

COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF IDEAS (CHID)

Report of the Review Committee, June, 2005

We, the following members of the review committee, have concluded our review of the CHID program and submit it herewith:

Matthew Sparke (Committee Chair), Department of Geography and JSIS, Box 353550
Anthony Geist, Division of Spanish and Portuguese, Box 354330
Caroline Simpson, Department of English, Box 354360
Susan Squier, Departments of English and Women Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, 228 Burrowes, University Park, PA 16802-6206
Timothy Lenoir, John Hope Franklin Center, Duke University, 2204 Erwin Rd., Durham, NC 27708-0404

Introduction:

CHID is an extraordinarily impressive undergraduate program at the University of Washington. It is impressive because of the intense enthusiasm of its students, their collaborative engagement in shaping the program's curricula innovations, and their pride in its conviviality and accessibility. It is impressive because it is genuinely interdisciplinary in the ways it reaches out from the humanities to connect student learning with research in the natural sciences, health sciences, social sciences and area studies. It is impressive because its commitments to student-led learning and interdisciplinarity are also combined with a practical attention to real world issues and global engagements. And, not least of all, it is impressive because CHID makes these important contributions to undergraduate learning at the university despite having no tenure line faculty and very meager funding. This year (2004-5), for example, the program has over 200 majors, has contributed over 3,300 student credit hours of teaching, and yet has received little more than \$200K in university funds. CHID's lack of budgetary support has sometimes been used to explain its creativity. But in the course of conducting this review, the committee has come to the conclusion that, faced with deep personnel losses and the departure of some key advocates in the UW administration, CHID's lack of firm institutional foundations now leaves it worryingly vulnerable. Thus while our first recommendation is clearly that the program should be continued, and while we seek to underline how CHID's contributions can be enhanced between now and the next review, we also emphasize that *unless the UW administration enacts other recommended reforms* the program might actually be lost.

Our review is organized into 4 sections. First, we describe the review process. Second, we highlight what appear to us to be some of the most impressive achievements of CHID. Third, we outline the pressing challenges that now face the program. And fourth, we provide a set of ten recommendations for programmatic reform.

Review Process

The review of the program with both internal and external members of the committee present took place from the evening of May 1st through to the afternoon of May 3rd. Prior to this, the internal committee members met to prepare the agenda for the

two days of interviews, and all members of the committee read the comprehensive self-study that had been provided by CHID earlier in the year.

Our interviews began with a long meeting with John Toews (History), the director of CHID. Over the course of the two days we proceeded to have interviews with the following CHID-connected faculty: Philip Thurtle (History), Kari Tupper (Women's Studies), Paul Berger (Art), Laurie Sears (History), David Silver (Communications), Nikhil Pal Singh (History), Eric Ames (Germanics), Leroy Searle (English), George Behlmer (History), Ted Kaltsounis (Education), Karen Litfin (Political Science), Uta Poiger (History), and James Antony (Education). We also interviewed all of the staff for CHID (most of whom also perform vital pedagogic roles in the program): Amy Peloff (Assistant Director), Theron Stevenson (International Program Coordinator), Jeanette Bushnell (Academic Advisor), Sylvia Kurinsky (Program Assistant), Lydia Ruddy (Student Assistant), and Matt Schieblehner (former Academic Advisor and TA). We met over lunch with approximately 25 students majoring in CHID, and three TAs who regularly teach for the program. Another large group interview took place with the Chairs and Administrators of various programs closely connected with CHID's operations: namely, Judy Howard (Chair of Women Studies), John Findlay (Chair of History), Gary Handwerk (Chair of Comparative Literature), Richard Dunn (Chair of English), Anand Yang (Chair of JSIS), Kathleen Woodward (Director of the Simpson Center), and David Fenner (Assistant Vice Provost for International Education). At the close of the second day, the full committee presented an initial response and set of recommendations to key UW administrators: David Thorud (Acting Provost), Susan Jeffords (Vice Provost for Academic Planning), Elizabeth Feetham (Acting Dean of the Graduate School), David Hodge (Dean of Arts and Sciences), Robert Stacey (Acting Divisional Dean of the Social Sciences), Gail Dubrow (Associate Dean of the Graduate School), and Janice DeCosmo (representing Christine Ingebritsen, Acting Dean of the Office of Undergraduate Education).

During the process of this intense two day period of interviews a consensus view of the CHID program came quickly to the review committee. We were all impressed by similar features of the program; we all came to the same conclusions about CHID's vulnerabilities; and we all shared similar ideas about what might be done to mitigate the vulnerabilities and sustain and enhance the program into the future.

Review Results Part I: CHID's accomplishments

Over the course of three decades CHID has become exemplary amongst American interdisciplinary humanities programs as a model of how to articulate and implement a vision of undergraduate education that empowers students as architects of their own education. Significant as it now is in stature and scope, today's CHID program grew out of a small NEH grant to UW in the late 1970s. Under the directorship of John Toews (who was hired into History in 1979 and who has remained program director ever since his promotion to tenure in 1981), CHID grew through the 1980s with administrative support from the Comparative Literature program as a form of 'Great Western Works' course bridging philosophy, literature and history. Then, as now, the program had no tenure track lines. Subsequently, in the 1990s CHID moved under the jurisdiction of the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) where it remained until 1998 when it moved back to the College of Arts and Sciences where it now falls under the administration of

the Divisional Dean of the Humanities. The support from OUE for CHID in the form of TA lines in the 1990s, came together with the tremendously charismatic leadership of Jim Clowes, a former CHID TA turned lecturer. As associate director, Jim Clowes worked closely with John Toews to turn CHID into a widely-praised center for educational innovation at the university. On March 1, 2004, Jim Clowes died from cancer, but the legacies of his work live on in many of CHID's most heralded accomplishments: including not least of all, its exemplary status as a model of worldly, transdisciplinary, student-led, liberal arts education. As we will now explain in more detail, these accomplishments have also been profoundly collective and have involved active and ongoing collaborations in close-knit networks of students, advisors and CHID-related faculty.

CHID's creativity and innovation

One way of summarizing CHID's accomplishments would be to point to its students' stellar academic achievements (including numerous Mary Gates fellowships, Bonderman fellowships, Zesbaugh and McNair scholarships, and Fulbright grants) and their subsequent career developments: whether as nationally known journalists for the *New York Times* and *New Yorker* or as professors with appointments at Harvard, Stanford, Duke, Michigan and Texas.¹ Similarly one can point to the prestige of the program at UW itself: the high praise it regularly receives from the Administration and Regents and the accolades it has won for its curriculum (including a Brotman award for instructional excellence). However, to focus solely on these measurable outcomes of CHID's work would also be to miss the deeper and more profoundly innovative quality of the program's educational accomplishments: accomplishments that relate as much to the learning *process* itself as to the notable successes it makes possible.

The core of CHID's innovative approach is that learning should be problem-focused, experience-based, and use-inspired rather than centered on learning a specific discipline. CHID recognizes the power of disciplines to provide rigorously focused methods and traditions of knowledge; it harnesses these strengths by bringing the disciplines into dialogue through a comparative approach connecting a diverse range of interpretive perspectives. The goal of CHID's transdisciplinarity is to encourage students to engage in critical self-reflection on the cultural assumptions that inform analysis of, and interaction with others. To foster this sort of deep intellectual engagement, CHID students from early on in their program of core courses encounter a powerful range of cross-cultural, comparative and critical orientations (or, what some of the students cannily glossed for the review committee as "the CHID disorientation experience").

Perhaps the most innovative features of the CHID strategy for accomplishing this mission of critical self-reflection are its highly innovative study-abroad programs, whose goals are to develop and sharpen the critical framework and analytic skills CHID students acquire in their core courses through a deliberately unsettling cross-cultural experience. These are not typical international studies programs; rather they are more like laboratories for first-hand critical examination of the conditions for cross-cultural dialogue and communication intensified in the study-abroad sites chosen for their features of deep ethnic and racial division, stark economic disparities, devastating violence, injustice, and disease. David Fenner, Assistant Vice-Provost for International

¹ All these achievements are noted in the CHID Self Study, p. 35.

Education at UW, applauded the program's focus on study-abroad sites with the potential for producing active learning about complex and charged issues rather than merely a pleasant foreign holiday. He noted before the committee that CHID had thereby become a model for the rest of the UW community, a model of ideas and innovations in study abroad that he hopes will continue to spread - as an "influenza of innovation" in his terms - across the university.

In addition to its core curriculum of transdisciplinary cross-cultural humanities and experience-based learning through foreign study, a third distinctive feature of the CHID program is its remarkable involvement of students in curricular design and program governance. Groups of students propose revisions in existing courses as well as generate entirely new courses for which they seek out faculty advisors. A key feature of the CHID program is the role of the peer facilitator, an advanced student chosen on the basis of leadership skills, academic interests, and knowledge of the CHID program and its resources. The peer facilitators function as facilitators of discussion sessions, resources to provide support and information, and liaisons between students and faculty who teach CHID courses. The result of these curricular and organizational structures is a group of intensely engaged, highly motivated and highly achieving students. Alongside these undergraduates, we should also note the important involvement of graduate students (chiefly from English, History and Comparative Literature) who enjoy the benefits of working as TAs in this highly-charged, intellectually-alive environment. It is the ideas and organizational capacity of the networks assembled by this close community of undergraduate and graduate students that have in turn connected CHID so closely to the community. By the same token, it is these same community ties that also explain in part why CHID has become such an easily communicated symbol of town-gown ties between UW and Seattle, and Washington State more broadly.

CHID's achievements in comparison to other programs

CHID is clearly pioneering and unique among undergraduate humanities programs nationwide. During the 1990s many other universities sought to invest students with responsibility for their own education as a way of invigorating humanistic learning. At Stanford, for instance, a university committee appointed by President Gerhard Caspar restructured the introductory humanities courses required of all incoming freshmen (approximately 1600 students each year) by embracing an educational mission similar to that of CHID. The Stanford Introduction to the Humanities Program (IHUM), however, was for first-year students only, and it was part of a distribution breadth requirement rather than a major. Moreover, the Stanford IHUM Program has never succeeded in engaging students in curricular initiatives or in responsible curricular roles, such as peer advising or generation of course content in any way comparable to the CHID program.

During the 1990s many universities initiated learning-community and service-based learning programs, some of which had goals similar to those of CHID. The Federated Learning Communities Program at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, for example, is a flagship among such initiatives, but from its earlier form as a multi-year program linking courses across the university with small seminars providing opportunities for collaborative reflection on the course content shared by FLC participants, it has dwindled through lack of university support to a one-year program intended to provide incoming students with skills in critical thinking, problem-solving,

and teamwork. Unlike CHID's development of a major based on transdisciplinarity, and unlike the ambitious and pedagogically innovative model of the early Federated Learning Community, the main goal of Stony Brook's current Learning Communities Program is to help students make the transition to selecting their majors. The Review Committee could not find another current example of a learning community program that has the intensive core curriculum of comparative and critically self-reflective learning that distinguishes CHID.

CHID bears similarity to but in terms of its breadth of vision has remarkable differences from some of the most highly-touted service-based learning programs at top flight American universities, such as Duke's program in Research Service Learning, or Stanford's Haas Center for Public Service. Both of these programs combine coursework and service experiences with rigorous reflection and writing by offering courses that strengthen critical reflection, enrich moral imagination and inspire personal integrity and civic engagement. Similar to CHID, these two service-learning programs aim to promote core goals of a liberal education, leadership and life skills through critical reflection about personal, institutional, and social ethics. Also like CHID these programs offer rewarding research opportunities within the context of a service-learning experience to push students to deeper levels of intellectual, ethical, and civic engagement. These programs, however, emerge from curricular programs such as Ethics and Society (at Stanford) and are independent of the student's major.

Through the vision of its founders and supporters over the years, CHID has managed to incorporate the best features of all these distinctive, and, in most cases, no longer existing, serviced-based and learning-community programs. CHID offers students a high-powered theoretical framework in the humanities broadly conceived, comparable in many ways to the intellectual frameworks of programs such as Duke's Literature Program or Stanford's Modern Thought and Literature Program; distinctively, it embeds that powerful intellectual framework within an experience-based approach to learning with a commitment to engagement with global and societal issues.

Notwithstanding its parallels with the programs at Stony Brook, Stanford, and Duke, CHID is also unique insofar as its development has depended so much upon a mix of charismatic leadership and low budget improvisation. Some of the program's creative use of student led learning doubtless can be traced to this situational mix of personal energy and institutional economy at UW. However, as we would now like to explain in more detail, this very same situational mix now leaves CHID looking extraordinarily vulnerable at a time of rapid institutional transition at UW.

Review Results Part II: CHID's challenges

Some of CHID's challenges stem directly from its success, including its rapid growth in popularity amongst undergraduates and its bold innovations in internationalizing education through study abroad. Other challenges stem, by contrast, from recent losses, including the death of Jim Clowes, the departure of Kari Tupper as a 50% lecturer in CHID, and the departure of two key administrators Michael Halleran (Divisional Dean of the Humanities) and George Bridges (Dean of Undergraduate

Education) who have been active in supporting the development of CHID. We will address the challenges of loss first before turning second to the challenges of the success.

The Challenges of Loss

- 1) The loss of *Jim Clowes* presents particularly wrenching challenges for CHID. His charismatic networking from the heart of the program to the rest of the university brought ever increasing numbers of faculty into CHID's orbit. His tireless work as a lecturer and mentor for students similarly brought in ever increasing numbers of undergraduates. And his willingness to travel globally and make the vital personal connections with local communities underpinned many of the early successes of the study abroad classes. It is obviously impossible to imagine 'replacing' such a unique figure, but at least articulating some of key areas in which he contributed makes it possible to imagine some ways of institutionally addressing the loss. This is what we seek to do in Part III with some of our recommendations.
- 2) The move of *Kari Tupper* away from UW to Whitman College represents another big loss for CHID. A 50% lecturer in the program who nevertheless put enormous care and creative energy into its teaching initiatives, her work simultaneously connected CHID more closely with Women Studies and to feminist theorizing about the production of difference, the power of discourse, and science studies.
- 3) The loss of *administrative advocates* for CHID might not normally be considered a proper focus of a review committee. However, because of CHID's lack of enduring institutional underpinnings, we feel obliged to underline that the upcoming departures of Deans Halleran and Bridges also now contribute to CHID's extreme institutional vulnerability. Acting soon to shore-up CHID's internal administrative foundations will be a vital response to this challenge.

The Challenges of Success

- 1) *Size*. As student interest in CHID continues to grow, and as the number of CHID majors increases, the program clearly faces a dilemma. Its student-led, problem-oriented approach to learning works best when CHID operates as a tightly networked community. It seemed clear to us as a committee that there is soon going to come a critical point when any more growth will eclipse such communal networking and create student alienation instead. Indeed, both the director and advising staff noted the increasing numbers of students that they currently do not know personally, a situation very different from the intensely personal connection that has characterized the CHID community, and such statements appeared to indicate that CHID may already be approaching its maximal size - at least with the existing numbers of staff. While exclusions based on grade-point averages obviously go against the whole inclusive vision underpinning CHID as a learning community, more thought and more support needs to be applied to mitigating the problems of growth.

- 2) *Space*. The issue of size also has space implications. Even just to continue at its current size, CHID needs more space than it is currently allocated in Padelford. Without more space for advising and visiting faculty, the energetic atmosphere of the reception area risks turning from a truly communal common space to an overcrowded and anonymous bull pit.
- 3) *Internationalization*. The plaudits that have been showered upon CHID's study-abroad classes have also come with increasing concerns that their proliferation risks diluting their effectiveness and integration into the core CHID curriculum. Theron Stevenson, the International Program Coordinator, described some programs like the one to South Africa as a 'core' study abroad program. Others, such as the one to India, seem much more weakly connected (with Karen Litfin, the professor who leads the India class, noting that only 1 or 2 out of the twenty students in the classes in recent years have actually been from CHID). As they stand today, therefore, it seems as if we can divide CHID's international programs into two categories: the 'core' programs in Cape Town, Belfast, Cyprus and Prague; and then the other more auxiliary programs including the College's Exploration Seminars that seem to be much more distant from CHID's concerns with peace, conflict and the global production of social difference and inequality. Clearly, there is a big service element to the wider university community in what CHID is doing to coordinate and shape study abroad, and this seems especially clear in the stewarding of the Exploration Seminars by Theron Stevenson. Clearly too, the funding for his International Program Coordinator position depends on CHID's ability to 'tax' all the study abroad program it administers. However, this dependency is leading to much less oversight and development of the core, CHID-related study abroad classes than seems warranted. One of the CHID-related faculty noted in this regard that students returning from this year's class in Cape Town were reporting dissatisfaction with the absences and hands-off approach of the course professor. We were also told that the most recent trips to Prague have been less carefully integrated with what CHID students were doing back at UW. Such problems might be reduced if the program coordinator could spend less time on unrelated 'income generation' courses and more time monitoring and improving the core, CHID-related programs.

It should also be noted here that several members of the review committee and a number of those interviewed expressed reservations about the lack of language training before and during the international expeditions. However, it became clear through the review process that this is primarily an issue in the auxiliary programs that are administrated but not conceived by CHID. The core programs either incorporate language study into the curriculum, make it less vital by studying in English-speaking settings, or compensate for it with engaged community learning with local NGOs, community groups and schools. More such innovations would be possible if CHID is given - as we recommend below - a tenure line appointment in transnational post-conflict studies.

- 4) *Curriculum*. Another concern voiced by sympathetic faculty critics of the CHID approach to study abroad is that it sometimes leads to what he called "naïve experientialism": a sort of gung-ho, go there, understand-everything-immediately-

through-experience approach. Ideally, such experientialism ought to be countered by the ways in which the CHID curriculum (including the vital CHID 210 on "The Idea of the University") enables students to be self-reflective about the limits of self-knowledge, Euro-centric philosophical traditions and the dominant conventions and exclusions of the American academy. However, as the program grows there is a danger that these forms of self-reflexivity will be limited if increasing student numbers weaken CHID's intensely collaborative approach to peer-facilitated auto-critique. Moreover, as a committee we were also persuaded by the sympathetic critics who argued that CHID really needs to go beyond encouraging personal reflection and do more to provide students with robust histories and geographies of race, culture, gender and capitalism as they relate to the production of the differences students confront on the ground in study-abroad classes. For these reasons, it will benefit CHID to undertake a revision of its curriculum to include more courses that highlight critical analyses of Western imperialism and its continuing legacy in the regions visited by students on study abroad expeditions. Some students we met with reported being unprepared for the resentment of US privilege they encountered, as well as an inability to make sense of it in retrospect. Clearly such students would be especially well-served by this sort of curriculum innovation. Instituting such changes would also pave the way for a broader curricular revision in CHID that re-energizes the existing model of intellectual cultural history by including courses that provide a materialist critique of racial and sexual political formations currently missing from the program. If the goal of CHID students, as one professor defined it, is "to change the world", and if, as the students themselves repeatedly asserted, they look to CHID to figure out how to bring "activism together with intellectual scholarship," then the addition of such courses would seem both logical and useful. Such a revision of the curriculum would undoubtedly work well to address CHID's current concerns about how to consolidate a new era of leadership and, in so doing, re-assert the power of their previous commitments. A revitalization of the CHID curriculum to bring its concerns up to date, from their origins in the late-seventies, is both due, and a highly appropriate development for the program, since it is in keeping with the CHID commitment to continual (and reflexive) reevaluation of the relations between the curricular materials and their social, political and geo-political contexts.

- 5) *Faculty.* The challenge of combining the diverse opportunities of experience-based learning with sophisticated teaching about the production of difference points in turn to a fifth challenge: namely the need noted in the self-study itself for more diversification amongst the faculty in the program. We believe that CHID's current focus on Western intellectual history should be re-conceptualized in light of important scholarly work on race, gender, sexuality, postcoloniality and globalization. While the specialization of CHID's faculty to date has been enormously useful to building the program's appeal, the "fairly traditional Western European focus" of many of their courses, to lift a phrase from the self-study, does not permit a rigorous consideration of, say, feminist critiques of globalization, or the political challenge of migrant, queer communities to a theory of diaspora. We suggest therefore that CHID draw on its tradition of individual self-reflection, only at a much broader, programmatic level. The issue here isn't using some bureaucratized 'diversity'

discourse in course descriptions. Rather, we see a need for a re-vitalization of CHID's course offerings by bringing in new faculty, a renewal of the faculty that should introduce scholars whose work directly analyses processes of minoritization, subjugation and inequality in different parts of the world. Without such change, CHID will be ill-prepared to take on the parallel challenges of enacting a successful amendment of its curriculum and ensuring that its increasing numbers of majors also include increasing numbers of under-represented minorities. Despite the program's openness and its apparent accessibility to transfer students from local community colleges - one of whom spoke enthusiastically at our lunch interview about how she had been attracted to CHID as a minority student from Seattle Central CC - CHID clearly needs to do more to attract such minority students. Understanding why and how to implement such changes in pursuit of diversification will also require a re-composition of the faculty on the advisory Board. The challenge in this respect is to include tenured associate professors doing work in areas relevant to a political critique of inequality and a commitment to and contact with minority students on campus. Such changes might also obviously enable some of the curriculum reforms noted above.

- 6) *Writing.* A smaller challenge brought up by the group of students we interviewed concerns writing instruction. Some of the students claimed that one of the successes of CHID's learning environment was that it had forced them to write a great deal. However, they also expressed a desire to have more guidance in developing specific writing skills. As a committee we suspect that this is an expression of more generalized student feelings about writing at UW, but by the same token we think CHID could usefully take up the challenge of working with others across campus to develop responsive innovations that are tied into CHID's core curriculum.
- 7) *Administration.* As it has grown, administrators have increasingly argued that CHID should become a 'line-bearing unit' with the capacity under UW rules to make recommendations about the hiring, merit and promotion of its own tenure-line faculty. These arguments were historically rejected by the director and others working in the program because of fears that 'departmentalization' would curtail CHID's dynamism, flexibility and educative experimentation. But now, in the context of both growth and the losses listed above, the director believes that becoming a line-bearing unit makes more sustainable sense. As a committee we wholeheartedly agree. One of the reasons relates to the more general concerns about institutional vulnerability. But another relates directly to the growing challenges of administering CHID as a program. These administrative difficulties became especially clear to the review committee when we heard about the case of the recent hiring of Phillip Thurtle.

Thurtle has now been hired to teach 100% for CHID. The national search that led to his hire was administered by CHID. And the UW administration deliberately supported making such an appointment. However, when it came to finding a 'tenure-line-home' for this new appointment, the director of CHID had to approach the History department and ask them to vote on offering an appointment to a colleague who would effectively be working for another program. Understandably, this was not

an easy question to ask or answer, and it was apparently made all the more difficult because more traditionalist historians of science in the History department balked at the sort of historical-*cum*-contemporary science studies practiced by Thurtle. We note all this here for two specific reasons. First, it is clear that the resistance in History will make Thurtle's application for tenure in that unit a difficult, if not impossible, challenge (something that was also acknowledged candidly by Acting Dean Stacey in the Exit Interview). As a review committee we wanted to note this in writing because it appears to us to be administratively unconscionable to leave a good scholar in such a difficult institutional bind. Second, it is clear to us that the obvious solution to the tenuring challenge (as well as so many others), is to transform CHID into a line-bearing unit. It is to this recommendation, the first of ten, that we now turn.

Review Results Part III: 10 Recommendations

- 1) *Transform CHID into a line-bearing unit.* As a committee we have concluded that the Administration has been right to argue for turning CHID into a line-bearing unit. Not only will this provide a solution to the sorts of administrative challenges posed by the Thurtle hire, it will create a more solid institutional platform from which to respond to all of the other challenges of loss, of diversification, of curricula innovation, and of size noted above. As a committee we understand the director's prior concerns about departmentalization, but we also think that *with adequate administrative support and safeguards* CHID's creativity will not be compromised by the sort of transformation we are recommending. In this respect, we should note that we see no need to move CHID from its current place in the chain of UW governance under the oversight of the Divisional Dean of Humanities. However, we do nevertheless see a big need for immediate administrative intervention in providing the actual lines and other supports that CHID clearly needs in order to survive and thrive as a line-bearing unit.
- 2) *Create new lines.* In terms of actual lines we believe that an immediate consequence of enacting recommendation (1) would be to transfer Phillip Thurtle's line into the new line-bearing CHID. Beyond this, 3 other new lines seem necessary (**a - c**), as well as a new rotating position (**d**) designed in part to institutionalize some of the campus-wide networking previously facilitated by Jim Clowes. Let us explain the need for each of these lines in turn:
 - (**a**) The first obvious need and the one most clearly articulated in the self-study is for a tenure-line faculty member whose research and teaching relates to **transnational post-conflict studies**. Such an appointment would be of a scholar who could speak knowledgeably (and ideally comparatively) about areas in which CHID's international programs are located. While the theme of post-conflict studies is obviously and justifiably a hot topic in the wake of recent wars in the Balkans, Africa, Afghanistan and Iraq, it would be important for the CHID tenure-line to be held by someone who can situate such empirical enquiry within a humanities framework with a theoretical

sensitivity to debates over global-local ties and the cultural legacies of imperialism. Such an appointment would regularize and sustain the intellectual foundation of the core CHID international programs.

- (b) The second need (which will be felt very strongly in the aftermath of Kari Tupper's departure) is for a tenure-line faculty member whose research and teaching is in **gender and sexuality studies**. Given other priorities at UW at present, it would make sense for this faculty member to also be able to build bridges with health sciences, queer studies and/or disability studies. Given CHID's Africa programs and student involvement with work addressing AIDS/HIV, there seems to be especial synergies possible with new department of Global Health. Yet such a CHID hire could come from a background in English, Comp Lit., Rhetoric, Anthropology, History, Law or Geography, and could also easily be connected to cross-appointments in such programs at UW (and thus not necessarily linked to Women Studies as Kari was). In any of these cases, though, the connection back to humanities work on issues of identity formation would be a necessary part of fashioning CHID's response to the *curriculum* and *diversification* challenges we have listed above.
- (c) The third need is for a tenure-line faculty member with research and teaching commitments to **post-colonial theory and critical race studies**. Again such an appointment would enable CHID to tackle head-on the challenges of *diversification* and *curriculum* innovation. In doing so, it would enable the program to build a more robust scholarly scaffolding for student engagements with questions of racial difference and inequality. This would in turn address the criticism of 'naïve experientialism' directed against some of the study abroad classes. Clustering with other units in such a hire seems a clear opportunity given current interests in the same area being explored by English, Comp. Lit, Women Studies and AES.
- (d) The fourth need is for a new sort of **rotating faculty position** in the reconfigured CHID unit. The idea would be to make this position something that CHID could offer as an honor to associate and assistant professors from other units on an annual basis. The external faculty would apply in a competition to teach for the year for CHID instead of for their own units (who would receive the 'buy-out' monies budgeted to CHID to support the position). The visiting faculty would benefit from working with CHID undergraduates as well as from a reduced teaching load (just 3 courses ideally). But at the same time they would bring in the outside ideas and synergies with other units that was previously improvised for CHID through the networking of Jim Clowes. One model for such rotating faculty positions are the innovative courses in the humanities funded through Simpson Center buy-outs. It should be noted in this regard that a possibility of further synergy and co-development may be to involve the visiting professor in CHID with teaching

one of the Danz courses in the humanities which are supported every year through the Simpson Center.

- 3) *Reinvigorate the CHID advisory board.* If CHID is turned into a line bearing unit it will also be necessary to reinvigorate the advisory board so that it has the depth and diversity to ensure adequate oversight of hiring, merit assessment, and selection of rotating faculty. Recomposed more as an executive committee with both CHID line faculty and external faculty involved (like the executive committees of LSJ and International Studies), such a board will be more effective at providing an interdisciplinary governance system for CHID. More than this, a recomposition of the board will enable the director to involve scholars eager to contribute *vis-à-vis* tackling the challenges of diversification and curriculum development. CHID already has contacts with at least a couple of younger associate professors whose increased involvement in the leadership of CHID would go a long way toward strengthening the program's current ability to address the politics of race and gender formations—the latter being another need with the loss of Kari Tupper—and who would help to guarantee that CHID will thrive in the future. Re-directing its attention to include associate professors among its key board members will also address something that particularly concerned the review committee: CHID's ongoing dependence on lecturers. While these lecturers have been essential to CHID's past development, and while we have only praise for their impressive level of commitment to the program, CHID's continuing reliance on their labor will become an increasingly vexing problem given the potential for exploitation, or even merely the appearance of exploitation, such dependence may effect or exacerbate. Moving toward more reliance on recently tenured professors, including those with an interdisciplinary interest who might be delighted to teach in a program outside the particular constraints of a more traditional unit, would help to resolve the lecturer dependency and the question of CHID's future leadership.
- 4) *Prepare for and manage internal cross-appointments.* Related to what we think is real faculty interest in contributing to the CHID advisory board, it should also be noted that a likely consequence of turning CHID into a line-bearing unit will be requests from faculty in other units to establish cross-appointments. This will probably happen for a diversity of reasons, but it needs to be anticipated and treated as a manageable opportunity rather than a disruptive threat. For the UW administration the possibility of being able to offer faculty a 50% or even 100% transfer to CHID may well prove to be a trump card in retention cases where the faculty involved feel alienated from their original home departments. For CHID in turn the possibility of such transfers may well prove to be another way of fostering diversity so long as a transparent and democratic process of approval is established that gives the director and CHID faculty the capacity to be selective.
- 5) *Strengthen the international programs.* We believe that CHID's brilliant innovations in international education can be further enhanced through 7 (a - g) specific amendments of existing practice.

- (a) We think that the study abroad programs most closely connected to the core CHID program need to be clearly identified and prioritized for development.
 - (b) Based on such identification and prioritization there needs to be closer oversight of the core programs with ongoing checks to ensure that faculty leaders are fully engaged with student work.
 - (c) The core programs once identified can be tied still more closely into the CHID curriculum with more development of institutionalized reflexivity on student learning such as the Dialogue Project.
 - (d) The goal of community involvement in the programs needs to be continually reinvigorated, especially in the absence of Jim Clowes who saw this need as a particular personal responsibility.
 - (e) The question of language and area knowledge preparation needs to be kept constantly in play so that maximum possible benefits are generated by the study abroad experiences.
 - (f) We also recommend that CHID do all it can to draw on the immense technological resources of UW (including computational, biotech, and engineering) in order to bring real material benefits to the communities its students work with abroad.
 - (g) Through a, b, c, d, e, and f it will be possible to work towards generating a sustainable 'learning institution' model for the core CHID international programs with ongoing adaptation to suggestions made by key individuals and institutions in international program study sites.
- 6) *Help CHID undergraduates further develop writing skills.* One more micro recommendation is that CHID might be able to do more to foster the acquisition of formal writing skills by collaborating in the college-wide effort to reform writing instruction. A possible outcome of such collaboration might be a move towards portfolio writing assignments, an example of writing instruction innovation that would appear to fit well with the CHID emphasis on processual learning.
- 7) *Support CHID teaching assistants with a graduate certificate program.* Our committee urges CHID to formalize and recognize the important relationship graduate students from other units have with the program by working toward the creation of a graduate certificate program available to MA and Ph.D. candidates in the College of Arts and Sciences (or, by petition, to students in other colleges). The availability of this graduate certificate program would enable graduate students teaching in CHID to build out from their existing teaching involvement to form an interdisciplinary academic and scholarly community. Such a certificate program would provide graduate students with evidence of their competence in interdisciplinary teaching and research, thus enhancing their marketable skills in a

time when the strongest candidates for academic positions present multiple specializations. Moreover, once the CHID graduate certificate was in place, it would also have the effect of drawing faculty members to CHID involvement, since they would be able to teach the graduate seminars that would satisfy the certificate requirements, as well as to act as advisors for CHID certificate students (in their own or in other departments).

Based on the model of certificate programs at other universities, the CHID graduate certificate could require an enrolled graduate student to complete five graduate seminars in addition to a teaching component (that could include a teaching practicum). Two dedicated core courses would have to be developed by CHID for the certificate program, while three others would be chosen from the menu of already existing courses in the student's own disciplinary specialty. The two core courses should reflect the innovative scholarly and pedagogical profile of the CHID program, including the attention to issues of critical race studies / postcoloniality, and to gender and sexuality, recommended in the revitalized CHID curriculum. One course should focus on the specific CHID research method and pedagogy, while the other course should offer an overview of the theoretical tools drawn on in CHID courses. In this way, the graduate students teaching in CHID would have the opportunity to formalize the already-existing but informal intellectual and pedagogical framework within which they are teaching in the CHID program. The additional three courses would ideally, over time, also be taught by the new CHID line faculty, but while the certificate program was in the start-up stage, they could also be chosen from a set of offerings in the graduate student's own disciplinary field that were judged by the student's CHID faculty advisor to be compatible with the CHID philosophy and methodology.

- 8) *Regularize TA funding.* Separate from point (7), but clearly part of regularizing CHID's relations with graduate students, we recommend an increase and regularization in committed TA funding from the College. More specifically, it would make sense for CHID to have regular funding for TAs who accompany faculty as assistants on Study Abroad programs or who could teach one-time seminar-size classes (the 498s in the CHID system) on themes not addressed elsewhere on campus. The freedom for advanced TAs to develop innovative experimental courses has clearly been a source of CHID's curricular innovation, but it is a form of TA use that does not appear to fit the standard formulae for TA allocation in the College (sections in large courses). TA work in the International Programs seems equally anomalous. As does the CHID-community relations TA role that was funded this last year by the Sterling Munro TA-ship for Lydia Ruddy. In all these areas regularizing funding for CHID's special TA positions could also be seen as an integral to the development of the certificate program.
- 9) *Develop development.* The CHID self-study reveals that, to date, little energy has been devoted to raising support for CHID from donors or from sponsored research. The review committee believes that the CHID program is poised to engage in some very productive fund-raising, both on the micro / local and macro/ national and international levels. In preparation for such development efforts, the review

committee suggests that CHID engage in two outcome studies: one of its foreign study programs, and one of the major itself. Some of the information such outcome studies would net is simply quantitative and best obtained by a faculty or staff survey of the pool of foreign study graduates and CHID graduates. However, a qualitative and narrative dimension of the outcome assessment could actually be obtained by current CHID students, in the form of an oral history archive of some of the experiences and accomplishments of CHID students. This could be modeled on the already existing Anthology Project's publication, *Elusive Horizons*. Such an oral history / archive project would have multiple intellectual and programmatic benefits, including: 1) the creation of an intellectual and pedagogical space where current CHID students could define the goals and methods (the mission, if you will) of the CHID program, 2) reinforcement of the program's commitment to the construction of a self-reflexive record of the CHID student body, and 3) exploration of the strategies for fund-raising available to CHID both among UW alumni and more broadly, in charitable foundations and sponsored research. (The Review Committee wants to commend current CHID students and faculty for proposing a pilot exploration of these issues, in terms of a CHID course on research funding, designed to teach students how to identify sources of outside funding, conceptualize fundable-projects, and apply for such outside funding.) Such a compilation could be augmented by the quantitative outcome studies (which should offer snapshots of the students' post-college activities, further study, and employment) and used by the UW development office to introduce potential interested donors to the distinctive impact of the CHID program on a student's college experience and postgraduate direction. To this end, the review committee also believes that efforts to engage in fund-raising for CHID should be detailed to the top echelon of UW development activity, as one of the university's signature offerings of excellence in undergraduate education. Given that CHID is clearly well-known even among the university Regents and thus by the director of the wealthiest foundation in the world, it seems like a terrible missed opportunity to treat CHID development as just another humanities alumni outreach project. The alumni model of fundraising will not work well for CHID in the short term because its alumni are still quite young. Instead, the college and university development offices need to highlight CHID's achievements as a flagship program embodying and *making available to all* some of the most exciting innovations in liberal arts education at the UW as a whole.

- 10) *Provide a better space for CHID on campus.* Even if only some of our recommendations are adopted, it seems clear that CHID will soon have to move from its extraordinarily cramped space in Padelford. As a review committee we are not in any position to judge how desperate competing demands are from other units, but if CHID is to continue with its current complement of 225 majors more and better space is certainly much needed. We would also recommend in this respect that CHID students and staff could usefully be involved (both for practical and educational reasons) in the design of the new space. We noted at the start that CHID's achievements have much to do with allowing students to become "architects" of their own education. With the new space such architectural engagement could usefully take concrete shape through student-led design and planning work.

Review Committee’s concluding comments:

CHID is at a tipping-point in its history, poised either to develop into one of the signature programs of the University of Washington, or—if it does not receive the necessary university support—to vanish. The Review Committee would view the latter outcome as tragic, not only for the current CHID students but for the university as a whole, and for the broader community it serves. We therefore strongly urge the administration to adopt the recommendations that we propose with this report.