

29 May 1999

REPORT OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE
JACKSON SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Committee Members:

Stevan Harrell, Professor and Chair, Department of Anthropology, UW (Chair)

Lisa Anderson, Dean, School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia U.

Diana Behler, Professor of Germanics, UW

Robert Gilpin, Professor Emeritus, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton U.

Robert Goldenburg, Professor of Comparative Religion, Stony Brook U.

Richard Moxon, Professor of Management, UW School of Business

I. Mission of the Jackson School

The Jackson School as a School of International Studies has three primary missions within the University of Washington: To provide undergraduate education in international studies to students pursuing prospective careers in trade, finance, diplomacy and other areas of international interaction and exchange, or who are intent on pursuing graduate education in these areas; to provide master's-level education to students who intend to pursue similar careers, or who intend to pursue doctoral degrees in area studies; and to coordinate a series of area-focused centers and programs focusing on interdisciplinary study and public education.

In addition, in its present form the Jackson school provides a home for interdisciplinary programs in Comparative Religion and Jewish Studies, units whose mission is somewhat different from the International Studies mission of the Jackson School, but which would for administrative and historical reasons have a difficult time existing outside the Jackson School's umbrella.

If the University of Washington is to serve as the educational and research focus of the increasingly Pacific-oriented society and economy of the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest region in the early 21st century, and if the University is to retain its place as one of the most distinguished comprehensive public universities in North America in the era of globalization, the Jackson School is an essential element of the University that ought to be supported and nurtured by the University administration, by the State government, and by the private sector in the Pacific Northwest. It is absolutely imperative if the University is to maintain both excellence and relevance in our increasingly interconnected world that the Jackson School be given the resources and support necessary to carry out its essential missions.

II. Strengths and resources of ISIS

In an era when most major American Universities are struggling with the changing conditions and shifting imperatives of a globalized economy, culture, and society, the University of Washington, in the form of the Jackson School, has already in place many of the necessary resources and cultural traditions to enable it to fulfill its mission with efficiency and distinction. These include:

1) A distinguished faculty in international studies, covering many disciplines, with and without appointments in the Jackson School itself. The East Asian Studies faculty is most distinguished, having the longest history, the broadest disciplinary coverage, and the best library and support resources. The faculties in Southeast Asian Studies, South Asian Studies, and Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies are also internationally distinguished and broad in their coverage. South Asian studies has rebounded from a low point a few years ago and has restored much of the traditional strength of the program. Latin American studies, Middle East Studies, European Studies, and Canadian Studies are smaller and less established, but display dynamism and student support that make them well-worth nurturing and supporting. African Studies, while a committee rather than a program, has shown remarkable vitality in recent years. Comparative religion and Jewish studies, while small in terms of their core, JSIS-line faculty, draw on remarkably diverse faculty from a variety of disciplines and departments, and consistently mount high-quality and popular programs with great public visibility. There are a few specific concerns about maintaining faculty quality in some programs, which are addressed below in section III. But on the whole, the University should feel fortunate to have such a distinguished group of scholars and teachers in these important fields.

2) A long history of teaching students at the B.A. and M.A. levels in International Studies, the various area studies, and Comparative Religion and Jewish Studies. Many of the area studies programs go back decades; Comparative religion was started in 1974; International Studies began in 1980, and has consistently been a popular major despite its reputation for difficulty. There have been changes and reforms in various programs, and there are still difficulties, described in Section III, with finding the right combination of courses, tracks, and majors. But the resources and experience are in place to offer outstanding programs in almost all areas.

3) Good access to support resources, such as libraries and outreach or resource centers. The East Asia Library, a University branch library in its own right, has one of the top ten collections in the US, and many of the other areal collections housed in Suzzallo-Allen Library are excellent. The resource centers mount a variety of useful public programs in the schools and community, and contribute to the visibility of the University in the area of international education, forging important links with businesses, international organizations, and other educational institutions at all levels.

It may be necessary for the Jackson School leadership and for certain University administrators to rethink the distribution and deployment of some of these resources, as detailed in Sections III, IV, and V. But there is no doubt the University and the Jackson School have in place the great majority of resources necessary to achieve the important missions outlined above.

III. Current impediments to most effective implementation of the mission of the Jackson School

Despite the importance of the Jackson School's mission and the basic adequacy of resources at its disposal to implement that mission, there exist several structural impediments to the Jackson School's ability to use these resources with maximum effectiveness. These include:

- 1) Undue proliferation of undergraduate degree programs. The Jackson School currently offers undergraduate degrees in International Studies, Asian Studies (with five separate regional tracks), REECAS, Latin American Studies, European Studies, Canadian Studies, Jewish Studies and Comparative Religion, with a minor in African Studies. International Studies counts about half of the 300+ majors; other programs range from 40 or 50 for Comparative Religion and International Studies down to 6 for REECAS. This results in too thin a spread of faculty time. Some programs are too small to justify teaching their core and capstone classes; others could usefully be consolidated as tracks in more broadly-based programs.
- 2) Undue proliferation and lack of focus in M.A. degree programs. The School offers both concurrent and non-concurrent master's degrees in International Studies, as well as regional studies degrees in China, Korea, Japan, REECAS, South Asia, and Comparative Religion. There seems to be little intellectual or career justification for continuing non-concurrent MAIS degrees; there seem to be inadequate resources to offer area studies degrees outside China, Japan, and perhaps Korea.
- 3) Inadequacy of staff resources. On the one hand, the Jackson School has lots of staff--there are four in the Student Services Office, two in the Director's Office, three in the Budget Office, and several more in the programs, including secretaries with general duties as well as assistant and associate directors responsible for a broad range of outreach and other program activities. But because of the very complexity of the school organization, there is a perceived chronic lack of staff. This is particularly true in the Student Services office, where both graduates and undergraduates complain that although all four staff members are highly competent, they are swamped with more work than they can possibly do, so that academic and career advising are both seen to be in short supply. Furthermore, there is a

perception both among staff and among faculty that the University provides less support to its Title VI centers than any comparable institution, and that there have been at least implicit warnings from the DOE bureaucracy that this is seen as a lack of commitment that might jeopardize possible future funding of the centers.

4) Incongruence of the administrative status and complex mission of the Jackson School. Currently, the administrative status of the Jackson School is that of a department within the Social Sciences Division of the College of Arts and Sciences, with its director reporting to a divisional dean. Although its FTE payroll is the size of that of a medium-sized department (30+ faculty), it administers the great proliferation of degree programs described in 1) and 2) above; involves over 100 faculty in teaching courses in its various programs; has over 200 separate budgets, including several major endowments; is home to more Title VI centers than all but two universities in the United States; and is thought of in the University and in the Community as perhaps the major site for the coordination of international education and research at the UW. Similar programs at universities all over the United States are either separate schools with their own Deans, reporting directly to the equivalent of the Provost of the UW, or are autonomous units within colleges equivalent to the UW's College of Arts and Sciences, reporting directly to that dean.

5) Historically-caused imbalances in faculty appointments from program to program. Because of the history of the JSIS's having grown out of the former Far Eastern and Russian Institute, the faculty with JSIS appointments are almost entirely in the East Asia and REECAS programs, with a scattering in Comparative Religion, South Asia, and other programs. This creates two kinds of practical problems: uneven voting on new faculty and promotions, and reduced ability of programs to ensure that their faculty are replaced when they are lost.

a) Uneven voting creates suspicion, and has done so for many years; it also tends to preclude certain kinds of innovative appointments. It also leads to replacement imbalances, in that some programs are able to replace their faculty by searching for positions that the Jackson school controls, while other programs must be more dependent on the goodwill of departments.

b) Replacement imbalances create instability as well as suspicion: because many if not most departments associated with JSIS define faculty positions primarily in terms of theoretical, methodological, or substantive specializations, rather than in terms of geographic areas, it often happens that a departmental faculty member specializing in one area is not replaced by a member specializing in that same area. This puts are studies programs, many of which are operating with the minimum number of faculty anyway (and sometimes staying afloat by

hiring temporary faculty on Title VI or other soft funds) in jeopardy whenever a faculty member departs.

6) A cultural and epistemological gap between area studies and international studies. There is a gap and a tension between faculty primarily identified with international studies and those primarily identified with area studies; this tension is partly structural, partly philosophical, and partly personal. There is a perception among IS faculty that area studies do not pull their weight in staffing the programs most essential to the mission of the school (by which they mean the IS program, which has the largest number of majors), and there is a perception among area studies faculty that IS faculty are greedy imperialists bent on drafting unwilling scholars to teach outside of their areas of interest in order to support an understaffed IS program. Some area studies faculty, perceiving that their students are excluded from some IS classes, refuse to teach such classes or teach them only reluctantly. Some area studies faculty dismiss IS faculty as out-dated, formulaic "Wallersteinians," while some IS faculty dismiss certain area studies faculty as intellectually narrow and uninterested in larger questions. This has prevented rationalization of degree programs for many years.

7) Overly circumscribed authority of the School director. Because area studies programs in particular control endowment money in much greater amounts than that controlled by the director, because many programs depend on non-JSIS faculty to staff many of their courses, and because of the historical culture of program autonomy, it is difficult to make any changes that disturb the status quo unless they are initiated by the programs themselves, and since the programs themselves are sometimes at odds, this makes changes even more difficult.

It should be noted here, however, that one phenomenon which might on the surface seem like a structural impediment, because it is a structural incongruity, in fact is no impediment to optimum functioning of the School's programs. This is the existence of the Jewish Studies and Comparative Religion programs within the Jackson School. Faculty both within and outside these two programs unanimously think that the programs are good ones and should be encouraged, and that in the absence of departmental status for one or both of these programs, residing within the Jackson School gives them a comfortable and convenient home.

In addition to these overall structural impediments to the accomplishment of the Jackson School's mission, there are also concerns about the future of certain specific programs:

A) The REECAS program seems to lack a coherent mission or a vision for its future. Even more than other area studies programs, it was formed in response to the Cold War imperative to "know thine enemy," and in the

post-1989 world it seems adrift. There is no consensus as to whether East European Studies ought to continue to be grouped with Russian and Central Asian Studies, as to what the role of Central Asian Studies might be, as to whether there should continue to be a B.A. program in REECAS, or as to the proper relationship between any programs of REECAS and related programs in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. There will be one senior retirement quite soon in this area, and perhaps another in a very few years, and infusion of new leadership at that time is essential if that program is to survive.

B) The Japan Program has been a distinguished one on some levels, particularly in the area of public policy, though its faculty have produced a curiously low number of Ph.D.s in academic disciplines. It has five appointments (4 full-time FTE, 3.5 of which are state money) in the Jackson School itself, and four of them are scheduled to retire in the next five years or so. There is thus the opportunity for the Japan Studies Program to re-invent itself in any way its members see fit. But it is important that vision be exercised so that they program looks toward the new challenges of the future, rather than trying to reproduce its glorious but now increasingly outdated past.

IV. Recommendations for removing structural impediments

We believe that there are ways to remove the impediments to the Jackson School's optimal functioning, and that these measures are feasible, practical, and relatively low-cost. They will involve some persuasion, as with any disturbance of the status quo that threatens the perceived position of some participants. But we have designed these recommendations as a set, or package, that takes into account the interests of as many groups as possible, asking each to contribute something to strengthening the overall enterprise. We believe that if our recommendations are implemented as a set, all participants in the Jackson School will be better off in the long run.

Below we offer a series of broad recommendations. Because they are a coherent package, we have grouped our recommendations into a few broad categories, each of which contains a number of specific recommendations:

1) Rationalize the undergraduate degrees and curriculum. As stated above, there are too many undergraduate major programs, and there is tension between International Studies and area studies. We propose that a single undergraduate major be created in International Studies. This major would retain part of the core curriculum of the present International Studies major, but the core would be a simplified version of the current requirements. Although the parties themselves should decide exactly what should be retained, one possibility is to retain a version of the 200-201-202 sequence on the front end, revised in to take into account the needs of students on area

tracks; make ECON 200-201 required only for certain tracks, and retain only the task force, which receives universal acclaim from faculty and students, on the back end. This option would discard the senior reading seminar and the qualifying paper, which is perceived by students as a roadblock since it is difficult to find faculty to sponsor enough of these papers. In between the 200-sequence on the front and the task force on the back, there would be an expanded number of tracks: the current substantive tracks should be retained as options, some of them perhaps requiring the basic economics courses. A series of area tracks would be added as additional options. This way there would, for example, no longer be an Asian studies major, but an international studies major with a series of Asian tracks.

We see many advantages to this proposed curriculum over the current state of affairs. First, bottlenecks in the current IS degree program would be eliminated. Second, resentment on the part of area-studies oriented faculty toward the IS program for hogging all the resources would be alleviated, since IS would have somewhat fewer requirements and they would be integrated with the area studies tracks in which the area studies-oriented faculty would have greater interest. Third, it would allow students to receive area-studies training at the undergraduate level without requiring as much faculty input as is now required for separate degree programs in each area. Fourth, it would protect against students' receiving degrees in programs that are so focused on local knowledge that they omit the general principles necessary for placing the local knowledge in context. Fifth, it would allow more flexibility to students who wanted to pursue part of their education overseas and still finish their degree in the standard four years or not much longer, something that is perceived as very difficult if not impossible now. Sixth, it would allow the creation of as many tracks as the faculty wanted to create, providing of course that they did not commit themselves to too many courses in so doing. For example, if Hellenic studies or Western hemisphere studies were a desired area of study, each could be more easily accommodated within a general International Studies major than if it had to be a major by itself. Seventh, it might obviate some "identity crises" such as whether East Europe belonged with Russia and Central Asia or with European studies: East Europe could simply be a track. Eighth, it would encourage at least some faculty who feel themselves on one or the other side of the IS-area studies divide to begin perceiving a common interest in the undergraduate project of the Jackson School as a whole. Ninth and finally, it would open up the possibility of more dialogue between the core faculty of international studies and faculty in the area studies who come from the humanities or natural sciences rather than from the social sciences.

We need to stress that implementation of this curriculum rationalization will require patience, understanding, and compromise from both IS and area studies faculty. We are aware that there have been several curriculum committees in the past, each of which has reached an impasse on issues such as the ones we raise here. For this reason, we consider it practically imperative that the director who actually

initiates this reform chair the curriculum reform committee him- or herself.

Finally, we want to stress that Comparative Religion and Jewish studies should remain independent majors within the Jackson School. Jewish studies has very few majors, but is structured in such a way that not much additional effort need be made to offer a degree curriculum from what is already done simply to offer a broad range of courses about the Jewish experience. Comparative Religion has a lot of majors, but by drawing on a wide variety of courses taught in several departments and joint listed or simply listed as Comparative Religion requirements or electives, it manages to offer an excellent degree with very little expenditure of resources specifically on the degree itself.

2) Rationalize the graduate degree programs. As stated above, there is a lack of focus in graduate curriculum in the Jackson School. We recommend that the M.A.I.S. degree be offered only in concurrence with one of the professional or technical schools--Engineering, Forest Resources, Marine Sciences, Architecture, Law, Public Health, or Public Affairs. When the M.A.I.S. degree becomes confined to these concurrent programs, greater efforts should be made to coordinate curriculum with these professional schools, and to develop joint courses where appropriate. It might also be desirable to have greater consultation with the professional schools at the time of admission. In addition, since the graduates of present concurrent degree programs state that they get almost all their career planning advice from the professional schools, the Jackson School should explore options for joint efforts in career counseling. When the M.A.I.S. program is fully coordinated with the professional schools in this way, we believe it would be possible and desirable to increase the number of students in that program.

We also recommend that the School and its constituent area studies programs undertake a careful examination of the viability and usefulness of each area studies M.A. program. From our interviews with an admittedly small sample of graduate students, it appears that the Jackson School lacks sufficient resources to offer M.A. degrees in areas other than China and Japan. A special case might also be made for the Korea program, since despite its small number of faculty it is one of the few such programs in the country, and it is quite possible that it is serving an important regional and national need even with its current limited resources. It is also possible that, with some rethinking and some release of resources obtained from the rationalization of undergraduate programs outlined above, viable graduate curricula might be mounted in other areas, but the director who oversees this reform should cast a skeptical eye on the viability of all area studies M.A. degrees.

Again, we see several advantages here over the present system. First, the reform would diminish or eliminate the phenomenon of rootless, floating M.A.I.S. students, wondering what they might want to do with their degrees. Second, it would help build bridges of many kinds, not just in graduate education but in

undergraduate education, research, and professional and community service, between the Jackson School and the professional schools, enhancing the Jackson School's role as a focus of international education in the University generally. Third, it would reduce unnecessary and uneconomical use of faculty time in area-centered interdisciplinary seminars, which are widely perceived as having little value.

Here we add again the same caution that a reform of this sort, particularly the re-evaluation and possible elimination of some area studies programs, will encounter some resistance. However, we think the primary resistance would come from those programs that have a large number of JSIS-appointed faculty, and two of these, China and Japan, are not candidates for re-evaluation. It is possible that REECAS as well can demonstrate that it has the faculty resources and the intellectual need for an M.A. program, but a thorough re-evaluation should take place before such a program is allowed to continue.

Here as at the undergraduate level, we see no problem in retaining the Comparative Religion M.A. degree in its present form. It works well, and its students are enthusiastic and end up in good Ph.D. programs.

3) Rationalize and reallocate some of the staff time in the school. It is widely recognized that complexity in the Jackson School creates the need for staff that might otherwise be allocated elsewhere; it is also recognized that the student services staff, while generally agreed to be doing a good job, have more work than they can reasonably be expected to handle. We therefore recommend that staff resources be looked at as a factor in consolidation and rationalization of majors and programs, and that the extra resources that come available through this process be allocated to the Student Services Office. We further recommend that the University provide some staff support for the Title VI centers, at a level commensurate with that provided by comparable institutions with comparable numbers and sizes of such centers.

This recommendation may be controversial, since it implies the addition of University resources. But at least part of it can be accomplished by consolidation in the context of program rationalization, and if provision of small amounts of staff salaries in the centers results in the retention of the centers themselves, this is money well-invested, in that it brings in much more than a matching level of funds.

4a) Raise the administrative level of the Jackson School. As mentioned in Section II, 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 of Arts and Sciences, 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 of the Jackson School 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 (herein DDIS) would report directly to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

There are several advantages to having the JSIS director be a divisional dean at the same time. First and not trivially, almost every head of a comparable unit at another university carries the title of Dean. The current JSIS director is president of an association of such heads, and is one of only two that does not carry this title. Second and more substantially, such a change in administrative position would be commensurate with the complexity of the Jackson School, whose courses are taught by well over a hundred faculty, even though they do not all have their lines in JSIS. Third, this change would remove the bottleneck that exists when the Divisional Dean for Social Sciences has to deal with the complexity of JSIS issues in addition to the other ten departments and programs that she oversees; adding JSIS is in effect like adding 4 or 5 departments if she deals with these complex issues directly; if she does not, she is giving the Jackson School short shrift, putting her in a very difficult position. Fourth, this change allows the Dean of Arts and Sciences to take a more direct hand in a project of internationalization that transcends the social sciences, increasingly involving the humanities and arts, the sciences, and potentially the professional schools. International studies is, in fact, more than just a social science project. Fifth, it sends a signal to the central administration that the College of Arts and Sciences places great importance on the continuing internationalization of UW education.

There is, of course, a potential cost associated with this kind of change, in the form of the additional staff that might be needed in the Dean's Office, not a trivial consideration at the time of U.I.F. But we feel that this is the only cost: it does not hurt the Social Sciences DD; in fact it relieves her burden. It does not hurt the Humanities-Arts and the Science DD; in fact it gives them greater access to cooperation in international programs. And it does not hurt the Dean of the College; it gives him a more direct finger on the pulse of a complex but growing area of focus for the College.

4b) Develop a mechanism through which the DDIS controls certain faculty positions in departments other than the Jackson School, positions that are dedicated to one or another area. This recommendation addresses the problem of instability in area program appointments mentioned above, a potential weakness in the Jackson School's area programs that is not the fault of the Jackson School itself. The precise mechanism to implement this recommendation should be worked out between the JSIS director, elevated to

the position of DD, the other Deans in the College of Arts and Sciences, and if necessary the chairs of the departments with the greatest stake in such a reform. But we venture to suggest a possible example here:

A pool of presently existing positions should be compiled, including those positions now in JSIS outside Comparative Religion and Jewish Studies, and also those positions either partly in JSIS area programs or wholly in departments but whose occupants play major roles in area studies programs (the exact list of positions to be included or excluded should be a matter of case-by-case negotiation at the beginning). These positions will be defined as under the control of the DDIS; whenever they are vacated the request to replace the occupant will have to be approved by the DDIS as in accordance with the general goal of maintaining the strength and viability of the specific area studies program. Whether they should also be subject to the approval of the social sciences or other relevant DD is a matter to be worked out when the reform is actually undertaken. These positions would not be locked in permanently, anymore than positions are locked into departments. But they could not simply be shifted from one area studies program to another, or from area studies to other topics, simply by the wish of a departmental faculty.

This may be the most controversial of our recommendations, so we hasten here to defend it. The current situation has been a cause for anxiety, resentment, and often real curricular crises over the last several decades; this alone is reason to find a viable solution to a chronic problem. It might be argued of course that any specialty, area studies or otherwise, waxes and wanes in importance as intellectual trends and fashions change, and that area studies, like rational choice, deconstruction, or neo-mercantilism, should have to defend its position purely in a departmental context. But we point out that area studies is different as long as interdisciplinary curricula (including tracks within the reformed International Studies major) and area based research centers (Title-VI funded or otherwise) are dependent on faculty hired and fired by departments. Again, it might be argued that there are other kinds of interdepartmental units, such as the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology or the Program on the Environment, that are also dependent on faculty whose appointments are in departments. But again there is a difference: those units do not grant graduate degrees in any case, and only some of them grant undergraduate degrees; in the case of PoE, it can draw on Central Administration funds to assure that departmental faculty will teach its courses. In the absence of such funds (and we do not seek them for area studies) another mechanism must be found to ensure enough faculty in each important geographic area. Finally, area studies programs are unlike others in that they supply the social sciences component of degree programs and research centers that also have humanities, arts, and to a lesser extent science and professional school faculty. And the humanities faculty in area studies are protected, because their departments are area-studies defined: NELC, Asian Languages, Spanish and Portuguese, etc. It is only the social sciences faculty that are vulnerable in this way. But the social science DD has to meet the needs of department chairs, thus putting her, again, in a position of

potential contradictory constituencies. To deprive these integrated area studies programs of their social science component is to unbalance them dangerously. All of these factors argue for making a special case for area studies, and the best way we can see of doing this, after long and complex discussions with a large number of people, is the one suggested here.

Creating the pool of international studies faculty controlled by the DDIS would create a further possibility for creative manipulation of positions for the common good. It would make it much easier to shift area studies positions or parts of positions between JSIS and the departments. This, we hope, would be a point in favor of this policy when trying to convince department chairs to go along. They could gain by cooperation.

5) Create a strong directorship and recruit a top person. As indicated by everything we have stated so far, the Jackson School is at a potential turning point. The current director is widely praised for his openness and problem-solving, but it is possible that he has done most of what he can to clean up the atmosphere at JSIS, and he has not taken it as his mandate to implement major structural changes. At any rate he has announced his decision to step down at the end of academic year 1999-2000. Now is the time to consider changes that will bring the School to its proper role in an increasingly internationalized University. Such changes will require a director with prestige, time, patience, tact, and firmness all at once. We thus recommend that a national search be instituted for a director to begin his or her term in Summer or Fall 2000. The search should be so constituted so that the position will be attractive to one of the handful of people around the continent with the requisite experience, personality, vision, and work-ethic to carry off the needed reforms. Incentives offered should include a high salary, commensurate with that paid to comparable Deans at other institutions (perhaps raised in part from the current drive to endow a professorship for this purpose); a mandate to direct the school and the newly-created International Studies Division full-time, with little or no teaching or research at least in the first three years; and if possible a few faculty positions, perhaps created out of bridging anticipated retirements (there are at least six in Japan Studies and REECAS, for example) to help the new Director/Dean shape the school in terms of his or her vision.

This recommendation is interlocked with all the other changes we have recommended. Because there are internal contradictions that need to be overcome, the director must come from outside, and have sufficient experience and prestige to convince the interested parties to cooperate and compromise in the name of the greater collective good. In order to lure such a person here, not only must the director be granted greater powers and a higher administrative position; he or she must also have a mandate to do the job full-time and a salary commensurate with the prestige and responsibility of the position. Without a new director of this stature, there is very little hope of making the needed changes. Without a mandate to make reforms, there is very little to attract a top-flight person.

V. Recommendations for changes in particular programs

As mentioned above, we identified particular tasks that need to be addressed by the Japan Studies and REECAS programs, for somewhat different reasons. Here we present brief recommendations for addressing those tasks.

1) Japan Studies Program. The task here is a simple one: bridge from the present, which is more or less the end of a quite successful era, to a future in which the program will have quite different missions and goals. We recommend that a master plan for Japan Studies 2005 be drawn up by a group that involves the widest possible participation of faculty in the area of Japan studies, not confined to those with appointments in the Jackson School. Faculty hiring should be undertaken in accordance with this master plan as retirements create vacancies. It is important that this plan does not assume a fixed number of faculty in the disciplines that they currently pursue, unless a careful consideration of alternatives shows this to be the best. It is also important that such a plan have the potential flexibility to shift appointments in either direction from the Jackson School to other departments and schools. This last requirement would be more easily accomplished if the Jackson School Director were made Divisional Dean for International Studies, as recommended above.

2) REECAS program. The task here is somewhat different and not as clearly defined as in the case of the Japan Program: re-invent a program so that it has relevance and interest in the post- Cold War world. There are not as many retirements anticipated here as in Japan studies (perhaps two in the next few years), so much will have to be accomplished by the existing faculty. But we feel that there is a sufficient lack of unity of purpose in the current faculty that the director (perhaps not waiting for the new director) should immediately form and chair a group that begins rethinking this program at a basic philosophical level. This reconsideration should include the issue of whether Russia, East Europe, and Central Asia constitute the right combination of areas to constitute a program. This is an important area of the world, and one in which the Jackson School and the UW have some important advantages and certainly have strong historical traditions. But the program at present seems somewhat adrift, and such a trend should not be allowed to continue.

VI. Concluding thoughts

The review committee has worked long and hard on this review process, conducting over 60 interviews and collecting massive numbers of statistics and documents, over and above the Jackson School self-study. We have undertaken this task with two assumptions. First, the Jackson School, already a crucial element in the ability of the University to provide both liberal education and professional

training, will have an even more important mission to pursue as the University as a whole becomes more internationalized. Second, if the Jackson School is to rise to meet this challenge (and it is imperative for the University that the Jackson School do so), everyone involved with the review, including the committee, the various deans, and especially the faculty of the Jackson School itself, must view the current situation from the perspective of maximum possible long-term benefit for the School and its mission, and not be forced by inertia or partisanship to wag fingers, wring hands, and shelve reports. We have made our recommendations with sometimes brutal honesty and forthrightness, and they may turn out to be wrong in specifics, but we venture to say not in spirit. We have made them in anticipation that administrators and JSIS faculty alike will rise to the occasion and do what they, in light of our careful and sometimes agonizing considerations, feel is the best course to ensure the future of the Jackson School and of international education at the University of Washington.

We realize that this report is not the end of the process, but rather an impetus for the true process of change to begin. We are, individually and collectively, willing to continue to be involved with the process if we can help in any way.