

Review of JSIS Graduate Programs in International Studies

Winter 2021

Ben Gardner

Associate Professor & Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Scholarship
School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences
UW Bothell

Wolf Latsch

Director, UW Study Abroad
UW Office of Global Affairs

1. INTRODUCTION

A serious, inclusive, and productive conversation about the School's graduate programs is long overdue. The issue has been on the School's agenda for many years, as is clear from the principal recommendations in both the *2008 and 2018 Ten Year Reviews*, and according to the findings in the present report.

The *2008 and 2018 Ten Year Reviews* both emphasized the need for significant curricular overhaul, simplification and streamlining in all of the School's graduate programs.

- The *2008 Ten Year Review* (1998-2008) was written at a time of healthy and even growing enrollments in all JSIS MA programs, yet there was a call for “across-the-board curricular reform” which did not happen. The PhD program had not yet been launched.
- The *2018 Ten Year Review* (2008-2018) was written in the light of declining enrollments in all the MA programs. It calls for “more of the same” curricular reforms although, in fact, there had been no curricular reform in the MA programs (or anywhere else in the School) since the 2008 review. The 2018 review did not result in any changes or in any sustained conversations about change. The PhD program was at the five-year mark in 2018 and the review recommended an urgent and significant review of that program, by a special task force, to be completed within a year. That review has not yet been undertaken.

The present report is a complement to the ten year reviews whose recommendations still stand and still await follow-up. We understand our report to be the result of a ‘listening exercise’ with more than forty School faculty and staff we spoke to, a greater number than had been involved in any of the ten year reviews. The trends in the graduate programs, and the ways in which faculty and staff view and interpret these trends, have, if anything, become more serious since 2018, and in greater need of response.

The facts and the trends (for detailed applications and admissions data see Appendix)

- In Autumn 2020 the School admitted the smallest-ever cohort of students across its ten tuition-based graduate programs.
- 30 applicants were admitted to the nine 2-year MA programs, and seven were admitted to the PhD program.
- This means an average of fewer than four students per graduate program.
- Instruction in these ten programs in 2020-21 will require the staffing of 32 *required courses*. (By comparison, Political Science offers 10 required graduate courses per year and History offers 11.)
- These courses represent the equivalent of eight full-time faculty members in 2020-21, or around \$800,000 in salaries & benefits, or over \$21,000 per admitted student, or approximately twice the in-state tuition rate.
- The number of applications to the ten programs for 2020-21 was 157, down from 277 in 2013, a decline of 43%.
- It was a historic low - until the application cycle for 2021-22 when the School received only 151 applications in total, moving the decline in applications since 2013 closer to 50%.
- Even in the PhD program, which has the largest number of applications per admitted student, applications have dropped by almost 50% since 2016 (from 105 to 57).
- The admissions process for the 2020-21 graduate cohort involved the time and effort of over half of the School's faculty. Almost as many faculty were on admissions committees as students were admitted to the School.
- The MA programs continue to face considerable challenges in the conversion of applicant interest and applications to actual enrollments in programs. This indicates that, in addition to facing decreasing interest and demand, the programs are not really competitive.

While individual programs have seen ups and downs in applications and admissions over the years, the trends are clear. JSIS graduate programs have become less attractive to applicants and they have become very costly to faculty and staff in terms of the time and effort devoted to teaching, advising, and administration.

Our conversations

Over a period of two months during Winter quarter 2021 we had around forty separate and mostly individual conversations with faculty and staff about the School's graduate programs. We provided opportunities for anyone to meet with us. These conversations were confidential and were marked by openness and candor. They revealed to us that the people we spoke to are ready, even eager, to have meaningful and results-oriented discussions about all of the School's graduate programs and about the proper shape and goals of graduate education in international studies.

There was a strong sense that such discussions are long overdue. There was also a recognition that these discussions will not be easy. There was an understanding that an open and honest discussion should mean that all options are on the table, for all programs, including the phasing out, merging, and/or reform of individual programs. There is an acceptance of the challenges and financial realities faced in the School but also a desire to take serious account of core JSIS values and mission beyond simple cost-benefit accounting. Harnessing this shared commitment to (possibly significant and painful) changes in JSIS graduate programs will be a significant challenge for the School. But there is broad agreement that it is a worthwhile challenge to take up. The people we spoke to are ready to contribute time, effort, and intellectual energy to honest and good-faith efforts to reform graduate programs as part of a truly School-wide and inclusive initiative led by the Director of the School. And we detected in our conversations a sense of urgency because things are not going to get better or easier by themselves.

This report is our attempt to summarize and relate *what we heard from faculty and staff in the School*, from those who met with us. We heard a wide range of views and a diversity of opinions and suggestions relating to graduate programs. There is a broad consensus that the School is at a kind of crossroads, that there is a readiness to come together. Graduate programs are a very resource-intensive and expensive part of the School and they are clearly in need of urgent attention.

2. THE PH.D. PROGRAM

The JSIS PhD program first admitted students in 2013. The program was designed to take advantage of the School's expertise in a number of areas of international studies. The unique features of the program include a three-year timeline to degree completion, a set of pre-designed foundational field seminars, access to JSIS faculty and the resources of University of Washington more broadly. The program filled a perceived void for a PhD program that would serve both academic and professional students who wanted training in social science and humanities theories and methods, as well as area and language expertise. The field seminars were an attempt to map the expertise and interests of JSIS faculty to important topics, methods and questions in International Studies. This would then map the vision and goals of the program for prospective students. Many JSIS faculty have given significant time and energy to the program by teaching the field seminars and other required or elective courses, serving on numerous PhD student committees, or serving on or directing the School's PhD committee.

Our review reveals important questions about the efficacy, sustainability and direction of the PhD program. Here are three main takeaways:

- There is broad consensus among those we spoke with that the current field seminar model is not working. Few if any faculty enjoy teaching the classes and most are uncertain about how to approach them. Many students feel their time would be better served in other courses that more closely align with their interests.
- The original promise of a three-year degree has not manifested itself. Most students spend closer to 5 or 6 years in the program and struggle to find adequate funding. The

three year timeline is not appropriate for a traditional academic PhD, creating multiple tensions in marketing and delivering the program.

- The total costs of running the program, including faculty and staff time governing, teaching, and mentoring, as well as funding, including fellowships, TA'ships and RA'ships compete directly for time, resources and energy with other graduate programs in the school. There are few synergies among the PhD program and the MA programs.

CHALLENGES

Funding

- Funding is very limited and the School does not/cannot offer the kinds of funding packages that are expected in PhD programs elsewhere. Funding was almost always mentioned first during our conversations as being the major challenge for students.
- A significant portion of graduate students funding from JSIS and the centers is dedicated to a small number of PhD students, including almost all the School's TA-ships and RA-ships.
- There are serious and persistent tensions in the School about the resource intensity of the PhD programs and how that detracts from MA graduate training and support: it is widely accepted that the PhD program has undermined the ability of the two-year MA programs to recruit and fund their own students
- Funding anxieties loom large for PhD students, and these are exacerbated by the messaging around a 3-year completion timeline

Curriculum

- The 'field seminar' model is not working well, students and faculty are largely dissatisfied with it, and are often vocal about its shortcomings
 - For faculty it is a challenge to teach them: it is conceptually challenging to create inter-disciplinary 'foundational courses' and the breadth of courses limits usefulness and runs counter to the promise of expedited completion.
 - For students, the field seminars are often only marginally related to their projects and the required classes often limit their ability to take more relevant courses
- There is a sense of the School "muddling through" with this program, that it is trying to make the most of the existing structure rather than having a deeper conversation about the program.
- The planning, staffing and scheduling of key courses, including the 32 required graduate courses, effectively falls on JSIS Office of Academic Services (OAS), and this coordination uses a considerable amount of OAS staff bandwidth and often puts staff in difficult positions vis-a-vis program faculty.

- There is a tension and lack of consensus in the School on what PhD training should or must include, specifically an ambiguity about 'professional or academic' has not been resolved, nor has it ever been discussed properly. PhD materials advertise:
 - "our practitioner faculty" - which is in fact not a clearly defined category or group with any kind of longer-term affiliation identity, instead it is *ad hoc* and not institutionalized
 - "leading edge scholarship and practice" - scholarship is of course well understood and practiced in the School, but the 'practice' part less so
 - "real world problems and solutions" - this promises more in terms of the closeness of the degree to policy and practice than the School can really deliver
 - "prepare students to meet the real world" - what does this mean and how is it achieved?

Faculty Support & Involvement

- Not everyone in the faculty is involved or invested in the program. Many faculty are unclear about the program and find that it is "hard to know what we are training the students for". We sensed only limited buy-in and support from many JSIS faculty who for various reasons feel marginal to the JSIS PhD project.
- The program is viewed by many as being quite 'top down' and not creating intellectual community
- A lot falls on the director of the PhD Program to organize people, to teach core classes and to serve on committees.
- There is an informal system of recruiting faculty labor which often leads to significant equity issues in terms of who does the work (e.g. it is often women and junior faculty members)
- Junior faculty often feel pressure to teach small graduate seminars (especially when asked by senior colleagues who cannot find others to teach them). Junior faculty also worry that by teaching these small seminars (which they do not necessarily want to teach in the first place) they are seen as not doing their fair share of teaching in the school and then feel pressure to take on larger enrollment undergraduate classes
- Most faculty said that they did not know what was expected of them in terms of teaching the PhD curriculum including exams or expectations for theses. This is echoed by the student feedback as well
- Many faculty are concerned about the fit between themselves as disciplinary PhDs mentoring and advising non-disciplinary/interdisciplinary students; they feel it is harder for them to judge substantive and PhD-worthy achievements outside of their own disciplines and training
- A number of faculty lack a clear sense of why we feel the need to have a PhD program at all, is it because faculty like to work with graduate students, or because the School is trying to "keep up with the Joneses"?

- There is only so much faculty and staff time and labor to go around. There continue to be considerable opportunity costs of investing so heavily in the PhD program; the PhD program makes considerable demands on faculty and staff in terms of teaching, governance, administration, and advising/mentorship.
- Area studies faculty can feel marginalized by the PhD, noting a lack of systematic involvement in PhD recruitment and admission and teaching. Some feel that students are inadequately prepared (in 'area studies' terms) for their research.

Resource Needs and Costs

- Many required small classes are hard to staff and create high 'opportunity cost' in terms of undergraduates courses (which could have higher enrollments and bring in more ABB revenue)
- Limited amount of total faculty and staff time and labor.
- Opportunity costs of investing so heavily in the PhD program in terms of MA programs.
- PhD program makes considerable demands on faculty and staff in terms of teaching, governance, administration, and advising/mentorship.

Promise and Reality

- There are strong tensions between the School's traditional focus on area studies expertise, and the lack of area studies focus/focus on expertise in the PhD program
- There is a tension in how to talk about the program
 - some faculty use the language of an 'applied' program and think that this is the niche
 - others are very resistant to this language and don't understand it. Some argue that 'applied vs theoretical' is a false dichotomy
- There is concern among many faculty that continuing the program may be irresponsible and "unethical"
 - because we are not delivering what we advertise and promise, e.g. the 3-year time to completion, for which some faculty are using some strong language (including unethical practices)
 - because we can't really provide the courses we need to provide or the non-academic/pre-professional opportunities we advertise
 - because the landscape and job market for PhDs is so depressed and the outlook is so gloomy, especially for academic jobs
 - because we cannot responsibly and sustainably fund the students and they have to come to an expensive city - funding communication is vague and unclear, many students are disappointed by how much they are on their own (if they don't come fully funded)

QUESTIONS FOR THE SCHOOL AND THE PHD PROGRAM

- Is it possible to provide more stable and robust funding packages (at least three years) to students? If so, how? If it is not possible, what should be done?
- Should JSIS create two options - a 3 year and a 5 year program? This would more accurately reflect the experience of students. What would it take to do this?
- How many resources- time, money, energy- does the PhD program demand from the School? How does this contribute to the overall graduate training at the school? Does this compete for those resources- time, money and energy- with other graduate programs in the school? What are implications for undergraduate education and enrollment?
- How is the labor and burden of running the program distributed? It appears that governance, teaching and mentoring burdens fall disproportionately on women and junior faculty. Managing the program has often fallen on individuals or small groups of people without strong central oversight or leadership. This has created a system that often relies on informal relationships to deliver promised outcomes. What new School wide organizational structures can be put in place to address this?
- If the School stops teaching the field seminars what does that open up? What other curricular changes will make the program less teaching resource intensive?
- Can we better articulate the MA and PhD programs? More joint courses and tighter intellectual and social community?
- How can we collaborate with other units on PhD education? Other suggested models include JSIS certificates as a way for non-JSIS PhD students to gain global and area studies proficiencies.
- Is it important for the Jackson School to have a PhD program for reputation and or branding purposes?
- What are different ways to organize the PhD program? Examples include:
 - Different 'tracks' in the PhD
 - More academic vs more (non-academically) professionally oriented
 - A more curated PhD experience (a 'British' or 'German' model)? -- students connect with specific faculty who guide the student through a tailored or individualized program and connect them to a wide range of resources and people across the University
- What would it mean to phase out the PhD program as it currently exists and focus on more collaborative inter-departmental forms of graduate training, with JSIS faculty doing work with PhD students in other departments? (The Divisional Dean noted that there are now fewer area studies experts in the disciplinary social science departments than ever before, and there is opportunity for JSIS to join forces with other units on specific programs and also opportunities for JSIS faculty to serve as area experts on committees in other units.)

3. THE M.A. PROGRAMS

The two-year MA programs are the historical core and foundation of graduate education in the School. The School as it is now has ‘co-evolved’ with these programs and many are closely connected to the NRCs. Faculty hires over many decades have been structured around area studies and the area studies and comparative religion degrees in JSIS. Compared to the area studies degrees the ‘general’ international studies degrees (BAIS, MAIS and PhD) are relative newcomers. In our conversations we detected a clear ‘passion gradient’ among the faculty, sharply descending from the area studies programs to the ‘general’ programs, with the MAIS being the least visible, known, or understood of the programs, and the PhD being the most visible but maybe least supported among the faculty.

We spoke to representatives from all but one of the two-year MA programs (including many current and former chairs). It was not our brief nor our intention to seek out information and insights specifically about any of the two-year programs other than the MAIS; but faculty and staff were keen to discuss with us the challenges and opportunities faced by those programs, and signed up for meetings with us for this purpose.

Both the *2008 and the 2018 Ten Year Reviews* emphasized the need for serious reform of the MA programs.

- The 2008 Ten Year Review called for an overhaul of the MA curriculum and a “continuation of ongoing discussions for reform of the graduate programs”.
- The 2018 Ten Year Review called for a “streamlining and professionalization of the curriculum” so the programs could better serve “graduates [who] now pursue career trajectories that are different from those in the past”. The review emphasizes the need for “more practical and professional training” to “to provide [students] with skills relating to non-academic career paths”. The School is seen as having too many small and shrinking programs and “existing degree programs should be simplified”. The review recommended that the MA programs should be less rigid and sequential and “more modular” in ways that might serve students throughout the UW who are interested in global and area studies issues.

During our more than forty conversations with faculty and staff we picked up strong echoes of these earlier recommendations. The conversation appears to be moving in the direction of even greater urgency, given the continuing decline in the applications and admissions numbers (for more details see Appendix):

- The nine 2-year MA programs admitted just 30 students in total in 2020, or about three students per program

- During the eight-year period 2013-2020:
 - programs were left without any admitted students on four occasions
 - nine of the admitted cohorts counted either one student or two students
- During the four years 2016-2020 there were only three MA entering cohorts (out of 36) with 10 or more students
- The largest program in the 2020 entering class had just eight students.

We noticed a greater openness to reforms and options that only a few years ago might have seemed unpalatable and avoidable, such as reductions in program length, or consolidation of some programs, or changes to the curriculum.

There are challenges that appear to be common to many if not all of the MA programs, and they are seen as interconnected. But many faculty and staff feel that the MA programs are largely isolated from each other, so there is not a lot of information and knowledge of what is happening in other programs. There is a sense of missed opportunities for conversations across programs about common challenges and common needs. There is a widely shared sense that opening up a sustained and inclusive and results-oriented conversation among all the graduate programs is needed, and needed soon. It is also seen as necessary to ensure that more junior faculty and recent hires feel buy-in and ownership, especially as 'generational transitions' among the faculty loom in many of the programs (this was mentioned by a number of the people we spoke to).

3.A. The M.A. PROGRAM in INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (GENERAL)

CHALLENGES

Application and Enrollment Trends (for more data see Appendix)

- Applications to the MAIS program declined by more than one third (35%) between 2013 and 2021.
- Accepted offers have declined by almost two thirds (from 12 to 5) since 2013.

Curriculum

- Based on the experiences of the four MAIS chairs involved with this report, the MAIS has for a long time been poorly structured in ways that students and advisers have found confusing and frustrating.
- For example, the program lacked a clear 'core' and was marred by odd requirements such as intermediate economics.
- These weaknesses have been at least partly addressed. But assessments of these weaknesses, and the efforts to alleviate them, have been largely invisible to the School community.
- Tweaks to the curriculum have been diligently carried out by faculty and staff and this labor has gone largely unacknowledged; it has also been haphazardly and poorly compensated.

- But it is still challenging for students to find relevant courses in the School.
- The program is advertised to applicants as being “designed for students with some professional experience or advanced training, who want to solidify their international and global studies scholarship and practical training.” But these application criteria are vague and inconsistently applied.
- And the promise of “practical training” is not clearly defined. The School does not provide “practical training” to students in any sustainable or predictable way. This is unsurprising since the faculty are not practitioners and the hiring of additional ‘faculty of practice’ is financially prohibitive.

Faculty Support and Oversight

- The program is not well connected with a wide enough range of faculty in the School, and is not anchored firmly enough in the faculty community.
- Because of this the program appears to operate largely in isolation within the School. Successive MAIS program chairs have found it challenging to connect students with School faculty for advising students on their capstone thesis or papers.
- We mostly drew blanks on MAIS during our conversations. Very few faculty or staff we spoke to had much or anything to say about the MAIS.
- While there was little criticism of MAIS among the faculty and staff we spoke to, there is also very little understanding of the MAIS in the JSIS community.
- There is no MAIS program committee meaning that the MAIS program chair has no institutional or collegial support in the School.
- As a professed ‘area studies school’ most faculty do not identify strongly with the ‘general’ degree programs, which makes running MAIS a lonely and sometimes frustrating experience with long terms of service and few rewards & opportunities in the School.
- Area studies faculty in the School feel that MAIS students often ‘specialize’ in areas without taking any area studies courses, leaving them inadequately prepared for their thesis or papers.
- There is little consultation between MAIS and the area studies programs & faculty in the School.
- MAIS students don’t have much of a community within the School.
- Most faculty are first and foremost ‘area studies’ researchers.

Professionalization and Practical Training

- The degree capstone is individualized and academic in format. It offers only the choice of a thesis or two research papers.
- There are currently no regular or institutionalized opportunities for collaborative or team-based capstone projects, or for any non-academic experience (e.g. internship, client project, task force)

- The relationship between academic and pre-professional experiences is not clearly articulated on the School's webpages and promotional materials, potentially leading to disappointed student experiences:
 - *"It is designed for students with some professional experience or advanced training, who want to solidify their international and global studies scholarship and practical training."* It is not clear from program materials what the underlined terms actually mean.
 - Program materials do not clearly articulate the potential value of the degree for students: *"The program emphasizes inquiry-based, critical analytic and writing skills that public and private employers demand"*. It is not clear from program materials what this actually means or how this claim is supported.
- Applicants or students with aspirations for non-academic, professional or policy work do not have opportunities to be trained in these areas.
- Practical, professional and policy-oriented high-impact opportunities (like the externally funded Global Research Groups) are available irregularly and often not for credit. They are not properly institutionalized within the MAIS curriculum and the School.

QUESTIONS TO THE SCHOOL AND THE MAIS PROGRAM

1. Is the School considering a survey of current MAIS students as well as MAIS alumni? We feel that such a survey would provide more specific feedback on what is working or not working in the program, from a student perspective. (Other Schools conduct these kinds of surveys regularly and create alumni groups much more intentionally than does JSIS.)
2. Should the program include collaborative and team-based experiences (capstone and other)? This might include the model of the undergraduate Task Force and other client projects or public-facing projects (including Calderwood Seminars), undertaking individually or in groups. Students could be given the option of a more traditionally 'academic' capstone project or a collaborative/outward-facing project. (Other 'general' IS programs in other APSIA schools provide more of these practical and professionally-oriented experiences.)
3. Should there be a more sustained and systematic integration of the degree program with career services in the School? This could provide students with more opportunities to explore the relevance of their studies and their degree to their careers -- for example through academically-integrated internship opportunities. (Career support is seen as essential to the mission of APSIA schools.)
4. Should the School consider accelerated versions of this program? This might be a 'two summers plus an academic year' model or a 15-month model. (The trends in APSIA are in the directions of shorter programs.)
5. Can the School commit, from a financial as well as curricular perspective, to a better 'institutionalization' of high-impact collaborative opportunities like the Global Research Group? (Client-facing projects and experiences are fairly standard in other APSIA schools.)

6. How can the School take advantage of our difference from other APSIA schools? How can we turn the School's approach to international and area studies into an advantage without becoming 'outliers' in APSIA in terms of the other experiential/co-curricular components routinely offered by APSIA schools?

3.B. THE M.A. PROGRAMS in AREA STUDIES and COMPARATIVE RELIGION

CHALLENGES:

Applications and Enrollment Trends

- Applications to the nine areas studies & comparative religion MA programs have declined by **47%** since 2013, from 209 to 111
- Accepted offers in these programs have declined by **60%** since 2013, from 61 to 25

Changes in the Job Market

- There is a widespread sense that "area studies has changed" - that there is "still life in it" but that it is not the same as 30 years ago, that the School is in danger of "getting stuck in the 90s"
- The area studies MAs have to adapt to these changes in the world and in the market for graduate degrees, define their strengths & advantages more clearly, connect these to the career aspirations & expectations of applicants and students, which will mean changes in many of the programs
- There is a need to look for new applicants and advertise what degrees are good for today, beyond the pathway to a PhD
- The job market has changed a lot, away from academia and government towards a large and growing 'third market' of NGOs, consulting, think tanks etc., and also a bigger international job market for international students
- Given these changes it does not make as much sense any more to spend two years of (often out-of-state tuition) on an area studies MA

Resource Intensity & Costs

- The large number of MA programs is very resource intensive for the School and costly in terms of teaching, advising, and administration/governance
- Given shrinking undergraduate enrollments there is a significant opportunity cost to the MA programs in terms of (potentially) higher-enrolling undergraduate courses.
- This, rather than low revenues based on graduate ABB *per se*, is one of the main concerns related to the many small graduate courses the School has to staff every year
- In many programs there are not enough classes for students to take, even required courses are hard to staff, or hard to find, or hard to offer consistently especially if they are owned and scheduled by other departments

- The JSIS PhD program has drained funding from the MAs, including RA and TA opportunities, which are down also because undergrad classes in JSIS have become smaller and fewer of them are now big enough to justify a TA

Sustainability and Academic Integrity

A number of faculty who are either currently leading, or have recently led, area studies MA programs, have said that their programs are not sustainable

- The demand for programs (applications, acceptances, recruitment yield) is very low and falling
- The payoff or return for the MA degrees, or their “value added”, is low and falling
- A number of programs feel they are “on life support” or in a state of permanent crisis
- Programs are losing academic rigor in their pedagogies and methodologies
- The size and quality of cohorts is very variable. Cohorts have become very small with increasing frequency in the last years, which means there is almost no community for the students and the teaching of required introductory courses becomes increasingly difficult
- Many programs are not really competitive any more and there is a shrinking number of applicants to choose from
- Programs face increasingly low yield: fewer students accept offers, and then actually enroll in the programs
- Different programs have different admissions profiles and priorities.

Curriculum

- Some MA program requirements are too complex and sequential and rigid
- There is often a scarcity of relevant courses that students can take, jeopardizing their path to graduation
- Because of this some requirements effectively force students to take sub-400 level undergraduate courses that they cannot receive credit for
- Students have only academic experiences, not pre-professional or career-focused (for careers outside academia) -- less academically focused students feel less supported -- no other options for them -- implicit but outdated assumption that all MA students are trained and ready to head to a PhD program

QUESTIONS FOR THE AREA STUDIES AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION MA PROGRAMS

1. Should there be common methods course/s for all MA programs to create common expectations, a common platform, and also more community for students and faculty?
2. Should there be a common ‘colloquium’ course in the first years of all programs? This might also help integrate increasingly small individual program cohorts, socially and academically
3. Should some of the programs merge into larger programs? Merging e.g. the East Asian programs (plus Taiwan Studies) or all the Asian programs was mentioned by a number

of faculty in the potentially affected programs. There are clear areas of opportunity here, but also concerns (e.g. related to identity, donor support, and impact on the competitiveness of NRCs)

4. What should be the role, if any, of common application and admission criteria and committees? There is some concern that alignment of criteria and processes could negatively impact the vision and mission of individual programs.
5. Should there be five-year BA-MA options in some of all the programs? This option was discussed favorably by a number of faculty and staff. Many people brought up the 5 year BA/MA option. This is a very interesting option, although more complex to design and run than it may first appear.
6. Could some of the programs considered one-year versions of their programs? The option came up in a few of our conversations. Of course there are challenges in terms of gaining language proficiency in a shorter program, but a shorter program might be aimed at heritage or native/near-native speakers.
7. Should programs consider creating certificate programs in their areas in addition to, or in some cases instead of, their MA programs? This could effectively serve the graduate campus community of students looking to the School for area proficiencies
8. Should programs more closely integrate career and professional development support & advising? Students feel that there should be more support in this area as they are preparing for a wider range of jobs than might have been typical in the past.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the School and its graduate programs urgently engage in the kinds of discussions that faculty and staff are expecting and readying themselves for. In preparation for this we suggest the following **set of four common questions to be put to all programs as well as the School as a whole** (in addition to the program-specific questions we formulated in sections 2 and 3 above):

These questions are intended to help programs as well as the School go ‘back to basics’ and be more intentional about graduate education in international studies, area studies, and comparative religion. They are also about creating a more cohesive understanding of the ‘graduate space’ in the School as a common intellectual, pedagogical and social community. In answering these questions individual programs might identify and include any members of their community, as defined by them, both inside and outside the School. Based on our conversations we believe it is essential that both faculty and staff participate robustly in this process.

- **Why** is the Program/School providing graduate opportunities?
 - What is the intellectual project of the Program/School with respect to graduate education?
 - What’s the Program/School’s ‘niche’ in the market for graduate education?
 - What can the Program/School provide better or differently than other institutions?

- **Who** is the Program/School trying to attract, teach, and train?
 - Who is the Program/School trying to attract?
 - How should the Program/School best reach applicants and communicate the Program/School's goals and strengths in graduate education?

- **How** is the Program/School teaching & training students?
 - What types of academic programs should be offered (e.g. one year, two year, certificate programs, PhD?)
 - What should be the mix of academic education (substance and skills) and pre-professional or practical training?
 - What kinds of collaborative or team-based experiences should be included in programs?

- **What** are we teaching and training students for?
 - What kinds of careers are available for graduates?
 - What is the 'value proposition' to applicants and students related to a graduate degree from the Program/School? (What is the return to the students, broadly defined, provided by the degree?)
 - How is the Program/School supporting professional development of students and preparing them for a diversity of careers?

Appendix: Applications and admissions data

1. PhD Program: Applications and Admissions

2013	Applications	63
	Admitted	8
2014	Applications	73
	Admitted	10
2015	Applications	93
	Admitted	8
2016	Applications	105
	Admitted	4
2017	Applications	92
	Admitted	4
2018	Applications	72
	Admitted	5
2019	Applications	53
	Admitted	5
2020	Applications	58
	Admitted	6

2. All 2-year MA Programs: Applications

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Comparative Religion	24	25	19	9	11	9	5	9
International Studies	68	60	65	72	67	44	52	46
China Studies	55	50	44	50	39	32	27	45
Japan Studies	25	16	9	17	18	17	19	13

Korea Studies	20	16	18	8	6	13	14	5
Middle East Studies	32	24	31	28	23	25	19	12
REECAS	24	15	17	20	18	23	19	11
South Asia Studies	18	10	13	9	7	11	11	10
Southeast Asia Studies	11	9	12	11	10	8	6	6
TOTAL	277	225	228	224	199	182	172	157

3. All 2-year MA Programs: **Admitted Students**

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Comparative Religion	8	7	6	2	1	3	1	3
International Studies	12	13	11	18	10	4	11	5
China Studies	12	5	12	10	8	7	8	8
Japan Studies	9	4	3	7	5	6	6	3
Korea Studies	5	5	6	0	0	5	2	2
Middle East Studies	7	7	7	2	3	3	0	3
REECAS	7	4	4	8	5	5	6	1
South Asia Studies	9	4	6	0	3	6	4	3
Southeast Asia Studies	4	1	5	3	2	2	2	2
TOTAL	73	50	60	50	37	41	40	30