

## **Ten-Year Review of the Henry L. Jackson School of International Studies**

**Submitted to the Graduate School by the Review Committee on September 24, 2019**

### **I. Introduction**

The Henry L. Jackson School of International Studies is a unit within the College of Arts and Sciences that serves a vital role for both undergraduate and graduate education at the University of Washington. Its faculty is comprised of a diverse and distinguished group of scholars who are experts in area studies as well as in cross-cutting thematic subjects that cut across national and regional borders. This combination enables the school to provide students with an opportunity to develop specialized expertise in language, history, and politics of specific regions, and/or to explore contemporary issues of global concern such as migration, religion, economic development, human rights, cyber-security, and space.

The School attracts and serves an increasingly diverse student body. Some of its undergraduate majors are very popular. Its MA programs and new PhD program also attract students nationally and internationally. Students go through rigorous education and are exposed to a strong interdisciplinary curriculum.

In addition to educating students, the Jackson School has an extensive public outreach role as an integral part of its mission. Most of this public outreach is carried out by the School's unparalleled eight Department of Education Title VI Centers, and other research institutes. The centers and institutes offer the public, the business community and policymakers with key knowledge and research that is relevant to addressing contemporary global challenges, including addressing global trade, preventing climate change and promoting human rights.

The School has made significant progress since its last ten-year review. It built on past areas of strength in regional studies and added some new ones that are less regionally based. Members of the Jackson School share a very strong sense of the need to continue to maintain excellence in areas of historical strength. However, they also see the urgent need to adapt to a fast changing economic, educational, social, and global environment.

The previous review report written in 2008 described a unit that was strong and resilient but under-resourced for realizing its fullest potential. Prior self-studies identified a gap between the language and culture focus of area studies programs and the thematic approach of International Studies. These distinctions still remain and became more pronounced with shifts in enrollment demands and student expectations. The Jackson School is beginning to work to meet those changes, including revising its curriculum, to build on old strengths and identify new ones. Our hope is that our report might help guide that effort.

The review committee's work began with a charge meeting in May of 2018. Following the charge meeting, the committee received the Jackson School's self-study and accompanying documents in December of 2018. The committee reviewed the self-study early in winter quarter of 2019, in preparation for the site visit. The site visit was carried out by the full committee on

January 28-29, 2019. It began with a working dinner on the evening of January 27th and extended through two days of interviews and meetings. During its visit, the committee met or consulted with members of the Jackson School faculty (of all ranks) and staff, graduate and undergraduate students, and members of the advisory board. A copy of the committee's site visit agenda is attached as an annex to this report. A summary of the committee's findings and recommendations was delivered at an exit interview on the afternoon of the 29th.<sup>1</sup>

The principal recommendations of the committee are listed at end of the report with our analysis and basis for those recommendations set forth below in four sections: structure, curriculum, PhD program, and administration.

## **II. Structure of the Jackson School**

The Jackson School of International Studies (JSIS) is currently administered as a unit within the College of Arts and Sciences, with the Jackson School's director reporting to the Divisional Dean of Social Sciences. There are some natural advantages to the current arrangement, in particular access to the resources of the College and connections to the disciplinary departments. Connections appear to be strongest with the history and sociology departments; we found the connection to the international relations and comparative politics faculty in political science to be surprisingly limited.

A number of faculty at JSIS believe that the school would be better able to attract resources and have a higher standing among its peers if it stood on its own. A comparison to other schools that are members of the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA) supports this position. There are currently twenty-three U.S.-based full members of APSIA. Eighteen are administered as separate schools (although as noted below, a number of these schools combine public policy and international affairs). Penn State's School of International Affairs is administered as part of the law school. The Yale Board of Trustees recently approved the Jackson Institute for Global Affairs becoming the Yale Jackson School of Global Affairs (opening in fall 2022). That will leave Georgia Tech's Sam Nunn School, USC's School of International Relations, and JSIS as the only U.S.-based APSIA full-member schools that are housed within the College of Arts and Sciences on their campus.

The 2008 JSIS Review Committee and the 2018 JSIS self-study both addressed this question. The 2008 report suggested that the university "consider elevating the title of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Those in attendance from the Jackson School included: Reşat Kasaba; Jose Antonio (Tony) Lucero, Associate Director; Katherine Kim, Director of Academic Services; and Toni Read, the Business Office Manager. University administrators and representatives of the Graduate School present included George Lovell, Divisional Dean for the Social Sciences, College of Arts & Sciences; Kima Cargill, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Graduate School; Patricia Moy, Associate Vice Provost for Academic & Student Affairs; Janice De Cosmo, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs; Becky Corriell, Director, Academic Program Review & Strategy, Graduate School; Chris Partridge Program Review Specialist, Graduate School; Anne Hirsch, Associate Professor, Department of Nursing, Graduate School Council Representative; and William McGuire, School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, UW Tacoma, Graduate School Council Representative.

**Confidential- Not for Circulation**

**Final Recommendations Pending Vote of the Graduate School Council Winter 2020**

director of the Jackson School to that of Dean, in keeping with standard practice within the field and with a view toward the successful recruitment of a successor to the current JSIS head... The fact is that, with no notable exceptions, the JSIS Director's peers hold the title of the Dean or higher. Especially in matters international, the title takes on an additional symbolic value, thus providing yet another rationale for elevating the title."

The previous review committee report in 2008 decoupled the question of title for the leader of the School from that of whether JSIS should be a separate unit outside of the College because, as they noted, "we can envision no realistic scenario that would lead to an independent Jackson School of International Studies short of an endowment that would sustain such independence."

The response from Gerald Baldasty, Vice Provost and Dean, and James S. Antony, Associate Vice Provost and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, dated February 8, 2010 reported that elevating the title of the director "was welcomed by the JSIS but deemed impractical at this moment of budgetary constraints," suggesting that at that time, even a higher profile within the College would have budgetary implications. On our visit, we were reminded that the budgetary picture in the immediate aftermath of the 2008 global financial crisis was more dire than the situation today, and so this question might be revisited.

The self-study completed by the Jackson School in December 2018 argued that "even though we are not a fully independent school, our long history, size, and our endowments allow us considerable autonomy in setting our goals and working to fulfill them." It cited the small number of schools that are not independent (citing Yale and Georgia Tech; as noted above, USC is another program in a similar structure) and argued, "Going forward, without an elevation in the School's status—either by becoming fully independent, or gaining divisional status within the College or through some other means—it will be increasingly difficult for the Jackson School to meet our current and future challenges." The self-study also noted that JSIS has outgrown Thompson Hall's physical capacity.

We heard on our January 2019 visit about plans to develop a strategic plan and a hiring priorities document for faculty searches. With the current director stepping down in 2020, any discussion of a strategic plan and hiring priorities will inevitably be drawn into the search process for the next director. And if the search is, as we heard, potentially an external search, any outside candidate for the director position will be focused on the question of the School's status as raised in the documents that precede this review. A discussion about the future of the Jackson School's status will also require a fundraising/development plan that should accompany a strategic plan and a hiring priorities document per the comment from the previous review committee regarding financial sustainability if JSIS sought independence.

In our discussions, three options arose for the Jackson School's future status that are different from the status quo. The first is to have the School remain in the College of Arts and Sciences in order to take full advantage of the ties to the departments, but make the director a divisional dean. This was the option suggested by the previous review committee and noted in the recent self-study as well. This would enable the director to participate in a wider range of

university discussions about resources and direction than is currently possible as a director of a department.

A second option, and one that was mentioned in the previous reports and in our discussions, would be for the Jackson School to become a free-standing school with a dean in the leadership position. This is the preference of many faculty within JSIS. This option would likely require a significant gift or set of gifts as noted by the previous review committee but could also provide an opportunity for that type of fundraising. Given the need for resources that this option would require, it would necessitate rethinking the size and purpose of the JSIS Advisory Board, which currently is not configured to support fundraising activities. Service on the Board should evolve to renewable terms (e.g., 3-years) to put the board more on a par with peer institutions. All, if not most, members should be asked to contribute a minimum annual gift as well as one larger gift during their time on the Board. Our understanding is that there are currently eleven members of the Advisory Board. A Board of approximately twenty to twenty-five members would be more typical at a comparable school.

A third option is one that neither the previous review committee nor the self-study mentioned but was floated on our visit: to merge JSIS with the Evans School of Public Policy and Governance. Several APSIA schools are configured this way, including Columbia University's School of Public and International Affairs, Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government, the LBJ School of Public Affairs at UT Austin, Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and the Maxwell School at Syracuse. UC San Diego's international affairs school recently added a public policy degree.

Each of these directions carries very different implications for the Jackson School's future. The decision should not be made hastily, nor can it be, since any change will likely require the reallocation of time, energy, and resources with the School and the University. One exercise that might prove helpful would be to establish a small group to examine the ways other schools have approached the challenge of moving from a department to a school in recent years (such as Duke's Sanford School and now Yale) as well as schools that have chosen to remain within the College (Georgia Tech), and a school like the Maxwell School at Syracuse that recently chose to combine Public Policy and International Affairs. The Review Committee notes that the issue of the Jackson School's status has been a recurring issue for more than two decades. The sentiment remains among faculty that having independent status would benefit the school in terms of its visibility, financial status, and stature among peer institutions.

Whichever path is eventually devised, the sentiment remains among faculty that having independent status would benefit the School in terms of its visibility, financial status, and stature among peer institutions.

### **III. Curriculum**

The Jackson School administers seven different undergraduate majors, 17 minors, 10 MA programs, and one PhD program. As of Spring 2018, there are 517 undergraduate and 135 graduate students in the School. Since the last review, the Jackson School has also added two

new degree programs: a PhD in International Studies, which is designed to train students for non-academic careers, as well as traditional academic fields and a Master of Arts in Applied International Studies (MAAIS), which is designed primarily for midcareer professionals.

The Jackson School curriculum shows a number of distinctive elements, especially when compared to peer programs in international affairs and international studies; these offer both unusual richness and clear comparative advantages. But as currently configured they also may hamstring the School's ability to respond to evolving student needs and faculty interests. The School—like its counterparts—is finding not only that student interest is shifting but that enrollments are declining. The difficult task for the Jackson School is how to achieve flexibility and expand into new areas without losing its traditional strengths. We believe this can be done through a healthy process of *streamlining* and *professionalization* of the curriculum.

The Jackson School's distinctiveness betrays its origins: it emerged from a collection of specialized area studies programs and added on top a layer of multidisciplinary programs; its faculty have always had rich expertise in languages and culture. In recent years, they have also added depth in areas of emerging global importance, often anchored in a particular region of study, which complements the thematic expertise of faculty.

All these gave the Jackson School obvious strengths—deep roots in many regions; a wide reach of global expertise—but also some less obvious ones, or at least some distinctive traits that make it stand out. Unlike some other programs that were founded or flourished in the post-World War Two era, the Jackson School is perhaps less oriented around security studies or traditional federal government service (in the Department of State, Department of Defense, or the intelligence community). Some of this relates to its own presence in Washington State, whose economy is focused on trade, technology and innovation. In other words, it might be a bit better positioned than some of its peer schools to respond to student needs as they shift partly away from older issues and as graduates pursue career trajectories that are different from those of the past.

The undergraduate students we spoke with were uniformly enthusiastic about the School. These students enjoyed the practical aspects of their curriculum, most notably the task force program, where students work in teams to design well-researched policy prescriptions to contemporary challenges such as modern slavery in global supply chains. We note that the vast majority were enrolled in the global studies track, which continues to grow in size. The largest program – International Studies (General) – is also the most demanding in terms of overall credits (70) and is the only capacity constrained major in the School. The number of majors in this program has grown from 251 in Spring quarter 2012, to 314 in Spring quarter 2018, an increase of 25%.

The master's students we spoke with were pleased with the quality of the instruction in terms of the expertise of their professors. They however indicated the need for more practical and professional training to provide them with skills relating to non-academic career paths.

**Confidential- Not for Circulation**

**Final Recommendations Pending Vote of the Graduate School Council Winter 2020**

The traditional strengths are worth preserving and the distinctive aspects of the Jackson School's offerings can be positioned more effectively to maintain and even augment the School's ability to attract strong students and faculty. But at a curricular level, that will require some repositioning.

The previous review committee report of 2008 noted how much had been accomplished in integration of the School and globalizing its focus; it called for some simplification of the curriculum and shoring up services for students such as advising. In that sense we are suggesting much more of the same.

First, existing degree programs should be streamlined. The Jackson School offers a large array of specialized programs at the undergraduate and graduate level, reflecting its heavy investment in specialized area studies. Most other APSIA schools invest more heavily in common or more general programs, allowing specialization without locking their faculty, course offerings, and students so rigidly into specific tracks. Jackson School students are voting with their feet for more general programs. The self-study notes this phenomenon: the International Studies major boasts robust growths and has had to make entrance to the major selective. It also notes declining enrollment in more specialized programs by posing the question: "How might we manage growth in the core major and address falling enrollments in other majors?"

To continue a large number of small programs, each with its own core requirements, some with specialized methods training, places burdens on resources, faculty time and teaching commitments, course staffing, and staff allocation. The heavy service duties of Jackson School faculty are increased by the number of programs that need academic direction. The self-study notes that much work (including, for instance, some professional development) is radically decentralized, taking place in the various specialized centers. The School's ability to offer student services at the central level—academic advising, career development—is hampered by the requirement to administer so many small programs.

What would a more streamlined program look like? The self-study raises the idea of "program integration," though the term is not defined. It is clear what it means elsewhere-- APSIA schools offer single or primary degrees. Even those that do not are finding—like the Jackson School—that many older specialized programs are attracting fewer students. It is critical to note that moving in such a direction does not require abandoning commitments to specialized fields and area studies. It suggests making far more liberal use of minors, certificate programs, fields of study, and concentrations. In that sense the curriculum is less rigid and sequential and more modular—students are guided to assemble blocks according to the intellectual and professional interests.

Such an approach would have a possible added advantage for the Jackson School—it offers opportunities to build unusual linkages in a University that has invested so heavily in fields that are global in nature but thus far unconnected to "international studies," where the faculty and programs of the Jackson School excels. A series of minors for undergraduates or certificate programs for graduates might attract in students who have some interest in integrating into their programs an education in a particular region of the world where they hope to work or

have strong interest (Korea, the Middle East) or some policy or political issues (environmental concerns, rights of indigenous people).

Indeed, the self-study poses the question of how to reconceptualize the mission and identity of JSIS in light of current global challenges and new approaches to global and international studies? Part of the answer could come through the kind of streamlining that other schools have experimented with. Of course, this kind of configuration could produce justifiable concerns from those who have invested much in the current configuration and might see it as an abandonment of area studies. Two ways to affirm the continuing commitment would be to step up a commitment to study abroad (not necessarily only to UW programs) and to encourage greater separation between the degree programs and the various centers in the Jackson School (that focus on research and programming). Such steps would lessen the administrative burden and have the very healthy effect of enhancing the international experience of Jackson School students.

Second, a careful professionalization can enhance the curriculum. The name of the international body to which the Jackson School belongs (and which its director served recently as president) is the Association of *Professional* Schools of International Affairs. It is so titled because the mission of its members is to train graduates for careers in international affairs—a field that is less well defined in its professional boundaries and licensing requirements than law or nursing but still requires a set of professional skills and a collection of bodies of knowledge.

The professionalization does not replace academics or scholarly disciplines. Indeed, many such schools regard their undergraduate majors (if they have them) as belonging firmly to the liberal arts; undergraduate programs tend to be less self-consciously professionally oriented. But most (though not all) eschew doctoral training viewing it as a scholarly rather than a professional degree.

Thus, it is the MA programs (and sometimes certificate programs and mid-career education) that lie at the heart of their professional mission and where the curriculum is most professionalized. The professionalization of the MA curriculum takes a wide variety of forms (policy writing and exercises; encouraging more applied research; cultivation of skills relevant to international affairs; more professionally-oriented pedagogies; professional mentoring; group projects with external clients; strong encouragement toward internships; flexibility for those combining part-time work and study; and support for networking, career counseling, and other professional development opportunities). Not all schools adopt all these forms, but in recent years, most APSIA schools have increased their commitment to those they see as most important.

The Jackson School's curriculum has followed this trend in unexpected areas and neglected others. Its undergraduate international studies majors complete a task force project (an exemplary program), but not its MA students. The graduate students we spoke with seem to yearn for additional practical experiences similar to the task force model. At present the MA programs prepare students more fully for academic careers than professional ones. Its MAIS

program takes cohort building, professional development, and instruction by practitioners—but seems to operate with much less involvement and little oversight by the regular faculty.

The unexpected pockets of professionalization that already exist may mean that there are models close to home for the Jackson School to explore if it moves to professionalize its MA programs (as we think it should). And again, there might be strong ancillary benefits in terms of allowing the Jackson School to construct graduate modules that students throughout any of the UW's vast array of globalized programs might find attractive and the gap—between public health, development, or cybersecurity—and international affairs easier for them to bridge as they design their own programs.

#### **IV. PhD Program**

This is the first review conducted since the start of the Jackson School PhD program, which launched in 2013 with a dual goal of training for academic careers and non-academic careers for policy-making, including government and NGOs. In 2008, the previous review committee report in 2008 endorsed the (then in-design) PhD program but cautioned for the “lack of clarity on key components,” in particular, how the PhD program would work with existing master's programs, allocation of resources to staff for required courses, and finding the elusive balance in the curriculum “between professionally and academically-oriented students.” These issues led the 2008 review committee to conclude that it was “unable to provide stronger recommendations about the merits, structure, and outcome of the proposed PhD” (page 4). In hindsight, it seems that the 2008 review committee's caution was well-placed.

The program was initially designed and advertised as a three-year PhD program. The curriculum was based on slim first-year course work, exams early in the second year, and a focus on dissertation in a year and a half. Only a handful of students achieved the demanding timeline; for most it was a four-year program. Some even took longer to finish—even when they were in the program as full-time students. For its part, as described in the self-study, the Jackson School has responded to this. For example, the program is now advertised as a 3-4-year PhD program. But that fix might have addressed the symptoms rather than root problems.

In our review, three factors came up as the reasons for the mismatch between advertised length of the program and time most students spend in the program. First, some students came with academic career expectations. To increase their competitiveness in the academic job market, these students carry out extensive field work, learn new languages, work as TAs to gain teaching experience, apply to academic conferences, and submit papers to peer-review journals. All these efforts, in large part motivated by the goal of securing an academic job, lead the students to delay their graduation. It is also not feasible to plan and execute properly funded research in many instances with a short time horizon, as grant cycles and the need to design research proposals anticipate students having a longer time to engage in these activities.

Second, the programs have few funding opportunities that are not tied to graduate TA-ships or RA-ships. As students work as TAs or RAs, they fail to work on their own research and finish their work within a demanding time frame. Moreover, sometimes students will not know if

they will receive TA-ships until a late date, causing uncertainty in terms of sustained funding. Increasing living costs in the Seattle area and lack of on campus job opportunities for international students compounds this anxiety and possibly strains PhD students' mental health.

A third factor affecting completion time is the difficulty in getting specific methods training for dissertation research. The PhD students are required to take three methods classes in their first year: Introduction to Research Design, Introduction to Qualitative Methods, and Introduction to Quantitative Methods. This provides a broad methods orientation necessary for students to be familiar in, and engage with, an interdisciplinary curriculum. But when students design dissertation research and plan their field work, they realize that they need specialized methods training such as archival methods or textual analysis. Some of the methods classes are not offered regularly, disrupting coursework plans. Some of the students we talked with perceive formal and informal barriers placed on them by program departments to prevent or dissuade them from taking methods classes offered by these departments.

Despite the challenges, the program administrator and most of the faculty were supportive of the program even if some felt that the program was launched in haste. A minority of School faculty leveled criticism, even so far as calling the PhD program "unethical," "flawed," "a source of student resentment," and an unnecessary "burden on faculty." Students did voice concern about support and funding, but overall the students we met were nevertheless quite excited about the program. These students cited the program's interdisciplinary orientation and faculty quality as the top reasons for their excitement. While acknowledging the problems, the administrators held a positive view about the quality of the program and of students' job placement opportunities.

Because the PhD program is fairly new and clearly adjusting and because opinions about it are divided, the committee paid close attention to it. Initially, committee members were skeptical about the program due to its dual nature (training for both the academic job market as well as the policy world) and the program's start when the US humanities and social sciences academic job market contracted. The cautious optimism of faculty and administrators combined with student excitement about the program moved the review committee's position to conclude that the PhD program is becoming valuable addition to the Jackson School and can have viable and even flourishing future – but only if Jackson School can refine the program operations and address systemic challenges such as student funding.

Some of the problems the committee heard about were new-program glitches, others were systematic and will need to be addressed. The review we conducted suggested a more in-depth evaluation is in order, and we suggest that the Jackson School establish a task force to evaluate it in greater depth that we were able to in order to investigate the following issues:

- 1) The program seems to be operating differently than what it was initially designed for. Given the mismatch between the initial design and its operation, what is the new mission of the program? In particular, while the dual nature of the program is an asset, is it sustainable? If the mission is training for academic jobs, what will it take to make the program rigorous so that its graduates will be competitive in a shrinking academic job

market? If designed for the policy world, does the curriculum incorporate practical skills training necessary for the policy or NGO world? Do the faculty who teach in the program have the background, experience, and training to prepare graduates for work in the policy world?

- 2) One line of argument the committee heard that may be the niche of the program is to train PhDs for non-American academic posts in regions such as Asia. Is it feasible for the program to build on that niche intentionally? If so, the program will likely draw more international applicants. Is the support to international students adequate to achieve and sustain that niche?
- 3) How can the program provide secure funding to PhD students, especially in the form of fellowships? If the funding is based on TA-ships and RA-ships, how can the Jackson School establish these early on so that students will have clarity of their funding situation? How can the Jackson School support students during their field work or specialized methods training offered by other universities? (Students mentioned their appreciation for travel funding.)
- 4) How can the program ensure that PhD students get specialized methods training to help them conduct their research? The Jackson School PhD program carries a strong interdisciplinary ethos and provides a rigorous methods orientation. But it should do more to help students access relevant methods training offered at the campus, or funding to access the training elsewhere, if not available on campus.

The review committee recommends that the task force submit its report and recommendation to the Graduate School within one year. We further recommend that the Jackson School submit a five-year interim report on the PhD program for further evaluation by the Graduate School or a designated work group that can provide additional recommendations to the Jackson School and its PhD leadership at that juncture.

## **V. Finance, Human Resources and Administration**

The Jackson School is a large and complex institution with a large infrastructure and bureaucracy. It relies on external fundraising and grant funding, in particular to run its centers and programs and to provide the university with such a rich and robust global studies footprint.

Recently, the Jackson School has, for example received a \$2 million grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York as part of their Bridging the Gap initiative in 2014; \$1 million from the Andrew Mellon Foundation as part of their initiative to support area studies in 2012; and, most importantly, its Title VI grants have been renewed three times, in 2010, 2014, and 2018, each time for approximately \$16 million for a four-year period. The impact of the Title VI grants at UW is hard to understate. In the last round these grants represented a net inflow of \$16.27 million into the University. They supported 345 students who are learning foreign languages with full scholarships. The National Resource Centers provided direct support to 126

**Confidential- Not for Circulation**

**Final Recommendations Pending Vote of the Graduate School Council Winter 2020**

courses spread across 21 departments and made possible very successful community and K-12 outreach activities.

The hiring of a full-time grants manager is a valuable step forward. Nonetheless, as the self-study indicates, much of the donor funding has often been to specific areas studies or country-related programs, as opposed to for general operations or more thematic issues. Hence, there is a need for additional fundraising focused on the broader thematic international studies topics. This would naturally require the attention of the Director as well as other faculty and staff.

The administration of the Jackson School relies on the 50 permanent staff members (both full and Fullan part-time) who fulfill various tasks associated with the Jackson School and its centers and information, the School created three new staff positions in the last ten years: a web master, data manager, and communications director. The staff members meet as a group once a month with the director to discuss school-wide issues that are relevant to their jobs.

All the centers and programs that are affiliated with the Jackson School have faculty directors and/or chairs who are appointed by the JSIS Director. Center directors and program chairs do not need to have appointments in the Jackson School. It is common for the same person to hold both titles, overseeing both the programmatic and curricular aspect of the unit in question. The Jackson School has a large number (21) of research centers and programs, and many faculty members are involved as directors and associate directors. Given the large number of staff and faculty engaged in various centers and research programs, it may be useful for the Jackson School to hire a professional human resources manager as part of the staff team. At present, there are many different configurations of faculty and staff that meet regularly, meaning that decisions are made in a host of potentially uncoordinated fashions. Faculty and staff gather only once per quarter for an all personnel meeting.

Perhaps one of the most significant challenges for the Jackson School will be to bring a greater measure of integration and coordination to a set of complex and decentralized system. With fiscal pressures on the School, there will likely be interest in ensuring that staffing minimizes duplication. This seems to be a matter of some anxiety among existing staff, so there will have to be attention to morale, professional development, and engagement as the Jackson School finds a way to configure itself. We do not have specific recommendations in this regard but note that it will likely be a major focus for the School in the coming years and that a general approach should be devised soon to guide the process. A Human Resources director could work with the director to further rationalize how faculty and staff interact and through what channels. A human resources person could focus on appropriate recruitment and retention of staff and encourage best practices in terms of faculty and staff development.

Indeed, the nature of school administration is not just a staff issue. Many faculty members are asked to take on leadership positions that require supervision of staff in addition to their normal teaching and research duties. While some appear to do so well, this is an area that requires conscious attention to provide an additional level of skill and support and training for faculty who take on administrative positions of various sorts.

We did note that the staff had formed a working group to address issues relating to prevention of sexual harassment in addition to a standing committee on diversity and inclusion. This effort is healthy sign of engagement and attention. Faculty should be encouraged to work with the staff on issues of concern as well as to engage in training focused on Title IX. As noted above, a professional human resources administrator could further assist with addressing policy and training relating to workplace harassment and gender sensitivity.

The overall supervision of faculty is also a large task for one director. At present, the director is supported by one associate director. The associate director has responsibility for internal curricular matters and can support the director. This structure, however, still seems quite lean given the larger organizational chart we reviewed. It would be preferable, for example to have two associate directors – one who can support the director with respect to internal issues of teaching and research and a second who can assist with external outreach, fundraising and grant making. We learned that in the past there had been two associate directors. If the director of the Jackson school becomes a Dean, it will be even more important to have senior leadership in the school to whom faculty and staff can report

## **VI. Principal Recommendations**

The Jackson School is encouraged to:

1. Consider elevating the title of the director of the Jackson School to that of dean, in keeping with standard practice within the field and with a view toward the successful recruitment of a successor to the current JSIS head.
2. Create one additional position with the title of Associate Director to assist in the management of the Jackson School and its programs and centers, and thus to free the head of the School to undertake development and external relations responsibilities.
3. Continue the work of curricular reform that is underway and to consider how to streamline programs to provide students with flexibility, compensate for declining enrollments in older programs by designing new ones, undertaking joint initiatives with other schools at the university, and attract new students.
4. At the MA level, undertake similar work to make the curriculum more flexible to meet changing needs, attract new students and configured to attract students to newer areas of interests, certificate, and mid-career programs. Streamline existing course offerings where possible. Further professionalization of the graduate program with curricular efforts as well as support services for students.
5. Create a task force for further refinement of the PhD program to report back to the Jackson School in one year with suggestions as to how to address the key challenges identified by faculty and students relating to time of the program, student funding, access

**Confidential- Not for Circulation**

**Final Recommendations Pending Vote of the Graduate School Council Winter 2020**

to core methodological courses, and identify the niche(s) the program's students are to be trained to fill.

6. Configure administrative staffing to support existing growth in the School and lay the foundation for future growth in scholarship, instruction, and outreach, in particular through the hiring of a dedicated human resources manager; develop better coordination, and ensure that faculty and staff receive the training and support they need to meet their administrative tasks and manage human resources.

Jackson School of International Studies Review Committee Anita Ramasastry, Professor, UW School of Law (Chair), Turan Kayaoglu, Professor & Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, UW Tacoma, James Goldgeier, Professor, School of International Service, American University, and Nathan J. Brown, Professor of Political Science and International Affairs, Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University.

CONFIDENTIAL