



**The Henry M. Jackson  
School of International Studies**  
University of Washington  
Box 353650  
Seattle, WA 98195-3650

---

---

June 26, 2009

Gerald J Baldasty  
Dean and Vice Provost and Dean  
The Graduate School

Dear Dean Baldasty,

On behalf of the faculty, staff, and students of the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies (JSIS), I want to begin by expressing our sincere thanks to the Review Committee headed by Professor Raymond Jonas of the UW History Department for its thoughtful and thorough report.

All of us are pleased that the Review Report acknowledged the “significant progress” that the School has made since its last ten-year review. We also appreciate its recognition of the School as “a unit of significant accomplishment and of singular promise,” the faculty as “an array of accomplished teacher/scholars,” the students as “exceptionally committed . . . to the School,” and the staff as “remarkably energetic.” In addition, the report rightly acknowledges “a team of University librarians” and a “watchful and engaged” Visiting Committee that help support the mission and vision of the School.

What follows is a response to the specific recommendations of the Review Report that is based on feedback provided by faculty and, to a lesser extent, staff. Their input—as well as that of students—was generated through a variety of means beginning with the School-wide circulation of the report electronically that produced a flurry of email reactions from faculty and staff.

Subsequently, the report was taken up at a JSIS faculty meeting on February 10, 2009, and then again at a faculty retreat held on April 3, 2009, that keyed on issues relating to the School’s mission/vision statement; recruiting priorities; governance structure; and curriculum reform. In addition, the report was discussed by different bodies of the School: the Program Directors’ Group (PDG), the Executive Committee; and the Outreach Coordinators’ Group consisting of staff members from different centers and programs. Program and center chairs and directors also considered the report at their meetings that involve JSIS and non-JSIS faculty members. In short, the report was widely disseminated and elicited comments from large numbers of staff and especially faculty

One faculty member, who sent in an email response to the report, expressed sentiments shared by many faculty, staff, and students when he observed: “The 10-year review appears very favorable to the School. I don't see any of the principal recommendations that we can't embrace. The first six recommendations are sensible and are things (e.g., curricular reform and transparent governance) we are already working on. Recommendations 7-11 require support from the College. Let's accept!”

In applauding the findings of the committee, a staff member lauded the Review Committee for identifying “both notable strengths and notable challenges in their report. If anything, I think they understated the complexity of the school and the potential for even greater distinction and quality here. For example, the summary refers to various majors and Title VI Centers but not to other centers or to the extensive and prominent roles JSIS plays in the university as a whole and the surrounding community. I have long believed that the Director of the school should have greater administrative support, and they did note that in their findings.”

The faculty of the European Studies program articulated equally positive sentiments, although they voiced concerns as well, as did all the centers and programs, about the lack of funding and staff support for their units. Representative of these sentiments is the following summary of the deliberations of the European Studies program provided by its chair, Carol Thomas:

The Ten-Year Review Report was an important item on the agenda of the recent meeting of the advisory committee of European Studies. It is useful to note that members of that committee represent a range of departments and include key people in the management of the Program: Steve Pfaff, Jim Donnen, and Phil Shekleton - all of whom were present. These comments, consequently, represent the responses of directors, staff, and faculty.

We were pleased to learn the praise for the School in general, for recognition of the enthusiasm of faculty, and the commitment of students. We were equally pleased that the growth of European Studies was acknowledged and would add that students majoring or taking a minor in our Program include many exceptional, dedicated students. The respect of graduates in European Studies continues long after they have left the University: among letters and messages that the current chair receives, a large number come from former students in the Program.

Apart from its mention coupled with Asian Studies, there was consensus that only slight attention was paid to individual programs. Rather the report focused on the larger structure of the JSIS which, to be sure, is important and we do agree with the review committee's recommendations in this regard. One member of the European Studies Advisory committee put our view concisely: “we are a victim of our own success.” The problems are several:

1. The Program is under-staffed both in faculty (1 dedicated position, with others devised through DAAD, evening division, or loaned time from other departments) and in staff in both the EU Center and CWES. Faculty and staff are

devoted, performance excellent. However, demands on their time have expanded as our program has grown. We agree with the Review Committee's recommendation that the greater demands must be addressed not only in compensation but in adequate number of people to manage the staffing and teaching requirements of an important program.

2. With respect to funding, we noted that European Studies has fallen out of the rotation scheme for development due to the fact that our year coincides with the centennial of the JSIS. The program has no line budget and only a very small discretionary fund.

Despite these serious difficulties, we have been addressing issues raised by the review committee, particularly curricular development. Over the past several years we have been reworking the European Studies program not, as the report mentions due to its complexity, but to provide a more coherent structure.

We have added more specialized courses to follow the required EURO 301 (EURO 302 in 2 tracks Politics/Institutions and Culture, focused on both Western and Eastern Europe). And this year we have created an alternative to the senior thesis seminar: "the writing of a senior thesis is now optional, through a research-intensive track." This arrangement has been approved by the Faculty Council on University Standards. Secondly, we have been ingenious about staffing our core courses of increasing size by drawing faculty from more areas into the program and thereby gaining seats for our majors in their courses. When funds for teaching assistants were not available for our core required courses, we added peer facilitators to fill that need, a most successful plan.

We are not involved in graduate programming, even at the MA level. This is not to say that it would be unsuitable but rather that it is currently impossible; in fact, being a central part of the Jackson School requires that we get involved in planning and teaching on these levels. Yet current personnel resources do not permit stronger commitment. We feel that this imbalance needs to be addressed within the planning process of the whole school.

Let me turn next to address specifically and in seriatim the "principal recommendations" of the report.

The first two recommendations pertain to the **curriculum** and urge a continuation in: "1. . . .the work of curricular reform begun in the discussions of a new PhD program" and "2. . . . the work of curricular reform to include an overhaul of the Masters and undergraduate curriculums."

That curriculum is in the lead-off position is fitting because, as the School's Director of Student Services observed, "we've long known about the pivotal role that curriculum reform could play, and how the consequences might ripple through staffing, efficiency, advising, faculty perceptions on teaching equity, etc." I am also pleased to note that we expect to submit our PhD proposal this coming academic year, as per UW guidelines, to the Graduate School and the HEC Board. This proposal, as the Review Committee ascertained, has been in the making for almost two years, much of this time spent on fashioning a curriculum that would create a program uniquely suited to the area,

comparative, and global studies strengths of the Jackson School and clearly different from discipline-based departmental PhD programs. Our deliberations about the program have generated remarkable consensus and momentum that we intend to build on to reform the MA and BA curriculums in the coming years.

The Graduate Committee of the International Studies (IS) program, the largest of the MA programs, has already taken a major step in this direction by proposing a revised program of study for its graduate students (See Attachment A, Memo dated June 7, 2009, IS Graduate Committee “Proposed Revisions of MA for IS Program”). Discussed and approved at the School’s June 9, 2009 faculty meeting, the new program has instituted changes with the following goals in mind:

1. To help students understand broad sources of stability and change in global systems and their relationship to cultural, economic, political, and social processes in localities around the world;
2. To be exposed to some of the most influential writings on major scholarly and policy issues in the field of international studies;
3. To know how to formulate and operationalize significant research questions;
4. To write an M.A. thesis or two papers based on original research, one of which must represent new analyses of evidence.

A School-wide committee on curriculum reform, which several faculty members volunteered to serve on at the April retreat, will tackle larger curricular issues this coming fall, especially relating to its seven undergraduate majors. Its charge will be to create greater curricular synergies and coherence among these different BA programs. Another major task will be to develop a plan that evens out teaching loads. Currently, some professors routinely teach several hundred students a year while others average well below a hundred. In other words, the curriculum committee will follow up on what the Review Committee urged in recommendation “4. [u]se the discussion and implementation of curricular reform to assure greater equity in teaching loads across the School.”

The Review Committee also recommended that the School “3. [b]uild on the momentum generated by curricular reform to craft a more inclusive and transparent governance structure” and “5. [e]xtend the revival of the Executive Committee by making sure that its meetings are regular and frequent, that its agenda is known, and its decisions communicated to School faculty.”

Beginning in winter quarter 2009, the Executive Committee resumed meetings on a regular basis to address pressing matters relating to curriculum and budget. These issues were also taken up at monthly meetings of the JSIS Line Faculty Group (LFG), that is, of those members with whole or partial line appointments in the School and of the Program Directors Group (PDG), 7 of 13 of whom are non-JSIS faculty.

Given the “incurable complexity” of the School—to use a term employed by one respondent to the review—members of the LFG and PDG initially sought to revamp the

Executive Committee, whose 6 members are split evenly between LFG and PDG representatives. Their aim was to reconstitute the Executive Committee into more of an advisory board that worked in tandem with them rather than as a body that set their agenda or duplicated what they did. There is also overlap between the PDG and the Executive Committee because 3 PDG representatives serve as well as members of the latter body. Therefore, to streamline the decision-making process, to reduce overlap, and to enhance synergies between the various bodies, the LFG and PDG proposed doing away with the Executive Committee and establishing a Faculty Council in its stead, whose duties and functions would be comparable but whose membership was to be restricted to line faculty.

At the June 2009 faculty meeting, the LFG unanimously voted in favor of constituting a Faculty Council as “an advisory board” that would meet regularly; comprise members representative of different faculty ranks and area and international studies programs; and consist of 7 members, 4 elected by the LFG and 3 appointed by the Director. Elections have just concluded, and to the four who have been elected I will be adding another three to round out the Council.

The following statement about the Faculty Council and the PDG spells out in detail their composition and duties and responsibilities. I am confident that these bodies will take the lead in helping the School address and resolve a range of issues, from curricular reform to budget.

### **Faculty Council**

The Jackson School **Faculty Council** is an advisory body of the Jackson School that will meet regularly and be chaired by the Director (or Associate Director). Meetings will be held once per quarter, or more frequently, at the preference of the Director. The function of the Faculty Council is to provide advice to the director and serve as a source of guidance and insight concerning matters related to Jackson School administration. The Faculty Council shall also be competent to decide matters that have been specifically and explicitly ceded to it by a majority vote of LFG. In deciding such matters, each faculty council member has one vote, and the Director, or the Associate Director if the Director is absent, has one vote. The Faculty Council consists of seven members (not counting the Director and Associate Director), four elected by the **LFG**, and three appointed by the Director. Faculty members who have at least 50% of their appointment in the Jackson School are eligible to serve on the Jackson School Faculty Council. The Faculty Council will always comprise members across all ranks (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor), unless there are no faculty members in the School at a particular rank AND faculty representation across area studies programs (including Comparative Religion and Jewish Studies program) to the extent possible. Council members will serve a two-year term and terms will be staggered so that approximately half the members will begin their term every year.

**Program Directors Group:**

The **Program Directors Group (PDG)** is composed of chairs of programs and directors of centers housed within the JSIS. The PDG also includes the Director and Associate Director of the JSIS. The PDG members, with their respective staff, provide leadership and coordinate the management of budgets and curriculum for all of the programs and centers housed within the JSIS. PDG members direct activities on behalf of students and faculty who are located both within the JSIS and outside the JSIS. PDG members maintain extensive organizational relationships outside of the UW, e.g. with heritage community members, non-profit organizations, and others. Thus, the PDG plays a key advisory role to the Director of the JSIS. Composed of all program and center directors, the PDG thus represents all major interests housed within the school. Its purview includes curricular and budget issues, and with the consent of the LFG, formulates hiring priorities.

The PDG is chaired by the Director of the JSIS and meets monthly. The PDG, at the request of the LFG will provide regular reports of their efforts. At the request and direction of the LFG the PDG can provide proposals regarding budget, curriculum, outreach, and other school-wide issues. Upon approval from the faculty the PDG can implement these proposals. Prior to providing proposals to the faculty, individual PDG members will gain consensus or approval through each program's or center's governance procedure. Agendas and minutes of the PDG meetings will be circulated to the LFG.

As the PDG description rightly notes—and a point that needs to be underlined more in the Review Report and in this response—each of the centers and programs convene regular meetings as well. In fact, they are often the bodies in which some of the key decisions are made about such matters as budgets, curriculums, and endowments that can have repercussions across the entire School. Over a dozen centers and programs routinely hold meetings of their JSIS and non-JSIS faculty members.

The faculty and students, I suspect, are in complete accord with the Review Committee's recommendation that we “6. [c]reate appropriate incentives and rewards to facilitate a sense of intellectual community within the School.” We already have made considerable headway in this respect, as is evidenced by the series of retreats that the faculty have had in recent years where there has been remarkable consensus about virtually every major issue ranging from recruiting priorities to curriculum reform to budgets and endowments. It is this same sense of common purpose that has led faculty to agree on the reorganization of the governance structure of the School and on a PhD program that will serve the entire School and have the added effect of better integrating our many MA programs. How much goodwill and consensus exists among the faculty, staff, and students was very much on display at the Centennial Gala this past May when everyone joined together to have a rousing celebration.

I would also point to the greater sense of community that has engendered collaborative projects between and among centers and programs. Several Title VI centers, in fact, are

gearing up to partner on such ventures in the coming grant competition this fall.

In addition, we have sought to enhance intellectual community in the School through monthly research seminars featuring the work in the progress of different faculty members. Equally positive have been the book launches at which faculty authors have been feted and presented readings from their new publications.

Unfortunately, the Review Committee's suggestion that the School "7. [i]ncrease staffing to support existing growth in the School and lay the foundation for future growth in scholarship, instruction, and outreach" comes at an inopportune time. Indeed, because of budget cuts and sharp reductions in endowment payouts, the School is not in a position to retain existing staff levels, let alone increase them. On the contrary, we have had to eliminate or reduce several staff positions in order to accommodate budget cuts. And I don't foresee us being able to restore any of these critical staff positions any time in the near future, certainly not without an infusion of funds from the College or UW administration.

The current financial crisis also means that the School cannot follow up on the recommendation that we "8. [I]mprove compensation for program chairs and center directors in order to retain and recruit talent in these key and, in the case of center directors, income-producing positions." As program chairs and center directors are well aware from having collected data from their counterparts at other universities, their compensation does not match what peer institutions offer, not by a long shot. In any case, the School cannot, on its own, enhance compensation to provide what our talented chairs and directors deserve because a substantial portion of it comes from upper administration. We have lobbied for more in the past but without success.

The recommendation of the Review Committee that UW "9. [c]onsider 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" is a note that has been struck by every previous evaluation of the School. The 1999 Report of the Review Committee of JSIS made much the same point in the following paragraph:

Raise the administrative level of the Jackson School. As mentioned . . . the Jackson School as a department in the Social Sciences Division is out of step both with its complexity and mission in the University and with the status of comparable units at other institutions. It might conceivably be desirable that the Jackson School be made an independent School with its own Dean, reporting to the Provost, but there are good reasons for keeping the Jackson School within the College . . . , which is the route we recommend. At the same time, however, the current administrative status is simply too far down the chain of command. We therefore recommend that the position of Director . . . be made concurrently a Divisional Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, with the title Divisional Dean for International studies, at a level coordinate, not subordinate, to the DDs of Social Sciences, Sciences, and Humanities/Arts. The Divisional Dean for International Studies would report directly to the Dean of the College of arts and Sciences.

Faculty and staff in the Jackson School today, I believe, concur with this point of view. They no longer wish for the School to become an autonomous unit—it fits in well and belongs in the College of Arts and Sciences. However, they would like to see its College- and University-wide role appropriately recognized by elevating the administrative level of the School and its director, as per the suggestion made in the current and previous review of the School.

As for the recommendation that the School “**10.** [c]reate one or more positions with the title of Associate Director to assist in the management of the Jackson School and thus to free the head of the School to undertake development and external relations responsibilities,” I should note that David Bachman currently holds that title and office and is centrally involved in managing the affairs of the School. In addition, as noted above, the new governance structure will help facilitate its administration, as do the dozen or so chairs and directors who preside over its programs and centers. I should add that what we need is not more associate directors but more staff, especially people who can help manage the School’s considerable development and external relations activities. At one time, the School was promised its own development officer but that never materialized.

Finally, the School welcomes the opportunity to forge a close working relationship with the newly appointed Vice Provost for Global Affairs. Or, as the Review Committee put it, “**11.** [b]ring the head of the Jackson School into a permanent, institutionalized relationship with the Office of Global Affairs and its head, the Vice Provost for Global Affairs.” I can’t imagine this or any future director not being interested in furthering this relationship that can only result in dividends for both the School and UW.

Once again, on behalf of the faculty, staff, and students of the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, many, many thanks to the Review Committee and the staff of the Graduate School for their efforts on our behalf.

Yours sincerely,

Anand A. Yang  
Director and Golub Chair of International Studies



June 7, 2009

To: JS Faculty

From: Sara Curran on behalf of the IS Graduate Committee (Bachman, Donnen, Friedman, Kale, Milligan, Novetzke & Radnitz)

Re: Proposed revisions of MA for IS Program

The MA in International Studies (MAIS) has been a well-subscribed program since its inception, enrolling between 40-50 students. For the most part, students are usually enrolled as concurrent students with professional masters degree programs (primarily in public affairs, business, and law with a handful of students enrolled in public health). Students are mostly pleased with the curricular flexibility of the program, but have felt they are not completely prepared for the required research papers nor do they finish the degree with a sense of their own international studies skill set (specifically an understanding of the field, historical and contemporary contributors to the field, relationship to academic disciplines or professions, as well as skills in reading, writing and researching in the field). To that end, we propose revisions to the program that will offer students greater grounding in the field of international studies and better preparation for writing and researching their papers. In the process, the revised program plan should enhance a sense of community and common purpose among our graduate students and better prepare them for, in the short-term, teaching assistance opportunities through the Jackson School and closely allied departments, as well as for a variety of post-MA career and scholarly opportunities.

For the most part, students in the International Studies Program Masters program are not students who go on to Ph.D. programs, although each year there are between 2-5 who do express an interest in doing so. Instead, most are concurrent degree students interested in combining professional skills with international studies knowledge, so as to pursue careers in international law, business, public affairs or the international non-governmental sectors. Each year, a smaller group of students pursue just the MAIS and are students from other countries (working in the public sector) or are U.S. students who have spent time abroad, are fascinated by their experience and seek knowledge and intellectual tools to make sense of their very intense experiences abroad. All are motivated by a desire to be involved in processes of social change and global betterment. Evaluations and debriefing sessions elicited at the end of their degree programs over the last three years indicates some frustration with the programming. These frustrations can be summarized as: a perceived lack of intellectual coherence across courses in the curriculum, limited preparation for the scholarly product expected for their degree, and a limited sense of a collective scholarly and professional community. All students would like to have the capacity to better read, research and write in the international studies field. And, students would like to structure the program so that it overcomes the tendencies inherent in a program where many of the students are participating in several different professional degree programs.

The consensus among the IS graduate program committee is that the MA should have the following goals:

5. To help students understand broad sources of stability and change in global systems and their relationship to cultural, economic, political, and social processes in localities around the world;
6. To be exposed to some of the most influential writings on major scholarly and policy issues in the field of international studies;
7. To know how to formulate and operationalize significant research questions;
8. To write an M.A. thesis or two papers based on original research, one of which must represent new analyses of evidence.

We thus propose the following changes in the IS MA curriculum:

1. We will revise SIS 500, to be offered during fall quarter of their first year of enrollment in the program. This required course will focus on historical perspectives on the “big” questions in International Studies along with the requirement that students audit SIS 200 [this requirement will be phased in over the next year]. The course will now be 5 credits rather than 3 credits with the addition of the auditing requirement. In addition, all incoming students will be asked to read one or two texts that provide some broad histories of the global system and/or globalization, such as *Worlds Together, Worlds Apart*, or Held et al., *Global Transformations* (tbd by JS faculty). Students with a previous record of accomplishment in an equivalent course, may request exemption from the auditing requirement. Any MA student wishing to be a TA for SIS 200, 201, or 202 must take the audit.

The purpose of the course is to expose students to the intellectual lineages and history of knowledge of some of the major questions in International/Global Studies (states and capitalism/markets, ethnicity/identity issues, nationalism, and so on). Students will read some of the classics and some contemporary examples of works that address these big questions with the primary emphasis of the course on the intellectual and historical roots of contemporary international studies concerns and debates.

2. We will revise SIS 501, Contemporary Global Studies, and it will be offered during winter quarter. SIS 501 will require that students audit SIS 201 (with the requirement phased in during this coming academic year (09/10)). Again, we will change the credit hours for this required course from 3 to 5 credits. Students with a previous record of accomplishment in an equivalent course, may request exemption from the auditing requirement. Any MA student wishing to be a TA for SIS 200, 201, or 202 must take the audit.

SIS 501 will have several pedagogical goals: it will expose students to the major recent works in some of the fields in our proposed Ph.D. program, but the works chosen will be problem focused rather than theory focused. These

texts will also provide students with a broad exposure to research design and methods. Students will develop and demonstrate preliminary mastery of the field of international & global studies through brief literature reviews that answer questions about the current state of knowledge regarding contemporary lines of inquiry on a topic of their choice within the field.

We will revise SIS 511 to be a required social science research design and methods course and it will be offered during the fall quarter of the first year. This moves SIS 511 from winter of students' second year. (For AY 09/10 first and second year students will enroll in SIS 511 during the fall quarter).

SIS 511 will have several pedagogical goals. The course will cover basic principles of research design, expose students to excellent examples of basic research within international studies as practiced in the social sciences from case studies to large n designs, and prepare students for conducting their own independent research project. The timing of the course will also allow students to conduct research during the summer, prior to their second year of course work. Students will be expected to complete short assignments throughout the quarter, develop critical methodologically focused, commenting skills on research articles, and produce a research proposal for their thesis or one of their empirical research paper. The course will include 3 hours of lecture/seminar that will cover the readings and 2 hours of research practicum for students to present and discuss their research projects.

3. We also propose changing SIS 512 to "Applied Directed Research." In this course one or more graduate students would conduct directed research, like a task force, under the direction of a faculty member or with an external client (with faculty direction). The final product of the effort would be a task force report that meets with faculty or client approval. This product could be counted as one of the two empirical papers required for the MAIS degree. SIS 512 would no longer be required and could be taken during any quarter.
4. We would reinstate the overview course sequence, SIS 591-593 for all students during the two years they are taking their SIS courses. This course would be a credit/no credit requirement for both first and second year students. Students in SIS 511 and SIS512 have asked of Curran, over the last three years, for more consistent opportunities to discuss research via a working group model. During the most recent debriefing about the program, students proposed just such a seminar for all MAIS students throughout their careers.

The goals of SIS591-593 would be to:

- a. Meet many of the JSIS faculty through informal presentations of their research during the fall and winter quarters (primarily during the fall). Students would be asked to read selections of faculty

publications and be prepared to discuss these works during the session.

- b. For 2<sup>nd</sup> year students to present précis of their own research papers (fairly developed works in progress) during the winter and spring quarters to their fellow 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> year students. Two other students would be asked to prepare written comments and facilitate discussion for each of these sessions. For 1<sup>st</sup> year students they will be asked to prepare 1-2 page research topics, questions, and justifications during the spring quarter for comment and feedback.
- c. For 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year students to learn how to engage in constructive dialogue with colleagues
- d. For MA students to develop a scholarly community and sense of intellectual coherence in the field of international studies

In general, other requirements for the IS MA program would not change.

**Summary of Components**

- Three Core Courses: SIS 500, 501, 511 (5 credits each for 15 total credits)
- Research Pro-Sem: SIS 591-593 (1 credit for 6 quarters for 6 total credits)
- Non-Core: Statistics and Economics
- Two of Three Foci: Professional, Regional Studies, Fields
- Written Product: Thesis or 2 Research Papers, or Task Force Policy Report & Research Paper
- Language: Demonstrated Language Proficiency in 2<sup>nd</sup> Language
- Oral Exam: Defense of Competencies in Core Courses and Written Research Products

**Required Core Courses**

<b>Course No: Title</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Qtr</b>
SIS 500: International Studies Survey Course (5 credits)	Survey of historical and contemporary international political, economic, social and cultural systems that have ordered and reordered places, communities, and individuals around the world. Simultaneously, the course will address countervailing forces emergent from individuals, communities, organizations and places that have resisted and exerted influence in attempts to define belonging and ensure human well-being. Students are required to audit SIS 200, as well.	Fall

<b>Course No: Title</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Qtr</b>
SIS 501: Contemporary Comparative International Studies (5 credits)	Seminar on contemporary theoretical and empirical debates through the reading and critique of recent, well-regarded scholarly books and articles. Students are required to audit SIS 201.	Winter
SIS 511: Research Methods in International Studies	Seminar on international studies research inquiry in history and social science. The course will cover approaches or debates in epistemology, study design, and the collection of empirical evidence.	Spring
SIS 591-593: International Studies Research Pro-Sem	Offered every quarter to enhance MA student knowledge of the international studies field, research collaborations among students and faculty, and socialize students to develop their writing, research, and presentation skills, and sense of scholarly community.	3 qtrs per year for total of 6 credits

### **Non-Core & Other Components**

<b>Course No: Title</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Qtr</b>
Non-Core	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intermediate level economics or equivalent</li> <li>• Introductory statistics or equivalent</li> </ul>	n/a
Two of Three Foci (18 credits)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional Expertise (business, law, public affairs, health, marine affairs, forest resources, social work, education, engineering, journalism)</li> <li>• Regional or Area Studies (Africa, China, Comparative Religion, European, Japan, Jewish, Korea, Near East Studies, RECISS, South Asia, Southeast Asia)</li> <li>• Fields (encourage students to focus on 1. States, Markets &amp; Society; 2. Governance, Law &amp; Rights; 3. Culture &amp; Religion; 4. Peace &amp; Security)</li> </ul>	n/a
Written Research Product	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master's Thesis (SIS 700)</li> <li>• Two Research Papers (1 can be a professionally-based paper and the other taken as SIS 600)</li> <li>• Directed Research Force Report (SIS 512) &amp; Research Paper (SIS 600)</li> </ul>	Up to 2 qtrs of credit
Language	Demonstrated language proficiency in 2 <sup>nd</sup> language	n/a
Oral Exam	Defense of Competencies in Core Courses and	Final

Course No: Title	Description	Qtr
	Written Research Product	

### **Two of Three Foci – Professional, Regional Studies, or Fields (18 credits)**

Students will be required to fulfill nine credit hours in each of two foci. These foci can be in an area of professional expertise, area or regional studies, or a field. Many students pursuing a concurrent degree in the professions will automatically choose the professional foci. A professional expertise focus can be in business, law, public affairs, health, social work, education, engineering, or journalism. For the regional or area studies focus, the Jackson School offers a wide array of opportunities including: Africa, China, Comparative Religion, European, Japan, Jewish, Korea, Near East Studies, REECAS (Russia, East Europe & Central Asian Studies), South Asia, or Southeast Asia. A third focus to choose from is the school-wide fields within the Jackson School as currently defined by the proposed Ph.D. program. These fields are: 1. States, Markets & Society; 2. Governance, Law & Rights; 3. Culture & Religion; 4. Peace & Security.

### **Written Product: Thesis, 2 Research Papers, or Task Force Policy Report**

Students will be required to demonstrate a significant written research product. This could be a master's thesis that would serve as a prerequisite for the JS Ph.D. Alternatively, students can write two research papers both demonstrating original research, however, one must be an original empirical analysis. Or, students can write a policy task force report for a client identified by the student with faculty advice and oversight. Students who write a task force report would also be required to submit an additional research paper to receive credit for the written product component of the degree.

### **Proposed Program Differences from Current Program**

The proposed program is different from the current MAIS program in four ways. First, the proposed core courses require additional time and work by the students. Second, students are offered the opportunity to focus on one of four fields of study that correspond to the proposed PhD fields. Third, the writing options for students are expanded to include a Master's Thesis or a Policy Task Force Report. Fourth, students are required to attend a one-credit overview course (SIS 591-593) during each of the six quarters of their MAIS program.