

## FINAL REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AT UCLA

29 May 2002

### I. THE COMMITTEE'S HISTORY AND MANDATE

Effective 1 July 2001, Geoffrey Garrett took office as Vice-Provost for International Studies, and as Professor of Political Science, at UCLA. Early last Fall, he appointed this Strategic Planning Committee and charged it to undertake a comprehensive review of ISOP's current structure and organization and to make whatever recommendations for improvement that it deemed advisable.<sup>1</sup> The Committee's purview explicitly included matters of budgeting, staffing, and relative importance of different program activities (e.g., conferences, faculty and graduate student support, visiting scholars, publications), and whether to merge or eliminate existing Centers or to create new ones. The Committee was specifically asked to focus first on: (a) the five largest Centers (in alphabetical order: African Studies, European and Russian Studies, International Relations, Latin American Studies, and Near Eastern Studies) and (b) the various Asian Centers.

Parallel to this Committee's deliberations and in close consultation with it, an Administrative Committee, headed by Sue Fan and including some of the most knowledgeable staff members in the College and in comparable units,<sup>2</sup> has focused on issues of budget and staffing. Their Report will appear separately, but that group has provided ongoing information and recommendations for this Committee as well.

### II. INTERNATIONAL STUDIES TODAY: INTERNATIONALLY, AND AT UCLA

We begin by articulating a vision for UCLA's international studies and programs. We attempt to set this vision within a framework that acknowledges the current nature of the world and of academic endeavors in the international arena. Additionally, we attempt to envision how UCLA's particular strengths can be best mobilized to rank it clearly among the world's best and most exciting venues for internationally-oriented work in higher education and research.

#### *The Nature of International Scholarship Today*

Over the last quarter-century, scholarly inquiry in all its principal domains — the natural and medical sciences, the humanities, engineering, the social sciences — has everywhere become more international, in three specific senses:

---

<sup>1</sup> The Committee's members are (in alphabetical order): Rogers Brubaker (Professor, Sociology), Sebastian Edwards (Professor, AGSM and Economics), Sue Fan (Chief Financial and Administrative Officer, ISOP), Gail Harrison (Professor and Chair, Community Health Sciences, School of Public Health), Efraín Kristal (Professor, Spanish and Portuguese, and Acting Chair, Comparative Literature), Françoise Lionnet (Professor and Chair, French and Francophone Studies), Ronald Rogowski (Professor and former Chair, Political Science), David Wilson (Associate Provost, College of Letters and Science), and Bin Wong (Chancellor's Professor, History, UC Irvine).

<sup>2</sup> Other members of the Administrative Committee are (also in alphabetical order): Madelyn De Maria (Assistant Director, Institute for Social Science Research), Debra Dralle (Director, Staff Human Resources, College of Letters and Science), Doris Dworschak (Manager, Department of History), Nick Hernandez (Director, Budget, Management, and Systems, College of Letters and Science), and Susan Sims (Assistant Director, Summer Sessions).

- Scholarship today is more internationally *collaborative*: the decline of political barriers to exchange<sup>3</sup> and the rise of fully competitive centers of scholarly work, and of generous sources of funding, in many lands has led to an explosion of cross-national interchange and collaboration (and, sometimes, of rivalries) in fields as diverse as astronomy, physics, molecular biology, medicine (think only of research on HIV/AIDS), economics, and the arts and literature. One simple gauge of this tendency is the growing tendency to award Nobel Prizes to cross-national teams of scientists.
- Academic consciousness is now more attentive to *non-U.S.* issues and approaches: important new thinking on issues such as poverty and famine, postcolonial politics and culture, and transmission and treatment of disease has arisen largely outside U.S. institutions and networks. Good scholarship today demands, more than probably ever before – and despite the widespread belief that English is becoming the universal language of science and scholarship – attention to international work in languages other than English.
- Perhaps most controversially, inquiry has also become far more *cross-national*, or indeed *supernational*, in its focus and its modes of inquiry. As examples, many scholars in the humanities no longer concentrate exclusively on what we have traditionally regarded as French or Spanish or Chinese literature; rather, for example, specialists in French literature increasingly extend their interest to other Francophone areas of the world by placing France within a broader context (including, e.g., questions of identity and language in the former French colonies, among immigrant populations in metropolitan France, and among regional minorities in Europe generally). In the social sciences, students of topics as diverse as democratization, economic transformation, organized crime, immigration, and ethnic conflict increasingly frame their inquiries in ways that cut across national and sometimes even larger regional boundaries, comparing (for example) trajectories of democratization in Eastern Europe and Latin America, or patterns of economic transformation in China and the former Soviet Union, or the activities of warlords in Bosnia, Afghanistan, and Somalia. In the field of public health, scholars are focusing on commonalities and common challenges as countries throughout the developing world undergo the “health transition,” driven by urbanization and demographic change, in which chronic noncommunicable diseases of adulthood emerge as costly epidemics even while earlier problems of poverty, infectious disease and malnutrition remain incompletely solved.

#### *The Recent Scholarly Re-conceptualization of International Studies*

Particularly (but, as we shall note, not only) in the social sciences and humanities, and most markedly in the 1990s, several factors forced a major rethinking of international studies. Those factors included (1) **intellectual trends** that had been gaining strength in the preceding decade, especially the increasing concern with globalization, diasporas, and transnational phenomena and the complementary sense that nation-states were weakening as “containers” of social life; (2) **changes in the organization of intellectual production**, including the growing internationalization of research and the rise of interdisciplinary but area-independent programs of internationally-oriented research (including cultural studies, ethnic and migration studies, gender and women’s studies, political economy, environmental studies, development studies); and (3) the **reconfiguration of the international political landscape** with the end of the Cold War. In response to these and other developments, “area studies” models of internationally-oriented scholarship – already on the defensive in the 1980s – were widely criticized as parochial, particularistic, merely descriptive, and even quasi-colonial (involving “us” studying “them”).

---

<sup>3</sup> The somewhat Draconian new restrictions that the U.S. government has placed on foreign scholars and graduate students in the wake of the attacks of 11 September 2001 threaten, at least in some disciplines and areas of research – a notable example already being the space sciences – to make the U.S. a far less attractive venue for international collaboration.

As but one important example, several major foundations have reconfigured their programs in accord with these trends. The Ford Foundation launched a \$25 million initiative in 1997 to "revitalize" area studies, preserving a concern "to ensure that knowledge and understanding of particular places are grounded in serious study of culture, language, and history," while fostering a "more truly international area studies" and encouraging new ways of conceptualizing the spatial organization of social life (in terms, for example, of the interplay between local and global processes) and new understandings of appropriate areal units (e.g., the Pacific Rim, the Mediterranean basin, and the "Black Atlantic"). The Social Science Research Council, recognizing the increasing internationalization of scholarship and the growing critiques of traditional area studies models, reorganized its international programs. The Mellon Foundation supported a program of "transregional" studies, the MacArthur Foundation a program on "Global Security and Sustainability."<sup>4</sup> Even the more conservative U.S. Department of Education, whose Title VI grants have been an important source of support for ISOP's constituent Centers, particularly in the area of language study, adopted in the late 1990s a somewhat more welcoming stance toward initiatives that transcend traditional regional boundaries.<sup>5</sup>

The natural, physical and biomedical sciences at UCLA, already heavily international in their constituencies and often (most notably in the fields of health and environment) in their substance and context, have also come to emphasize cross-national collaboration and research foci even more strongly. And the major funding sources for the "hard" sciences, notably the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Science Foundation, no less than those for the "soft" sciences and humanities, have increasingly emphasized, and have supported in their funding decisions, a global perspective and context; so have significant parts of other "hard" science funding sources, e.g., industry and bi- or multilateral agencies.

#### *Our View of Area Studies in the Changed Environment*

This Committee has debated long and hard, formally and informally, the proper role of area-specific research and training in the changed scholarly environment. It has by no means done so alone, but with extensive soundings – including surveys, interviews, and long conversations with relevant Department Chairs and Deans – among our colleagues. (We have endeavored to draw into the conversation not only those already centrally involved in existing area Centers, but also leading scholars in international studies who, for whatever reason, have been only peripherally involved in such Centers.) We have arrived at – or, perhaps, discovered – a surprisingly broad area of agreement.

Are place-specific research and training irrelevant in the radically new intellectual and institutional context? Not at all – provided that "place-specific" is not limited to a single country or a culture, conceived as a homogenous unit utterly incommensurable with other such homogeneous units. Cultures and nations probably never were homogeneous; certainly they no longer are. They were never incommensurable or hermetically sealed; now, they are more similar and mutually interpenetrating. Important variations and differences must be explored even within small areas, while major connections and commonalities span far larger units. The relevant places or milieux need not be nation-states or even particular cultures; just as languages and cultures increasingly cross traditional state boundaries and intermingle, so too do the relevant sites for place-specific research. Under these conditions, place-specific research may require innovative

---

<sup>4</sup> Other foundations, to be sure, remain committed to regionally oriented funding. An overview of the current situation may be gleaned from the capsule descriptions of internationally-oriented philanthropy compiled by the Philanthropy News Digest: <http://fdncenter.org/pnd/20010327/20010327.html>.

<sup>5</sup> All of these tendencies have been intensified by reaction to the events of 11 September 2001. In particular, the Department of Education has markedly increased funding, including making individual stipends more generous, for foreign languages. By one estimate, UCLA's total funding from FLAS (Foreign Language Area Studies) fellowships will increase 72 per cent next year.

research tools. An increasingly important, and hitherto largely neglected, task must be to provide training in new, or newly relevant, cultural knowledge and research tools (emergent slangs and dialects, new visual vocabularies or archival or statistical techniques) that permit work of the necessary depth.

Thematically- or problem-oriented research that "cross-cuts" traditional regional boundaries is crucial; but international research on specific themes or problems often – several of us would say, almost always – requires rich knowledge of particular places, milieux, or contexts. One cannot effectively study the burgeoning richness of Spanish-language literature today without knowing an array of regions, histories, and dialects; nor can one convincingly compare the post-authoritarian transitions in Eastern Europe and Latin America without serious knowledge of the histories, institutions, and languages of those areas. "Cross-cutting" research divorced from place-specific knowledge easily degrades into vapid pontification on fashionable topics. Over the longer run, it can produce researchers devoid of linguistic tools and contextual knowledge.

Precisely the various processes summed up in the notion of "globalization" make it more urgent than ever to assure serious training in specific – though not necessarily nationally bounded, and certainly not isolated – languages, culture, milieux, or contexts. Consider, for example, the September 11th attacks and their aftermath. Militant Islam and terrorism (including particularly the potential of large-scale bioterrorism) are paradigmatically cross-regional problems; yet they are grounded in particular places, contexts, and configurations. They highlight the importance of porous borders, transregional processes, and global flows – of ideas, ideologies, images, people, money, goods, weapons, and diseases. Yet at the same time, they dramatize the need for, and the high cost of neglecting, rich contextual knowledge, grounded in language and area training, of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and other predominantly Muslim societies; and also of diasporic communities and cultural melds in such areas as Hamburg and London. The same could be (and has been) said of less immediate but equally pressing problems: post-Soviet economies, state-building in Africa and parts of Asia, HIV/AIDS virtually throughout the world. To meet the challenges of the twenty-first century, international studies, at UCLA and elsewhere, must be structured so as to foster **both** place-specific and problem-oriented training and research.

These conclusions apply equally to large and increasingly important domains of the medical and natural sciences. Research on vectors of disease transmission, and on public health generally, increasingly requires a close knowledge of cultures and considerable facility in local languages. International collaborations, even in the "hardest" sciences – think of experimental physics and the CERN<sup>6</sup> facility – are greatly facilitated by, and in some cases impossible without, some sensitivity to other cultures and to the political realities of funding in other countries and regions. Experiments involving human subjects, whether in medicine, psychology, anthropology, or experimental economics, require even greater cultural sensitivity and interpretation.

#### *Structural Support for International Studies at UCLA: Some Basic Principles*

In considering how support for International Studies should be structured at UCLA, we proceed from two principles: **appropriate centralization** and **highest marginal benefit**.

Appropriate centralization. Each activity should be focused, we think self-evidently, on the level that best facilitates it. While some may hold that international activities are always best conducted by individual scholars or Departments, we take it as obvious – and the vast majority of colleagues surveyed agreed – that *some* activities will require, or will at a minimum benefit strongly from, support at the College- or campus-wide level. Particularly in the globalizing world

---

<sup>6</sup> Centre Européen pour la Recherche Nucléaire: see <http://public.web.cern.ch/Public/Welcome.html>.

we have already described, there is unmistakably a role for something like ISOP and its constituent Centers.

Highest marginal benefit. Among the activities that can benefit from centralized support, ISOP should prioritize according to the simple principle of "biggest bang for the buck," i.e. attending first to those activities that yield greatest scholarly, reputational, and instructional benefit for the given cost.

Taken together, these principles delineate a range of activities rather different – in our judgment, at least – from the one that ISOP currently supports. At one extreme might come international activities that require no centralized support and would benefit little if at all even from extensive ISOP support, e.g., a collaborative effort by an Israeli and a UCLA theoretical physicist that could be conducted entirely by telephone and e-mail. At the other extreme would stand research that fits only partially within existing regional-studies centers and that, with modest centralized support from ISOP, would yield enormous benefit, e.g., work on such "cutting edge" questions as (to name only a few examples chosen at random) the global cultural and political influence of Spanish- or Arabic-language film or television, the importance of political and legal reform in the development of market economies, or the link between transportation systems and disease transmission.

While we offer more detailed recommendations below, we note here two illustrative examples. On the one hand, ISOP could (and, in our view, should) give high priority to a national program of post-doctoral fellowships in international studies, akin to what the Hoover Institution, Harvard University, Princeton University, or the University of Michigan now do in a variety of fields. The cost would be modest, the benefit – in terms of visibility, contact with best current research, and instruction – enormous.

On the other hand, ISOP should *not* remain what, in the eyes of many Department chairs and Deans, it has evidently become, simply a "cash cow" that supports routine activities (including the provision of faculty FTE) for which the College or the Chancellor should normally bear responsibility. Such activities are enormously costly, and – particularly after the rather quick dissipation of their initial impact – return little marginal benefit.

One further implication of these principles also deserves mention even at this initial stage. While the traditional area-studies emphases of ISOP's constituent centers remain important, for reasons we have already elaborated, it is crucial in the light of today's rapidly changing global and scholarly environment that a greater share of ISOP's resources be available to support the kind of supra-regional, cross-cutting research that is at the forefront of much current work. Again, we propose to state our recommendations on this point in greater detail below.

### III. SPECIFIC ISSUES

From the Committee's own knowledge of the situation, from its earliest survey of documentation, and from its opening conversations with the Vice-Provost and with Deans and Chairs of affected units (see below), several issues of pressing concern came at once to the fore and shaped our agenda of deliberations. We shall address most, if not all, in our various recommendations.

#### (1) *Appropriate allocation of authority between ISOP and its constituent Centers.*

From its inception until last year, ISOP had been a weak confederation of existing Centers. ISOP had limited budgetary authority and played, in practice if not in theory, a limited role in the selection and re-appointment of Center Directors. In a reorganization that attended ISOP's move into the College and the appointment of Professor Garrett, major budgetary and personnel authority has been vested in the Vice-Provost, enabling him to make whatever

changes may seem appropriate. Yet the issue of appropriate and efficient allocation of day-to-day authority, the question of what powers and functions the central ISOP office should routinely exercise and what should be housed in the Centers, remains very much to be decided.

(2) *Regional vs. thematic centers, long- vs. short-term programs.*

Given the intellectual revolution in international studies that we described at the outset, does there remain a privileged place for area studies centers? Can a stronger case be made for “thematic” centers? Or, in a rapidly changing world, should research be altogether less “Center”-centric? An alternative model might be short-term but well-funded research “programs,” in which something like three to five years of seed money would be allocated for interdisciplinary research on a topic of lively current, but uncertain long-term, scholarly interest: examples might include the post-Communist and post-authoritarian transitions, the rise of radical Islamic fundamentalism, or the political and public-health implications of HIV/AIDS. At a minimum, it can no longer be taken as axiomatic that UCLA receives maximum research return from a structure based almost entirely on traditional area studies, or indeed on Centers as they have been traditionally configured.

(3) *Duplication, overlap, and “underlap” of existing Centers.*

In at least some areas, the existing Centers within ISOP betray a mostly accidental pattern of growth, informed perhaps more by efforts to recruit and retain leading faculty, or to court external donors, than by any rational plan of organization. In the Asian area alone, we find Centers for China, Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia (yet, curiously, none for South Asia); but also a Center for East Asian Studies (whose *raison d’être* is to serve chiefly as a vehicle for Title VI funding by the U.S. Department of Education); thematic Centers for Buddhist Studies and for Comparative and Interdisciplinary Research on Asia; and, nominally topping the whole edifice, an Asia-Pacific Institute which is somehow to have overarching authority over the whole lot but currently has neither a Director nor a significant budget.

The Center for Buddhist Studies is not paralleled by a Center for Islamic Studies,<sup>7</sup> and it appears that the only significant ISOP-funded work on Islam remains within the Near Eastern Center (suggesting, at least by structure, that Islam is not also of crucial importance in Asia, much of Africa, and increasingly Europe and North America).

We mention these oddities and omissions of organization, not to say that the remedy for them is obvious — it is not, at least to us — but to force serious contemplation and discussion of manifestly important issues. Does the existing structure of Centers, even conceived in “territorial” terms, still make sense? What alternatives might better further research on international studies at UCLA? We offer our tentative answers to these questions below.

(4) *Priorities among various kinds of activities.*

ISOP, and even more its constituent Centers, supports a broad panoply of scholarly activities and research funding: monographs and journals, conferences, lecture series, colloquia; websites, collation of statistics, short-term research groups; direct support of faculty (travel, RA funds, limited summer support), graduate students, and some post-doctoral scholars and visiting fellows; outreach to the broader public; and grant-writing and donor cultivation, currently centered in most instances on pursuit of Title VI funding from the Department of Education.

---

<sup>7</sup>There is a joint degree program at the graduate level in Islamic Studies, headed in recent years in “personal union” by the Director of the Von Grunbaum Center for Near Eastern Studies but with a much broader advisory committee. Still, according to recent external reviewers, even this modest effort has a tenuous hold on life.

If one asks why a given Center has a particular “mix” of these activities, the real answer turns out, more often than not, to be simple inertia: we do this because we have always done it. But circumstances change, and in our view marginal benefits and costs of activities — including, of course, their opportunity costs — need regularly, perhaps even annually, to be re-evaluated. Has a monograph series, perhaps once quite prestigious, become merely a “vanity” vehicle, publishing works for no better reason than that no respectable university press would take them? Have brilliant opportunities to attract first-rate journals been overlooked or rebuffed? Could working papers or statistical resources, still appearing in hard copy (and sometimes in large quantity), be moved more economically and with greater impact and ease of use onto the Web?

Complicating any evaluation of the real and opportunity costs of various activities has been an opaque and unrealistic system of accounting, in which (at least in the great majority of instances) both office space and staff time are somehow treated as free goods. The seemingly simple question of how much a given conference, seminar, or publication costs turns out to be almost impossible to answer, because (a) the traditional accounting system counts only categories of outlays — so much for equipment, for student support, for travel, and so on — not their purpose; and (b) no records have been kept of the staff time, or the office space, devoted to such activities. Reforms that will permit realistic accounting are now underway, and are discussed more fully below.

That said, various issues need also to be raised in connection with some of the main types of Center activities. Publications (print and electronic) have already been touched upon; among the others are:

- a. Grant-writing: how to improve the technical quality, and to make less onerous to faculty, the process of writing Title VI grant proposals; how best to facilitate (whether under ISOP or other entities) individual grant-writing (and awareness of grant opportunities) among affiliated faculty.
- b. Grants in support of faculty research. A considerable part of many Centers’ budgets goes to individual faculty for travel, research assistance, and on occasion summer support. Often such resources are made available by a Center as part of recruitment or retention efforts. How transparent, open, and equitable are the procedures by which such subventions are decided? Is it more effective to give a few large grants or to award many small ones? What are the opportunity costs of faculty support in terms of forgone post-doctoral or graduate student support?
- c. Permanent and visiting FTE. Traditionally ISOP’s strongest — indeed, almost its sole — resource and bargaining chip was its trove of faculty positions, or FTE, usually conceived as permanent, i.e. to be awarded eventually for a “ladder” faculty position, with — no small consideration — the Chancellor responsible for any resultant “upgrade” moneys required for a senior appointment.<sup>8</sup> During the interregnum of Acting Vice-Provost Phillip Trimble, no permanent allocations were made; all FTE were used for visiting positions. Taking the present opportunity to think afresh, what are the actual benefits and costs of using these FTE for “hard,” or permanent appointments, vs. deploying them to support on ongoing stream of visiting faculty, graduate students, or (see immediately below) post-doctoral scholars?

---

<sup>8</sup>ISOP controls a total of twenty such FTE, the majority of which are currently filled at the tenured level. By most reckonings, roughly seven of the twenty (the figure varies with actual or impending retirements, resignations, and even externally funded leaves) are currently open and available for use for ladder or visiting appointments.

- d. Post-doctoral positions. High on the wish list of many Center Directors, but with rare exceptions viewed as too expensive to implement, is the possibility of having a nationally competitive program of post-doctoral research appointments. What are the real costs and benefits of instituting such an obviously desirable program, and how might it be implemented?
- e. Graduate student support. Some Centers (most notably Chinese Studies) devote a very large part of their outlays to support of graduate students, others very little. Support comes in a mix of fellowships, research assistantships, and even work-study and clerical jobs (some of the latter masquerading as research assistantships, usually in the Centers that are most staff-deprived). Some such funding is used, just as in efforts at faculty recruitment, to “top up” and make more attractive Departmental offers to particularly promising new graduate students. Where FLAS fellowships are available (and given particularly their newly augmented stipends), more generous support is possible, in many cases extending a graduate student's residence by a full year to permit intensive language instruction. Again, however, inertia seems to dominate: old patterns, whether of high or low support, simply persist. If we think anew, what are the appropriate levels and forms of graduate student support (which may, of course, vary among Centers and between Centers and ISOP)? Where FLAS funds are available, can more innovative use be made of them?
- f. Teaching. A crucial part of the mission of any Center that receives Title VI funding, and indeed of many that do not, is furtherance of graduate and undergraduate teaching, by such various means as support for visiting faculty, for language instruction, and for particular course or seminar offerings. Many Centers have an affiliated Interdisciplinary Degree Program (IDP) at the undergraduate level; some have also an interdepartmental Joint Degree Program (JDP) at the M.A. or Ph.D. level. In the current circumstances, a new issue has achieved prominence, on which we offer specific recommendations below: whether to seek establishment of an undergraduate major in International Studies.

More generally, we have concluded that a thorough and probing review of each of the existing IDPs and JDPs is required, but would be well beyond the resources and the deadlines of this Committee. We raise particular questions about the form, purpose, and survivability of the graduate Joint Degree Programs: is there a market for their graduates, do the Programs cohere intellectually, and do they attract as good students as do the normal academic Departments?

- g. Outreach. Again, an important part of each Center's mission, particularly so when Title VI funds are involved, is outreach to the larger community: the transmission of scholarly knowledge, in appropriately accessible form, to the interested public and to the mass media. At present, ISOP and its centers engage in outreach and service activities in three main ways: (a) intensive summer workshops and special topic seminars for K-12 teachers; (b) community education programs (chiefly public lectures and language/cultural consultation for media and service agencies; and (c) international and inter-campus agreements and consortia. Coordination of centers' outreach endeavors is nominal, except that ISOP designates a .25 FTE staff position to support the summer K-12 institute.

Obviously outreach efforts are an essential part of Title VI funding, and they can also be important in attracting and cultivating potential donors. But outreach efforts and effectiveness have varied considerably among the various Centers. What is the appropriate mix, and how can outreach be made most cost-effective? Could more be achieved by greater co-ordination of at least some outreach activities? We offer some specific recommendations below.

*(5) Role of South Campus and of professional schools.*

While the traditional ISOP held a campus-wide mandate and reported only to the central campus administration, in fact its activities centered almost exclusively on the North Campus. Extensive and important international activities in the natural and medical sciences, and in engineering, proceeded in relative ignorance of ISOP's existence; it also appears that neither ISOP nor its constituent Centers made significant efforts to encourage international work or collaboration that would have bridged the "hard" sciences with humanities and the "soft" sciences.<sup>9</sup>

At the same time, the "old" ISOP did strongly involve many of the North Campus professional schools — AGSM, Education and Information Sciences, Law, Public Policy, and others. We have become keenly aware that ISOP's move into the College of Letters and Sciences raises fears in those quarters that ISOP will now involve only people in the College and eschew any broader mandate.

What role should the future structure of International Studies at UCLA assign to the professional schools, and what measures should be taken to guarantee their fruitful and collegial participation?

*(6) Procedures for review, and possible termination, of Centers.*

While most Centers are subject to normal five-year internal and external review, others have been much less frequently reviewed (sometimes only every fifteen years); one, as best we could ascertain, has never been reviewed since its inception, an interval of more than three decades. Even where reasonable frequency of reviews has been maintained, the process has too often seemed subject to manipulation or error: the external reviewers, the faculty and graduate students whom they query, the time that they devote to various activities, can be (and sometimes demonstrably have been) dictated by the Center Directors themselves, with the predictable result of a uniformly laudatory review that glosses over even the most manifest problems and ignores the views of dissenting faculty. The option of terminating an underperforming Center, or even of displacing an underperforming Director, has only rarely been seriously canvassed.<sup>10</sup> It seems to us self-evident that comprehensive reviews should be performed every five years, that ironclad procedures should guarantee the independence, inclusiveness, and objectivity of the entire review process; and that the question of whether to continue the Center's existence, and if so whether a change of Director might be advisable, should always be expressly raised and seriously considered. We advance more detailed recommendations below.

*(7) Allocation of space among existing Centers*

Even as their creation and growth appear to have been largely conjunctural, so the assignment of space among the existing Centers, or between them and ISOP's central administration, seems to reflect history and accident more than rational evaluation. In the narrow and often inhospitable confines of Bunche Hall, all Centers perceive a shortage of space, or certainly a desire for more; some chafe at concessions imposed on them to meet the needs of new Centers. But what in our view has been lacking is a rational and concentrated effort to allocate space in the most efficient and productive way, let alone any mechanism to

---

<sup>9</sup>Among the simplest examples might be work on: (a) strategic studies, including antiballistic missile defense and nuclear proliferation, that would involve scholars from the social sciences, engineering, and computer science; (b) public health, with collaboration between social scientists, specialists in public health, and medical researchers; or (c) on the historical and present-day effects of changes in communications technologies, with input from historians, library and information science, and (especially for the present day) computer scientists.

<sup>10</sup>We are aware of only one case in the past fifteen years in which an external review has culminated in such a recommendation.

re-evaluate assignment of space periodically. The Administrative Committee has begun such an effort and will report on those issues separately.

#### IV. THE COMMITTEE'S SOURCES OF INFORMATION

##### A. *Narrative and budgetary reports*

The Committee reviewed the standard **brochures and informational reports** from the units it was mandated first to review: the Centers for African, for European and Russian, for Latin American, and for Near Eastern Studies; the Burkle Center for International Relations; and the various Asian-oriented centers. It also requested, and promptly received, "**executive summaries**" of recent activities and issues, from the Directors of each of those same Centers.

Working through the Administrative Committee, it went on to examine available **financial reports** for the most recent fiscal year (2000-2001), looking specifically at

- i. Appropriation, expenditure and end-of-year balance for all ISOP units;
- ii. Analysis by seven activity categories for each of the units already mentioned, as well as ISOP central administration;
- iii. Sample detailed expense reports, for each of the five largest Centers, on events, publications, and payments to faculty and students.

Finally, the Committee reviewed – in its later sessions, jointly with the Administrative Committee – *personnel reports* of two main kinds:

- (a) outlays for salary (to faculty, staff and students) for each of the Centers; and
- (b) a staff analysis by types of activities and task categories within each Center.

The attempt to analyze and compare financial statements revealed a troubling lack of uniformity, and hence of transparency, in the accounting formats employed. (One major Center, which pointed with pride to its extensive array of publications, showed no expenditure whatsoever for publications in its reported annual budget!) The generally inconsistent and non-comparable accounting techniques, we believe, result from no evil intent but rather from excessive decentralization, widespread non-communication between the various Centers, and – to no small extent – from varying skill levels of center staff in preparing and interpreting financial data. These deficiencies, taken together, resulted in much further delay, since virtually all budgetary information that was submitted required verification and adjustment by central ISOP administration. As we note more explicitly below, our experience points to the pressing need to institute an annual reporting schedule, together with a uniform divisional standard for financial record maintenance and reporting, for all ISOP units.

##### B. *External reviews of major centers*

The Committee also examined the most recent external reviews of the major Centers. It was startled to learn that only the Organized Research Units (ORUs: among the group studied most intensively here, the Centers for African, European, Latin American, and Near Eastern Studies) are even required to undergo regular review. The usefulness of the reviews

that were available was mixed, in part because some – notably those of African Studies [1997], Latin American Studies [1997], and Chinese Studies<sup>11</sup> [1996]) were rather dated.

In part, however, our consideration of the external reviews revealed flaws in the review process; we make recommendations later in this report about ways in which that process might be improved to ensure fair, open, and thorough reviews.

### C. *Views of International Studies faculty*

#### 1. *Individual interviews*

The Committee identified a long list of International Studies faculty across the campus, making sure that some were included who, despite considerable scholarly stature, had been only peripherally involved (if at all) in ISOP. One of our committee members, Associate Provost David Wilson, who had considerable experience in focused interviews, spoke with thirty-seven such colleagues, spending about an hour in the office of each of them. About two-thirds of those interviewed were from ten different Departments in the College of Letters and Science; the remaining one-third were from five different professional schools.

Without going into unnecessary detail, we note that one structural change was supported almost unanimously in these interviews: that the central leadership of ISOP should control more resources and exercise more initiative, particularly in promoting projects that cut across existing Center lines and boundaries. Several colleagues also argued that the structure of the various Asian centers should be rationalized and that the umbrella Asian studies institute should be made more substantial. Very few, however, believed that more dramatic structural change was necessary. About one in ten respondents contended that the area studies structure should be abandoned, and others were agnostic on the subject; but the vast majority of the interviewees believed that with proper leadership—which could ensure, for example, that gaps were filled and that cooperation occurred—the existing area-oriented structure was a good one.

#### 2. *Internet survey of a broader sample of International Studies faculty*

Working from an existing lists of faculty who had been involved in some aspect of ISOP activities, we invited over 650 UCLA colleagues to complete a brief internet survey regarding international studies at UCLA.

The survey asked the respondent to identify the research center that had proved most helpful, then asked a few descriptive and evaluative questions. The descriptive questions had to do with which kinds of help had been provided by ISOP centers and what funding sources the respondent most relied upon. The evaluative questions had to do with how the ISOP centers might have been more helpful, what central functions might be added or enhanced in ISOP, and whether the respondent had open-ended remarks on the state of international studies at UCLA.

A total of 66 colleagues – almost exactly ten per cent – responded to the survey; and the Committee found almost all of the responses informative and helpful. Many contained concrete and thoughtful suggestions that have contributed significantly to the Committee's deliberations.

### D. *Interviews with relevant Chairs and Deans.*

---

<sup>11</sup> Over the last decade, Chinese Studies was the only non-ORU in our set to have undergone external review.

The Committee conducted extensive interviews with Deans and Chairs of Schools and Departments that, by virtue of permanent or visiting FTE, or ongoing budgetary allocations, appeared to be heavily impacted by ISOP or one or more of its Centers. Usually in groups, and over a period of several weeks, it interviewed the Deans or Acting Deans of (in alphabetical order) AGSM, Arts and Architecture, Education and Information Studies, Law, Public Health, and Theater, Film, and Television; and the Chairs or Acting Chairs of (also in alphabetical order) Anthropology, East Asian Languages and Cultures, Ethnomusicology, Geography, Linguistics, Political Science, Slavic Languages and Literature, Sociology, Spanish and Portuguese, and World Arts and Cultures.<sup>12</sup> Interviews were attempted with a few other relevant Chairs and Deans but eventually fell victim to scheduling difficulties.

*E. Interviews with Center Directors*

The Committee interviewed the Directors of each of the major Centers – African Studies, the Burkle Center for International Relations, European and Russian Studies, Latin American Studies, and Near Eastern Studies – individually, to complement what we could learn from written materials on each Center. It also conducted group interviews with the Directors of the various Asian Studies Centers.

*F. Lessons of particularly successful centers, at UCLA and elsewhere*

The Committee also briefly examined a number of what are widely regarded as the most successful research centers, both at UCLA and nationally, with a view to ascertaining "best practices." Obviously, the Committee believes that ISOP centers could profit from looking, more than they now appear to do, at how those centers operate, what their strengths are, and how they benefit a wide range of faculty.

The main lessons of these highly successful centers may seem obvious but, in our view, bear re-stating.

- a) All are headed by renowned scholars, with a proven record of administrative ability and a clear vision of the kind of research they want to foster.
- b) All are supported by a highly competent and well-organized staff, who assist not just the directors but a broad range of affiliated faculty with grant writing, budgets, and budget narratives.
- c) All involve a very broad and interdisciplinary set of scholars, including ones not traditionally associated with the center's particular focus.
- d) All actively seek new research agendas and new collaborators across a variety of approaches and disciplines, working particularly to involve younger scholars. Many run highly successful and internationally competitive postdoctoral programs.
- e) All are highly inventive and experimental in their programs, including such activities as
  - inviting guest scholars for short periods of time, to participate concentratedly in a seminar series or to give a series of public lectures;
  - sponsoring collaborative research projects, particularly on pioneering new topics or approaches (these often include some support for fieldwork and involve both graduate students and faculty);

---

<sup>12</sup> We note that our Committee also included among its members the Chairs, Acting Chairs, or immediate past Chairs of Community Health Sciences, Comparative Literature, French and Francophone Studies, and Political Science.

- seeking out new sources of funding, both inside the institution and from foundations; and
- conducting an extremely active program of high-visibility colloquia, drawing both on resident faculty and on distinguished visitors.

f) All seek international visibility, by means ranging from brochures and e-mail postings, to the hosting of international congresses of relevant scholarly associations, to establishing field offices in their regions of interest.

g) Many, including particularly the most energetic and ambitious, host the editorship of major journals in their fields.

## V. WHAT THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Drawing upon all of these sources of information, and more, and on the vision of International Studies at UCLA articulated earlier, the Committee has attempted to formulate specific recommendations, on the issues raised earlier, for the future organization of International Studies at UCLA.

### A. *Centralizing ISOP*

The Committee is unanimous, as were most faculty we interviewed, in recommending that International Studies<sup>13</sup> at UCLA be more centralized. The existing highly decentralized structure has, in our view, long since proved suboptimal. Specifically, we recommend the following measures:

#### 1. Role of the Vice-Provost

The Vice-Provost appoints (and may remove) Center Directors and sets that portion of Center budgets that comes from the University. In order for him to meet these duties and to fulfill his responsibility to coordinate and guide the overall direction of International Studies at UCLA, the Committee recommends that the Vice-Provost create a more coherent structure that recognizes past achievements and plans for future excellence in an open and flexible manner. The basic area-studies orientation should in our view be retained; but rationalization and consolidation of Centers, particularly in the Asian field (on which we say more below), may well serve that orientation better than does the existing structure.

The scales, organization, and activities of ISOP's constituent Centers vary dramatically. Some of these differences appear to us excessive: as one leading instance, the responsibilities and compensation of Directors and Associate Directors, and the levels of staffing, vary more across Centers than circumstances appear to warrant. We recommend, independent of any restructuring, a comprehensive review, with a view to making compensation commensurate with responsibility, and staffing – both in numbers and in quality – commensurate with need.

To ensure future excellence, the Vice-Provost's office should assume direct responsibility for those activities that benefit all centers or that develop economies of scale or specialization, including notably grant-writing (see below). In addition that office should be able to support international studies efforts that do not readily fit under any existing Center

---

<sup>13</sup> Parenthetically we recommend, deferring to the obvious, that the name "ISOP" be abandoned and replaced with the simpler "International Studies" – or, even more succinctly, "UCLA International." Virtually all of the "Overseas Programs" that were once part of ISOP's brief have been moved to other jurisdictions, and the longer title leads only to misapprehensions of the unit's actual role.

but meet the interests and needs of faculty; to this end the Vice-Provost should have the power to promote activities cutting across and connecting the areas covered by existing centers through colloquia, programs and working groups. The Vice-Provost should be guided in these efforts through increased communication with faculty, including those who are already active within existing Centers as well as those who, while active and prominent in international studies, have previously been un- or underinvolved. To remain open and flexible, the Vice-Provost should, in the Committee's view, have the power to invest in initiatives (again, discussed more fully below) that are explicitly limited in their duration, or whose continuation will be re-evaluated after an initial phase of funding. In brief, the powers of the Vice-Provost should be commensurate with the responsibility required for shaping the basic dimensions and directions of international studies at UCLA.

## 2. Broader, more candid, and more effective reviews of existing Centers

Most specifically and urgently, we recommend (a) that the Vice-Provost, in consultation with the Advisory Committee (see below), play an active role in ensuring candid and unbiased external reviews of existing Centers; and (b) that **all** Centers under the Vice-Provost's authority be subject to such reviews at least every five years.

As we noted earlier, currently there are no provisions to assure regular external review of non-ORU Centers. We regard that situation as entirely inappropriate, from the standpoints both of UCLA's quest for excellence and of safeguarding the best use of what is, after all, in large part the money of the people of California.

We by no means propose an adversarial review process, but stricter guidelines and procedures are required to ensure a more objective assessment of a Center's, and a Director's, performance. At the bare minimum the review committee should consist exclusively of prominent scholars, with no vested interest in the process, from a variety of appropriate disciplines; and it should interview a representative pool of faculty working in the given Center's area of responsibility, including ones not closely involved in the Center's activities.

## 3. A small, independent, and effective Advisory Committee

Particularly in light of the Vice-Provost's augmented authority, the Committee sees increased need for a wise, independent, and intellectually diverse International Studies Advisory Committee, whose counsel should be sought on any major new initiative or program, and – as indicated earlier – on reviews of existing Centers.<sup>14</sup> We envision a group of not more than seven members (joined normally by the Vice-Provost *ex officio*), appointed for two-year overlapping terms by the Provost on the advice of the Vice-Provost, meeting at least quarterly, and consisting exclusively of internationally recognized scholars in International Studies. At least one member, but probably not more than two, should always be from outside UCLA. To guarantee its independence, the committee should include no existing or recent heads of centers and programs, nor any faculty heavily invested in an existing program. Normally members should commit not to seek funding from International Studies, nor from any of its associated Centers, and not to accept any remunerated position under the authority of the Vice-Provost, during their term of service on the Advisory Committee and for one year subsequently. In any event, the strictest norms of recusal should be observed, so that at all times even the appearance of a conflict of interest is avoided. Ideally, the Committee should consist of colleagues who can encourage existing centers and programs while identifying new directions in which UCLA can pursue International Studies.

---

<sup>14</sup> We emphasize that we do not advocate that the Vice-Provost be bound by this group's advice – for the responsibility is ultimately his – only that he consult it. In our view a good Advisory Committee should have the same three rights that the perceptive Walter Bagehot (*The English Constitution*, 1867, chap. 2) assigned to a constitutional monarch: "the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, and the right to warn."

#### 4. Achieving economies of specialization and of scale.

While we anticipate that some of the foregoing recommendations may excite controversy, the Administrative Committee's research, and our own, indicates virtually no opposition – indeed, considerable support at all levels – for substantial centralization of many staff functions that are now distributed, and not infrequently duplicated, throughout ISOP's constituent Centers.

In the existing system of staffing, typically within each Center a staff of from one to three FTE performs a full-range of administrative duties, from budget management and accounting, through conference and event organization, visitor support, and community outreach, to grant-writing and publications. (The only functions currently centralized in ISOP are personnel/payroll and some aspects of computing services.) Most of these staff are hired for, and excel in, knowledge of the relevant cultures and languages across a variety of academic disciplines. Yet these highly trained professionals often devote the majority of their time to tasks for which they are *not* trained, and which often represent a waste of their valuable skills: in some extreme cases, extremely erudite and perceptive staffers find themselves devoting considerable hours each week to posting flyers for upcoming events on bulletin boards and in elevators. At a minimum, ISOP's extremely decentralized and duplicative structure requires these culturally and academically skilled employees to perform tasks such as finance and accounting, grant-writing and administration, graphic design for publicity materials, or database and website creation and management.

Such an arrangement, in our judgment, poorly serves both valued employees and ISOP's (and its Centers') overall mission. As we have seen with particular force in the area of budgeting and accounting (see above), practices across ISOP's twenty-six units are frequently sub-par and nowhere uniform enough to permit effective comparison and oversight. Existing staff are often equally unhappy, feeling forced to handle accounting tasks for which they simply are not prepared professionally.

We clearly agree with what appears to be almost uniform staff sentiment in recommending that such routine functions as payroll, grant administration, accounting, website development and maintenance, database administration, and graphic design be centralized, either at the level of the Vice-Provost's office or among "clusters" of existing units.<sup>15</sup> We also advocate centralization of the business side of all publication projects. While Centers can best manage the content and maintain editorial control, certain common tasks including accounting, marketing and distribution, contract administration, and web-based publishing technology could be consolidated to the benefit of all publication projects. To the extent that publications are contracted out to journals or presses, as is suggested below in a more detailed section on publications, the Vice-Provost's office can usefully provide centralized information on competitive rates and terms, can vet proposed contracts to ensure that UCLA's interests are safeguarded, and can assist in ongoing negotiations and oversight of contractual arrangements.

#### 5. Centralizing grant-writing and -researching.

A recurrent complaint of Center Directors, and hardly less frequently of Center staff, concerned the lack of adequate staff support -- at the Center or ISOP levels -- for the preparation of grant proposals, whether for the Centers themselves or for individual faculty working in International Studies. A major aspect of this problem concerned the notoriously complex, labor-intensive preparation of Title VI proposals, which provide a substantial share

---

<sup>15</sup> One possible scenario would be for the five major Centers to use shared staff. The future Institute for Asian Studies (see below) could provide core staff support for all of its member centers. Topical projects and other short-term programs could form another cluster to share administrative support.

of many Centers' budgets. Economies of scale and skill, we believe, suggest that ISOP central staff should be vested with major responsibility for assisting Center Directors with the preparation of Title VI and other grant proposals. Since Title VI proposals are similar in many respects across areas, particularly in the technical criteria by which they are evaluated in Washington, it makes good sense to centralize their preparation. An ISOP grants-and-development team could presumably keep in closer touch with relevant people in the Department of Education than Center Directors can be expected to do, and could keep abreast of successful Title VI proposals submitted by other universities. Moreover, the ISOP staff could coordinate and routinize the complex process of data-gathering required by the DOE. The staff could also facilitate possible efforts to submit new and innovative Title VI proposals, for example a non-area-specific International Studies proposal, about which there has been some preliminary discussion. Vesting substantial responsibility in the ISOP staff would increase the chances of securing and retaining Title VI funding.

The value of a skilled grants and development team, however, would go well beyond Title VI. Staff members with appropriate skills and experience would not only greatly facilitate the now onerous process of preparing Title VI grants, but could also assist Center Directors and individual IS faculty in the preparation of other grant proposals. They would not only have the technical skills needed to prepare budgets and necessary supporting documentation, but would have good contacts in and knowledge of the foundation world, and therefore would be able to take a proactive role in suggesting possible sources of funding, and to work with Center Directors and individual faculty to shape proposals in a manner likely to secure funding. Given the enormous complexity of the foundation landscape, and the many opportunities for funding that exist outside the small circle of the best-known foundations, a skilled and knowledgeable grants and development team would be an enormous asset to all Centers, Programs, and faculty concerned with international studies. We stress, however, the importance of attracting staff, in sufficient numbers, with the necessary skills, knowledge, energy, and initiative. The appointment of a new Director of Development is an excellent first step, but we see some augmentation of his staff as essential to provide the level of centralized service that we envision.

#### 6. Re-evaluation of staff and space.

If functions are consolidated and centralized as we have suggested, the job descriptions of existing Center and ISOP staff will change, as will appropriate staffing levels in various units. We therefore urge the Administrative Committee, in close consultation with the Vice-Provost, to continue and complete its comprehensive review of staffing needs and responsibilities. We do not envision any need for substantial increases in overall staff; but substantial redeployment, and some retraining, of existing staff may be required.

We recommend also that the Administrative Committee conduct a thorough reassessment of space allocation and utilization throughout International Studies. While space will probably always be at a premium, many Centers with active programs or large student and visitor populations face serious over-crowding, while less active units devote considerable square footage to underutilized libraries and common rooms. We would put a high priority on creation of communal space for scholarly interchange among particularly active groups of faculty, post-doctoral scholars, visitors, and graduate students.

#### 7. Actively involving South Campus and Professional Schools.

The relocation of ISOP administratively into the College of Letters and Sciences, as noted earlier, has provoked concern and some sense of alienation among UCLA's Professional Schools; and previous interaction between ISOP and South Campus – including those natural sciences lodged directly within the College – has been less than ideal. The mere fact that ISOP's, and the Vice Provost's, charge is campus-wide will not in itself reassure, or elicit greater co-operation, from this large constituency. Rather, structures and mechanisms must

be put in place to demonstrate commitment to the broader campus outside the Humanities and Social Sciences. The Professional Schools – chiefly AGSM, Arts and Architecture, Education and Information Science, Law, Public Policy, and Theater, Film, and Television, but including also Medicine and Engineering – clearly regard international activities and concerns as central to their programs, and the publications and reports of these units demonstrate the vigor and breadth of their international activities. Further, many of them are funded by competitive extramural sources and are highly visible in the relevant national and international arenas.

The Committee recommends that the Vice-Provost take concrete steps to include the Professional Schools and South Campus in internal structures (particularly advisory committees) at all levels of ISOP, including both the central ISOP structure and ISOP's constituent Centers. In addition, he should: (a) encourage specific Program initiatives involving the leadership of the Professional Schools and South Campus; (b) invest in the development of specific relationships between the Professional Schools and Letters and Science units in the international arena; and (c) look critically at the long-term benefits of strategically placed faculty resources (particularly temporary FTE) in these areas.

*B. New programs and activities that International Studies should institute*

The Committee is strongly persuaded that, to meet the needs of the changed intellectual environment outlined earlier, a reconfigured and more centralized International Studies at UCLA should adopt several new initiatives, even if doing so requires a shift of resources away from existing units. Specifically, we recommend each of the following:

1. Short- to medium-term interdisciplinary Programs, independent of existing Centers

To address the growing array of questions and topics in international studies that fit comfortably within the domain of no single existing Center, the Committee strongly recommends that the Vice-Provost, in consultation with his Advisory Committee (see above), devote substantial funding to a series of major interdisciplinary research initiatives. We specifically suggest three-year (in exceptional circumstances up to five-year) Programs, with total funding over their lifetime of up to \$150,000 each. At least three, and perhaps as many as five, such Programs, we believe, could be in process at any one time. Proposals for Programs, or for smaller grants within the thematic domain of a Program, should be in response to an explicit and widely disseminated annual RFP, which might well stress particular broad themes in any one year (e.g.: Culture, Ethnicity, and Migration; Markets and Society; the Role of the Sciences in Development). Support for such Programs should be not merely financial, but should guarantee highly capable staff support and provide a space and a forum where new ways of doing research are supported and valued.

A model for such short-term projects might be found in the five-year Multicampus Research Groups (MRGs), formerly funded by UC's Office of the President. Such programs are particularly valuable to the extent that they bring junior scholars and seasoned researchers together around themed interdisciplinary research.

High priority should be given to programs that are interdisciplinary and collaborative (particularly when they join North and South Campus, or Professional Schools and College units), that are not specific to any one region, and that show serious prospects of attracting extramural funding. It would be an additional advantage, but by no means a requirement, for a proposed Program to involve two or more existing Centers.

Such Programs would, in our view, also better equip UCLA to respond to calls from funding agencies such as the Mellon, the Rockefeller, or the Ford Foundations in their efforts to foster progressive research that can help cut across received disciplinary alignments and

agendas. We also take it as self-evident that, in responding to internationally-oriented RFPs from such funding sources, the office of the Vice-Provost should take a "lead" role in configuring the UCLA response.

2. A nationally pre-eminent Postdoctoral program in International Studies.

We also strongly recommend the establishment, directly under the Vice-Provost's office, of a high-profile, nationally visible, and internationally competitive Post-doctoral Fellowship Program, which might be titled the UCLA Fellows in International Studies. Modeled on such prestigious national post-doctoral programs as those at Harvard,<sup>16</sup> Michigan,<sup>17</sup> Princeton,<sup>18</sup> and Columbia,<sup>19</sup> such a program would compete nationwide for the very best younger scholars and would establish what to the best of our knowledge would be the first internationally-oriented but not area-focused multi-year post-doctoral program.<sup>20</sup>

The program that we envision would involve at least six new appointments each year, with each Fellow appointed for at least a two-year, ideally a three-year term, involving some teaching duties and an affiliation with an academic department. We recommend a stipend of at least \$50,000 to compete with top existing programs and with rising assistant professor salaries. Newly minted Ph.D.s and beginning assistant professors should be given equal consideration. Finalists should be interviewed in person; UCLA Ph.D.s or assistant professors should not be eligible; there should be no citizenship requirement.

To maximize the integration of such a post-doctoral program into the UCLA community, we propose the following:

- (1) The post-doctoral program should be co-ordinated with a Visiting Scholar program aimed at mid-career people.
- (2) The new group of Fellows in International Studies, including both post-doctoral and Visiting Scholars, should be afforded its own dedicated space, including a common area, within International Studies. Even if post-doctoral Fellows are teaching with Departments, they (and the Visiting Scholars) should have offices and shared space within International Studies to promote intellectual sociability.

---

<sup>16</sup> There are two relevant postdoctoral programs at Harvard. One is the Harvard Society of Fellows: eight appointments per year, all fields, three-year tenure, stipend of ca. \$50,000 annually, no teaching, Ph.D. not required. No citizenship requirement. No web site. The second is the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies. Ph.D. not required, though pre-doctoral applicants must have made "significant progress" on dissertation. For those whose work "combines disciplinary excellence in the social sciences with an in-depth grounding in particular countries or regions outside the United States, Canada, and Western Europe." Four to six appointments each year, two-year tenure, predoctoral annual stipend of \$24,000, postdoctoral annual stipend of \$36,000, no teaching. No citizenship requirement.

<http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/academy/>

<sup>17</sup> Michigan Society of Fellows: four appointments each year, all fields, three-year tenure, \$42,000 annual stipend, the equivalent of one year of teaching during the three years.

<http://www.rackham.umich.edu/Faculty/society.html>

<sup>18</sup> Princeton Society of Fellows in the Liberal Arts (inaugurated in Fall 2000): three-year appointments, "humanities, social sciences, and selected natural sciences," annual stipend of \$54,000, half-time teaching. Graduates of Princeton not eligible. <http://www.princeton.edu/~sf/>

<sup>19</sup> Columbia Society of Fellows in the Humanities: two-year appointments for Mellon Fellows, \$37,000 + \$3,000 research support, teaching in Columbia's general education courses.

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/societyoffellows/>

<sup>20</sup> The Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies is a two-year postdoctoral program, but it remains area-based.

(3) A small group of perhaps six to eight UCLA Faculty Fellows in International Studies would constitute the selection committee for post-doctoral Fellows. They would also serve as mentors for the Fellows and would help to foster intellectual gregariousness, e.g., through weekly lunches (see below). Modest compensation might be appropriate for Faculty Fellows.

(4) Eight to twelve UCLA Graduate Fellows doing internationally-oriented work, and well advanced on their dissertation projects, could also be selected each year, and perhaps even be given small awards. They would attend the lunches with the postdoctoral Fellows and might constitute a seminar series of their own on dissertation work in progress. This could be a valuable form of professional socialization for a small group of outstanding UCLA graduate students.

(5) To further promote intellectual exchange and sociability, post-doctoral Fellows, Visiting Scholars, UCLA Faculty Fellows, and UCLA Graduate Fellows could meet for lunch (provided by the Society) weekly, perhaps alternating between informal conversation one week, presentations by Fellows and others the next.

### 3. Summer training institutes in new topics and research techniques.

Both International Studies and its constituent Centers should, in our view, consider conducting summer training institutes, wherever possible in conjunction with such existing programs as that of the National Endowment for the Humanities, to explore new and lively topics and to teach specialized research techniques in which UCLA, or UC at large, has particular competence. Examples might include ways to combine research methodologies across disciplines (e.g., archaeology and history, or anthropology and game theory), specialized archival techniques (including needed linguistic or notational skills, e.g., in deciphering newly available documents), or training in unusual language skills such as dialects or creoles. The projected audience would include both graduate students and established scholars, including scholars who seek (as under a current Mellon Foundation initiative) to master new disciplines. Other institutions have begun to mount such activities. Through such summer institutes UCLA Centers, and International Studies as a whole, can both perform valuable scholarly services and raise UCLA's intellectual and professional profile nationally and internationally.

### 4. An undergraduate major in International Studies; new incentives for instruction in foreign languages.

UCLA, we believe, would be well served by the creation of a rigorous undergraduate program in international studies which would prepare our students for high level work in this area. The major should, of course, not duplicate existing undergraduate degrees in the humanities and social sciences but should bridge those divisions and encourage interest from other disciplines, including the natural sciences. It should aim to attract only highly qualified students with a strong interest in international studies. Majors would be given the opportunity and the incentive to gain the necessary skills to pursue serious research in this area. The major should have among its degree requirements proficiency in at least one foreign language, as well as broad competence in economic, political, and cultural analysis. More broadly, such a major should serve as only one aspect of a wider effort by International Studies to encourage and invigorate instruction in foreign languages at UCLA.

We are well aware of the many hurdles within the UC system to creation of a new major, but we urge the Vice-Provost, in consultation with appropriate colleagues and Senate officers, to establish in the very near term a Special Committee to develop and advance a specific proposal for such a major, and to address the broader issue of incentives to study other languages and cultures.

### 5. No new Centers at this time.

Our final recommendation for International Studies as a whole at UCLA is a negative one. While this Committee has carefully considered (and has noted at various points above) the often cogent arguments for one or more new Centers in International Studies,<sup>21</sup> on balance we have concluded that the interests of International Studies and the University would be better served by greater, rather than less, flexibility in structure and in deployment of resources. Thus at the present time we recommend the establishment of no new Centers, either regional or thematic. On the contrary, we propose greater use of short- and medium-term Programs (see section V B 1). This recommendation does not preclude the designation of specific programs as “centers” when required by a funding agent, for the life of a grant period; depending on specifics, such activities might be located within existing Centers or Programs. It also does not preclude a variety of foci for either Centers or Programs (geographical areas; countries; substantive themes).

#### *C. Reconfiguration of existing Centers, possible disestablishments*

The Committee saw the confused administrative situation in Asian Studies as particularly requiring reconfiguration. As noted earlier (sec. III.4), at present there are three single-country Centers (for China, Japan, and Korea), one regional Center (for Southeast Asia), and a Center for East Asian Studies, which overlaps at least the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Centers; plus thematic Centers for Buddhist Studies and for Comparative and Interdisciplinary Research on Asia; and, nominally superintending the entire structure, an Asia-Pacific Institute.

While further steps may prove necessary, we recommend as an immediate and minimum step a considerable strengthening of what is now the Asia-Pacific Institute. It should finally realize its mission as a shared platform for all of the Asian Centers, should in our view be renamed simply the Institute for Asian Studies, and should be given real authority and responsibility (including, of course, a Director and appropriate staff). Specifically, we suggest that the Institute be given responsibility for Title VI management and share with existing country-specific and sub-regional Centers responsibility for fund-raising. Under such a scenario, the Center for East Asian Studies would no longer possess distinct purposes meriting its continuation.

The Committee further notes that the Center for Global Health and Education has not to date had particular impact on any of the relevant professional schools or interaction with other ISOP Centers. Whether continued as a Center, or as a Program for Global Health, it should have a specific mandate involving all four of the Health Sciences Schools and relating to the geographically focused Centers. In any event it should have a short-term initial mandate; its continuation after a predetermined time would then depend on the development of a constituency of faculty, focused activities, demonstrated impact, and relative advantage of one structure over another in the extramural arena.

#### *D. Recommended reforms of existing Centers.*

The Committee sees several aspects of existing Centers as generally in need of improvement. It urges the Vice-Provost, working with Center Directors, to advance appropriate reforms in each of the following areas.

##### 1. Publications and publication strategies: monographs and journals

---

<sup>21</sup> Two possibilities struck us as intellectually defensible, yet at this point not compelling: Islamic Studies, for which there is a demonstrable need and opportunity, an existing IDP in need of some attention, and a geographic span involving several area studies Centers; and South Asia, a geographical area notably neglected in the current structure of geographically-focused Centers.

Several of the existing Centers boast active publications programs. These range from journals, such as the prestigious *African Arts*, to monograph series, to statistical abstracts. Generally speaking, however, we see these publication programs as lacking focus. Some individual publications seem not to be subject to rigorous quality control. In the most problematic cases, Center-sponsored publications appeared to be vehicles for promoting a particular faculty member's graduate students, and in others they were little more than "vanity press" operations.

The Committee noted with some concern that only a handful of international studies journals, all of them country- or region-specific, is edited at UCLA – *Modern China*, *Journal of Korean Studies*, *African Arts*. No scholarly association journal in international studies (or in any related discipline) is currently edited at UCLA, and apparently none has been edited on campus for quite some time.

We believe that most Centers should rethink their publication strategies in at least three ways: (a) As an elementary measure of cost-saving, and to achieve greater efficiency and visibility, they should move away from in-house operations and "contract out" the business and printing side of their publications to (or, at the very least, establish alliances and agreements with) existing major publishing houses, i.e. either university presses or commercial publishers of scholarly works.<sup>22</sup> The Centers should be advised and guided in these steps by the Vice-Provost's Office, which presumably will accumulate wide expertise in rates, contractual practices, and the relative reliability and reputation of presses. (b) In light of bids from external publishers, and after a careful review – once effective accounting procedures are in place – of the real costs of their publications, they should reconsider their strategies, including considering when and whether to drop or reconfigure existing publications that seem less than cost-effective, or to launch new publications that seem to have a real audience. And (c), as one strong focus of each external review, the quality and real cost of each Center's publications should be fully assessed.

We also think that the Vice-Provost and the various Centers, working with appropriate officials in the Colleges and Schools, should make serious efforts to attract the editorial offices of "flagship" international studies journals, including particularly those published by leading scholarly associations. This would have a number of advantages, including increasing the visibility of international studies at UCLA in general, and of the specific Centers in particular. Also attracting top journals would provide graduate students – acting as editorial interns -- with valuable experience in the scholarly process, and would provide extensive opportunities for scholarly socialization. In the past UCLA has benefited from these indirect effects of housing major journals. This was the case, for instance, during the late 1960s and the early 1970s when the *American Economic Review* was housed in UCLA's Department of Economics, and during the 1970s and 80s when the *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics* was housed in the School of Public Health. We are aware that running the editorial office of a major journal is costly in space, time, and money. We believe, however, that with the truly top journals the benefits far exceed the costs.

## 2. Making better use of the Web and the Internet

The Centers are not taking full advantage of the Internet as a vehicle for disseminating research. Although every Center has a web page, and some of them are in our judgment quite "snappy," their usefulness is limited. While quite a few Centers list their Working Paper

---

<sup>22</sup> Virtually every major scholarly journal today solicits such publication bids and, after considering the relative price and merit of the proposals, contracts out its printing, distribution, and publicity work to a commercial or university press.

series, only a couple allow electronic downloading,<sup>23</sup> and in most cases it is not even clear how the reader can obtain them.

We strongly recommend that a number of the Centers' current publications be moved *in toto* to the Web, becoming available as electronic resources only. This is particularly the case with the *Statistical Abstract of Latin America* (SALA), a publication that has had a useful (and profitable) life, but whose current hard copy format is undeniably antiquated. Scholars now request statistical series almost exclusively in electronic downloadable form, and hard cover volumes of statistics have approximately the usefulness of 45 rpm recordings. We also believe that the Centers should make a particular effort to provide access to unusual and hard-to-obtain data sets, including for example ones on migration, remittances, household surveys, political developments, and the arts.

Currently Centers' web sites have very few links to other international studies resources, and in particular very few Centers provide links to scholarly institutions outside North America. Web sites' links to "funding opportunities" are in most cases restricted to UCLA or UC sources; surprisingly few Centers provide information on outside funding opportunities. Most Centers provide lists of affiliated faculty, but almost none provides links to faculty personal web pages.

We are convinced that Internet-based resources will become increasingly important in the scholarly world, and we believe that the ISOP Centers should make a major effort to advance the frontier, or at least not to lag it so markedly, in this area. On a more positive note, we thought that the *Hispanic-American Periodicals Index* (HAPI) web-page – linked to the Latin American Center – was particularly useful, as it provides on-line search services that are not otherwise easily available.

### 3. Assuring transparency and equity in funding opportunities.

While many Centers have long had, and others have over the years adopted, transparent and equitable procedures for the allocation of the funding opportunities they control, some continue to be plagued by the reputation, and sometimes the reality, of favoritism, personalism, or "old boy" ties in how they allocate funds. We take the following as elementary principles, which every Center should observe and which the Vice-Provost's oversight should assure:

- (a) Funding opportunities should be widely disseminated and advertised to all those eligible to apply, including both faculty and graduate students, with reasonable deadlines, and with guidelines that clearly outline the detailed requirements.
- (b) Members of selection committees should represent a diversity of perspectives and should rotate at a minimum every two years to insure against the formation of any self-perpetuating group of "insiders."
- (c) Students receiving stipends, research or travel funds should represent a broad cross-section of disciplinary or methodological approaches, and they should in no case be working with just one or two of the same affiliated faculty.

### 4. Assistance in recruitment and retention.

---

<sup>23</sup> The Burkle Center for International Relations, for example, indicates on its website (<http://www.isop.ucla.edu/bcir/>, tab "Publications") that Working Papers can be obtained only in the print version, at a price of \$20 per paper, plus shipping and handling. This is, in our view, a seriously antiquated impediment to transmission of scholarly research, in an era where any paper can be scanned into PDF format and posted on the Web in a matter of minutes, at virtually no marginal cost.

The better-endowed Centers, and ISOP itself, have often provided generous assistance in efforts to recruit and retain the best faculty (and, as we note below, the most promising graduate students) working in affiliated areas. The Committee urges that this practice be continued. At the same time, in the interest of transparency and equity, such subventions of recruitment and retention efforts should be discussed (to the extent time allows) with the appropriate Advisory Committees, and should in any event be notified to them once the arrangements are finalized.

#### 5. Use of permanent and temporary FTE.

Traditionally, and indeed as a central part of its original mandate, ISOP, often through delegation to its constituent Centers, provided permanent faculty FTE to encourage the recruitment of internationally- or area-oriented scholars. In the last few years, temporary ("Visiting") FTEs have been more widely used, in part to avoid longer-term commitments until a new Vice-Provost could be appointed. In the Committee's view the temporary FTE have proved themselves very useful, in some Departments, in helping bring to campus scholars whose teaching is innovative, interdisciplinary, and a model to other scholars in similar fields. Such temporary appointments can do a lot for small Departments that may be heavily impacted by leaves, and particularly for the graduate students who become exposed to other ways of working in a given field.

In other cases, and perhaps most often in larger Departments and Schools, Visiting appointments have worked poorly, e.g., with Visitors brought at great expense and effort teaching only one or two students. In those units, the Committee recommends that the Vice-Provost regard the FTE as a fungible resource and seek better uses, e.g., in support of internationally-oriented seminars or the recruitment of particularly able international graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.

The Committee approaches permanent, or "ladder," FTE far more skeptically. While they can be an important source of renewal for departments that have become overly protective of the research *status quo*, they represent a major, and extremely long-term, commitment of International Studies resources. We would urge that permanent FTE, at least for a trial period of perhaps five years, no longer be used. If they are ever to be used in the future, it should be only under the most compelling and exceptional circumstances.

#### 6. Student support

A predominant theme among faculty we interviewed was the need for better graduate support in International Studies, and particularly for more effective use of such support in recruiting the very best graduate students to UCLA. The Committee's view is that Centers on average do better at mobilizing, and at awarding fairly, support for graduate students already at UCLA than they do in recruiting new students.

With regard to support for students already at UCLA, the Committee expresses concern that, in a few Centers, RA-ships appear to be used for clerical purposes rather than to support students in genuine research projects that engage them intellectually. We urge that the Vice-Provost correct this situation forthwith, if necessary by affording proper clerical support to underfunded units.

As regards recruitment of new students, we recommend that the Vice-Provost's Office, working both on its own and in close collaboration with existing Centers, develop a clear and regularized procedure for co-operating with relevant Departments in recruiting the most promising graduate students to UCLA. International Studies and Center resources can appropriately be used either to create full Fellowships or, probably more often, to "top up" Departmental offers to students with International Studies interests so as to make the overall

UCLA package nationally competitive. The Vice-Provost's Office and relevant Centers should also be involved, and should fully collaborate, in campus visits of prospective graduate students.

A particular problem that affects International Studies at UCLA is the high out-of-state tuition that foreign students – virtually barred from achieving residency – must pay. We strongly recommend that the Vice-Provost work with the Provost and Chancellor to provide a UC-wide solution to this problem. At the same time, the International Studies Development Office should make it a priority to assist interested parties in raising funds to support American students interested in international studies, and to bring outstanding foreign students to relevant departments and programs. As noted earlier, it will also be important to assure that the new visa restrictions necessitated by national security since 11 September 2001 not become an irrational impediment to the entry of increasingly essential foreign students and scholars.

### 7. Interdisciplinary Degree Programs

There is clearly a need for a comprehensive review (beyond the scope of this committee) of existing IDPs in their teaching mission. There are two different issues at hand: the current M.A. programs, and the undergraduate programs.

#### a. The M.A. programs

While there may be sound arguments for continuing to support the M.A. programs currently sponsored by the various teaching units, a case can be made for the creation of an M.A. in International Studies that would provide a range of options to students for specialization in both traditional and in emerging areas of research.

It should be noted that many faculty members we interviewed expressed the perception, usually based on their own experience in teaching graduate seminars, that existing interdisciplinary M. A. programs attract students of markedly lower quality and appear to be less serious and less focused than Departmental degree programs. We are persuaded that these allegations should be closely investigated; and we recommend that the Vice-Provost's Office, working closely with relevant Senate bodies, examine carefully the quality and coherence of each of the existing interdisciplinary M.A. programs. As a starting-point, appropriate officials in the Vice-Provost's Office should be charged simply to gather relevant standardized data on the qualifications, progress, and placement of recent cohorts of students.

The review of existing programs should, in our view, also assess the potentially contradictory needs of (a) students who enroll in the various graduate programs as step in their goal to pursue further graduate work at the Ph.D. level, and (b) students who pursue a short-term graduate degree to serve professional (non-academic) goals.

#### b. Undergraduate IDP degrees

Fewer concerns have been voiced about undergraduate IDPs, but two issues seem to the Committee worth addressing more closely. (1) In a very few undergraduate IDPs, issues of excessive narrowness of approach, and sometimes also seemingly unrigorous requirements, have been raised. (2) Even in the highest-quality undergraduate IDPs, the overall issue of cost-benefit analysis needs to be raised. Some programs are quite small, yet demand a heavy investment of staff and faculty time. To address these concerns and others, the Committee urges: (a) that the same Special Committee that will develop proposals for a new International Studies major (above, V.B.4) consider also whether existing undergraduate IDPs in the International Studies arena might more effectively, and with overall cost savings, be "folded in" as special concentrations within such a major; and (b) that as a part of each

external review, the quality and breadth of any affiliated undergraduate IDP be specifically addressed.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The changes we propose will reform, rather than revolutionize, International Studies at UCLA; yet there can be no doubt that some of the reforms will seem radical (and perhaps unsettling) to many. We regard the concrete measures advocated here as the bare minimum to align UCLA with the changed intellectual environment, and to realize at UCLA the vision of International Studies, that we sketched at the outset.

Our most basic recommendations aim simply to "level the playing field," ensuring among other things: (a) that reviews of International Studies Centers and other units are regular, fair, and open; (b) that research funds are awarded equitably and transparently; (c) that allocations of staff, space, and funding among units – including compensation of Center Directors – are commensurate with levels of activity and impact; and (d) that budgeting and accounting procedures are uniform, transparent, and informative about true costs of activities. (See particularly sections V.A.1, 2, 4, and 6; V.B.6; and V.D.3 and 4.)

A second set of recommendations, which we anticipate will excite the least controversy, seeks through appropriate centralization of administrative functions to achieve economies of scale and specialization, and to free Center staff from the burdens that they find most onerous and least compatible with their own expertise. By lodging in the Vice-Provost's office such functions as (a) RFP-researching, assistance in grant-writing, and grant administration; (b) the purely business aspects of publication; (c) website-maintenance; (d) budgeting and accounting; and (e) event (e.g., conference) logistics and publicity, individual Center staff will be liberated to apply their irreplaceable expertise on cultures and academic disciplines to appropriate research, organizational, and outreach purposes. (See sections V.A.4 and 5.)

Our third set of recommendations, which we regard as the most important, is intended to give International Studies at UCLA the responsiveness to new intellectual currents that the times demand, as well as greatly improved scholarly visibility. By generous provision of "seed money" for short- to medium-term research initiatives independent of existing Centers, and by establishing a nationally pre-eminent post-doctoral program, lively new Summer Institutes, and a high-quality International Studies major (sections V.B.1-4), UCLA International will go far toward making UCLA one of the liveliest and most exciting venues for research and study in the international arena. A corollary recommendation, intended also to maintain a commitment to cutting-edge research, is the avoidance of open-ended commitments to activities that may quickly prove outdated (sections V.B.5, V.D.5). And crucial to this whole endeavor, in our view, is more intensive outreach to those disciplines and scholars at UCLA who, while active and eminent in International Studies, have been substantially underinvolved in ISOP and its existing Centers (see V.A.1 and 7, V.B.1).

Finally, and again consistent with our perceptions of the changed environment for scholarly activity and communication in International Studies, we recommend changes in the programs and procedures of existing Centers, including in a few cases possible mergers or reconfigurations, and substantial alteration in the governance of UCLA International itself: see, respectively, sections V.D.1, 2, 6, and 7, V.C, and V.A.3.

We are persuaded that these recommendations, taken as a whole, are required to achieve the excellence in International Studies that UCLA deserves. They will constitute a crucial first step toward making UCLA what it can easily become, one of the world's most exciting, open, and attractive venues for research and teaching in the international arena. We strongly, and respectfully, urge their speedy adoption. We conclude by expressing our profound gratitude to the staff of ISOP and its affiliated Centers, to the colleagues and Center Directors who responded so promptly and generously to our requests for information and opinion, to the Administrative Committee that so ably paralleled our own efforts, and to Vice-Provost Garrett for his support, patience, and openness.

Respectfully submitted: [Signature on File]

\_\_\_\_\_ Rogers Brubaker

\_\_\_\_\_ Sebastian Edwards

\_\_\_\_\_ Sue Fan

\_\_\_\_\_ Gail Harrison

\_\_\_\_\_ Efraín Kristal

\_\_\_\_\_ Françoise Lionnet

\_\_\_\_\_ David Wilson

\_\_\_\_\_ Bin Wong

\_\_\_\_\_ Ronald Rogowski (chair)