Develop capital campaign for new space	
As part of development, engage in outcome study of int'l program and of the major itself	
Promote CHID to UW development experts	
Create development advisory board	