



UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

MICHAEL W. MCCANN, DIRECTOR
LAW, SOCIETIES AND JUSTICE
Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center

TO: Elizabeth Feetham, Acting Dean of the Graduate School

FROM: Michael McCann, Director, and the faculty of Law, Societies, and Justice, and the Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center

RE: Response to Review Committee Report for CLASS/LSJ

We the faculty of Law, Societies, and Justice and the Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center are grateful to the review committee and administrators who conducted the program review. The review seemed fair in process and the substantive evaluation is quite agreeable and helpful. Both the internal reviewers (Keyes, Bacharach, Klawitter) and external reviewers (Mather, Sarat) were excellent choices who exercised sound judgment at all points. We especially appreciated opportunities to talk about the review as it developed, rather than having it imposed on us as an alien force. In short, we are satisfied with how it all turned out, especially with the ringing endorsement of our ambitious programmatic efforts.

Our response begins with a general discussion regarding various points that we want to underline in the review committee report, and then proceeds to consideration of specific recommendations. We agree wholeheartedly with nearly all of the recommendations, and in fact we briefly outline plans long in place for actions that go rather further than the committee proposes on most items. We also provide additional information clarifying our program history and activities at various points to make sense of the issues at stake, but this almost always underlines our agreement with the committee recommendations. Our response will include discussion of one specific recommendation with which we disagree (name change) as well as some general comments developing how our own identity and aspirations as an academic program faculty differ somewhat from the characterizations of us by the review committee. In both matters, our aim is primarily to amplify our own vision regarding where we are going in ways that may be hard for others to fully understand from our initial report. We conclude by elaborating on the committee's welcome recommendations for increased budgetary support.

Overall. We are gratified with the very, very positive general characterization of the program – our “exceptional faculty,” our “motivated and enthusiastic students,” our “cutting edge... undergraduate program (that) is gaining respect not only on campus but also nationally,” our “innovative” effort to be truly “interdisciplinary” as well as “comparative and global” in substantive approach, our path-breaking contributions to human rights study, our clear “methodological focus,” and our effective senior leadership, to name a few of the important traits the committee found relevant. We also appreciate the review committee’s recognition that we are an exceptionally young program; four of our six appointed faculty are Assistant Professors, and none of the six has been at UW yet for four years; the LSJ program is only in its second official year of existence. That we are applauded for justifying so quickly and so fully the investment made by the College is very rewarding for those of us who have worked so hard. We have no doubt that our next review, which we welcome in five years, will confirm that we will have gone much further yet in fulfilling our original vision and mission.

Recommendations on Institutional Linkages. Much of the review grants attention to a series of issues regarding the complex institutional status of the LSJ and CLASS programs. This is not surprising, given the problematic, tangled history of the earlier Society and Justice (SoJu) program that preceded LSJ, the ambitious and complex vision of interdisciplinary program status imagined in the UIF proposal, and our lack of institutional resources (administrator, staff, office space) necessary to become truly independent. We address several components of these related issues here.

- ❖ Linkages to Sociology. The recommendation that LSJ should be entirely separate from Sociology is most welcome; it simply reaffirms what was always the case administratively, at least during the 1990s, and surely since LSJ/CLASS was institutionalized. Sociology never opted for an administrative role in Society & Justice, and LSJ has worked to reduce the dependence of our students on Sociology courses. Moreover, LSJ and Sociology advisors are working cooperatively to provide good counsel to students about the differences as well as similarities of our courses, curricula, and overall majors. For these reasons, we are surprised that the issue of relations with Sociology even came up. The only still unsettled issue concerns the appointment of one faculty member (Beckett), who is presently 50%LSJ and 50%SOC, but this really turns on that person’s tenuous relationship to Sociology, and it has few implications for institutional relations between the units.
- ❖ Political Science. The committee recommends a more formalized contractual, and perhaps compensated, relationship between LSJ/CLASS and Political Science. We agree. LSJ/CLASS owes much to Political Science, including the services of its terrific administrator, Ann Buscherfeld, and a very favorable “trade” of faculty/staff offices. Even so, the two units interact as discrete entities negotiating mutually beneficial arrangements, with the faculty, curriculum, and the like of the former rather more independent than the reviewers recognize. Whatever residue of interdependence remains is a function of the actions by the dean’s office in the early 1990s to strip SoJu of its staff and offices and to force it into the administrative domain of Political Science. LSJ/CLASS would welcome greater independence from Political Science in the present era. We have asked for our own administrator and office complex, and received some assurances that would happen, but only

in the undefined future. If and when this occurs, our independence will be complete. Until then, whatever the present deans-- who have been infinitely more enlightened and supportive regarding our efforts -- can do to formalize relations and to compensate Political Science for the “loan” of staff and offices, which the review committee recommends, is most welcome. We are very happy to discuss working this out with the administration, but in the past our initiatives on the matter have been met with no response.

- ❖ Law School. We agree that locating LSJ/CLASS within the Law School makes little sense. We in CLASS long have sought to develop informal relations with the latter unit, but an interdisciplinary social sciences program should not be housed in a professional school.
- ❖ JSIS. We welcome the conclusion of the committee that LSJ/CLASS would not fit well in JSIS. There are some intellectual parallels and connections between the units, but institutionally we have very different agendas. LSJ faculty appreciate and have learned from the SIS undergraduate program, but our larger intellectual and research visions as a group is not a good fit for JSIS. We look forward to continuing to build the informal, complementary relationship.

The Challenge of Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Studies. We are pleased that the review committee recognizes that the undergraduate LSJ program “is successful in attracting an impressive number of majors” even while raising admission standards, that students are “enthusiastic in their support of the program and praising of the content of the courses and of the instructors,” and that the program offers students a “challenging and rich education.” Indeed, we have shown that the student evaluations for the dozen or so courses taught by core LSJ faculty members are among the highest of any unit on campus. The committee report then goes on to offer some suggestions for scrutinizing and reforming the curriculum, especially the entry level courses. This is unsurprising and welcome, for we told the committee that we have been working on this and have planned a series of retreats this summer to make some big decisions. Indeed, Associate Professor Steven Herbert, our very diligent and creative LSJ faculty coordinator, and Mark Weitzenkamp, our newly hired academic counselor, have developed an innovative, promising plan for addressing some basic problems. Several curricular changes have been made recently or are in process, all consistent with reviewers’ general recommendations.

- ❖ First, the number of Sociology courses that students can take to fulfill LSJ requirements has been significantly curtailed. The new plan allows students to take a single criminology-related course toward the LSJ major; previously, they could take up to four. This is a key move in our attempt to distinguish ourselves from Sociology, and will enable/encourage students to experience the full curricular breadth of LSJ. Advisors in LSJ, Sociology, and Central Advising have coordinated efforts to provide students useful information for distinguishing among the different majors.
- ❖ The second key change is a reduction in the number of core courses required for application to the major, which enables us to structure course sequencing more successfully. Previously, students were required to take three courses before they could apply. This enabled us to vet our applicants fully, but the requirement had a significant

downside. Because demand for the core courses is heavy, many students could not complete three core courses until late in their junior year, or even early in their senior year. As a consequence, many students were taking the core courses *after* taking higher-level classes. Many students were also loading up on many of the then-allowed Sociology courses, and thus not benefiting from the unique curricular experience LSJ offers. To change this pattern, we have reduced the requirement for application to the major to a single core course (already approved). While this may seem to reduce structure, it actually *adds* structure by allowing our earlier-entering majors to grab the first seats in core courses, before the seats are taken by others outside the major; these opportunities for our admitted students to take core courses early in the major will be identified and encouraged strongly by our program advisor. We fully expect our majors to be able to complete our core courses “on the way in,” most of them early in their junior year. Further, we plan to reserve a significant number of seats in each core course for transfers and sophomores. Our intent is to admit students much earlier in their UW careers, so that we can ensure a sequential move through the curriculum; students will now take the core courses *first* before doing more advanced work.

- ❖ Each of these shifts will help us to ensure that students are exposed to a wide range of our curricular offerings and in a more sensible sequence. Our next major challenge is to ensure that our core courses are working effectively, individually and collectively, to enable our students to develop the necessary conceptual and analytic tools for more advanced coursework. Accordingly, we are planning a series of meetings over the coming summer to re-evaluate the core courses. These meetings are meant to accomplish three purposes. The first is to establish a set of central concepts and skills that our core courses will reinforce. For example, we need to help students to develop the skill of doing comparative analysis. Other possibilities suggest themselves, but the group will need to decide on a limited set of goals that each faculty member can reinforce in each core class. A second main purpose of the meetings will be to discuss our individual core courses, and to assist each other in restructuring those courses in ways that will reinforce the core concepts and skills. A third purpose will be to discuss teaching strategies to make our classrooms more active and our instruction more effective.
- ❖ On an ongoing basis, we continue to search for courses in other units that could find a sensible place in our curriculum, and to entertain invitations from other units about the possibility of cross-listing courses. For example, we recently established a cross-listed course on prisons with Anthropology. We also continue to isolate courses that our majors could profitably take in preparation for the major. For example, we changed our admissions requirements to include an English composition course; we also strongly suggest an additional English class. There are other courses, most notably in the social sciences, that we need to explore as possible suggestions to interested pre-majors. But rather than just listing classes that appear related, our approach has been to contact faculty, examine syllabi, discuss course pedagogy, consider methodology, and the like to make sure that every course fits our intellectual designs. We are concerned about the quality and fit more than the quantity of our course offerings.

- ❖ To help manage such ongoing challenges, an undergraduate curriculum committee will be in action next year and will include the Associate Director/Curriculum Coordinator along with two other faculty members. This committee will meet regularly, and continue to fine-tune the curriculum to ensure that our goals for the undergraduate program are met. This committee was planned this year, but it was postponed amidst staff problems.

Faculty Governance. The committee identifies some underdeveloped areas of internal faculty governance in LSJ (and CLASS). We are very aware of these issues and have been working on them. However, the recommendations must be framed in the larger picture of the recent context. We are a very new program; half our faculty just arrived at UW in the last two years, and they appreciated being saved from much involvement in governance while they worked on their classes and other basic duties. That said, we had very frequent group meetings on intellectual matters (reading groups) and we had four full faculty meetings last year. According to our master plan, this year was scheduled to step up collective participation in common matters of governance. Over the summer of 2003, the director proposed a plan for scheduling two formal meetings each quarter, with an optional third meeting. Committees were scheduled for the undergraduate (LSJ), graduate (CLASS), and conference planning components; chairs of each were appointed, and the last committee was put into action. However, much of this was suspended in September, 2003, at the start of Autumn quarter, after the unexpected departure of our only staff person, who was battling cancer. The loss of our only staff member threw us into relative chaos, and the plans for formalizing governance had to be put on hold as everyday administrative demands absorbed energies. Even so, we had full faculty meetings in fall and winter quarter; we also held many sub-group meetings, including weekly reading group meetings involving most faculty members and during which governance issues were often discussed. The review committee thus examined the program in this context when internal organization had taken a step backward amidst personnel crisis, and we think that the result is an exaggerated picture of internal governance problems. Indeed, our initial self-study makes all of this very clear. In any case, we agree with virtually all recommendations and have them on our agenda.

- ❖ Voting faculty. Each year we have designated additional senior faculty from beyond the LSJ appointed faculty to round out our official voting faculty, as the review report suggests. These have included Jamie Mayerfeld and Joel Migdal, plus Susan Whiting last year when Migdal was on leave. Every personnel issue – hiring, merit raises, third year contract renewal – has been addressed by the voting faculty with at least five tenured members (McCann, Becket, Herbert, Mayerfeld, Migdal or Whiting). This academic year Mayerfeld and Migdal have continued to serve as senior voting faculty members. Appointment of senior faculty as voting members is a routine annual matter. At the same time, the decision to appoint all LSJ faculty 50% in a larger, disciplinary home unit was intended to offset any “quality control” and fairness issues that might arise from small LSJ senior faculty size. The review committee was informed of this, and we welcome the encouragement to become more vigilant and formal about the process in the future.
- ❖ Processes for Appointment and Promotion. Each faculty member’s contract letter specified a “joint judgment” about promotion will be offered by the two units to the dean, with the “home unit...considered the primary unit for promotion considerations.” The LSJ director tried at the times of hires to work out more detailed plans for the third year

review process and later tenure review processes with home unit chairs/directors, but in two of the cases (Godoy, Osanloo) the latter preferred to defer precise arrangements to a later time. In short, it was the home units that were reluctant to formalize arrangements. Nevertheless, in each case it was noted that the terms of review for promotion and tenure were to be clearly specified at the time of the third year review, which we are undertaking at the moment. In the one promotion/tenure case to date, LSJ worked very cooperatively with Geography to review and promote Steven Herbert in exactly the way (joint committee, single report, separate unit votes) that had been projected in advance. This is the model that has been specified for all promotion processes except in Sociology, which prefers entirely separate review processes. We point out that it is the duty of home units to administer reviews in cooperation with the LSJ director; so far relations have been cooperative, but initiative from several home units has been lacking, and the LSJ director has had to start and shepherd many processes. It is surprising that the review committee did not ask the director, who could have produced documentation, about these questions. But it surely is true that recent experience makes clear that all this will require more work to formalize, and we are very committed to doing so.

- ❖ Adjunct Appointments. The review committee recommends making adjunct appointments for “friends” of LSJ/CLASS, and especially for senior faculty who are appointed each year to fill out the official voting faculty. We wholly agree. This had been planned for this past year, but it has just been another of many issues awaiting action as time and energy permit in a new program. We expect to submit names of several Adjunct Professors (McCann, Mayerfeld, perhaps Migdal and Talbott) this spring, 2004. More will be submitted next year, most likely.
- ❖ Appointment of Michael McCann. The committee report suggests the change in status of McCann from 100% Pol S to a joint appointment with LSJ. When McCann began the process of leading the LSJ/CLASS development, however, he made clear he would not change his appointment, and Divisional Dean Susan Jeffords approved this commitment. Political Science has lost leading faculty in recent years to alternative commitments, and McCann pledged not to be part of that trend. He continues to play important roles in Political Science and in the mentoring of top graduate students. Changing his appointment would not alter his capacity to wear many hats in both programs. As noted above, he surely should become an Adjunct in LSJ (see above), as he will continue as director for several more years and be active in the programs far into the future.

Administrative Support and Structure. The committee report raises a number of issues and offers several recommendations regarding program leadership and administration. We agree with all of these points, some of which have been addressed already, and some of which require new resources to address adequately.

- ❖ Appointment of Director. The committee recommends that the appointment of the director be “regularized.” We note that has been the case from the start. Professor McCann was appointed as director for a five-year term, beginning in 2001; the charge was formally issued, in writing, by the dean. That appointment makes some sense, as

McCann was the author of the original UIF proposal and shepherded the initial phases of program development. A multi-year plan, approved generally by the LSJ faculty and discussed with the divisional dean, for formal leadership transition into the future was provided the committee. As McCann's first term ends in 2006, it is proposed that he be renewed for 3 more years. The reasoning at stake is that the Associate Professors, one of whom can take over as director, and Assistant Professors should all be promoted to the next rank by that time. At that time, McCann will happily turn over authority to the extraordinary faculty and its preferred leader(s). This is all subject to the usual processes of review and recommendation initiated by the dean's office.

- ❖ Internal Faculty Leadership Positions. The committee recommends that faculty members appointed to other administrative posts in the programs be given clear understandings as to what compensation or release time is available for their work. Each year, starting in 2002-3, the compensation for LSJ Undergraduate Program Coordinator has been negotiated with the director. A key problem is that our small new program has neither the luxury of course release time nor summer salary budgeted for this or other positions; this year we are using UIF rollover funds for summer salary compensation, but that funding will not be available next year. We expect that compensation will continue to be negotiated on an annual basis, but we cannot regularize the compensation until our resource base is supplemented. If budgetary support is provided, we will happily standardize compensation for administrative service.

Graduate/Research Activity. The Committee correctly identifies a variety of our ongoing and planned endeavors related to graduate education and coordinated research. The report is also accurate in noting that our progress on these plans has lagged behind undergraduate program development, as our self-study clearly notes. And we appreciate greatly the committee's expressed support for the graduate certificate program proposal that we are about to submit. However, we view these interrelated graduate and research enterprises as far more central and realistic for our future than the review suggests. Since its inception, graduate education has been a key component of the LSJ/CLASS vision. As was stated in the original UIF proposal,

The (CLASS) Center also will be directed to providing a coordinated network of new faculty, classes, and financial resources for graduate education. This will benefit students working within existing disciplines as well as facilitate development of a new interdisciplinary Ph.D. certificate program.

We take this mission very seriously. It is a primary end of our entire endeavor, a driving force behind our programmatic vision, as well as a means to generate a cutting-edge undergraduate program befitting a top research institution. In this regard, we view ourselves as quite different from CHID, to whom the review compares us. On the one hand, we appreciate the flattering likening of LSJ to CHID as an interdisciplinary, cutting-edge undergraduate program. On the other hand, CHID has no faculty research orientation and graduate education mission approaching that of CLASS. Indeed, we take far more seriously the outside reviewers' comparison of our efforts to that of Jurisprudence and Social Policy at U.C., Berkeley, which has been the leading *graduate* program in the nation for the past twenty years, entirely separate from the undergraduate legal studies program. We are honored that one committee member, Austin Sarat, urged us to develop a Ph.D. program now, noting that we would become among the best, if not the best, program around. In this regard, our future trajectory will be far more like Women

Studies, which began as an undergraduate studies program, developed a graduate certificate, and then recently created a Ph.D. program. We have already achieved far more progress on this vision than the review report recognizes; much of this is outlined in our initial self-study. We add a more systematic statement about our activities and plans here, much of it led by Associate Professor Katherine Beckett.

- ❖ The Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center refers to the research-oriented intellectual activities of the program faculty. This activity includes ongoing reading groups, colloquia, grant proposals, and other projects enlisting program faculty as well as sponsorship of speaker series, co-sponsorship of visiting individual speakers around campus, organization of thematic conferences, and collaborative research projects. Several collaborative grant proposals have been submitted by CLASS faculty already. The Center also provides a coordinated network of new faculty, graduate classes, financial resources, graduate mentoring and dissertation supervision, research and teaching assistance opportunities, and common participation in reading groups, speaker series, and conferences. This has benefited students working within existing disciplines: three major graduate placements by our interdisciplinary faculty combinations last year were in interdisciplinary legal studies programs at research institutions, and at least three other placements in disciplinary units were greatly enhanced by identification with the multi-disciplinary graduate faculty and courses.

- ❖ Consistent with the vision laid out in the original UIF proposal, we are developing a graduate certificate program in law and society studies, which the review committee report supports. Law and society is its own recognized discipline, with its own canon and its own job market. We are in a position to compete extremely well in placing graduates within that market, not to mention in the various wings of disciplines where interdisciplinary law and society studies (as a coordinated program) figure prominently. Indeed, our growing interdisciplinary graduate faculty and curriculum should soon rival the top law & society programs at UC Berkeley (JSP) and NYU. The goal is to supplement and enhance Sociology, Political Science, Geography, Women Studies, and Anthropology students' capacity to compete for faculty positions in their own disciplines, as well as in the growing number of interdisciplinary law and society departments and programs, by "certifying" their expertise in this area and by broadening and enhancing their professional socialization and networks both on and off campus. Our plan was vetted through the national graduate program consortium in the Law and Society Association, on which Professor McCann was a founding executive committee member. It is our firm belief that offering a graduate certificate in law & society studies will further enhance UW graduate students faculty placement opportunities in top university research institutions, undergraduate legal studies and criminal justice programs, and law schools around the nation. It is also worth noting that the plan to develop the graduate certificate program has already served as an important recruitment tool for LSJ/CLASS faculty recruiting of top students in their home departments. Indeed, law and society faculty around the nation are regularly urging promising undergraduates to contact us about opportunities for graduate training, both in and beyond the disciplines.

- ❖ Although we are currently engaging in many (but not all) of the activities that will constitute the graduate certificate program, consolidating these activities as part of a graduate certificate program will formalize, regularize, and broaden these activities. It will also put us in a position to compete for institutional grants for graduate education, such as NSF's IGERT grants. Consistent with the University's requirements, our graduate certificate will (pending approval) consist of the following. First, students will be required to take three 5 credit courses from faculty in or affiliated with CLASS. Each student will be required to take a core course in law and society studies, currently being co-taught by Professors McCann and Beckett. (This course will be offered as LSJ 501 in future iterations). Students will be able to choose two other courses from a suite of regularly offered graduate courses taught by CLASS faculty. In addition, we will offer a graduate course entitled "Special Topics in Law and Society Studies" so that two LSJ/CLASS faculty who are not otherwise able to teach graduate classes (Assistant Professors Angelina Godoy and Patrick Rivers) will be able to do so. A list of these graduate courses is attached, in Appendix I.
- ❖ In addition, to fulfill the graduate school's "capstone" requirement, students pursuing certification will be required to develop a scholarly paper in the law and society mold. This paper will be presented at the on-going work-share group, and, later, at the annual meetings of the Law and Society Association. (Financial assistance will be provided to make this possible). This process will serve several functions. First, by regularly participating in the work-share group both as commentators and presenters, students will interact with other graduate students and faculty; this provides an on-going opportunity for professional socialization. Second, students will gain experience in presenting their work, and incorporating feedback from their colleagues. Finally, by traveling to the annual conference and presenting their work in that venue, students will gain important professional experience, as well as networking opportunities. Students will be encouraged to submit their capstone paper for publication once this process is complete.
- ❖ Grant Generation. The CLASS director and faculty have great ambitions to generate funding – through NSF, through private foundations, and through private donors – to support our research and graduate education activities. We are very eager to initiate this activity. However, the present inadequate staffing level and demands of LSJ development and CLASS formation leave absolutely no time and energy for anything, much less the long term fund-raising projects. But we hope that this coming year will produce some individual research grants from NSF, and the following year, when the director is on sabbatical, will permit some time for larger institutional grant proposals and fundraising.

All in all, we are well under way toward fulfilling this vision of formalizing our contributions to graduate education and to putting ourselves in position to compete for institutional research-support grants from NSF and leading foundations.

Changing Our Name. The review committee recommends that we simplify our name, eliminating either LSJ or CLASS, preferably the latter. We have discussed this at great length. At present, we are not inclined to undertake this recommended change, for reasons related to our

discussion in the previous section. From the start, LSJ referred only to the undergraduate program, and CLASS referred to the various intellectual activities involving colloquia, speaker series, graduate student activities, and the like; CLASS is the umbrella concept, and LSJ is a specific component. It is true that many of the same faculty members are involved in both of these types of activities. But we very much view ourselves as “wearing different hats” and, more important, playing different roles. We are very concerned not to exhaust all our energies on the undergraduate side of our faculty lives, which admittedly has dominated so far. The UW is, ostensibly, after all, a research and graduate training institution, despite growing pressures to the contrary. Moreover, a few important faculty – Joel Migdal, for example, but also law school professors like Veronica Taylor and Anita Ramasastry – have little connection to LSJ but are founding, active members of the CLASS group. The CLASS Center functions as a research center. Many interdisciplinary centers exist on campus, and we view ourselves as part of that orbit; our faculty group is unanimous on this point. It is also relevant in this regard that CLASS has established a reputation in the law and society research and graduate world. CLASS is the official founding member of the National Consortium on Graduate Law and Society Programs. When faculty from around the nation and world contact us, they nearly always contact us by reference to CLASS. For example, when a well known senior law and society scholar, Gad Barzilai, contacted us recently about affiliation as a visiting scholar over the next two years, he referred exclusively to CLASS, never to LSJ. This was true for our efforts to recruit a new faculty member this past year in Political Science, Naomi Murakawa, who knew all about CLASS but nothing about LSJ. And so on. Finally, and perhaps most important, our discussions with administrators at NSF, Ford Foundation, the SOROS Foundation, and the like all have confirmed that it is essential to have a research center and graduate training organization that is *separate* from undergraduate program activity. In this regard, we follow the models of UC Berkeley’s JSP program, University of Wisconsin’s Institute of Legal Studies, and the other leading law and society programs where research and graduate activities have organizational identities and names separate from undergraduate programs. By contrast, law and society programs that have floundered in graduate program development have failed to develop separate identities from their undergraduate programs. All these reasons counsel against reducing everything we do to the LSJ label. Even should we become a department with a Ph.D. program in the future, as we hope, it still may be advisable to have a CLASS Center as a research organ that is independent for a variety of reasons. No doubt there may continue to be some modest confusion on campus, because LSJ and CLASS are interconnected. But there are very good reasons to keep both identities separate, as initially planned.

Future Review. The committee recommends that the CLASS/LSJ programs be reviewed again in five years. We welcome this, for we think that will provide an excellent opportunity to assess our progress in realizing our original vision.

Recommended Resource Augmentation. We applaud the committee’s recommendations for increasing the program resource base. It is especially worth noting in this regard that the non-personnel core operating budget for LSJ and CLASS together is essentially the same as the severely cut SoJu budget allocated for .5 FTE, no staff members, and 50 undergraduate majors in 1993. This operating budget is radically inadequate in nearly all the core categories. Appendix II outlines our existing budget, the shortfall in covering basic costs, and projected annual need. We do now have one staff member funded from the UIF grant, but this represents fewer staff than in

CHID, which has roughly the same number of undergraduates but no research and graduate component, and than in Women Studies, which serves far fewer undergraduates. On top of this, our one staff person handles about 35 LSJ minors, 25 Human Rights minors, and a new Disability Studies minor. As such, the committee report recommends a permanent 50% CSA or 4-quarter GSA appointment to add staff support. The committee recommends the following:

Operating Budget (see Appendix II)	\$20,000/yr	\$40,000 biennial
CSA or GSA staff, 50%, 4 quarters	\$16,000/yr	\$32,000 biennial

We very much need both of these resource enhancements. However, if we were asked to prioritize, we would rank the operating budget increase ahead the staff support, as the former provides us greater flexibility and meets costs of basic functions that we cannot cut.

In addition, the program has three other pressing resources needs.

- ❖ First is an increased allocation of TAs. We presently have 13 permanent TA quarters/yr, which is 3-4 less than we have used in each of the last two years; demand has continued to increase, while our TA allocation has shrunk. We need at least 16 quarters of TA a year to meet present demand for 130 majors. Our plans for streamlining our curriculum and moving students through coursework in sequential fashion are greatly impaired by lack of TAs. Likewise, our ability to admit students into core classes necessary for admission into the major is directly affected by the supply of TAs.
- ❖ Second, the possibility of independence depends on gaining our own administrator, freeing us from dependence on Political Science and its terrific administrator, Ann Buscherfeld. The committee report recognizes this point generally as well.
- ❖ Third, we very badly need office space of our own. Most of the space we have was “borrowed” from Political Science; all of it is in the Gowen complex of that department. We can never be independent until we are geographically separate as well as financially autonomous. Moreover, our CLASS Center will remain virtual, and invisible to many observers, until we have a geographically centered space. We have received many commitments to this end from the deans; the retention offers to Katherine Beckett and Steven Herbert make finding space a very strong commitment of the dean’s office. We surely hope that there is some realistic plan in the deans’ scheme.

Conclusion. We again extend our appreciation to the review committee and to the administrators who have overseen this process. LSJ is an undergraduate program on the move; it is already one of the very best in the nation, ranking next to programs at U.C. Berkeley and U. of Wisconsin as well as liberal arts heavyweights like Amherst College. The CLASS Center has high aspirations, deep commitments, and clear plans for becoming a major source of cutting-edge scholarship and interdisciplinary graduate education. Our aim is to become the most dynamic research group and graduate training program in the nation, a goal that the outside reviewers thought was well within in our reach. All we need is time and some modest resource supplementation. We appreciate the support provided us to date by the A&S deans, and we look forward to increased support in the future to help us make good on our commitments.

Appendix I. Graduate Courses Currently Offered by LSJ Faculty

LSJ 501, “Law, Society, and Politics” (Beckett, McCann)

LSJ 5XX, “Special Topics in Law and Society Studies” (Godoy, Rivers)

Political Science 561X, “Rights, Politics and Power” (McCann)

Political Science 561, “Law and Politics” (McCann)

Political Science 562, “Law and Social Control”

Political Science 563, “Supreme Court in American Politics” (Lovell)

Political Science 564, “Law and the Politics of Social Change” (Lovell, McCann)

Political Science 566A, “Problems in Comparative Legal Institutions” (Cichowski)

Sociology 590A, “Law and Social Control” (Beckett)

Sociology 590B, “Drugs, Politics, and Justice” (Beckett)

Anthropology 537, “Seminar on Political Anthropology and Law” (Osanloo)

Geography 574, “Geography, Law, and Social Control” (Herbert)

JSIS 590, “Violence and Politics in the Americas” (Godoy)

Proposed Organizing Framework

Law and Social Change

JSIS 590, “Violence and Politics in the Americas” (Godoy)

Political Science 561X, “Rights, Politics and Power” (McCann)

Political Science 561, “Law and/As Politics” (McCann)

Political Science 564, “Law and the Politics of Social Change” (Lovell, McCann)

Law and Social Control

Political Science 561, “Law and Politics” (McCann)

Sociology 590A, “Law and Social Control” (Beckett)

Sociology 590B, “Drugs, Politics, and Justice” (Beckett)

Geography 574, “Geography, Law, and Social Control” (Herbert)

Legal Institutions

Political Science 561, “Law and/As Politics” (McCann)

Political Science 563, “Supreme Court in American Politics” (Lovell)

Political Science 566A, “Problems in Comparative Legal Institutions” (Cichowski)

*** We plan to explore and to add additional courses by William Talbott (Philosophy), Veronica Taylor (Law), Naomi Murakawa (Pol S), and others to this list in the next year. We do want to keep the graduate program within a tight circle of well coordinated faculty, however.

Appendix II. Budgetary Shortfalls/Needs for LSJ/CLASS (requested by the review committee; the version below is revised)

The operating budget for LSJ/CLASS remains essentially the same as that for Society and Justice after it was cut dramatically in the early 1990s, and had only .5 FTE and little intellectual/academic credibility. We used 100% of our UIF funding for new faculty hiring and staff, so nothing was added to the operating budget to cover the new faculty, staff, students, and activities. We now have six appointed faculty members, and several close friends (soon to be “adjuncts”) all of whom incur costs that cannot be passed on to home units (offices; travel costs for law and society functions outside disciplines, etc), plus a 250% increase in majors (50 > 125) over SoJu and administration of three different minors (LSJ, Human Rights, Disability Studies). Our programs have thrived with a large UIF reserve that was rolled over from before we hired permanent faculty, some temporary annual allocations by Divisional Dean Susan Jeffords, and use of McCann’s Hirabayashi Professorship. But the first two supplements are depleted, and the last should not be sustained. To continue the bare level of activities of the last several years, we would need an additional \$18,000 of operating money each year, plus three temporary TA quarters made permanent. All this is just for the undergraduate LSJ program. We also have spent \$10-15,000 each year on graduate student recruiting, travel, assistance, and the like. We view the recognition of the CLASS contributions to graduate education as quite basic in this regard; even minimal support at \$12-15,000 a year would help.

The dollar figures below are listed with annual amounts first, and biennial sums in parentheses. The text that follows explains the use of the funds, past sources that exceed state budget, and our minimal needs.

01-20 Temp instructors \$29,562 (59,124).

We use this to pay instructors for five very important, longstanding, popular classes in LSJ, the key classes we decided to hold over from the SoJu program – Redkey’s Criminal Legal Procedure, Walsh’s Courts and her White Collar Crime, and Fehr’s Corrections. Fehr has recently alternated the last class with Legal Ethics, another fine offering from him which fits our format even better. One of these 5 used to be in the ED program, and that funding was moved into the permanent state budget when the old EDP was downsized. We have recently added David Lovell’s (a south campus Professor) “Philosophies of Punishment” to the list, even though we do not have money for it. All of these courses provide the key offerings in the criminal justice and social control track, as alternatives to the criminology and deviance classes we no longer feature. We also are committed to a three course sequence on disability rights, which has been paid for by temporary funds patched together across campus the last two years; we are looking for handouts again next year for this important set of courses. We have no remaining funds for the various special classes by instructors, graduate students, visitors, etc – the 4-5 great offerings that come our way each year, and have been funded in the past by UIF rollover money that is non-existent.

01-30 TAs \$53,043/yr (new permanent allocation)

This amount is the equivalent of less than 13 quarters of TAship; last year and this year each we actually used 16 TA quarters, supplemented from temporary dean's allocation, our instructor budget, and the last of the UIF rollover fund. The new permanent allocation leaves us 3 quarters short of actual use and demonstrated need the last two years. And even with the 16

TA quarters (of which we are 3 short for the future), we still turned away more students than we accepted to our four core classes; we are far short of meeting demand.

01-40 RA \$0

We have no non-teaching graduate support, for GSA or RAs.

01-80 Hourly (readers, office help) \$707 (1414)

This is the first dramatic deficit in our operating budget, after TAs. We have averaged \$3000/yr on readers for two large and several medium-sized classes the last two years. It has been paid from the now depleted UIF rollover fund. We need at least an additional \$2500 per year for this.

02 Honoraria \$400 (800)

We have spent \$4500 on average each year for our colloquia series, taken from UIF rollover and McCann's professorship. This is a conservative figure, and we meld most of our funds with others to be efficient. We need at least \$4000 in this category.

03 Services (copying phones, etc) \$4307 (8614)

This falls a bit short, about \$1000, each year.

04 Travel \$1050 (2100)

This is another dramatic deficit. We promise each faculty member \$750 a year, which adds up to \$4500, so we are \$3500 short in this category. Even this leaves the director with no travel support, and nothing for graduate students. It is critical that we provide our scholars support in attending the annual Law and Society meetings along with the disciplinary meetings funded by home units. Without such attendance, we will flail in oblivion.

05 Supplies \$1350 (2700)

This also falls short. It barely covers the printer cartridges for faculty, not to mention everything else. This needs to be doubled, another \$1350/yr.

06 Equipment \$0

Need anything be said? We purchased copying machines, fax machines, etc. with the original UIF money, but these require upkeep and replacement. Moving every year into new offices, none of them our own, incurs lots of basic equipment costs. At least \$1000/yr seems essential.

Finally, there is no money in any categories to pay summer salary or, preferably course buyout, for the undergraduate coordinator (\$5000). That was paid this year from the last of the UIF rollover budget, and will have to be paid in the future out of the very inadequate 01-20 instructor budget, which would be disastrous for our curriculum.

Summary of Budget Shortfalls/Needs—ANNUAL basis (not biennial):

A. 3 Teaching Assistants

B. Other:	Hourly	\$2500
	Honoraria	4000
	Services	1000
	Travel	3500
	Supplies	1350
	Equipment	1000
	UG coordinator buyout	<u>5000</u>
		\$18,350

C. 50% staff administrator – CSA, professional, or GSA \$16,000 plus benefits

In addition, we need money for non-teaching graduate student support and office space where faculty can meet, gather faculty and grads, etc. The old SoJu program had a meeting room, a lounge, a staff office for two persons. The deans have promised us an office complex down the road, but some support from the committee recommendation would be welcome. Right now, the only LSJ space is a staff office donated by Political Science on a contingent basis. One major obstacle to campus recognition of the CLASS Center is the absence of an office complex that provides a geographic center for the program.