

FINAL REPORT
POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
TEN-YEAR REVIEW COMMITTEE

submitted to:

The Graduate School
University of Washington

April 4, 2016

BACKGROUND

The Committee for the Department of Political Science Review (hereafter “the Review Committee”) was appointed by the Graduate School in the Fall of 2015. Its charge was described in a letter from David L. Eaton (Vice Provost and Dean) dated November 9, 2015. The Review Committee includes both local and external representatives. The members are:

Stevan Harrell, Professor, Department of Anthropology, UW
 Rose McDermott, Professor, Department of Political Science, Brown University
 Rogers Smith, Professor, Department of Political Science and Associate Dean for
 Social Sciences, University of Pennsylvania
 Stewart Tolnay, Professor, Department of Sociology, UW [Review Committee Chair]

The broadly defined charge to the Review Committee was “to assess the quality of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs [in the Department of Political Science] and to provide faculty with constructive suggestions for strengthening the programs.”

The Department posed the following three more specific questions for the Review Committee:

- *Which metrics of success should be the department’s focus as we move forward into the future? How much should our department value the goal of improving our national rankings relative to other goals and measures? Given resource constraints, what are target steps for improving our research profile and national standing while maintaining a distinctive intellectual identity?*
- *How can the department best balance the goal of improving the value and intellectual coherence of our undergraduate program with the goal of maintaining majors and undergraduate enrollments? How can we meet the course staffing needs of an improved undergraduate program?*
- *What are the best practical strategies for maintaining and improving the success of our Ph.D program? What strategies can meet the challenges of recruiting outstanding students in the face of competition from programs that offer much more financial support?*

A target date of April 4, 2016 was set for the Review Committee to submit its report to the Graduate School.

PROCEDURES

On November 9, 2015 the Graduate School convened an initial planning meeting of the Review Committee, with the external members participating by phone. The general objectives and procedures for the review were discussed and the dates for the site visit were finalized. On February 26, 2016 Steve Harrell and Stew Tolnay met with

Department Chair George Lovell for a general discussion of the Departmental Self Study and Unit Defined Questions in preparation for the site visit the following week. The purpose of this meeting was twofold. First, it gave Professor Lovell an opportunity to share with the Review Committee any additional information that would help to improve the efficiency and utility of the site visit and to give special emphasis to any of the issues included in the Self Study. Second, it allowed Professors Harrell and Tolnay to ask clarifying questions and to gather additional information they could share with the entire Review Committee prior to the site visit.

The site visit and meetings with departmental members were held on March 3rd and 4th. Harrell, McDermott, and Tolnay met for a working dinner on the evening of March 2nd. All committee members participated in a working breakfast on the morning of March 3rd and a working dinner on the evening of March 3rd. Representatives of the Department of Political Science (faculty, students, and staff) were interviewed on March 3rd and 4th. Exit discussions (one with and one without departmental representatives) and a final debriefing of the Review Committee were conducted from 2:30 to 5:00 pm on March 4th. [See Appendix A for the full site visit schedule.]

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The Department of Political Science has a long history of providing high quality undergraduate and graduate educational and training opportunities for students at the University of Washington. Its faculty have contributed significantly to scholarship in the department's four substantive areas of concentration—American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Theory. The department's intellectual reputation in the discipline has been built on the publication of high impact books, published by respected university presses, more than on the publication of articles in top-ranked political science journals, though faculty members make both types of contributions. The department maintains strong ties to other units on campus, including the Jackson School of International Studies, the Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences, and the Law, Societies, & Justice Program. All of the department's activities and programs benefit from an excellent support staff under the leadership of Ann Buscherfeld, Department Administrator.

Much of the intellectual activity of the department is organized around a set of five research centers: The Washington Institute for the Study of Inequality and Race, Center for American Politics and Public Policy, Center for Communication and Civic Engagement, the Harry Bridges Center for Labor Studies, and the Center for Environmental Politics. The primary purpose of these centers is to provide subsets of intellectual communities, rather than to motivate and assist the preparation of applications for extramural support for the research programs of affiliated faculty. Given the modest budgets and staff support dedicated to the centers, this emphasis appears to be a rational response to prevailing conditions.

Since the department's last ten-year review in 2004-5, significant internal and external forces have resulted in a number of changes to which the department has responded, or will need to respond in the near future.

After building impressive strength in the area of Racial and Ethnic Politics during the early 2000s, several key faculty members have left the department in response to attractive packages from competitive universities. Gary Segura was hired by Stanford University; Matt Barretto left for UCLA; Naomi Murakawa is now at Princeton; Luis Fraga joined the faculty at Notre Dame University, and ongoing recruitment efforts threaten additional losses. The magnitude of attrition suffered within this substantive concentration weakens its current vitality and endangers its long-term viability.

The hemorrhage of faculty was not restricted to a single specialty area. In addition to the loss of faculty in Racial and Ethnic Politics, Peter May, Margaret Levi, and Ellis Goldberg retired (Levi subsequently became the Director of the Advanced Center for Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University). Bryan Jones was recruited to by the University of Texas-Austin and Michael Ward was hired by Duke University. As a result of this attrition, the faculty FTE in Political Science has declined from a high of 30 in 2006-07 to 23 now. The lack of a single female full professor presents both a structural and impressionistic challenge for the department.

Until quite recently, the department's effort to attract the best caliber of graduate students grew more difficult each year as the recruitment packages offered to prospective students lost ground to those provided by its peer departments at other institutions. Recent increases in stipends that were negotiated through the graduate students' collective bargaining unit have helped to stall the deterioration in their competitive position for graduate students, and possibly even to improve their relative position slightly. Unfortunately, this modest progress was achieved through the "cannibalization" of existing lines, resulting in a reduction in the number of assistantships that can be offered to prospective students. Very recently announced substantial additional reductions in the number of teaching assistantships available from the College of Arts and Sciences will further undermine the effort by the department to recruit and retain high quality graduate students. This represents a daunting challenge for the department as it seeks to maintain the high-performing graduate program that it has developed over time.

The department's ability to recruit and retain high quality graduate students is further hindered by the sharp decline (at least since the last ten-year review) in the amount of extramural funding garnered by faculty. At its peak in 2007-08 the Department housed roughly twelve external grants, totaling roughly \$1,900,000 in annual revenue. The most recent figures for 2015-16 show one external grant with less than \$100,000 in annual revenue (estimated from Appendix B, Figure 4). The external funding environment has grown significantly more competitive in recent years, a trend that undoubtedly contributes to this decline. The department has also lost some of its most successful grantspersons, which also contributes to the loss of revenue. In addition, however, the

department appears to lack a culture of grant-seeking that motivates faculty to persistently pursue extramural funding from federal agencies and private foundations.

At the time of the department's last ten-year review, the number of undergraduate majors and total annual undergraduate enrollments had peaked at levels that were, quite likely, unsustainable. Both have declined since then. This is a trend experienced by other departments in Social Science Division of the College of Arts and Sciences. On the one hand, the current number of majors and enrollment levels are probably more consistent and sustainable with the reduced number of faculty FTE. On the other hand, the University's "activity based budgeting" model intrinsically encourages high undergraduate enrollments and large numbers of majors. The department faces the interacting tensions of (1) declining faculty FTE, (2) reduced support for graduate teaching assistants, and (3) a funding environment that rewards high enrollments and large numbers of majors. These tensions present the department with both the challenge and opportunity of deciding how to best continue providing a high quality educational experience for students at the University of Washington.

These changes experienced by the department since its last ten-year review, and the challenges that they present, are reflected in the "Unit Defined Questions" posed for the Review Committee by the department (see above). And they motivate and frame much of the following narrative, as well as the Review Committee's recommendations.

DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE

After a now-distant troubled past, the department has enjoyed a series of able and effective chairs, with George Lovell being the most recent example. But partly as a legacy of that past, when the department was also much larger, it has an unusually elaborate governance structure that appears to impose high service demands—even as the faculty as a whole rarely meet to deliberate over matters of common concern and significant importance, for example regarding prospective promotion cases.

That structure includes a chair; associate chair; executive committee; personnel committee; undergraduate and graduate committees; graduate admissions committee; graduate financial aid committee; graduate placement director; field coordinators; convocation committee; and more, with a (desirable) diversity committee soon to be added. A Political Science Department with around 25 members would typically have only a chair; a graduate chair and committee, in charge of all graduate matters; an undergraduate chair and committee, in charge of all undergraduate affairs; and ad hoc committees for other tasks. Searches are most often conducted by such ad hoc committees, created for positions decided upon through deliberation by all faculty members and with approval by the university administration. Promotions are decided upon through deliberation by all faculty members of higher rank. To conduct such deliberations, departments typically meet once a month, in many places over lunch to conserve time. These meetings also provide venues for working through other departmental issues: it is not wise for the department's enviable collegiality to be sustained partly through benign neglect of difficult topics.

Given its commendable emphasis on and success in graduate student placement, the department may well want to maintain some of its distinctive structures. But the executive committee appears moribund and can be eliminated; the desirability of the personnel committee should be reviewed; and consolidation of other committees should be considered. The result may be to lessen burdensome service loads while maintaining efficiency and promoting broader faculty engagement in collective decision-making on a range of important topics.

Specific Recommendations

- *The department should streamline its governance structure through the reduction of standing committees, which should reduce the departmental service burden.*
- *The department should also consider more regular, general faculty meetings (structured by rank when appropriate) for deliberative discussions of departmental issues, including potential personnel cases.*

FACULTY

The faculty consists of four assistant professors, nine associate professors, and eleven full professors. The morale and collegiality among faculty members seem generally high, and people appear to enjoy being part of the department. The department divides itself along the discipline's standard four subfields of (1) American Politics, (2) International Relations, (3) Comparative Politics and (4) Political Theory. However, the department has also invested heavily in particular concentrations that bridge across subfields, most notably in the area of Racial and Ethnic Politics. As noted above, as a result of some notable recent retirements as well as faculty leaving for other institutions, the department has experienced a significant reduction in size, going below the number of FTE reported in the last external review, which was considered barely sustainable at that time. This shrinkage in faculty has hit the Racial and Ethnic Politics concentration particularly hard. While such poaching by competitors can be seen as validating the quality of these faculty members, it leaves a significant gap in coverage in the department in an area which has recently been known for its strength, and has attracted graduate students wishing to work in this area.

The department has prepared a four-year hiring plan to guide its recruitment in the near future. That plan was implemented during the current academic year when the department received authorization from the College of Arts and Sciences to recruit for two junior level faculty. The hiring plan devoted less attention to recruitment strategies and priorities in coming years, under the assumption that the success of this year's recruitment will shape the nature of future hiring. When this year's recruitment is completed, the department will need to engage in the difficult conversation of what subfields will be privileged in future hires. There does not appear to be consensus on that issue.

One of the challenges brought about by the loss of faculty involves the reduction in extra-mural funding available within the department for faculty and their graduate students. Such external funding will become increasingly critical as reductions in central administration funding for graduate student support makes it more difficult for students to obtain sufficient funding to complete their training in normative time. Finding ways to incentivize grant applications such as course reductions or leveraging other forms of institutional support, might be encouraged to help fill this gap.

The quality of mentorship of junior faculty (i.e., assistant professors) is impressive. The long-running successful record of promotion and tenure cases is testimony to the success of this mentorship. The conscious support and attention given to this process for junior faculty might well be extended beyond tenure to provide additional mentorship for associate professors to achieve the rank of full professor. In particular, it would be helpful if the standards for promotion to full professor were clarified and made more transparent. For promotion to the rank of full professor, the department should consider adopting a broader set of criteria that includes achieving excellence in teaching/mentoring, service, and research. Additional supports might prove helpful as well, including implementing a formal mentorship process for those at the rank of associate professor or additional support for research or travel funding.

As alluded to in the section on Departmental Governance, the promotion to full professor would be improved by involving all current full professors in the annual evaluation of associate professors, including consideration of their readiness for promotion. Reliance on the small Personnel Committee for this purpose restricts the perspectives that are brought to this process and reduces the likelihood that other full professors might serve as advocates for specific associate professors whom they deem appropriate candidates for promotion.

Specific Recommendations

- *The department is wise to continue emphasizing its distinctive intellectual strengths, rather than following conventional models of Political Science Departments. It may be prudent to take advantage of the wider variety of well-regarded journal outlets now available to publish both high impact articles and books.*
- *The department should seek to clarify the standards for promotion from associate to full professor and consider a broad set of criteria for promotion that considers service, teaching/mentoring, and research.*
- *The department should seek ways to improve the mentoring of associate professor faculty, including implementing a formal mentoring arrangement that matches associate professors with appropriate full professors.*
- *The department should develop a strategy for increasing extramural research funding among its faculty. Incentives such as release time from teaching and increased*

emphasis given to grant support for merit increases and promotions should be considered.

■ *The Review Committee fully recognizes the fiscal constraints facing the College of Arts and Sciences and the University of Washington, which will likely limit faculty recruitment in the coming years. However, the gaps left by recent faculty losses should be filled as soon as possible to avoid future degradation in the department's research productivity and its ability to offer high quality graduate training—both of which could negatively affect its national reputation.*

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

The Political Science Department's undergraduate program is a historic and current strength of the department. Undergraduate majors are on the whole very happy with the attention that they receive from both faculty members and teaching assistants, and with the quality of the class instruction, again both from faculty and TAs, particularly in the advanced classes and in the honors program. The writing center receives universal praise and acclamation. At the same time, retaining the high quality and strong reputation of the department's undergraduate program will require working through some issues that have emerged in recent years due to trends beyond the department's control. We discuss these below.

Declining numbers of majors and FTE enrollments. Depending on how the total is computed, the number of majors has declined from a high of about 1,300 in 2005 to somewhere between 700 and 900 today. This creates difficulties in getting permission for new or replacement hires, as well as declines in the number of TA positions the department can offer. However, with the sharp decline in faculty numbers in recent years, it seems unfeasible to grow the number of majors again, something that would place an unbearable load on faculty and advisers. The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to any attempt to increase enrollments in current classes.

Structure and content of the curriculum. Undergraduates and faculty mentioned the following concerns regarding the current state of the undergraduate program.

- *Unclear structure of major and program requirements.* Political science is an open major with relatively few requirements; this can easily lead to a feeling of lack of structure or lack of sequence in an undergraduate program.
- *Overlap between classes.* As is common in departments everywhere, faculty do not consult with each other about the specific content of their classes, with the result that undergraduates perceive that they are being taught the same material several times in different classes.
- *Lack of practical applicability.* Some faculty and undergraduates feel that the undergraduate program was designed less for the careers that undergraduates

are likely to pursue than for the discipline of political science; the term “mini graduate program” was heard more than once.

- *Lack of intellectual diversity.* Respondents were divided on this, but there were mild complaints of Eurocentricity, bias toward progressive politics, and not enough inclusion of international students.
- *Services.* The advising office and writing center seem to be very well run and highly appreciated by students and faculty alike. However, many students we talked to felt that there should be more efforts at community-building among students, better guidance on finding appropriate internships for advanced undergraduates, and perhaps a formal mentorship program similar to that in the Department of Economics or Jackson School of International Studies.

Specific Recommendations

In light of the preceding, we recommend the following:

- *That the department’s faculty undertake a serious review of the undergraduate program, which might be rebuilt to focus on important themes in local, national, and international politics, rather than on the scholarly branches of political science as a discipline. The recent restructuring of the program at Stanford University has been mentioned as one possible model to follow. We recognize that there are feasibility and workload issues involved in such a review, and that the department might decide against the restructuring. But it is time to consider the possibility in a formal manner.*
- *That the department consider helping undergraduates to organize community activities, perhaps with modest amounts of funding.*
- *That the department seek alternative funding to avoid closing of the Political Science Writing Center.*
- *We recommend against the department trying to increase its number of majors or number of students enrolled, unless there is a commensurate increase in faculty numbers, which seems unlikely.*

GRADUATE PROGRAM¹

The department rightly takes pride in its outstanding graduate program, even as it also sustains excellence in undergraduate teaching. The department maintains a truly

¹ The Review Committee had access to the results of a Catalyst Survey of graduate students that was conducted by the Graduate and Professional Student Senate prior to the site visit. All members of the Review Committee read the report that was prepared from the results of the survey and those results were considered and discussed prior to the Exit Discussion. In the end, because of the extremely low response rate (16 students or 23% of all graduate students) and concomitant concerns about the generalizability of the information, the Committee decided to give little emphasis to the evidence gathered by the survey or contained in the report. One respondent’s reference to Political Science Department Ten-Year Review Committee Report April 2016

superb record of placement for graduate students completing their Ph.Ds. Students generally report excellent support from their faculty advisors/mentors, though there is some unevenness in the distribution of graduate mentoring across faculty. Students are encouraged to publish during their graduate training, and many are successful in doing so. The department relies on its graduate students to help shoulder the still large undergraduate enrollments and number of majors but also supports them in learning the craft of teaching. Many Political Science graduate students take advantage of the advanced training in quantitative methods that is offered by the Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences (CSSS).

Despite these notable successes, the department's graduate program faces significant challenges as it seeks to sustain its quality into the future.

Funding packages for prospective graduate students are not competitive with the wealthiest programs, even among public universities. Despite recent union-negotiated increases in stipends, compensation for graduate student employees has been eroded by increased fees and, at best, have only been able to keep pace with those of competitors. The attractiveness of funding packages offered by the department is further reduced by the requirement that the vast majority of UW graduate students teach from the start of graduate school. The exceptions have been those few students who are admitted with first year fellowships, but it is wise to consider discontinuing those awards to first year students, especially since their recipients have not fared particularly well.

The departures in recent years of four outstanding faculty members in the area of Racial and Ethnic Politics have also made it more difficult to recruit graduate students of color and to provide appropriate mentoring for those who come to the UW and wish to specialize in that subfield. For this area to continue as a substantive strength in the department, additional recruitment will be required to replace the lost faculty.

Students in some subfields, especially American Politics and International Relations, as well as those pursuing the CSSS Ph.D Track in Political Science, face requirements that mean they are still taking courses in their third year, instead of the two years of course work that is common in most graduate programs in Political Science. Most, but not all, graduate students considered the required number of courses to be an impediment to the timely completion of their degrees.

Although there is a valuable tradition in the department of students working comfortably with more than one faculty member, thesis supervising and graduate student mentoring still appear to be even more concentrated on a few faculty members than is typical in many strong Political Science programs.

"sexual harassment issues" was noted with concern by the Committee and helped to inform subsequent questioning of graduate students who were interviewed by the Committee. Despite discrete probing, from multiple angles, the Committee received no additional feedback that hinted of a problem of sexual harassment in the department.

Specific Recommendations

- *The challenged funding environment for graduate students in the College of Arts and Sciences makes it wise for the department and the university to give priority to graduate student funding in advancement efforts.*
- *The department should consider whether it can reduce course requirements in some subfields.*
- *The department should investigate the uneven distribution of graduate training across faculty members and consider strategies for achieving a more equitable distribution that does not degrade the quality of training and mentoring. Graduate student mentoring should be emphasized more strongly in merit decisions and promotion cases.*

STAFF SUPPORT

The departmental staff, both in the main office and in the advising office, seems to be working smoothly, with no specific complaints or roadblocks other than understaffing coming to light in our review. The efficiency and effectiveness of the Political Science support staff is due, in no small part, to the leadership of Ann Buscherfeld, departmental administrator, who is a past recipient of the University of Washington Distinguished Staff Award. The Review Committee heard many laudatory comments about the level and quality of support that they received from the departmental staff.

Like all departments, Political Science feels itself understaffed. This may be affecting the ability of faculty to write and administer grants, since the department administrator is charged with all the grant administration, a job that often goes to fiscal specialists. This is a division of labor that perhaps needs to be investigated, but it appears not to be a major problem. On the whole, there are remarkably few staff issues in the department, making this a matter of little concern.

Specific Recommendations

- *Political Science faculty should have access to stronger pre- and post-award support for external grants. If the financial climate does not permit increasing staff FTE for the department, then collaborative relationships with interdisciplinary research centers in the College of Arts and Sciences, for example the Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology or the Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences, should be explored for those faculty with the appropriate substantive and/or methodological profiles.*

DIVERSITY

The department has had a particular concentration in Racial and Ethnic Politics, which has been significantly reduced by the recent loss of several faculty members from this area. This leaves a gap in this area. With the departure of a number of faculty of color, the department faces a challenge in sustaining a conducive and supportive environment

for faculty and students of color. Some individuals within the department expressed concerns about the climate for members of color, particularly in the wake of recent departures of prominent faculty in this area. Graduate students have gotten together to create a group to work on this issue, and expressed appreciation for Chair George Lovell's support for their efforts, which included recent roundtable events. The department should consider building on this effort to create a Diversity Committee, comprising both faculty and graduate student representation to ensure sustained attention to these issues across ranks. The department will need to decide whether or not it can continue to support an explicit concentration in the area of Racial and Ethnic Politics if it is not able to seek and retain additional faculty in this area within the current funding climate.

One of the most notable aspects of the department is its lack of a female faculty at the rank of full professor, especially after two significant retirements of faculty members in that category. Several women have remained at the rank of associate professor for a long time, and therefore providing additional female mentorship and modeling at the higher ranks remains an obvious and immediate necessity. Importantly, the Review Committee did not find evidence of explicit gender bias nor of deliberate structural impediments designed to inhibit the promotion and recruitment of senior female faculty. Rather, the department's current situation appears to be the result of idiosyncratic factors coupled with past failures to more proactively take steps to address the issue. Nevertheless, the problem is a major one.

In our opinion, this is one of the most pressing needs the faculty faces at the moment. We strongly endorse adopting a hiring priority for a senior female scholar in particular, and scholars of color more generally. This is particularly important if the department is to retain its impressive recent concentration on Racial and Ethnic Politics.

Specific Recommendations

- *The department should consider the creation of a Diversity Committee, with representation from faculty at various ranks, graduate students, staff, and undergraduate students.*
- *The Department should adopt a hiring priority for senior female scholars and scholars of color.*

ADVANCEMENT

The department has demonstrated considerable recent success at attracting private support in the form of gifts and endowments. Currently, the department holds endowments totaling over \$3.5 million, with roughly one-half of that donated since the last ten-year review. To be sure, most of the impressive record of fundraising consists of two large gifts—one for the Severyns Ravenholt Endowment and a second from Dr. Richard Wesley, a long-time supporter of the Department. Since 2012 the department has averaged roughly \$180,000 in annual interest income from endowments.

Like most social science departments, Political Science cannot depend on generous and consistent giving from a large pool of graduates with high capacity. Rather, they will likely continue to benefit from the occasional generous contribution from a former faculty member or their family or from a unique friend of the Department, as well as smaller gifts from students, faculty, and community members. Also like most social science departments, few faculty members in the Department of Political Science are eager to commit their time and energy toward fund raising.

Despite the Department's laudable record of fund raising, the inconsistency and unpredictability of that revenue stream advises against a decision to rely too heavily on gift giving to support their regular programs.

Specific Recommendations

- *The department's advancement efforts should prioritize support for graduate students, including increased funding for travel, research, summer support, and to top-off stipends.*

CONCLUSION

The Department of Political Science at the University of Washington is a highly functioning academic unit. It is committed to providing high quality graduate and undergraduate educations, and to the conduct of cutting edge scholarship consistent with its somewhat boutique profile. And, by the Review Committee's assessment, it is generally successful in all of those regards. As with all academic units, however, periodic and strategic "fine tuning" is advisable to help assure the continuation of current successes into the future.

The body of this report provides the narrative that is based on the Review Committee's evaluation of the department's programs. The specific recommendations contained within the report offer the Committee's best advice for proactive or corrective measures that the department should consider moving forward. For the most part, these are minor or modest recommendations. In our estimation they are also important and deserve the careful attention and consideration of the department.

The Review Committee recommends continuing status for the programs of the Department of Political Science at the University of Washington and that its next programmatic review be conducted in ten years time.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Department of Political Science
Site Visit Schedule
All Meetings in Smith 40a except as noted.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2

6:00 p.m. Dinner – Review Committee
Nell’s Restaurant (206-524-4044)
6804 E. Green Lake Way North

THURSDAY, MARCH 3

9:00-10:00 A.M. George Lovell, Chair and Jamie Mayerfeld, Associate Chair

10:00-10:45 **Full Professors I:** Tony Gill, Steve Majeski, Aseem Prakash

11:00-11:45 **Assistant Professors:** Jeffrey Arnold, Megan Francis,
James Long, Rebecca Thorpe

12:00-1:15 P.M. **Lunch: Post-Doctoral Lecturers and Finishing Graduate
Students:** Yoav Duman, Aaron Erlich, Kirstine Taylor, Hannah
Walker, Kassra Oskooii.

1:15-1:30 Individual Faculty Appointment

1:30-2:15 **Undergraduate Students: Meeting in GOWEN 1a**

2:15-3:30 **Associate Professors I:** Beth Kier, Karen Litfin, Susan Whiting.

3:45-4:15 **Full Professors: American Politics** Michael McCann, John
Wilkerson, Mark Smith

4:30-5:15 **Full Professors III:** Lance Bennett, Jim Caporaso, Jon Mercer

5:15-5:30 Individual Faculty Appointments

6:00 Dinner – Review Committee
Ivar’s Salmon House (206-632-0767)
401 NE Northlake Way

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Department of Political Science
Site Visit Draft Schedule
All Meetings in Smith 40a except as noted.

FRIDAY, MARCH 4

- 8:30-9:00 A.M. Individual Faculty Appointments
- 9:00-9:30 **Administrative Staff:** Ann Buscherfeld, Department Administrator; Steve Dunne, Senior Computing Specialist
- 9:30-10:15 **Advising Staff:** Meera Roy, Susanne Recordon, Tamara Sollinger, Mark Weitzenkamp.
- 10:30-11:15 **Associate Professors II:** Chris Adolph, Victor Menaldo, Chip Turner.
- 11:15-12:00 **Grad Student Elected Leaders and GPSS Reps.** JP Anderson and Travis Nelson, GPSS reps; Jennifer Driscoll, President; Emily Christensen (GPC Rep and Lead TA), Seth Trenchard (UPC Rep), Paige Sechrest (Equality Initiative in Political Science).
- 12:00-1:00 P.M. **Lunch** – Review Committee – UW Club, Colleen Rohrbaugh Room
- 1:00-2:30 Review Committee Executive Session
- 2:30-3:30 Exit Discussion with Review Committee, Department Representatives, George Lovell and Jamie Mayerfeld, Judith Howard, Divisional Dean of Social Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences
Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning, The Graduate School
Patricia Moy, Associate Provost for Academic and Student Affairs, Office of the Provost
Michaelann Jundt, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs
Graduate School Council Representatives:
Patricia Kuszler, Professor, School of Law
Joaquin Herranz, School of Public Policy and Governance
Augustine McCaffery, Senior Academic Program Specialist, The Graduate School
- 3:30-4:30 Exit Discussion Continues without Department Representatives.
- 4:30-5:00 Review Committee Final Debriefing.