

University of Washington
Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies
Ten-Year Review Report
18 December 2008

Introduction and Executive Summary

The Henry L. Jackson School of International Studies is a unit of significant accomplishment and of singular promise. Its faculty is blessed with an array of accomplished teacher/scholars who are committed to the scholarly enterprise of advancing knowledge and as such make particularly effective and engaging classroom instructors. Jackson School students, in turn, are exceptionally committed to their course of study and loyal in their attachment to the School. They manifest an evident *esprit de corps*. A remarkably energetic staff has carved out a prominent profile for the School in the wider community, a direct consequence of the outreach mandate embedded in the School's unparalleled *eight* Department of Education Title VI Centers. The outreach role they fulfill is carried out not from a sense of obligation, but from a sense of mission. Finally the School is ably supported by a team of University librarians who see their role in the School as collegial rather than the product of a mere service responsibility. The School's Visiting Committee is watchful and engaged; it fully shares the School's ambition for itself.

The School has made significant progress since its last ten year review. The report produced in May of 1999 described a unit often divided against itself – the gap between the language and culture focus of Area Studies programs and the thematic approach of International Studies being the most obvious. To all appearances, these differences have been overcome and there is reason to be optimistic that recent and ongoing discussions for reform of the graduate program will yield new models for across-the-board curricular reform as well as a new model of collegial governance.

This report is the result of weeks of work carried out by the review committee. Our work began with a careful review of the Jackson School self-study early in the quarter, followed by a charge meeting on 13 October 2008. In addition to the internal members of the review committee, the charge meeting was attended by Judith Howard, Divisional Dean for the Social Sciences, Janice DeCosmo, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Academic Affairs, Anand Yang, Director of the Jackson School of International Studies, James Soto Antony, Vice Provost and Dean Associate Dean for Academic Programs, and David Canfield-Budde, Academic Program Specialist in the Graduate School.

Following the charge meeting, the internal members of the committee met or consulted with members of the Jackson School faculty and staff, as well as with leaders and members of allied units on campus. Our efforts culminated in a site visit carried out by the full committee on 19-21 November. It began with a working dinner on the evening of the 19th and extended through two days of interviews and meetings. A summary of the committee's findings and recommendations was delivered at an exit interview on the afternoon of the 21st. Those in attendance included Douglas J. Wadden, Executive Vice Provost, Ana Mari Cauce, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Judith Howard, Divisional Dean for the Social Sciences, Janice DeCosmo, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Academic Affairs, Anand Yang, Director of the Jackson School of International Studies, James Soto Antony, Vice Provost and Dean Associate Dean for Academic Programs, and David Canfield-Budde, Academic Program Specialist in the Graduate School.

The principal recommendations of the committee are outlined here. Discussion and justification of these recommendations can be found in the report that follows.

Principal Recommendations

1. Continue the work of curricular reform begun in the discussions of a new PhD program.
2. Extend the work of curricular reform to include an overhaul of the Masters and undergraduate curriculums.
3. Build on the momentum generated by curricular reform to craft a more inclusive and transparent governance structure.
4. Use the discussion and implementation of curricular reform to assure greater equity in teaching loads across the School.
5. Extend the revival of the Executive Committee by making sure that its meetings are regular and frequent, that its agenda is known, and its decisions communicated to School faculty.
6. Create appropriate incentives and rewards to facilitate a sense of intellectual community within the School.
7. Increase staffing to support existing growth in the School and lay the foundation for future growth in scholarship, instruction, and outreach.
8. Improve compensation for program chairs and center directors in order to retain and recruit talent in these key and, in the case of center directors, income-producing positions.
9. Consider elevating the title of the director of the Jackson School to that of dean, in keeping with standard practice within the field and with a view toward the successful recruitment of a successor to the current JSIS head.
10. Create one or more positions with the title of Associate Director to assist in the management of the Jackson School and thus to free the head of the School to undertake development and external relations responsibilities.
11. Bring the head of the Jackson School into a permanent, institutionalized relationship with the Office of Global Affairs and its head, the Vice Provost for Global Affairs.

Undergraduate and Graduate Programs; Curriculum

The Jackson School possesses a deserved campus-wide reputation for its engaged and motivated students. Its eight undergraduate programs continue to attract talented students with wide-ranging interests. International Studies, historically its signature program, allows admission on a competitive basis, and its students are admired and highly regarded by the faculty who teach them.

The number of students majoring in Jackson School programs has more than doubled in the last ten years, from over 300 to nearly 700. While the number of International Studies majors has remained stable at around 180, both Asian Studies and European Studies have grown rapidly in recent years; the number of majors in Asian Studies has nearly doubled since 2003-04 while the number of majors in European Studies has more than tripled. These three programs – International Studies, Asian Studies, European Studies – account for three quarters of the School's 692 majors. JSIS programs in Latin American Studies, Comparative Religion, Jewish Studies, and Canadian Studies account for the balance of the School's majors. Comparative Religion and Jewish Studies have shown consistent numbers of majors in recent years while Latin American Studies has shown significant growth in majors. All indications suggest that these are strong and thriving programs.

The undergraduates we met were thoughtful and articulate. To a person, they expressed enthusiasm for the School and the caliber of instruction they receive. Many of them indicated an understandable interest in completing a study abroad program during their course of study, and felt encouraged by the School to do so. At the same time, they also explained that it was nearly impossible to sufficiently integrate a study abroad experience into the curriculum to enable graduation within four years of entry to the University of Washington. Any efforts to create such integration would notably benefit the undergraduate program. With respect to the honors track in particular, the Committee would like to recognize the extraordinary energy and enthusiasm of the School's honors students, notably as manifested in our interaction with the Jackson School Student Association members and leaders. It is unclear to us, however, whether the capacity of the honors track could be substantially increased without diluting the experience.

As much as students expressed enthusiasm for their classroom experiences, they also described the challenge of navigating a complex curriculum. For an enterprising student, this complexity is no real obstacle; in fact, it can create flexibilities that many appreciate. However, we are concerned about more typical students, those who may face unnecessary difficulties in finding their way through Jackson School majors. Here, the lack of advising resources is especially problematic and telling. The School's curriculum should be consolidated and simplified – and undergraduate advising expanded – if enrollments are allowed to continue to climb, especially if Asian Studies and European Studies continue to grow at their present pace.

Similar consolidation would likely benefit the Masters level curriculum as well. The School has enrolled some 150 students in its eight MA programs in the current academic year. Most

programs currently enroll about twenty students, with International Studies (at 41 students) and South Asia (at 7) representing the largest and smallest programs. With care, it seems possible to consolidate courses across these small programs, particularly with respect to courses organized around methods and themes. Here, too, better student access to guidance and advising would be welcome. Although the review committee met with a rather small number of MA students, this group indicated that they would welcome more direction as they move toward their degrees.

The proposed PhD program provides a model for a more structured curriculum. To its credit, the School has taken the opportunity of planning a PhD program to rethink its curriculum across the board, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The effort to isolate four key clusters of intellectual themes and to integrate those systematically with area studies concentrations at the graduate level provides a template for undergraduate curricular reform. This reform could work to provide more obvious pathways for undergraduates through their respective majors, to decrease redundancies within the curriculum, and to address perceived inequities in undergraduate teaching loads among faculty.

The review committee endorses the preparatory work done to develop the structure for a PhD program, and deeply appreciates faculty interest in that program. The PhD program could well help create a stronger and more cohesive intellectual community within the Jackson School and provide for many faculty members a much-desired opportunity to advise graduate students engaged in high-caliber independent research. Yet the committee's enthusiasm for the PhD program was notably tempered by the as yet inadequate consideration of key issues. At present, there is no clear curricular structure for the program, nor any indication of how it will articulate with the existing Masters programs. It is not obvious whether there exist sufficient resources to staff any new courses or to recruit strong students. There also appear to be unresolved questions concerning the appropriate balance within the curriculum between professionally and academically-oriented students. Because of the lack of clarity on these key components, we are unable to provide stronger recommendations about the merits, structure, and outcome of the proposed PhD. As these critical programmatic decisions are made in coming months, we urge the creation of a clear and inclusive structure for doing so; this will maximize the possibilities of generating greater internal cohesion in the process.

Governance

The Jackson School differs from other units in the College of Arts and Sciences in that many of its *key* faculty members are not also *core* faculty members. Important or even mission-critical courses, for example, are taught by faculty members whose appointments are merely fractionally – or sometimes not at all – within the School. Programmatic issues aside, such divided loyalties have posed unique governance challenges to School leadership. Faculty members have faced challenges in meeting the service requirements and expectations of multiple units. The School, in turn, has found it difficult to attain a quorum for the purposes of governance and decision-

making. Such challenges, in the past, were sometimes exacerbated by the divergent efforts of international studies and area studies faculty within the School.

The committee commends the School and the current director for the great progress made since the last program review. The School has added many new faculty members and has largely bridged the cultural divide between International Studies and Area Studies. New efforts to solidify the governance structure of the School could leverage this nascent social capital to launch additional gains in intellectual community and efforts toward common goals.

Recently, program chairs and center directors have begun to meet regularly with the director. The committee believes that this is a critically important step to increasing information sharing and cooperation across programs and centers to the betterment of the core School activities. Center and program activities and resources could be better coordinated to maximize their collective impact, especially in times of diminishing resources.

The JSIS Executive Committee, a body of elected and appointed chairs and directors, is being revived to provide advice to the director and to streamline decision-making for the School. This too will increase the efficacy, efficiency, and transparency of decision-making within the School. To use this body effectively, meetings should be held at regular intervals, the agendas circulated, and the decision-making content communicated to the Jackson School community.

The committee heard repeatedly that the International Studies track of the undergraduate program drew especially impressive students and lots of them, but that the School struggled to staff the courses. The International Studies program suffers by having no endowment resources and little leverage over the teaching obligations of the many faculty hired with connections to the area studies programs. New mechanisms need to be developed to staff the large and successful courses for the International Studies students in an equitable fashion by faculty throughout the School. Equity here must include an assessment of the student credit hour loads across faculty within the School, as well as contributions to the programs in demand by students.

Finally, the committee judges the School to be ready to create new venues for collective intellectual community. There is palpable excitement from many faculty members (we heard this mostly loudly from newer faculty) about the quality and broad diversity of academic disciplines, approaches, and research within the School. Although brown bag lunches and other approaches have been tried, we urge the School to continue efforts to find opportunities for faculty and students to share research and ideas. We would love to see some resources centralized or new monies raised to support efforts to foster collaborative research or intellectual community.

Administration and Leadership

The Jackson School is *au fond* interdisciplinary and global: hence, its incorrigible complexity. Yet it operates with minimal bureaucratic overlay and administrative costs. We should therefore congratulate the faculty and staff for their efficiency and dedication.

As much as the call for greater resources is a standard theme in external review committee reports, the case for JSIS requires serious attention. The work of Title VI centers, of which the School is fortunate to host eight, is extremely labor intensive. To take the East Asia Center, for example, its 3.5 staff FTE's is probably the smallest of any existing East Asian Title VI Center (peer institutions, public and private, frequently have twice, and at times triple or quadruple, the staff size). The allocation of additional FTE's not merely relieves the undue burden on the existing personnel but also makes possible additional activities – including writing external grants – that may result in a virtuous cycle of vibrant growth. The quest for greater administrative efficiency would surely be self-defeating; JSIS would risk losing the next round of Title VI grant competition.

We recommend higher levels of compensation for center directors and program chairs. Compared to peer institutions, JSIS Title VI directors are under-compensated: ditto for program chairs. It would be tempting to applaud the selfless virtues of JSIS faculty and urge them to maintain their high moral seriousness but in our imperfect world the School and the University risk burn-outs and even defections. Proper remuneration, whether in terms of course relief, research money, or stipends, is likely to boost morale and also productivity. Additional compensation is especially crucial for center directors as the need for development intensifies. That is, limited outlay may result not only in greater workload but also greater material gains for centers, JSIS, and UW. Let us caution against taking the low road. Higher efficiency and synergy is probably *not* possible at JSIS. Specifically, we do not recommend that the same person run the center and the program concurrently. The two functions, though complementary, pose distinct challenges. Exceptional people exist (and therefore exceptions should be made), but “doubling-up” these positions should not be the norm.

Most crucially, the role of the Director begs for additional administrative support. At the very least, the revamped Associate Directorship should carry more of the burden of internal management. We may easily envision two, three, and even four functionally distinct Associate Directors: e.g., of faculty, research, teaching, development.

By engendering a leadership team at JSIS, a properly-empowered and well-supported Director may safely focus her or his energy on external relations. S/he should certainly work closely with the new Vice Provost for Global Affairs (VPGA) and the Office of Global Affairs. The nexus between VPGA and JSIS Director should also facilitate the connections between the University leadership and JSIS faculty members, who provide profound local knowledge of and networks around the world. In conjunction with the Visiting Committee, the Director should seek not only to enhance the work and reputation of JSIS but also to generate grants and gifts.

On the question of leadership titles, there is certainly an argument to be made for elevating the status of the Director to that of the Dean. This promotion may be uncoupled from the possible autonomy of the School as a Division with the College of Arts and Sciences or a separate school altogether. The fact is that, with no notable exceptions, the JSIS Director's peers hold the title of the Dean or higher. Especially in matters international, the title takes on an additional symbolic value, thus providing yet another rationale for elevating the title.

Finally, we come to the question of whether the mission of the School might more effectively be advanced if it were an independent unit, outside of the College of Arts and Sciences. Such an arrangement is not uncommon among international studies and diplomacy schools on campuses elsewhere. Closer to home, we would simply note the independent status of the Evans School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington. However, we can envision no realistic scenario that would lead to an independent Jackson School of International Studies short of an endowment that would sustain such independence.

Jackson School of International Studies Review Committee

Raymond Jonas, Professor, UW History (Committee Chair)

Steven K. Herbert, Professor, UW Geography

Marieka M. Klawitter, Associate Professor, UW Evans School of Public Affairs

Robert L. Gallucci, Dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University

John Lie, Professor and Dean, International and Area Studies, University of California, Berkeley