

**2016-17 ACADEMIC SENATE REVIEW OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES IDP**

**Internal Reviewers**

Abby Kavner, Undergraduate Council, Earth, Planetary & Space Sciences, Review Team Chair  
Yung-Ya Lin, Undergraduate Council, Chemistry and Biochemistry

**External Reviewers**

Victoria Lawson, University of Washington, Geography  
Michael Watts, UC Berkeley, Development Studies

**Date of Site Visit:** January 12-13, 2017

**Date of Report:** February 24, 2017

**Approved by Undergraduate Council:** April 21, 2017

<b>Appendix I:</b>	External Reviewers' Reports
<b>Appendix II:</b>	Site Visit Schedule
<b>Appendix III:</b>	Self-Review Report (The self-review report was previously distributed. If you need a hard copy, please contact the Academic Senate Office at extension 53851.)

## **2016-2017 Academic Senate Program Review of the International Development Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program**

### **1. Introduction to the International Development Studies Program**

This report is a summary of the Academic Senate's review of the undergraduate interdepartmental degree program in International Development Studies (IDS). The review took place on January 12-13, 2017. Prior to the review, a pre-site meeting was held with Cindy Fan, the Vice Provost for International Studies and Global Engagement and Chris Erickson, the Senior Associate Vice Provost and Director of the International Institute Chris Erickson. An additional pre-site meeting with IDS chair Michael Lofchie and Sandy Valdivieso, the Academic Counselor for IDS. During the site review, we were joined by external reviewers, Professors Victoria Lawson and Michael Watts, and held meetings with VP Fan and AVP Erickson, Chair Mike Lofchie, undergraduate students, graduate student teaching assistants, program faculty, and the administrative staff.

The IDS program (est. 1987) is the oldest of three undergraduate interdepartmental programs housed in UCLA's International Institute. The other two programs are Global Studies and International and Area Studies. The last Academic Senate review, conducted in 2008-2009, grappled with several major internal and external structural issues with the IDS program, leading to strong recommendations for increasing the rigor of the academic program and better managing the enrollment, and increased intellectual involvement both from faculty within the program and the International Institute itself. The report recommended suspending admissions to the major, and possibly disestablishing the program if adequate progress was not made on the recommendations.

During the past eight years, under the leadership of Professor Michael Lofchie, the program has strengthened significantly, by introducing a competitive application process to the major as well as implementing changes to the curriculum. The program is now thriving, aided by reduced enrollment, enthusiastic and dedicated students, broad faculty, and heroic staff.

In this report, we summarize some of the strengths and achievements of the IDS program and offer some suggestions for pushing for continued excellence. We note that while constructive changes have been made within the program since the last review, issues remain concerning the IDS program's context within the International Institute and its relationship to the other undergraduate programs housed within the Institute. The review committee thinks this is an important time for UCLA to come forward with broad intellectual leadership and vision for UCLA's International programs.

### **2. Strengths and Achievements of the program**

Both of the external reviewers' reports expansively commended the program and its leadership for the great strides made since the last eight-year review, calling the program a "striking success story" (Watts) and "a jewel that should be supported going forward" (Lawson), and speaking to the extraordinary leadership and dedication of Professor Michael Lofchie (both

Watts and Lawson).

According to the IDS self-review, the program is committed to “broadening student understanding of the economic, political, and social challenges faced by the world’s developing regions.” This mission was consistently echoed and amplified throughout our visits with faculty, students, and staff.

## **Curriculum**

Prerequisites include two courses in economics, one in statistics, three in social sciences, and two years of foreign language study, with a minimum GPA of 2.0 in these courses. The major requires students to take eleven upper division courses once they are admitted to the program. Students take four IDS core courses in Theory and Development Practice, three courses in Social and Critical Theory (each from different departments), one course in research methodology, and three regional and disciplinary electives. The IDS core courses are offered during the academic year. However, all of the core courses and additional methods courses are also offered during the summer sessions. Many students in the program elect to take these core courses over the summer, when there is a wider array of courses offerings. Going forward, the program should be cautious about relying too heavily on summer offerings, and should ensure that students are able to complete the program without taking courses over the summer. Students in the major are required to take a senior seminar, IDS 191. This course is limited to 25 students, and is designed to provide research experiences for the students. In AY 2013-2014, nine of these capstone seminars were offered. Core faculty members teach a majority of the courses.

A new minor in Global Health was formally approved in 2014/2015, with IDS 140 as its core course. Last year, this core course was renamed Global Health 100: Global Health and Development, and is open to all undergraduates, including IDS students.

## **Faculty**

In part as a response to the last review of the IDS program, International Institute FTE and part-FTE new hires are now explicitly obliged to teach within the Institute’s Interdisciplinary programs. This has bolstered the ranks of core faculty members teaching IDS core courses, including Apter (History/Anthropology), Heuveline (Sociology), Ross (IoES, PoliSci), Harris (Sociology), and Posner (PoliSci).

In addition to the core Institute faculty, faculty are also employed via a course-release program (reimbursed to department chairs at 50% salary of step II lecturer). This has brought in faculty such as Gupta (Anthropology), Ozler (Economics) and Sheppard (Geography) to teach core courses and senior seminars.

The IDS Faculty Advisory Committee consists of 15 core- and associated faculty. Their primary role is to evaluate student applications to the IDS program.

## **Student Body**

The enrollment of the IDS program has been almost halved since the last review. Now, students are granted admission to the IDS program via a competitive admissions process in their junior

year. About 200 students apply annually for 135 slots in the major. On average, about 25% of the students in the program are transfer students. Over 90% of the transfer students enroll during at least one summer session, as do over 80% of the four-years. Over two-thirds of the students are female, and about one-quarter of the students are underrepresented minorities.

## **Staff**

The IDS advising office is staffed by a full-time SAO, Sandy Valdivieso, and a part-time advisor, Erica Anjum. In addition to the IDS program, they are also responsible for the Global Studies major and minor. They serve 600 students in the major, plus they assist with applications for the 150 prospective students. They are a dedicated staff, providing drop-in counseling and proactive information sessions, as well as organizing regular workshops and events for the students.

## **3. Goals and Plans for the Program**

The IDS program continues to revise its curriculum in response to student requests, faculty research and teaching interests. A new Global Health Minor was established last year within the International Institute. The self-review outlined possible studies on global human rights for LGBTQ communities in the developing world. In Fall 2016, a capstone seminar was taught in this area. Students have also requested that the program include an additional research methods course that is specific to the study of developing countries.

Additional further needs identified in the self-review included increasing opportunities for students to visit, study, and do research in developing countries. While ~30% of the IDS students take advantage of UCLA's many study abroad programs, many more students would welcome opportunities to study abroad in developing countries. However, opportunities are limited due to curricular constraints on the students, and funding constraints on the programs, especially due to the increased costs/risks associated with students' travel to the developing world.

Perhaps by necessity, the IDS self-review emphasized improvements and accomplishments since the last eight-year review, rather than elucidating an intellectual framework for future directions. All of the reviewers left excited and enthusiastic about the program, and want to see the IDS program work in conjunction with its sister programs within the Institute (i.e. Global Studies, International and Area Studies, etc.) to continue to maximize their potential.

As noted by Lawson:

“However, self-study documents are typically forward-looking with a narrative about where a program is going. I would have appreciated more of this in the IDS self-study. Presumably much effort and emphasis has been placed on stabilizing the major since the last review (and the Little report, 2009) with correspondingly less emphasis on the future. This stabilization has now been accomplished; majors are steady, students are high-quality and the curriculum has been rationalized in large part. Now is the time to think about the intellectual vision and future hallmarks of IDS at UCLA. This is important both because of the shifting nature of the broad field of development studies and because of the changing context of the International Institute at

UCLA, with the emergence of new majors and minors.”

And by Watts:

“Curiously there is little in the Self-Study, or indeed from discussions among core faculty, which provided a sense of where the program sought to be ten years from now. Should it, as one faculty suggested in passing, be retained as it is and left alone? This “steady-state” position is entirely respectable. But it is clear that IDS could grow and retain its quality; there is arguably a need to think about MA programs; and as new minors and majors (global health, migration, and human rights) are generated and spun off from within the International Institute, at the very least there are questions pertaining to the linkages, connections and coherence among these programs and other sister programs such Global Studies. The transition in leadership as professor Lofchie step down, makes the question of the future and where the good ship IDS seeks to go, all the more pressing.”

While the charge of our review team was limited to reviewing the International Development Studies program, it became apparent to all of us that the future of the program cannot be separated its sister programs at the Institute—especially the Global Studies program—as well as the mission and leadership of the International Institute. Similar questions were raised in the Academic Senate’s 2013-2014 review of the Global Studies Program. Their top programmatic recommendation was:

“Develop a vision for the future of the Global Studies program at UCLA. Responses to the other recommendations in this report will depend largely on the IDP’s vision of itself in the future. The vision should be in the form of a statement discussed and voted on by the IDP Faculty Administrative Committee, and should address the GS IDP’s relationship with the other IDPs in the International Institute, specifically the International and Area Studies and International Development Studies IDPs.”

#### **4. Recommendations**

In this section we have highlighted recommendations that were raised by the entire review team. Further details and additional recommendations are provided in each of the external reviewers’ reports.

#### **To the Vice Provost of the International Institute and the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost.**

1. Given the complexity and interrelationships of the academic programs within the International Institute (especially Global Studies and International Development Studies), there needs to be intellectual leadership examining the future of these programs from the top and also throughout the International Institute, and a governance structure that allows for more crosstalk (See Recommendation #10 & 12 by Watts, and last page of the Lawson Report).
2. Increase the staff support from part-time to full-time. (See recommendations of Lawson

and Watts (#6))

3. TA parity: Currently the IDS TAs are responsible for 75 students per TA while the norm in the departments from which TAs are normally recruited is 60 students per TA. This results in a larger burden for TAs assigned to IDS programs. The TA support for the IDS program should be increased for parity. (See recommendations of Lawson and Watts (#7))
4. To aid in building the intellectual community of the International Institute, provide a dedicated space for students in the various undergraduate programs to meet, organize activities, and build relationships.

### **To the IDS program**

5. Curricular changes:
  - In light of the recommendations made by the external reviewers, conduct a review of the curriculum and consider unifying/cross-listing some core courses that are relevant for both the IDS program and the Global Studies program, such as economics classes and methods courses which are relevant for both programs (See recommendation #9 by Watts).
  - Offer a prerequisite introductory course laying out the framework for thinking about international development studies. (See recommendation #1 by Watts)
  - Summer program. Endeavor to structure the core offerings to lessen the dependence on summer courses. Expand core-courses to include methods courses and additional upper division core courses. Try to match some of the richness of core offerings of the summer sessions during the academic year by
    - Continuing to find ways to fund students to either/and perform senior thesis and/or study abroad and/or internships (See recommendation #4 by Watts).
    - Structure as many capstone courses as possible to include data analysis exercises.
    - Increasing the number and variety of senior-level core course offerings.
6. Admission to the major. Consider changes in the review of applications program to let students know sooner whether or not they are accepted to the program—preferably before they begin their junior year. (See recommendation #2 by Watts)
7. Reliance on summer sessions. We noted that the IDS program is making heavy use of summer sessions, with a richness of IDS offerings during the summer sessions that were not matched by the offerings during the academic year. While this helps bring in funding for the program, it may also prove burdensome for students who might otherwise spend summers either in employment, or doing summer research/field work related to their

program. In addition, the summer offerings are generally not taught by ladder faculty.

8. Continue to expand the IDS intellectual community at UCLA.
  - o Incorporate some of the superb new faculty hires whose research is in the area of development studies at UCLA.

### **Final Recommendation**

The Undergraduate Council recommends that the next review be scheduled on a regular eight-year cycle in AY 2024-25, pending a satisfactory progress review response.

Respectfully Submitted,

Abby Kavner Undergraduate Council, Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences, Review Team Chair  
Yung-ya Lin, Undergraduate Council, Chemistry and Biochemistry

**Appendix I:** External Reviewers' Reports

*Victoria Lawson, University of Washington, Geography*  
*Michael Watts, UC Berkeley, Development Studies*



January 18, 2017

**External Reviewer Report for International Development Studies Major,  
UCLA  
Victoria Lawson, Professor of Geography, Director UW Honors Program  
University of Washington**

**Overview of Process**

Our evaluation team, commissioned by the UCLA Undergraduate Council, spent two days (January 12-13) interviewing administrators, faculty, staff, teaching assistants, students and alumni involved with the IDS Program. The schedule of interviews was thorough, we spoke with a wide range of people and we felt as a committee that we had excellent access to, and insight on, the program. All committee members reviewed the self-study and supporting materials prior to the site visit. The External Review Committee worked closely together to digest information and to arrive at our collective assessment of the program for our exit meeting with the administration. Everyone was very forthcoming with information we requested and we have a robust picture of the program.

**Overview Impressions of IDS**

Interdisciplinary Development Studies (hereafter IDS) at UCLA is a very impressive program. Taking on the breadth and complexity of processes constituting 'development', IDS is appropriately configured as a broadly-framed liberal arts major that integrates practice and policy training. IDS students are smart, motivated, creative and hungry. The IDS major is in high demand and students clearly have a passion for their learning in the program, witnessed in part by their willingness to wait two and half years to enter this selective major! IDS also attracts a very diverse group of students including underrepresented minority and immigrant students. In short, the IDS Program is a jewel that should be supported going forwards.

The current strength, rigor and coherence of the IDS major is a testament to the extraordinary leadership and dedication of Professor Michael Lofchie. He, along with a very small and dedicated staff, have done heroic work to reinvigorate and stabilize the program over the last eight years. The potential of this program is extraordinary going forwards because the work matters, the students are very impressive and demand for the major is high and can continue to grow. Furthermore, the affiliated and core faculty are a very talented group who are both excited and committed to being involved in the program. UCLA is to be commended for investing in IDS with the shared

FTE model that hires faculty into social science departments and IDS simultaneously. This is a strong model that should be continued as a vital investment in the future of this interdisciplinary program. This is a major that matters.

However, self-study documents are typically forward-looking with a narrative about where a program is going. I would have appreciated more of this in the IDS self-study. Presumably much effort and emphasis has been placed on stabilizing the major since the last review (and the Little report, 2009) with correspondingly less emphasis on the future. This stabilization has now been accomplished; majors are steady, students are high-quality and the curriculum has been rationalized in large part. Now is the time to think about the intellectual vision and future hallmarks of IDS at UCLA. This is important both because of the shifting nature of the broad field of development studies and because of the changing context of the International Institute at UCLA, with the emergence of new majors and minors.

The field of development studies is broad and interdisciplinary, grappling with global interconnections that produce enduring inequality, massive migrations, global environmental shifts and global political-economic interconnections. Currently, IDS as a major does emphasize the endurance and intensity of poverty & inequality around the globe. However, the current mission statement of the IDS major in the self-study appears to emphasize the study of the Majority World (places outside the OECD) from their histories and contemporary connections with North Atlantic States (page 1 of self study report). While specific courses within the major undoubtedly engage these global and historical interconnections, the major overall seems to currently be framed as focusing on questions around poverty and inequality *within* countries in Asia, Eastern Europe, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. To the extent that my reading is correct, this signals a tension between courses taught and the overall framing of the major that warrants discussion.

As I write this report, a question threading through for me is the relationships between IDS and the Global Studies majors and whether there is value in IDS having a more explicit engagement with global studies (a shared set of prerequisite courses perhaps)? It is important to hold the space for development studies, but in a way that doesn't separate this work from global historical relational analysis and critical social theory. There is great value in encouraging students to grapple directly with the interconnections between 'North' and 'South' because the range of topics within development studies call attention to the fundamental interconnectedness of histories and contemporary processes in producing global inequality and enduring poverty that are globe-spanning and not purely regional. The overarching framing of

the IDS major could more explicitly invite students to theorize and practice a relational analysis of how places of intervention are interconnected globally and historically and how myriad flows and exchanges reproduce patterns of inequality or 'improvement'.

### **How well does IDS teach undergraduates?**

The major is strong, with a robust volume of applications, excellent students and with students gaining good placements in development practice and graduate school after graduation. Students express great satisfaction overall with the quality of instruction and of courses within IDS. Students very much appreciate the interdisciplinary structure of the major and they also value the balance between analyses of root causes of inequality with an emphasis on action. This said, students and faculty identified areas of challenge for the major.

**The timing of admission** into the major should be examined. Freshman students must wait 2.5 years to apply to the major and then may not gain entry. This compresses their time taking core classes and compounds the challenge of not always being able to get access to core classes offered during the academic year. Consider offering an earlier admissions process, then perhaps a 2<sup>nd</sup> round admission for transfer students.

**A series of programmatic issues** and suggestions raised by review respondents are also worth exploring:

- Offering a prerequisite introductory course that lays out the framework for thinking about the breadth of themes and approaches to understanding international development studies. Students would value a course that anchors the major broadly and guides their thinking as they take courses across various depts. A course like Geography 4 in addition to the economics course would provide a broader engagement with the global geographies and histories of development.
- Expanding core courses to include an in-house methods course and additional upper level core courses.
- Development is an expansive field and the course options for students range widely across campus. Students would value pathways that sequence courses through the major to build knowledge sequentially, building to more coherent understandings of particular themes/areas within development studies (themes listed on the website (<http://web.international.ucla.edu/institute/idps/ids/>)). This suggestion mirrors one made in the previous (2008) review about developing tracks within the major.

- This major iterates theory and practice and students are hungry for study abroad experiences and internships that ground and nuance classroom learning.
- Address the tension inherent in the fact that many practice-oriented courses are only available in the summer when some students want to be away gaining field experience. And yet, students also need and value those very courses, leaving them to choose coursework/travel/practice.
- Increasing the emphasis on, and support for, student thesis work. Create support structures for the Honors option and address the expressed shortage of faculty willing to advise students on theses. Some members of the program suggest that either study abroad or a thesis should be required so that students are better prepared for their futures. One idea raised is a capstone honors seminar for all students doing theses.
- The relationship of development theory and practice to place or region seems relatively underemphasized in the major. This leads to the possibility that students will assume that development issues and practices are universally applicable across places. The major would benefit from faculty discussion of the extent to which students should be asked to grapple with histories and cultures of development in particular places. This would invite students into a process of understanding and valuing reflexivity about the politics of engagement, understanding knowledges that emanate from outside the West, and of engaging as interlocutors with people in places in constructing both the problematics of, and responses to, 'development'.
- Address the TA workload equity issue between departments and IDS. There is currently an imbalance between # students/TA in IDS versus some departments that have a lower ratio (we heard 1 TA/75 students and in social sciences, norm is 60 students – although this may vary by department).
- Increase advising staff available to IDS. Currently advisers are shared between IDS and Global Studies and this means that IDS is substantially understaffed to meet broad needs and to build extra-curricular activities for students in order for them to build community. If more advising staff were available they could support the development of student internships, faculty-led study abroad experiences, career panels and deeper relationships with alumni.
- Provide a dedicated space for students to meet, organize activities and to build community together. The glue for interdisciplinary programs often comes from extra-curricular activities and from having spaces to meet and discuss ideas informally. Space does matter.

- Explore ways to expand the intellectual community beyond classes: speaker series, internships and study abroad opportunities for students, etc.
- Inviting in some of the superb new faculty hires in development studies at UCLA such as Ananya Roy; Eric Sheppard; Helga Leitner; Hannah Appel among others.

### **Is There an Imaginative and Workable Long Range Plan for IDS?**

As noted earlier in this report, the IDS self-study does not focus on a forward-looking plan for the major. There are two key aspects of planning ahead that need attention: first, future leadership of IDS itself and second, building a cohesive community planning process that integrates voices of faculty, staff and students into planning the future of the major.

A leadership transition will likely be coming in the foreseeable future and so developing future leadership should be a priority. This question of identifying leadership and directions for the major connects to a second point: IDS could benefit by engaging in more collective work to strengthen a cohesive identity as well as priorities for the program going forwards. There does not appear to be a broadly inclusive conversation about the issues raised in the previous section of my report.

Many members of the program expressed a desire for a long-range vision for IDS. There is an opportunity to have a robust and intellectually engaging governance process that brings faculty and student voices into the intellectual vision and future direction of the program. The Faculty Council could be one vehicle for more regularly and thoroughly inviting colleagues into this collective and creative process. Ideally, there would be faculty retreats and regular meetings to build a vision for future. These discussions could pose questions: What are the IDS's strengths given the hallmarks of strength and distinctiveness at UCLA, in Southern California, on the Pacific Rim (or something else)? What are the central specializations (pathways perhaps) within the major (rather than a long list of themes) and do IDS and Global Studies both complement/inform those specializations? This collective intellectual and programmatic visioning might also interrogate the relationships between development studies, global studies and area studies programs; it might explore the relationships between IDS and Global Health; or the proposed minor in human and particularly LGBTQ rights. Members of IDS could usefully discuss future direction of the program, which emphasizes and what institutional relationships will support the IDS major as a forward-looking and distinctive program.

**Do current admin structures make sense for fostering the IDS program? Are there closely related units where more collaboration should happen?**

Yes, this interdisciplinary model of education, housed with the International Institute is a strong model for interdisciplinary development studies. This Institute provides a site where nimble curricular work can happen, as well as a site where connections could be made between development studies, global studies, global health, migration studies and area studies along with continuing collaborations with departments across Colleges all around campus. Further, the UCLA commitment to FTE sharing is a superb mechanism for cementing and solidifying this important interdisciplinary program.

Despite this potential, the review team found the leadership to be somewhat reticent about their intellectual vision for undergraduate education within the International Institute overall. I remain unclear about how the leadership sees the various programs within the Institute complementing each other or relating to each other. I also remain unclear about precisely what is the governance structure that coordinates a forward-looking imagination about the various components of undergraduate international education and therefore, how IDS fits into that vision. This matters because answers to some of the issues raised in the previous section depend upon the relationships and coordination across the various majors and minors that co-exist in the Institute, most particularly perhaps Global Studies and IDS (but perhaps also minors in Global Health, Migration and more). The Institute is described on its website as a hub for international education and research. But beyond this function of collecting 'things international' together, it is difficult to assess how the future of IDS can be imagined, or how IDS relates to the rise of new minors and majors within the international institute. I wonder whether proliferating new programs is the best way to educate students, in the context of potentially substantial overlap between programs? There is exciting work to be done in building a coordinated intellectual space for international, global and development studies. Creating more coordination and perhaps collaboration among majors/programs would be of enormous benefit to students.

# EVALUATION OF THE UCLA INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (IDS) PROGRAM

Michael J Watts  
Class of 63 Professor and Co-Chair of Development Studies  
University of California, Berkeley  
[mwatts@berkeley.edu](mailto:mwatts@berkeley.edu)

January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2017

## Overview

The International Development Studies (IDP) program was founded in 1987, initially reviewed in 1991-92 and subsequently in 1999-2000. If the originality and potential importance of the program was widely appreciated across the UCLA campus in the early years – a “small jewel” as one report put it – by the early 2000s the program confronted a number of problems including a need for strong leadership and for the prompt and effective implementation of a series of senate recommendations. These challenges came to a head in the 2008-09 Academic Senate Report – the ‘Little Report’ – which, even if a number of its judgments might be contested, nevertheless properly took note of a raft of serious structural problems which jeopardized the future and the credibility of the IDS program. IDS, the report concluded, was “fraught with institutional (structural), departmental and instructional difficulties”. The inventory of recommendations addressed the size and quality of the majors, the management of enrollment, the organization, structure and rigor of the curriculum, the uncertainty of departmental and faculty commitments (especially by ladder ranked faculty), and not least a need for oversight and robust leadership. If the “good ship” IDP was listing and taking on water a decade ago, it has undergone a remarkable transformation since the last review; to extend the metaphor, the ship is now upright, and steaming ahead at 20 knots. The fact that IDS has so successfully reduced and managed enrollment, upgraded and restructured the curriculum, attracted outstanding students, and established a structure in which core courses are taught fact 7-8 ladder-ranked faculty – some of whom in virtue of their appointments are contractually obliged to teach in IDS – is a singular achievement. Institutional and organizational changes and reforms in academe are often long and difficult, if not tortuous, and the faculty and administrators are to be commended for a remarkable turnaround. In particular the leadership, dedication and hardwork of Professor Michael Lofchie has been absolutely indispensable; his heroic labors should be applauded. In addition, the work of the staff – Sandy Valdiviesio and Erica Anjum – have proved to be the quality of the program, as have a vested core of faculty drawn from across the social sciences who ensure a coherence, consistency and rigor to the curriculum. Finally, the administration is to be congratulated for ensuring that social science appointments in development studies carry obligations to teach core courses - something which we at Berkeley have struggled (and failed) to do in our Development Studies program over the last four decades - and for generously providing a substantial increase in resources. Collectively this is a striking success story. There is no better marker of IDS success than the extraordinary students and alumni the review team interviewed during our visit, and the innovative student-led initiatives they have developed (for example, the Global Development Lab). The central question is, therefore, about the future: where should IDS go from here? Curiously there is little in the Self-Study, or indeed from

discussions among core faculty, which provided a sense of where the program sought to be ten years from now. Should it, as one faculty suggested in passing, be retained as it is and left alone? This “steady-state” position is entirely respectable. But it is clear that IDS could grow and retain its quality; there is arguably a need to think about MA programs; and as new minors and majors (global health, migration, and human rights) are generated and spun off from within the International Institute at the very least there are questions pertaining to the linkages, connections and coherence among these programs and other sister programs such Global Studies. The transition in leadership as professor Lofchie steps down, makes the question of the future and where the good ship IDS seeks to go, all the more pressing.

### **IDS in a Comparative Context**

IDS at UCLA – and the questions regarding its accomplishments, needs and future goals – can be profitably situated and assessed in relation to a short discussion of comparable DS programs in North America at top-tier research institutions. My purpose here is to raise two matters which may be of relevance to the IDS evaluation and the program’s future trajectory. First, many development studies programs across the country are struggling to think through in substantive and pedagogic terms the relations between development and global studies. The proliferation of inter-disciplinary programs coupled with the changing and complex relations between “development”, “globalization” poses a raft of interesting challenges. And second, development as an academic arena has changed over the last couple of decades and this has implications (and challenges) for how development theory and practice – the twin elements of any development studies program – are organized and taught within universities.

In sharp contrast to Western Europe where degree-granting at undergraduate and graduate Schools, Institutes and Departments of Development Studies have existed for several decades, undergraduate programs in the US remain something of a rarity (there are twelve formal DS majors in top tier institutions). In Europe, and in the U.K. in particular, the first research and degree granting development institutions (for example the Institute of Development Studies at Sussex, and the International Institute for Social Studies, in The Hague) were founded much earlier, in the 1950s and 1960s. Development Studies became an established field in major research institutions across Europe, where many of these programs, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, have a heavy professional and practical orientation. Compared to Europe, Development Studies in the US (especially at the undergraduate level) remains relatively weakly institutionalized. It is quite true that most top tier research and liberal arts universities typically offer some form of inter-disciplinary program or concentration in ‘global or international studies’<sup>1</sup>. The sort of free-standing, dedicated development studies major of the sort which exists on the UCLA campus may be uncommon in the US but its establishment was prescient, a curricular forerunner of the globalization and internationalization which shaped curricular developments in the late 1990s and 2000s. I have chosen to focus on three programs in three strikingly different settings: one within the UC system (at Berkeley) located in the International Institute, one located within one of the elite private schools situated in the Watson Institute at

---

<sup>1</sup> There are obviously other international studies and global development programs around the country – for example at the University of Virginia, the University of Toronto, American University, University of Kentucky, University of Colorado – but many are little more than weakly institutionalized minors or they resemble nothing more than an academic mailbox offering some form of certification.



Brown University, and the other in Canada at Queen's University that has a longstanding and very well regarded global development program<sup>2</sup>.

Development Studies (DS) at **Berkeley** was established in 1977 as the result of a cross-disciplinary faculty initiative led by Professor Carl Rosberg of the Institute of International Studies, and was the first undergraduate major established at a major U.S. university devoted to the study of the political economy of development. There are five required lower-division courses for entry into the major: DS10 (Introduction to Development Studies); Econ 1 or 2 (Introduction to Economics); Anthropology 3 (Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology); IAS 45 (Survey of World History); and an introductory course in statistics (Statistics 2, 20, or 21). These requirements ensure that majors have a firm grounding in the social sciences, along with a theoretical and methodological grounding in interdisciplinary approaches to Development Studies. The upper-division required courses include (a) DS100 (Development in Theory and History); (b) two disciplinary courses from among the social sciences; these courses must be from the SAME discipline; (c) two additional development related courses; (d) a methods course; and (e) three courses pertaining to a geographical area on or within Asia, Africa, Latin America, or the Middle East. These courses may be drawn from more than one discipline. The upper-division curriculum builds on the lower division requirements to ensure that DS majors combine substantial training in the social sciences and regional expertise with a strong commitment to interdisciplinary analysis of questions of development<sup>3</sup>. In addition, students must graduate with the equivalent of four college-level semesters in a modern language, preferably linked to their geographical area of expertise. The program encourages students to take advantage of the Study Abroad program, and a number of them fulfill at least part of their area and language requirements at universities in the regions in which they are most interested. The panoply of courses within the disciplines, areas studies programs, and professional schools that are relevant to the DS major naturally change over time in relation to new hires, visiting faculty, and the development of new courses by ladder-ranked. DS has struggled (and failed) to make appointments with contractual obligations to teach DS core courses. As a result there were major problems in the coherence and consistency of the curriculum. This was resolved twenty years ago by the Dean contracting a social science department (Geography) to teach the two core DS courses (with all the attendant problems of resourcing, compensation and costs for the department). A faculty advisory board provides an active governance structure but even with 100 majors the program generates problems in terms of students gaining access to lower division requirements and especially advising (much of which is peer group in nature).

The Development Studies concentration at **Brown University** is a much-lauded program, attracting some of the most talented students at an institution noted for the high caliber of its undergraduates. It is located within the Watson Institute for International Studies, an exceedingly well-endowed Institute capable of providing faculty and student resources that are

---

<sup>2</sup> There is a need for a systematic review of the proliferation of such global development studies programs as a particular form of curricular innovation and inter-disciplinary study on US campuses – and to assess this development in relation to the much greater development studies presence in the UK, Sweden, German, Holland, Denmark and so on.

<sup>3</sup> This broad curricular structure is replicated in most of the DS programs in other North American universities though the weighting of disciplinary courses (for example the number of Economics requirements) may vary substantially.

frankly unthinkable on the Berkeley campus. The major focuses on what it calls complex processes of social, economic, cultural and political development has theoretical, methodological, practical and ethical dimensions. As such, it calls on a wide range of academic disciplines. Development Studies concentrators are encouraged to develop the “combination of skills and specialized knowledge that is best suited to their area of interest within the field”, but simultaneously focusing on “a particular region or nation that requires an intimate knowledge of internal factors, as well as an understanding of larger global processes.” The DS concentration is designed to produce graduates with expertise in the study of development rather than area specialists, the large majority of concentrators combine their course work with some kind of first-hand experience in the developing world. Most students spend time in developing countries either by studying or conducting research for their capstone project abroad. In 2015 there were 16 majors (half of which completed honors); over the previous five years there had been a downward trend from a historical average of roughly 30-35 majors. Interestingly, this is not unrelated to the fact that all concentrators are required to write a thesis (roughly 80% involve fieldwork supported by resources from Brown), and the demands on faculty time (as advisors) has exceeded the capabilities of the system in which there are (like Berkeley) no full or part FTE’s associated with the major. While physically located in the Watson Institute, the program is funded and administered directly by the Dean of the College. The faculty director is provided with a course release and a stipend. The major requires 11 courses and a language. Four core courses are required: the Sociology of development, research methods, a senior seminar (in effect a thesis writing class) and an Economics course on international development. Two disciplinary courses are required (in addition to the Economics core class i.e. for a total of three different disciplines); three electives focused on regions; in addition there is a final year advanced seminar, a capstone independent study (including but not solely confined to a senior thesis); finally language competency at the 600 level is required (at Brown six semesters). Students have access not only to the very substantial resources of Watson, and the resident faculty most of whom have parts of their time “purchased” by the Institute and hence offices in the building, but a staggering array of undergraduate travel and other fellowships permitting (in addition to an education abroad experience) the opportunity for most students to intern abroad and use this experience as a basis for a thesis.

**Queen’s University** has a quite prestigious and longstanding inter-disciplinary major in Global Development Studies (GDS), established in 1997 as a free-standing program. The GDS program is located within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences that account for two-thirds of all students university-wide. The major currently has 70 majors and there are 6 ‘core faculty’ and a number of adjuncts. A major consists of 60 credits, half of which are mandatory in seven core courses/requirements including DEVS 100 6.0 Canada and the “Third World”, DEVS 230 3.0 The Global Political Economy of Development, DEVS 240 3.0 Culture and Development, DEVS 300 3.0 Theories of Development. The optional credits (30) include 18 from ‘regional’ or ‘thematic’ courses at the 200 and 300 (upper division) level. Honors thesis and directed reading courses are available for those who are eligible. Admission to the DS programs is based on the students’ Queen's University grades (cumulative average); the major simply accepts students with the highest grades in descending order until the degree option is full. The advisors recommend that students register in DEVS 100 in their first year as this is a prerequisite for second year DS courses. At the end of the first year students choose between a Major, Medial or Minor program in Global Development Studies. The major is structured to ensure that students

have access to a number of small dedicated seminars in their last year. The Queen's model is intriguing because it began by deploying a model structurally similar to Berkeley – that is to say a major with no core FTE, recruitment of faculty time from social science departments and administrative functions fulfilled by staff in multi-functional (program) units. The demand for the major grew very rapidly however – the freshman development course has an enrollment of 500 – and the pressures and strains on the “decentralized model” produced two developments. First, in 2003 full time appointments were made directly in the GDS program. There are currently 6 FTE, all of whom have affiliations (but no administrative obligations) with other social science departments in order to work with graduate students. Second in 2008 the major was capped at 65. Currently the program is the most difficult major to gain admission into on the Queen's campus: almost half of applicants are turned away when they apply at the end of their first year. The core faculty have direct control over the course curriculum and rotate freshman and upper division core courses. Advising is not onerous although as the major has grown 4<sup>th</sup> year bottlenecks arise around access to final year seminars.

Much can be said about these programs, but the standout findings of this brief comparison are as follows:

- the curricular structure of the programs are broadly similar combining core courses with configurations of disciplinary, area, methodological and language competencies
- there are structural challenges at the level of course offerings and advising in programs unless FTE are located in some way to the teaching programs
- there are few and limited incentive systems for faculty participation unless stipends or other forms of support are available (including resources to teach seminars)
- curricular consistency and intellectual coherence is always maintained through core faculty (or disciplinary) commitments to programs over time
- the realization of the potential of the major depends of well qualified, self-motivated students committed to the subject matter who benefit from capstone and thesis writing experience (especially where funding is available) and wherever possible internships
- post-doctoral fellows can be an especially effective (and relatively cheap) way of compensating for some of the structural challenges of inter-disciplinary programs
- having clear incentives (stipend, course release) for faculty heading the programs
- strong leadership within the program and a constant navigation/co-ordination with respect to cognate majors ('global studies', 'international studies', area studies') is key as these programs mature and develop

While there are marked differences between the Brown, Queen's, Berkeley and UCLA campuses, the broad intellectual architecture of the programs (core classes, language and regional/geographic competency, and mixes of disciplines and area courses) is similar. Each program is administratively located in different sorts of international or global institutional entities. The points of difference turn on how (and whether) ladder ranked faculty teach and advise within the program, the breadth and number of lower division course requirements, how each programs teaches economics as part of the core curriculum, relationships to the affiliate disciplines and programs, and opportunities for internship and study abroad.

A second comparative question speaks to the changing ways that development has been framed (and how scholarship has changed over the last 2-3 decades) and what it implies for curriculum.

The first is that, however construed, development studies combines theory and practice/policy. How and in what ways these are taught and incorporated into curriculum is important (something to which I return in my recommendations). Often DS programs tend to be light on practice even though this is precisely a strong motivation in students coming to the major in the first place. Second, development is, of course, a highly contested concept, and arguably one of the most important words in the English language. As Raymond Williams noted long ago, its various meanings have changed over time but it has become shorthand for a complex set of social, economic, political, cultural and institutional transformations over the last five hundred years. The reference point for these transformations is typically “the West” or the “developed countries” and the revolutionary changes in economic and political organization associated with Northwest Europe in the period after fifteenth century. But the emergence of development understood in this way – as economic and political modernization and a culture of modernity centered on the capitalist and socialist states of the North Atlantic economies – has always been inseparable from, and intimately bound up with, the making of another world (now conventionally called to use the language of UNDP the Global South (i.e. states marked by mass poverty, human want and insecurity, truncated opportunities, vulnerable well-being and by low economic productivity). As a consequence the boundaries between developed and developing, Global South and Global North are complex, porous and shifting – and further complicated by processes of globalization. All of which makes the substantive framing of DS programs challenging (how is development really different from global studies?). Thirdly, while development studies tends to especially (but not exclusively) focus properly on political economy broadly construed – and must address the obvious centrality of economics in the study of development – there are several pedagogic challenges which arise. One is that often the humanities and the arts are largely missing from the curriculum. A second is that many DS programs find it difficult to have economists centrally involved the teaching of core classes – economic development ends up being taught by political scientists or sociologists – and equally, upper division economics classes are often foreclosed for DS students (even with lower division requirements) by the entry requirements (typically mathematical and quantitative skills).

The conclusions from this brief comparison of the substance of DS programs is that there are a number of questions which are peculiar to an inter-disciplinary program devoted to development which turn on the demands of theory-practice and on the shifting terrain of development itself (development and what it entails is very different from say thirty years ago). The proliferation of minor and areas of substantive specialization– health, human rights etc., – is a reflection of these changes, as indeed are the various efforts (Berkeley is simply one example) to reorganize development studies as parts of global studies programs which attempt to rethink how best organize these inter –disciplinary majors.

## **The Review Process**

The team spent two full days with students, alumni, staff and faculty and met with the Director and relevant administrators. The information provided to us proved exceptionally useful in assessing the program. The team offered an exit report – one part of which was an executive session - in which many of the issues outlined below were briefly covered. At the same time, and perhaps inevitably in a program such as IDS which is embedded in a complex structure (the International Institute) and in which there are links and affinities to other programs (for example

Global Studies), and questions of leadership, academic jurisdiction and divisions of labor, and governance arose which took the team beyond the confines of IDS as such; in short a number of concerns arose that extended beyond our remit. For example a key question was how and in what ways Global Studies is different from Development Studies and whether this framing might need to be reconsidered; or where the intellectual leadership might come from for the Institute as a whole of which changes in IDS in the future would necessarily be part; and what were the mechanisms for co-ordination among units, minors, programs etc., within the Institute; and what is the role of the Vice Provost and Associate Vice Provost with respect to providing leadership and direction for IDS over the next decade. All of these questions – all of which collectively speak to the central concern of where should IDS go from here – would have demanded information on, and an evaluation of programs and structures, which were clearly not part of our brief. As you will see from the recommendations below, on occasion my evaluation brings me into arenas which seemed relevant but beyond the scope of the review as such. Finally, I have chosen to address the key issues as I see it by not separating out, as is customary, the recommendations from the evaluations. Rather I have organized my remarks around the key issues as I see them – the vision for the future, curriculum, staffing etc., – and draw together the evaluative and normative findings.

## **Evaluation and Recommendations**

1. **The Curriculum:** in sharp contrast to the state of affairs described in the Little Report, the IDS curriculum has been radically upgraded and improved. One expression is the degree to which core course are now taught by ladder ranked faculty: currently five exceptionally distinguished professors account for instruction in DS100, DS120 and DS130; ditto the senior seminars. Second the structure of the curriculum is robust: the IDS major has more pre-requisite at the lower division level than any other program in the country. Third, the substance of the core course has improved not least in the ways in which course content across the core courses reflects both a consistency (across time) and a coherence in relation to ensuring that students are exposed to a broad raft of development theories through complementary courses. Fourth, the curriculum has endeavored to integrate a number of courses addressing practice and policy (typically through visiting practitioners during the summer sessions). Funding has historically been available to bring in lecturers and to fund ladder ranked faculty who teach overload. And all of this has been instituted while ensuring the highest levels of rigor and academic achievement and (apparently) a low percentage of students (16%) completing their degrees in more than four years. There is no question this is deeply impressive. At the same time there are a number of issues which need to be addressed:
  - There is no lower division development studies (or globalization) class; there is considerable demand for such by students because as structured (see below) students typically take classes for 2.5 years before declaring and taking core DS courses. As a consequence lower division pre requisites are unanchored from development studies as such.
  - While the core classes currently on offer are outstanding and in various ways (as they must) deal with aspects of economic development (building upon 2 Economics prerequisites) there is no core class taught by an economist. The economics content of the core classes are taught by sociologists, political scientists and anthropologists.

- There is an almost constant clamor among students for more upper division core classes. In part this reflects two things. First, there is a dearth of classes on policy and practice and most are taught in the summer session when some students are obviously not in residence; and second, while the DS100 series are wide ranging, development is a vast field which demands a specialization in subfields like health, finance, agriculture, trade and so on.
  - Even with currently capped numbers of majors, some students are compelled to take core courses during the summer. Some faculty felt that these courses did not meet the standards of the Fall or Winter classes (and were not taught by ladder ranked faculty). There is a larger issue here which I understand in terms of the political economy of offering summer classes as a way of generating revenue. But many students are not in residence for summer sessions when popular courses by practitioners tend to be taught.
  - There is an obvious need – recognized by the program – for a core course on research methods. The standing policy is that all IDS core courses are taught only by ladder-track faculty members and this would demand the recruitment of a core member of our faculty with the competence and interest in teaching an IDS research methods class on a regular basis.
  - Given the mission of IDS – its central concern is inequality – there is considerable opportunity (one thinks of the new Luskin initiative on Democracy and Inequality) to perhaps cross listed courses or draw students into other Departs where these questions are key. A number of students referred to courses they had taken – often by accident – which they felt complemented and filled out some of the core courses. All of this suggests there may be some creative ways of refiguring the curriculum.
2. **Admission to the major:** one of the consequences of having a large number of required lower division pre-requisites is that the time at which IDS majors can commence taking core courses is relatively ‘late’. The fact that students are not admitted into the major until 2.5 years into classwork – with no guarantee that they will be admitted into a rigorous program – has important knock-on consequences. One is that for 6 or more quarters a student may not have an occasion to directly relate their pre-requisite coursework to development studies. This is, as I mentioned above, particularly debilitating because there is no lower division development studies class or classes which might fulfill this role (even though we were informed that some classes on the books in other departs – in Geography for example – might fulfill this niche). At Berkeley for example there are freshman development studies, global history, and global political economy classes. Second, insofar as such only commence their core classwork (late) in their Junior year this tends to produce (i) a sort of compression effect in ‘cramming’ classes into the remainder of the student’s time at UCLA, and (ii) runs the risk of having to improvise around not being admitted into core classes which are always impacted (i.e. scheduling problems). Both issues – the time of declaration and the desirability of a freshman development studies class (perhaps at the expense of dropping one of the other requirements) requires careful consideration. Again this discussion could be productively conducted in conjunction with Global Studies.
3. **Advising:** faculty who are through their FTE appointment are obligated to teach in the IDS core obviously have contributed to the robustness of the IDS program. At the same

time there will necessarily be tensions in any system in which a significant part of a faculty line is rooted in a Department which obviously carries multiple teaching and advising responsibilities. To put the matter bluntly some faculty may simply fulfill the responsibility of a core class and feel like their obligations are fulfilled. For students poor advising and faculty direction is often flagged (in the alumni data, and in the UCUES document for example). It appears too that the peer group advising system is relatively poor (again the UCUES data suggest this is the case). One wonders whether the extremely small number of students writing an honors thesis – particularly given the quality of IDS students - is not unrelated to this problem – and indeed a number of students did express this opinion. [Parenthetically in Global Studies has an obligatory thesis yet does not seem to confront this problem]. I appreciate that there will always be structural constraints in any interdisciplinary program which operates in part through the generosity of faculty whose own priorities (professional and intellectual) might reside elsewhere but this does not alter the fact that some creative solutions need to be developed.

- 4. Internships:** development studies encompasses scholarship and theory but also policy and practice. Keeping both of these elements in conversation within a DS program is one of the great challenges pedagogically (at UC Berkeley for example Professor Roy developing a practice focused minor called Global Poverty to address this tension; Brown has the resources to provide for each DS major some sort of overseas internship and work experience]. The challenge is multi-dimensional. First, students necessarily and understandably crave some sort of Global South *direct experience*. UCEAP provides one such opportunity – apparently about 20% of major make use of the program and 9 countries were included in the Global South for 2014-15 – but in spite of support of the Study Abroad office obviously not everyone can make use of it. Second Summer Travel Study is another possibility but this does not exist for IDS – but it does in Global Studies and indeed has as one of its locations in China (Shanghai). These programs to be available will need scholarship support should they be developed for IDS. But perhaps the larger issue here is why there might not in the future be more co-ordination between these IDS and GS programs as regards developing Summer Study Travel. Third, the demand for internships is naturally huge and potentially provides the sort of “hands-on” experience many students demand. There are a number of complex issues here (recognizing that some students by sheer force of will generate these opportunities). Such a program if entertained will take time, effort and money. It is implausible for example that such an internship data base or program could be developed – as some students expected – by IDS staff. Equally relationships between universities and NGOs take a long time to construct so that relations of trust and competency can be established (one program in the UC system which has done this is Community Studies at UC Santa Cruz); it will require faculty using their connections and building up connections with NGOs, multilateral agencies etc. And finally there is the question of what interns will bring to an internship. While students clearly have the desire and drive to intern somewhere in South Africa or Thailand, they need to be equipped to do so. One part of this is a skill; one part is confidence and cultural sensitivity. The idea that one can send students “off to the field” – liability questions aside – to do internship is both naïve and dangerous in my view (again Professor Roy would have experience of this since this is

exactly what the Blum Program at Berkeley was designed to do). Last but not least a part of this demand for “experience” can be met by having a much larger presence – through classes, lectures, workshops etc., - of practitioners as part of the core class structure (something I described above).

- 5. Student Evaluations:** data provided by the UCLA/SAIRO program on student experience (UCUES 2014 data) confirms the view articulated by all faculty: namely (i) the rigor of the program is not in question, (ii) the quality of the students is outstanding, and (iii) the graduates are in general satisfied with IDS major. Across virtually all of the indices provided in the UCUES data, IDS majors exceeded – in some cases by a substantial margin - the scores on comparable responses at the College, and All Campus levels. All of this is to be lauded. [Parenthetically let me note that the current students and the alumni who we interviewed were deeply impressive in terms of their maturity, intellectual breadth, their dedication and energy and in the case of the alumni their accomplishments. The IDS majors are overwhelmingly (80%) female – a national pattern incidentally in DS programs – a phenomenon which I find somewhat puzzling and perhaps might warrant some sort of analysis.]. However, there are a number of questions which suggest that IDS is underperforming. Respondents were less likely to be working with faculty, less likely to complete an honors thesis, less satisfied with the quality and access to upper division courses and not least seemed to be less satisfied with faculty advising and faculty feedback. Some of these issues confirm a number of concerns which I address elsewhere in this report.
- 6. Staffing and Space:** IDS is exceptionally fortunate in having Sandy Valdivieso in ‘the front office’. Her portfolio is enormous, but her experience and wisdom in guiding students and developing programs is – by all accounts from students and faculty – nothing short of miraculous. At the same time – if I compare her brief to staff in DS at Berkeley – she is stretched thin and the possibility that some of the recommendations which might emerge from this review be readily accommodated in her portfolio is clearly implausible. Erica Anjum similarly brings considerable knowledge (as a graduate of IDS), and skill, to the administration of the major. At the very least her position should be made full time simply to better serve the demands which *currently* exist. While it is clear that since the last review considerable resources have been invested in IDS, my own view is that the case for at least another 50% time staff person – particularly in view of the sorts of initiatives which might emerge from the review – is compelling. The advising burden alone which the two staff persons shoulder is considerable. I appreciate that Professor Lofchie notes in his response to CPB that the International Institute provides financial resources which, in his view, are ‘not a constraint’ which is encouraging. Nevertheless, he too comments on the demands on administrative personnel. Raising the question of space is I realize a red flag to a bull but I will simply make one observation. In programs such as IDS the question of community is always an open question: it is not a department and in some circumstances can become a mailbox. The staff provide a crucial social glue in this community building. But minimally (in our experience at Berkeley) providing a space – a ‘home’ room – for students has a generative effect on this community building (and it needs to be said in send a positive signal to students who may lack some of the benefits of being in a discipline)’



7. **TA Sections:** a small point but one worthy of consideration. There was some grumbling from both faculty and TA's that there is a lack of parity between the social science departments and the Institute regarding section loads per TA: 60 per TA for Political Science (for example), but 75 for the Institute. This is not only a matter of equity and parity but I presume – given that the TAs are unionized – potentially a legal and contractual matter. Practically, this lack of parity created for departmentally-based TA's a greater work load.
8. **New leadership:** IDS is at a key watershed moment for a number of reasons. The successful repurposing of the last eight years has well-positioned the program to think about “the next phase” of its development; equally the growth over the last decade of faculty on the UCLA campus with broadly construed development interests has expanded the horizons of what IDS might become; and the new initiatives within the Institute (such as Global Health) and across the campus (a globally oriented Black Studies, the new programs in the Luskin School) offer a new and exciting landscape to think about the relation of IDS to new centers of research and teaching. For all of these reasons the transition in IDS leadership as Professor Lofchie prepares to step down after the completion of the review looms large. It is not within our remit to think concretely about this question but one hopes that Professor Lofchie's successor has the sort of breadth and reaching in thinking about development studies in the 21<sup>st</sup> century to seize and building upon the comparative advantages of the UCLA campus and the exciting new developments inventoried here.
9. **Global Studies:** not unlike other development studies programs across the US, IDS has a ‘twin sister’ within the Institute in the Global Studies program (at Berkeley for example the program was the Political Economy of Industrial Societies (PEIS)). For reasons that I have outlined above, the border and boundaries between these sorts of programs are necessarily porous and sometimes blurred; and perhaps this is both necessary and generative. But in the review team's discussion with faculty, students and administrators alike the distinctiveness of Global Studies and its relation to IDS was extremely murky. Curiously, senior faculty centrally involved in both were unable to provide anything like a plausible answer to the question beyond endorsing the student adage that IDS wants to ‘save the world’ and Global Studies ‘rule the world’. Obviously our remit was not to review Global Studies but time and time again our conversations inevitably led to common ground between programs or questions of overlap and complementarity – and indeed substantive theoretical questions addressing how who thinks about the global, the local and the developmental. This murkiness was compounded by the fact that faculty directing Global Studies or with contractual obligations to teach in it by virtue of their interests or dispositions seem to fit easily (sometimes better!) in IDS. There are several ways to think about this. First while there are we gather meetings with program heads, there is a need to (i) ensure regular discussions across the programs, (ii) to explore ways in which resources or future developments might be shared or co-ordinated, and (iii) to use the obvious affinities between the programs as a way of encouraging debate over the mission and vision of international studies on the campus. Second, as one faculty member put it, there is a need to bring together faculty across the Institute in a more systematic

way to create a sense of community. At the very least there is a need for some intellectual leadership to ensure that these conversations begin in earnest as IDS entertains its future

#### **10. Co-ordination and Governance across and within units in the International**

**Institute:** once again the remit of the review team was not to evaluate the Institute or its governance structure. But the sorts of questions which emerged from the discussion pertaining to Global Studies brings into sharp focus a larger issue about what the next phase vision for IDS might entail. There are many moving parts in the Institute, and appeal of interdisciplinary study will continue to produce new sorts of minors and perhaps majors as the Global Health, Migration and Human Rights minors are spun off from new configuration of faculty and research (and funding) on the UCLA campus. This is all to the good. At the same time, left to its own devices there is a danger of (i) a proliferation of programs and initiatives with redundancy and overlap, (ii) a complex landscape which makes for difficult navigation for students, and (iii) problems of co-ordination across programs. Letting a thousand flowers bloom is fine until it is not. The message here is leadership. It will circulate require engaged and active governance by and among the programs. But it will also require intellectual direction from above. Whether the Vice Provost and Associate Vice Provost, in view of their existing portfolios and dispositions, are best positioned to undertake this leadership I cannot say. But at this key juncture it is not clear to me at least where this leadership will come from and whether there is a governance structure – an advisory board or some faculty leadership across programs – which can begin to lead a sustained conversation about the future and where international and global studies should go over the next decade.

**11. Growth:** it is someone paradoxical – as someone located in the UC system – that one of the “successes” of the IDS is its reduction in numbers. I quite understand that by the early and mid-2000s the program was confronting serious constraints and the question of rigor and quality demanded a radical rethink. On the other hand, IDS is now in a very different position. It is a high quality and rigorous IDP and the envy of many departments. At the same time all faculty and the Director are convinced that the 220-250 cap does not reflect the total demand; in other words the number of majors, based on student demand and interest, could clearly grow. Assuming that standards and reputation could be maintained (and there is no reason to think it could not), should the IDS grow? Naturally growth will need to be resourced because already administrative staff are at (more than) full capacity, and there are pressures on core classes given faculty resources. But one assumes that there might be other faculty hirings in development in the future and the possibility to grow out IDS’s core faculty; in this way in principle numbers could grow. This is not an argument that growth is always good – as the Director put it, the program is a jewel perhaps leave it alone – but this nevertheless poses the question: what do faculty want IDS to become in the future? With the prospect of new hires is the goal to grow it out? How and in what way? Could such growth be combined in some way with a (reorganized?) Global Studies? Even within the confines of the current budget, is there a plan to develop a Master’s program? And what might this entail in relation to expanding new interests such as global health or human rights? At the very least this

needs to be thought through and perhaps by constituting a committee to examine what is happening elsewhere on American campuses who are exploring ways to globalize the social sciences (<http://www.amu.apus.edu/lp2/school/security-and-global-studies/index.htm>, <https://sgs.stanford.edu/>, <http://www.cmu.edu/hss/globalstudies/>, <http://www.liberalstudies.nyu.edu/page/gls.about>) and the humanities (<https://globalstudies.trinity.duke.edu/>).

**12. Vision:** the central and compelling question for IDS is where does it wish to go; in what direction is the boat sailing? If it is a steady state, then the recommendation I have offered here are in large measure “tweaking” the program to iron out some constraints – some of which in any case are perhaps structure to inter-disciplinary programs. On the other hand demand for this program is high; inter-disciplinarity is the future; new and exciting initiatives on campus have a global thrust; and not least now is the moment to begin these conversations. This leads me to a final point. One of the strengths of the IDS and Institute programs is the availability of parts of FTE which can be offered to department hires with the payoff for IDS of a teaching commitment. The danger here is that without a vision of what the program needs in the medium and long term, IDS (or Global Studies) may opportunistically make the most of these opportunities on the grounds that the new hire “does development” rather than fit a plan of substantive hires around a longer term vision. It is a choice between getting new FTE commitments which might permit new courses and student growth against a more planned and systematic building of core faculty around substantive areas and needs and a clear and well articulated plan

## Conclusion

The IDS program has witnessed a remarkable turnaround. While there will always be tensions and constraints in inter-disciplinary programs which have neither the full time faculty nor the resources of a social science department, IDS is a powerful example of what can be achieved with a combination of leadership, creative administration, committed faculty and staff, and first class students. IDS is a success story. I have built my evaluation around the question of IDS 2.0: in other words, with these successes and with an acknowledgement that there are matters to be addressed, what will be the goals and purposes for the next decade? This is an opportune moment - both in relation to a changing world and the campus and International Institute in particular – for the UCLA community to entertain this question. My view is that such a project will demand strong and intellectually creative leadership and a wide ranging conversation which places IDS on the larger canvas of various international and global programs within and beyond the International Institute.

## **Appendix II: Site Visit Schedule**

**UCLA Academic Senate Program Review**  
**International Development Studies IDP**  
**UCLA International Institute**

---

**Site Visit Dates: January 12-13, 2017**

**Review Team Members:**

**Abby Kavner**, Review Team Chair, Undergraduate Council, Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences

**Yung-ya Lin**, Undergraduate Council, Chemistry and Biochemistry

**Michael Watts**, University of California, Berkeley, Geography

**Victoria Lawson**, University of Washington, Geography

*All meetings will be held in 11372 Bunche Hall (11h floor) unless otherwise indicated.*

**January 11 2017:**

7:00 p.m. Dinner meeting: Initial organizational session for review team members only (**Luskin Conference Center- Plateia**, 425 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095; 310-794-3563)

**January 12, 2017:**

8:00 Breakfast discussion with Program Chair **Michael Lofchie**

9:00 Meeting with Vice Provost **Cindy Fan** and Associate Vice Provost **Chris Erickson**

10:00 Meetings with members of Faculty Advisory Committee and core courses Instructors:  
**Akhil Gupta Anthropology, Eric Sheppard Geography.**

10:50 Meetings with members of Faculty Advisory Committee and core courses Instructors:  
**Nancy Levine Anthropology, Dan Posner Political Science.**

11:40 Lunch: review team members only [*at the FacultyCenter*]

1:00 Meetings with members of Faculty Advisory Committee and core courses Instructors: **Andrew Apter History, Timothy F. Brewer Medicine, Judith Carney Geography, Ed Keller Political Science, Sule Ozler Economics.**

2:00 Meeting with summer Lecturers: **Steve Commins Urban Planning, Vijitha Eyango.**

2:45 Meeting with representative **IDS undergraduate students.**

3:30 Meeting with **Alumni** (Riya Didwania '16, Sammar Smesme'15, Laura Van Voorhis '15)

4:00 Closed session for review team only

6:00 Dinner with external reviewers. (*Mike Lofchie will meet reviewers at **Napa Valley Grille** at 6pm, 1100 Glendon Ave #100, Los Angeles, CA 90024*)

**January 13, 2017:**

8:00 Breakfast (review team members only)

8:30 TENTATIVE: Skype meeting with Alumni Joan Hanawi'16

9:00 Meeting with Teaching Assistants: **Aubrey Blacker, Yanina Gori, Madina Thiam**

9:30 Meeting with Associate Director for Study Abroad, **Sergio Broderick-Villa**

- 10:00 Meetings with members of Faculty Advisory Committee  
**Ananya Roy** *Urban Planning-Social Welfare*, **David Rigby** *Geography*
- 10:50 Meeting with Chief Financial and Administrative Officer, **Ron Sugano**
- 11:15 Meeting with IDS Part time undergraduate advisor, **Erica Anjum**
- 11:40 Meeting with Director of Student Affairs, **Gaby Solomon-Dorian**
- 12:00 Meeting with IDS Program Counselor and Student Affairs Officer: **Sandy Valdivieso**
- 1:00 Lunch: review team members only [*at the Faculty Center*]
- 2:00 Closed session (review team members only)
- 3:00 Final review team meeting with Chair **Michael Lofchie**
- 4:00 EXIT MEETING (2121 Murphy Hall). The meeting includes Review Team Members, Program Chair **Michael Lofchie**, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost **Scott Waugh**, Vice Provost **Cindy Fan**, Associate Vice Provost **Chris Erickson**, Vice Provost for Graduate Education **Robin Garrell**, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education **Patricia Turner**, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion **Jerry Kang**, Undergraduate Council Chair **Ertugrul Taciroglu**, Graduate Council Chair **Jessica Cattelino**, FEC Rep **Dimitri Shlyaktenko**, CODEO Rep, and CPB Rep **Marco Iacoboni**

Program Staff Contact: **Sandy Valdivieso** (310-825-5187, [sandy@international.ucla.edu](mailto:sandy@international.ucla.edu))

Academic Senate Staff Contact: **Eric Wells** (310-825-1194; [ewells@senate.ucla.edu](mailto:ewells@senate.ucla.edu))

**Appendix III: Self-Review Report**

*(The self-review report was previously distributed.*

*If you need a hard copy, please contact the Academic Senate Office at extension 53851.)*