

Self–Study Narrative

Law, Societies, and Justice and the *Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center*

A. Overview of Program Strengths and Limitations

Law, Societies, and Justice is a new and exciting enterprise. Just over four years since we were funded by the College UIF grant, just over three years since any of our core appointed faculty¹ even arrived at UW, and just over one year since the authorized new curriculum for the LSJ program became fully operable -- we are still finding our way and constructing our basic mission, identity, and commitments. Any assessment of where and who we are must emphasize this fact of program youth.² At the same time, however, there can be no doubt that we have accomplished a great deal and are well on our way toward realizing – indeed, to exceeding -- our originally stated goals as an academic unit. The following narrative self-study will attempt to gauge our relative progress by evaluating these past achievements, our present plans, and our continuing challenges or limitations in light of the ambitious vision that brought us together in the first place.

It is important at the outset to demarcate clearly for readers the three key components of our organizational structure, which in practice are relatively inseparable and will often be discussed together in the following pages.³ Law, Societies, and Justice is the title of the undergraduate program that grew out of, and replaced, the older Society and Justice program. The core program faculty have developed and now teach the bulk of the LSJ curriculum; we teach all required core courses and senior seminars as well as supervise all the required internships and optional senior theses. The Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center refers to the research-oriented intellectual activities of the program faculty. This includes reading groups, colloquia, grant proposals, and other projects enlisting program faculty as well as sponsorship of special speaker series, co-sponsorship of visiting individual speakers around campus, organization of thematic conferences, and collaborative research projects. Finally, the CLASS Graduate Fellows program entails a variety of linkages between CLASS faculty activities and graduate

¹ LSJ is made up of several layers of faculty involvement, for which this report uses specialized terminology. “Newly hired faculty” include three Assistant Professors (Rachel Cichowski, Angelina Godoy, Arzoo Osanloo) who were recruited with UIF and other funds in a coordinated search; all three have 50% appointments in LSJ. The “core appointed faculty” include these three plus three other faculty members who have 50% appointments in LSJ – Patrick Rivers, Steven Herbert, and Katherine Beckett (the latter two recently promoted as Associate Professors). The “program faculty” includes the previous six plus others who regularly participate in LSJ as teachers and scholars in the research community –Professors Michael McCann and Joel Migdal; Associate Professors Jamie Mayerfeld, Susan Whiting, and Andrea Simpson; and Assistant Professor George Lovell. An ever-changing group of other scholars from various departments also engage with us at times on various activities

² See the UIF proposal and the Five-Year Plan for a record of our origins and development. Appendix A.

³ This organizational scheme has stuck to the vision of the original UIF proposal. See Appendix A.

students – a menu of interdisciplinary law and society graduate courses, graduate mentoring and dissertation supervision, a proposed interdisciplinary certificate, research and teaching assistance opportunities, and common participation in reading groups, speaker series, and conferences. The bulk of university funding for all these activities is specifically allocated for LSJ, but it also indirectly supports graduate TAs and RAs, staff, speakers series, faculty travel, and the like. We note here that we are not entirely sure whether the program review for which this self-study is written concerns just LSJ or the entire three-tier complex of activities, which was imagined in our original UIF proposal. Since we envision the three dimensions as an integrated whole, we will provide the full monty in this report.

Our narrative will follow fairly closely the standard university guide for existing program review, even though our program is new and does not offer a graduate degree. We are proud of who we are and do not mind comparison with bigger, more traditional disciplinary units.

Program Strengths. LSJ in its formative years has exhibited a great many strengths and distinguishing virtues. Perhaps the most important of these is *fidelity to the key elements of the larger intellectual vision* that generated the program and continues to animate our activities. We remain firmly committed to that proposed model of a truly interdisciplinary program of scholars united by the goal of studying legal conventions, discourses, and institutions “in society,” from “the bottom up,” in systematic comparative, cross-national and transnational perspective (see Appendix A). This framework grew out of reflections about select cutting edge research in the law and society field; we are the only program in the nation to organize a faculty group, undergraduate curriculum, research agenda, and intellectual community committed to this particular vision. In our view, we have gone remarkably far in advancing the very original and ambitious idea that we proposed.

The key to this advance is the *high quality of the faculty group* that we have assembled. It is worth noting that the Society & Justice program, from whose demise LSJ emerged in Phoenix-like fashion, just five years ago claimed only .5 FTE. This one-half line was held by a distinguished senior faculty member who had been hired by Sociology, but he immediately connected with other programs on campus (CSSS) rather than SoJu. We managed in just three years to generate six faculty members with 50% appointments in LSJ (total of 3.0 FTE) through a variety of means, including not least the UIF funding and additional investments from the College (plus trading the .5 position of the original faculty line for another faculty member in Sociology). These six faculty, including four Assistant Professors and two recently tenured Associate Professors, all reflect the high quality, diversity of interests, and fidelity to our basic program profile that we had imagined. They are an outstanding group. When joined to the 5-6 highly active scholars already on campus who also have invested in the program, this becomes a remarkable group. That this cohort could come together, fuse as an intellectual community, develop a brand new undergraduate curriculum, and become a leading force on campus in such a short time is testament to their individual quality and collective synergy. Once our junior faculty members publish the first books they all have in development, joining the impressive output of more senior faculty, this cohort will undoubtedly make a major mark in national and international academic circles as well.

The development of this faculty group must be assessed a complete success that exceeds our original expectations and assures great achievements in the future.

We emphasize in particular the *interdisciplinary* character of this group, its vision, and its endeavors. From the start, we imagined a faculty group and curriculum that was not merely an aggregate of different disciplinary interests, but rather was the product of truly interdisciplinary scholars, research projects, and courses. Our core faculty received degrees in Sociology, Anthropology, Political Science, and Geography. But both junior and senior faculty are all, to some degree, refugees from disciplinary centers who cross boundaries, speak articulately in several disciplinary tongues, and identify with the established interdisciplinary field of law and society. We are all familiar with a range of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, and we vary in the combinations of methods we employ. That said, most of us lean toward post-positivist epistemologies, process-based institutional or cultural analysis, and triangulating approaches that employ multiple methods of empirical research, including especially interview-intensive, case-study inquiry. This enables us to read common scholarship, interact through references to a very broad canon, understand and draw on each other's scholarly research, and develop classes integrating diverse ideas, understandings, and materials that transcend any one discipline. Indeed, our discipline is the interdisciplinary tradition of law and society research, which has developed its own extensive canon, conventions, and standards of rigor. Intellectually, this common investment in interdisciplinarity has been the most gratifying part of our ambitious endeavor, even if it has posed some institutional and pedagogical challenges.

Another distinctive facet of the LSJ vision institutionalized in practice is its commitment to *comparative* study. Indeed, ours is the first law and society undergraduate program, as far as we know, in which such a commitment is a founding principle. This is true in several regards. First is commitment to comparative cross-national study of law in society. Our courses not only cover a large part of the world map – Latin America, Europe, East Asia, South Africa, and the Middle East as well as North America – but, even when teaching classes largely about the United States, engage in comparative analysis and theorizing. Our core question is: How does law matter and what does it mean in different contexts, and what difference does this make for understanding law and legality generally? Moreover, we tend to emphasize attention to social history and genealogy as their own animating principles of comparison. To understand any moment of law in practice, we posit, one must locate that in an evolving context of power relations. Not least of our collective concerns is how contemporary processes of globalization are remaking social and political relations through and outside law, altering the context of legal practice in fundamental if highly contested and indeterminate ways. Finally, our commitments to comparative study fuse with the “bottom up” ethos to emphasize seeing law through the eyes of variously situated populations, and especially those who are most disadvantaged by existing relations, who often look to law for some modest transformation, and who only occasionally are benefited by law's delivery on its basic promises. This inclination is most notable in the focus on gender, race, class, and other lines of differential power relations within all societies. In all these ways, our research and teaching agendas mark a self-conscious allegiance to the study of difference, variation, and contrast in human experiences of law. This has enabled us to bring our students a fabulous new educational experience, to

connect intellectually with many diverse endeavors on our campus, and to mark a unique presence in the academic world of law and society scholarship. These commitments are so fundamental that they are explicitly signaled in the titles of for both the *Comparative Law and Society Studies Center* and the Law, *Societies*, and Justice program.

Yet another strength of our program is its commitment to, and achievements in advancing, *diversity*. This was true in our faculty hiring and recruitment; of our six core faculty hires, four are female, one is African American, and two are members of ethnic minorities born in other countries. Moreover, our program focuses extensively and systematically on issues of racial, ethnic, gender, religious, class, sexual, and other lines of fundamental difference in contemporary societies. The comparative cross-national and global emphasis likewise promotes a conception of citizenship attuned to the increasing interdependencies of diversely situated peoples in the world. In all these ways our emphasis on comparative study and attention to diversity are closely interrelated.⁴

One of the most palpable products of our efforts is the development of a formidable presence for *human rights* study on the UW campus. Just several years ago, only a handful of uncoordinated courses on human rights were offered on the Seattle campus, and the topic barely registered on the larger UW agenda. Building on the small but critical steps of the three-campus Human Rights Research and Education Network, we hired two human rights experts (Osanloo and Godoy), committed resources to supporting a new menu of courses enlisting half a dozen faculty, institutionalized the human rights minor, dedicated one of the three new LSJ tracks to human rights, and undertook high-profile campus events (such as a year long speaker series and a spring conference) and collaboration with other units on various events regarding human rights. In a very short time, we believe that CLASS/LSJ has done much to make UW a player in human rights education and research. And we are committed to doing far more on this front in the future. We believe that this achievement alone justifies the investment made in us by the College.

So far, we have listed mostly intellectual strengths – the commitments that we put into practice in our research, teaching, and service activity. It is only in terms of understanding these threads woven into our activities that we can capture the radical *transformation in undergraduate education* wrought by the Law, Societies, and Justice program. The program has replaced almost completely the old Society & Justice curriculum. Only a few of the old staple classes remain, all as electives; an entirely new list of core classes and emphasized electives has replaced them. Even more important is the new pedagogical vision animating those classes. The interdisciplinary, comparative, social-justice oriented offerings provide an educational experience in the most lofty of liberal arts molds, one that is worthy of a top research university. We put into practice everyday the type of inquiry-based and experiential learning exercises that university leaders talk about so much. Indeed, we are aiming to provide among the most intellectually challenging, rich, and unique experiences for undergraduates at the UW. These commitments are evident in many innovations – in the increased academic component of our mandatory internship, which is the oldest on campus; in the increased support for study abroad; in the growing numbers of students taking the new honors option, which involves additional seminars and a thesis developed over two quarters of faculty-supervised research; in the senior seminar requirement and vast list of seminar

⁴ These points are developed later in the “diversity” section of our narrative.

options; in the expanded opportunities for individualized student study and research with program faculty; in the increased collaboration with CHID, International Studies, and other similarly situated programs; to name a few. This is what we initially projected and, in our view, we have been more successful than even we expected. What is more, we are constantly deliberating about and taking actions to go further yet in making the type of program that we imagine. Our accomplishment is confirmed in part by rapidly growing student demand, but even more in changed student demand; our student profiles are more diverse in every way, and especially in their intellectual commitments and career aspirations. In short, we offer our traditional students interested in law enforcement a different, more rigorous, and richer educational experience, while providing to many other types of students – headed for law school, graduate study, and public service within and beyond our nation – an exciting, new option at UW. The LSJ program has not only won recognition on the UW campus, but it has been praised nationally as a model of intellectual innovation and sophistication.⁵

Finally, we think that the three tiers of our programmatic aspiration and organization – undergraduate program, graduate student mentoring, and faculty research community – are coming together in the type of *complementary, almost seamless interrelationship* that we imagined. The fact that our core faculty are together constructing and teaching our own designed curriculum, that we are working with graduate students as TAs as well as on their and our own research, and that a multiplicity of individualized linkages among faculty, graduates, and undergraduates have developed – all evidence the connections that we hoped to produce in imagining the program. As such, the program functions intellectually much like a traditional department, despite the absence of a formal Ph.D. program and substantial staff support. This represents a radical departure from the old SoJu program, which relied primarily on courses by off-campus instructors and unaffiliated campus faculty. As undergraduates become increasingly active in research projects with faculty and graduate students, these ties should strengthen further. Perhaps most important, the fact that all three levels of activity build on the faculty agendas and interests as research scholars assures that familiar tensions among roles are likely to be minimized in our intellectual community.

Limitations and Challenges. Our achievements have not come easily, and we find ourselves beleaguered by constraints and obstacles that impede further progress and threaten to undermine what we have done. Some of these weaknesses owe to our institutional situation, some to resource problems, and some to inadequate time and energy; some will be overcome soon and some likely will dog us into the future. We note the most important of our concerns here.

The most palpable weakness in our efforts so far has been a modest amount of *administrative disarray* to which undergraduates have been subjected. Much of this has been a necessary, unavoidable product of radical programmatic transformation. But the costs of change have been exacerbated by several lamentable facts. The first is the problem of staff. Our limited staff support of one professional Curriculum Coordinator has proved to be inadequate, turnover has been rapid, and recent prolonged absence of

⁵ The LSJ program was invited to be one of several founding members of a national consortium of law and society programs in 2002, the first year of existence for both. Consortium leaders have singled out LSJ for praise as a “cutting edge” program in numerous public contexts over the last two years.

our present key staff member due to serious illness has been very costly in many ways.⁶ Efforts to use students, for wages or credit, to fill various staff needs have not worked out well, largely due to the variable reliability of students and lack of permanent staff to train and oversee them. We have done the best we can piecing together inadequate resources and coping with turnover and then absences, but student majors have good reason for frustration. Students often are confused about where to go for information/advising, and they sometimes find no one there, someone that is unfamiliar, or someone who is less than fully informed. Other basic needs – especially managing our high-design website and email lists for LSJ and CLASS as well as basic clerical duties – have been left untended for long periods of time. We simply do not have the staff to assist and administer much of what we aim to do. The drain on our faculty, and especially the director, is immense. These problems have significantly undermined our overall progress in developing a first-rate intellectual program.

This problem is compounded by the *geographical dispersal of our faculty* that results from the lack of any office complex to call our own. Students must look all over the quad and beyond to find our core faculty members. For example, they do not know where to find Professor Steven Herbert, who last year took over as coordinator of the undergraduate program, but whose office is several buildings away from the LSJ office, which itself has been forced to change location three times in the last four years. As a result, students often resort to contacting director McCann, which is a stone's throw from the present advising office. This problem is even greater for Arzoo Osanloo, whose office in Denny Hall impedes regular interaction with other LSJ faculty. Coordination among faculty and with the staff is rendered very difficult as well, thus compounding the disarray faced by students. We also have no meeting room of our own, which means we must routinely schedule meetings and events in different rooms, often changing locations or canceling at the last minute as other units exercise their prerogatives to preempt us. It simply is very difficult to build an academic program and a research center without any central physical space on campus that facilitates regular close, face-to-face interaction.

A third obstacle has been our inability to escape or transcend completely the *residual pull of the SoJu program roots*. This is true in several ways. One dilemma is that our traditional students, who are primarily interested in criminal justice, tend to bring to our classes a narrower – geographically and intellectually – set of perspectives and interests than we think optimal for our curriculum to be successful. This is changing somewhat, as we attract new types of students, and it is gratifying to find that the traditional CJ students enjoy our new courses and often are transformed, or at least challenged, by them. But we struggle with their lack of background in contemporary world history and conceptual analysis (especially concerning “power”) that limits their potential to take advantage of our offerings. A second related part of the “SoJu problem” has been our failure to communicate an accurate image of our contemporary program to students, advisors, and others on campus (and to community colleges) beyond the

⁶ LSJ presently has only one staff member – a permanent full-time professional Curriculum Coordinator, for which we hired at the start of the 2002-3 academic year, after two previous years with unsatisfactory staff arrangements. The position was constructed from two 50% positions in previous years. The holder of the present position has been out of work for all of 2003-4 fighting a serious illness, which has left us with a patchwork of temporary graduate and undergraduate student staff to advise over 100 students, coordinate all curriculum, and provide routine administrative and clerical services for LSJ and CLASS. This situation has made program administration and the development of this self-study extremely difficult this year.

program itself. This suggests one reason why some students continue to demand LSJ as a major even though our curriculum may fit their interests less well than did SoJu previously and perhaps Sociology does now. This same problem of inadequate communication might also explain why we have not attracted more different types of students as rapidly as we might like. We also note that our transformation into LSJ has created tensions with at least one unit, Sociology, even while it has cultivated good relations with many other units. We do not fully understand this, but it no doubt derives in large part from the fact that the older SoJu program was closely connected – often in fractious as well as complementary ways – to Sociology, while LSJ has grown out of closer relations to Political Science, JSIS, and other units. This programmatic tension has been exacerbated by disputes over faculty affiliations and the like. We continue to work on healing these bruises, but they remain from the past. Indeed, we have made recent progress in coordinating with Sociology to communicate more precise, accurate information about our respective majors, their overlaps, and their differences. Again, our severe shortage of program staff makes progress on these related matters difficult.

A fourth problem is that our *funding base is tied almost entirely to the undergraduate LSJ program* and provides little support for research and graduate training activities. We decided at the outset to commit all of our UIF and subsequent College funding to faculty lines and a staff position. The staff allocation turned out to be inadequate even for LSJ, much less for other activities. Moreover, the inherited Society & Justice budget provided almost no money for travel, colloquia, speakers, and RAs. We have benefited to date from conservative use of UIF money unspent in the first year for faculty lines and from Tools for Transformation funds, both of which could be rolled over across biennia. But those funds are now exhausted. This has required diversion of state funding from curricular expenditures (mostly off-campus and graduate instructors, but also TAs) to support for faculty travel and speakers. Even the most creative budgeting plan cannot provide adequate support for the CLASS Center and graduate activities, however. At the same time, our curricular budget itself has become severely strained; diversion of funds has limited the classes we can offer as well as limited expanding large classes to meet student demands.

A fifth related problem is that the demands of undergraduate program development and other ongoing activities have permitted *little attention to our initial priority of seeking outside funding support*. Our UIF proposal speculated that the CLASS Center should be well situated to generate foundation and federal grants. We still believe this, and we have begun to submit individual research grant proposals while exploring institutional grant possibilities. But, again, our small faculty size and lack of staff support have thwarted focus on grant generation. Moreover, we have no development plan or activity at all and will not in the near future. None of this can be changed significantly due to our present staffing challenges, student-centered curriculum, and relatively junior faculty group properly focused on research publication and teaching.

Finally, we have not advanced as far as hoped in *cultivating a larger and more engaged graduate student constituency*. We never intended to create an interdisciplinary Ph.D., but we did hope to build a larger pool of graduate students beyond Political Science interested in law and society studies. However, our CLASS Fellows program still is mostly Political Science graduate students, we have little money to support them beyond TAs, and the demands of the undergraduate program have drained energies

for graduate involvement. That said, we have created a core graduate course in “Law and Society” and a menu of other graduate-level classes taught by our faculty as well as submitted a proposal for the interdisciplinary certificate status for students in disciplinary Ph.D. programs that was planned. Moreover, CLASS Graduate Fellows have found terrific jobs to date. We do think that we will quickly advance further on this front as our junior faculty develop a graduate following for their research agendas and the demands of the undergraduate LSJ program recede to a more routine level. Funding challenges will remain, however.

The Changing Context of Developing and Fulfilling Expectations. Our summary assessment is simple and straightforward. We believe that LSJ has come a very long way quickly in delivering on the projections about intellectual contributions to UW and, especially, on the undergraduate program transformation outlined in our UIF proposal. At the same time, we have encountered a variety of challenges and obstacles to institutional development, some expected, some unexpected, many the byproduct of our achievements. No doubt our UIF proposal underestimated the resource needs and logistical challenges at stake in developing the three-tiered program we imagined, but we have done more with those resources than even we thought possible. Our constraints are quite apparent to us and we are constantly working through or on plans for dealing with them. Once we get past the present issues involving our full time curriculum coordinator, we can move forward again quickly. Other problems will require additional resources, some of which (an office complex) the deans have vaguely committed to us for the future. In any case, within just a couple of years we have created an intellectually creative enterprise on the UW campus that is new, exciting, productive, and highly efficient. We believe that LSJ is quickly becoming one of the most distinctive and distinguished programs in the Arts and Sciences.

B. Faculty Productivity: The Nexus of Research and Teaching

As emphasized above, assessment of LSJ faculty research productivity must be placed in the context of our very young program and our very junior faculty group. Four of the six core appointed faculty are Assistant Professors, two in their second year and another in her third year at UW; the other two are recently promoted Associate Professors. These scholars are only in their second, third, or fourth years at UW. Moreover, it is important to remember that most of our faculty members are interdisciplinary scholars burdened with constructing unique research projects, agendas, and audiences. As such, it makes little sense to try to identify quantitatively and comparatively the aggregate research output (articles, books, etc) of our faculty, in the ways that are conventional for longstanding disciplinary departments. That said, we can easily document some indicators supporting why we believe that this faculty group is well on its way to establishing a distinguished record and reputation for research and teaching.

It is worth adding a few words at the outset to the earlier discussion of our process for hiring new faculty. LSJ was extremely fortunate to benefit, soon after its inception, from hires made in other units of four individuals who are key contributors to our faculty.

Katherine Beckett (Sociology, UCLA) was recruited by UW's Sociology Department in 1999, where she was an Assistant Professor at Indiana University. She came to UW, starting in 2000, in part because of the Sociology department's strength, but also because of the broader LSJ/CLASS program prospects. She recently changed her position to 50% in LSJ, while the original SoJu 50% faculty appointment (Ross Matsueda) merged 100% into Sociology. Not only did Beckett immediately become a player in LSJ, but her husband, Steven Herbert (Geography, UCLA), joined us as the first 50% LSJ faculty appointment (50% in Geography). Both individuals provided critical intellectual assets and energy as we recruited junior faculty; both were recently promoted with tenure by their respective units. In addition, Assistant Professor Patrick Rivers (Political Science, U. of North Carolina) chose last year to move 50% of his appointment from the American Ethnic Studies program into LSJ. Assistant Professor George Lovell began with a 100% appointment in Political Science in 2001-2 (after spending three years at William and Mary), but his hire was closely coordinated with the LSJ search and he has also become a key member of the LSJ/CLASS faculty group without changing his appointment.

Meanwhile, the subsequent search for three new entry-level faculty members (two supported by the UIF, one by additional College funding) was challenging and long. We advertised in many disciplinary and interdisciplinary forums. The first year produced a disappointing applicant pool, but the second year was large and deep with great candidates. Rachel Cichowski (Political Science, UC Irvine) was our first hire, in the first year of the search (2000-1); Angelina Godoy (Sociology, UC Berkeley) and Arzoo Osanloo (Anthropology, Stanford) were hired the next year. All three were superbly trained, demonstrated the type of interdisciplinary intellectual interests we desired, and showed potential for outstanding research publication records. We have been extremely pleased to hire these terrific new faculty members for the program.

Cultivating a "Research Culture": Individual Excellence and Group Support. Even while quite junior, the Assistant Professors have shown great promise of research productivity. Lovell has published four referred journal articles, several edited book chapters, and a very favorably reviewed recent book with Cambridge University Press. He has established himself as one of the leading historical institutionalists working on American judicial politics. Angelina Godoy has submitted her revised dissertation manuscript – on vigilante violence and demands for legal order in Latin America -- for review to several top university presses, Rachel Cichowski (legal mobilization around the European Court of Justice) has submitted her manuscript to Cambridge University Press, and Arzoo Osanloo (women's rights in Islamic nations) is preparing to submit her manuscript soon as well. Cichowski, in just her third year at UW, has published three refereed journal articles, several edited book chapters, and a co-edited book with Oxford University Press already. Patrick Rivers is using a post-doctoral fellowship at the University of Chicago to complete a book (on hate speech) already under contract; he has an article and a book chapter published and several more under review or ready for submission for review. In short, this is a very, very promising group of junior scholars whom we expect to develop outstanding reputations within just a few years.

These new hires join a distinguished group of tenured scholars. Katherine Beckett is a prolific scholar who has published two widely praised books and over a dozen articles (several winning awards) in her still young career; she has submitted

several research grants for a new book and article series. Steven Herbert is working on a new book that follows up his well-reviewed and widely known *Policing Space*; he also has published a host of journal articles and book chapters. Susan Whiting has established herself as a leading scholar on law and economic development in China, and Jamie Mayerfeld is starting to publish in his recently developed interest area of human rights. Andrea Simpson is well into her second book, on legal mobilization politics of African-American women around environmental justice issues. Professor Joel Migdal is one of the most prolific and influential (author of many books and articles) scholars on comparative state/society relations in and beyond the field of Political Science. Professor Michael McCann is a widely respected scholar in law and society studies; his fourth book is about to be published by University of Chicago Press, following his multi-award winning volume *Rights at Work*. Recently promoted professors Anita Ramasastry and Walter Walsh along with Professors Veronica Taylor and Lou Wolcher in the Law School all add distinguished scholarly credentials to this group as well. In sum, we fully expect that the UW will be able to boast in just a few short years time about featuring one of the most outstanding faculty groups of law and society researchers in the nation, and perhaps the best group grounded primarily in the social sciences.

We believe that our contributions to research will grow for reasons that transcend merely the quality of our individual scholars. From the start, the CLASS/LSJ vision has been committed to creating an intellectual community that promotes research excellence. The program director has attempted to provide some measure of mentoring to the six core appointed faculty, and the Associate Professors are stepping up as well with regard to Assistant Professors. But even more important is the development of the CLASS faculty community itself as a source of intellectual stimulation, learning, and development. Our common interest in “knowing” the law and society canon and especially our common interest in interrogating racialized, gendered, and classed power relations – all provide much ground for mutual exchange. Not only is there great sharing of ideas, reading of each other’s work, and discussion about professional matters among the larger core faculty group, but the larger faculty group is composed of distinct, overlapping subgroups that cluster around a variety of substantive interests. These intellectual clusters include: violence, social control, and criminal justice (Beckett, Herbert, Godoy, Rivers); legal disputing and mobilization politics (McCann, Cichowski, Lovell, Osanloo, Migdal); law and popular culture (Rivers, Beckett, Herbert, McCann); courts and related legal institutions (Lovell, Cichowski, McCann, Osanloo); and human rights (Mayerfeld, Osanloo, Godoy, McCann, Lovell, Rivers). Such groupings conveniently provide even more motivation for regular intellectual exchange and collaboration. These factors also make it relatively easy for us to unite around support for inviting or co-sponsoring visiting speakers as well as developing conference themes.

Moreover, senior colleagues have worked to encourage and assist junior faculty submission of grant proposals for development of past or new research. McCann, Migdal, and Whiting all have been successful in generating research funding in the past, and we hope these examples will be helpful to others. In the last year, Katherine Beckett has submitted two large grant proposals as lead PI, joined by McCann; Beckett and Steve Herbert submitted another foundation grant proposal for a separate project; and Rachel Cichowski won a German Marshall Fund grant, which is supporting her leave and work in Europe for much of this academic year. Several campus Royalty Research proposals

have been submitted by junior faculty, and several NSF grant proposals are in the process of development as we write this report. All in all, the confluence of intellectual interests and activity among our diverse interdisciplinary group greatly nurtures the developing “research culture” in CLASS. We are committed to continuing to build on these beginnings. We are all aware that successful grant generation will greatly help our faculty produce more and better research as well as cultivate stronger ties with graduate students from units around and beyond the quad. We also expect to apply for some large institutional grants that will support both individual and collaborative research projects. If we, individually and collectively, prove successful in these ventures, some serious challenges await us in fulfilling our teaching obligations, which are particularly problematic in a small program without our own graduate students. But we will happily confront that dilemma when we get to it. The director is also committed to working with junior faculty in becoming more professionally connected to the Law and Society Association through participation in annual meetings. Finally, our commitment to solving our three primary resource needs – common office space, increased staff support, and increased graduate student/speaker funding – is directly related to enhancing further the research culture of our unit.

Teaching Responsibilities. Another positive dimension of our program is that research and teaching interests for most faculty are fairly well coordinated, consistent, and complementary. Given that the core faculty members have taken an active role in designing the core curriculum and were hired for their combination of teaching and research interests, this should not be surprising. The joint appointments for LSJ faculty could pose some problems, and they have raised a few issues. However, for the most part we have been able to work out course assignments in ways that please both units and fit faculty inclinations.

The modal four-course teaching load for our faculty is: one large (150-200) service course, in either LSJ or jointly listed in LSJ and a home unit; a second medium sized (40-75) upper division class; and two seminars, one of which might be a graduate seminar. Student credit hours vary, but a load of about 1200 SCH/yr is average, although new faculty began with lighter loads. That our faculty members are eligible to teach 1-2 LSJ (or other) senior seminars on topics of their choosing each year further facilitates instructional duties that are complementary to research activity. The relative equality in teaching loads also means that burdens are shared fairly and at no particular expense to anyone. For example, while the LSJ director is the faculty of record for the 20 or so program interns each quarter, individual supervisory roles are distributed evenly among the core program faculty, insuring closer, more individualized attention for students and equitable course loads for faculty. Our unit is not, and is unlikely to become, one where some faculty are primarily researchers and others do the teaching; everyone is well situated and encouraged to excel at both. The fact that many of our courses are jointly listed between LSJ and home units not only facilitates good relations generally among units, but it also enables faculty to balance their professional and intellectual commitments in flexible ways as well. This works better for some faculty than others, but so far most aspects of the LSJ roles have complemented activity as individual researchers and members of the CLASS community.

Other steps have been taken to make teaching and research as complementary as possible. The director has worked with home units to make research quarter opportunities available to all LSJ faculty. So far this has worked very well. The availability of research quarters was a critical factor in recruiting first-rate faculty from top programs, and it remains critical as these scholars build their research and publishing records. Another resource that we are just beginning to develop is the integration of undergraduate students into our research projects. We have very smart, able, and creative undergraduates, and we would help ourselves greatly as scholars by using course credit options to involve them more as assistants in our research. Several of us have done this quite successfully, and we look to expand the practice more widely. For example, just this quarter, Professor McCann has organized a team of five students to conduct original research into news coverage of civil litigation for future article publication.

One other notable feature of our faculty teaching activity is its very high quality. The program began from the visionary leadership of two senior faculty who each had won university teaching awards. We were fortunate that two of the first new faculty to align with us, Beckett and Herbert, were outstanding teachers. All four of the new junior hires (including Lovell here) showed promise of outstanding teaching, and all have lived up to those expectations so far.⁷ Indeed, we recently have been besieged with requests from the Honors Program trying to bargain with us for access to several of our terrific faculty instructors. Our corps of select off-campus temporary instructors – including most notably William Redkey, Mimi Walsh, and Larry Fehr – also adds splendid teaching skills and interesting classes to our curriculum each year. This high quality teaching has quickly generated demand both for our class enrollments and for individual mentoring that threaten to overwhelm us. Overall, though, the fact that teaching is highly valued and skillfully practiced by our faculty members is another factor that reduces tensions between the research and teaching missions,

One challenge to both our teaching and research productivity, by contrast, derives from the fact that most of our faculty are also administratively talented, at least by academic standards. As a result, home units have been calling on some faculty members to assume roles that compete with LSJ/CLASS involvement and individual scholarship. This is common to all units, but it can be especially costly for more junior faculty and in a small unit like ours that depends on contributions from everyone. This suggests yet another way in which additional staff support within LSJ is a profound need.

In sum, the LSJ teaching regimen has been designed in ways that complement, build on, and mesh with active faculty research agendas. In ways we will suggest later, this “fit” should benefit the instruction of students as much as scholarly research endeavors. This is a huge departure from the old SoJu program, and it is only fitting for a top research university like the University of Washington.

Staff Relations. Earlier sections of this study have briefly mentioned issues related to staff. Most important, we have noted that: one full-time permanent staff position is inadequate for managing LSJ, much less for other dimensions of the program. Moreover, we have experienced continuous staff turnover, with a new person in the role each of the past four years; and the serious health problems faced by our present staff

⁷ See p. 22 *infra* for a list of teaching evaluation scores, and Appendix B for a department summary of teaching evaluations by our instructors in key LSJ courses.

member over the last six months have left us scrambling for adequate temporary help and resources to pay for it. It is important to put this grim picture in perspective, however. First, our capacity to fund a permanent professional position owes to additional support provided by our deans on top of the UIF grant, for which we are grateful. This full-time professional staff arrangement works far better than the two 50% classified staff positions with which we initially experimented, and it is infinitely better than the SoJu years when we had no independent staff and depended entirely on Political Science. Second, Karin Stromberg, who became our first Curriculum Coordinator in August, 2002, was marvelously efficient, creative, diligent, and wonderful in every way until she was slowed and then disabled by returning health problems. We diverted substantial funds from our curricular budget to recruit Karin, and we have been extremely blessed and happy to have her join us. We were short on staff support even with Karin, however, and her absence since the start of fall, 2003 has greatly exacerbated the problem, making an already stressful situation very difficult and draining—for the director, for faculty, and especially for students. Third, this difficult situation has been moderated significantly by the generous back-up of Political Science, who has provided us graduate advisors when needed and other types of support. The present and, especially past, Directors of Academic Services (Meera Roy, Sharon Redeker) have been very understanding, helpful, and patient. Sharon Redeker, who is officially retired, has selflessly and without compensation provided us many scores of hours administering our curriculum; without this assistance, things would have been complete chaos. Moreover, Ann Buscherfeld, the Political Science Administrator, provides all the budgetary coordination and administration for the program. This is a huge benefit for us which, while unfair to Ann, only works because of her extraordinary skills and efficiency. We doubt that this arrangement can last far into the future. Fourth, our faculty have been very patient and understanding about the situation; the entire group has supported doing what is best for Karin first and dealing with the consequences for the program as best we can. Students have also been generally patient, but their lack of knowledge about the situation has led to a fair amount of frustration.

We do not know how the immediate situation will turn out, although we do now have a solid plan for able temporary staffing in winter quarter, 2004; our hope is that Karin will be able to return at that point. Beyond that, we will continue to experiment with other low-cost options. The most obvious of these is to provide program students internship credits for office assistance. They seem to enjoy this when we can keep them busy, because they have the opportunity to interact with faculty, graduate students, and visitors on a regular basis. However, such students tend to be quite uneven in their performance and oversight demands are fairly high, especially because we must continually teach new students the basic ropes. We did experiment with paying a work-study eligible student last year. This is an inexpensive option to secure a stable worker, but we could find no comparable student this year. We also have worked out a great cooperative arrangement to share a graduate RA with the Institute for Transnational Studies this year, which has been invaluable for organizing and administering our speaker series and conference on "Human Rights from the Bottom Up." Whether we can continue this arrangement in the future is uncertain, and unlikely.

In sum, we would love to be able to discuss our arrangement for promoting staff productivity and development, but our present challenge is to stabilize the position we

have and seek to add more staff in the future. Our capacity to fulfill each of our various missions depends greatly on finding some ways to fill these staff needs.

Program Governance: Small is Beautiful. Finally, our structure of program governance has been committed to sustaining faculty investment in research and teaching. Given our small program size and the fact that all core faculty have 50% appointments in home disciplinary units, our internal governance duties have been limited to our undergraduate curriculum and to intellectual projects such as speaker series, colloquia series, conferences, and the like. The founding director (McCann) led virtually all organizational matters in the initial two years, involving the other faculty as needed. Once our core faculty arrived and were settled in, specific leadership responsibilities were delegated to a faculty undergraduate coordinator (Herbert) and faculty graduate coordinator (Beckett), who still work closely with the director. Beyond that, ad hoc leadership of special activities such as reading groups or conference planning has been established. For example, Steve Herbert has organized reading groups involving faculty and graduate students over the last two years; a committee of Mayerfeld, Godoy, and Osanloo was designated to develop the year long “Human Rights from the Ground Up” speaker series and spring conference, while Simpson and Lovell helped McCann to organize the special event on *Brown v. Bd. of Education* in fall, 2003, with Peter Irons. From the start, our goal has been keep internal governance activity as simple as possible, and to save collective assembly for intellectual exchange. Given the relatively new status of the faculty and program, the director has assumed much responsibility for leadership and administration to date, but that will continue to evolve toward a more shared, democratic arrangement in coming years. In fact, it has been very gratifying to find that many of the program faculty members show an aptitude for leadership initiative and administrative savvy as well as excellent scholarship. Our biggest concern is not the level of future administrative demands on faculty from LSJ, but rather from home units who have recognized these skills.

C. Relations with Other Units: The Institutional Challenge of Interdisciplinarity

We already have mentioned aspects of this topic, and we actually believe that we need say relatively little more. The reason is that the LSJ experiment in interdisciplinary and multi-unit cooperation seems to be working extremely well, at least relative to familiar complaints that interdisciplinary relations are unworkable and rarely produce quality scholarship. We offer some reflections about how and why this has worked so well in our case.

The Institutionalization of the Vision. Many ingredients of our original design have meshed well to produce coherence and compatibility in our complexly constructed multi-disciplinary design. The first element was the initial decision to locate 50% of all LSJ lines in a disciplinary “home” unit. The logic was that home units would gain a “free” faculty appointment in exchange for providing administrative services and resource support (travel, etc.) that LSJ could not fund as well as flexibility in course assignments. As such, disciplinary units and LSJ quickly recognized their respective

stakes in mutual cooperation. A second key was to hire truly interdisciplinary (or multi-disciplinary) scholars who would want to be part of LSJ and feel “at home” there as much as, if not more than, in a disciplinary unit. A third ingredient was to design teaching loads so as to benefit each disciplinary unit while privileging LSJ curricular priorities; joint courses with variable splits of seats for each unit is the key provision, as is the availability of the faculty member for graduate teaching, mentoring, and supervision in the home unit. A fourth factor was recruitment of top scholars whom any reasonable unit would make compromises to obtain and keep. The fifth key element has been for the director to remain vigilant about building good relations and striking bargains that are viewed as mutually beneficial by all parties. The sixth element has involved gaining consensus on common evaluation procedures, from merit raises through contract renewal and promotion, between units sharing joint positions.

Overall, this intricate institutional foundation of our vision has proved to be sound; we have been extremely successful in hiring terrific faculty, and we have been mostly successful in building good relations through mutually beneficial arrangements among units. There has been no magic at stake beyond solid institutional design of symbiotic relations, much hard work, ample good will, and perhaps a bit of luck. It probably helped that the founding director had administered SoJu for several years and, more important, had been chair of Political Science for four years. The challenges of this small interdisciplinary program have been no greater than, and also probably not much less than, that of running a moderately large department; he was used to building consensus, making mutually beneficial deals, preempting tensions, and the like. One other major factor has been the supportive relationship with Political Science, which has been extremely kind to LSJ, even more so after the chair of the former unit stepped down to direct the latter. Working in the shadow, and with the consistent support, of a highly productive, cooperative, efficient unit like Political Science has no doubt softened and even leveled some of the bumps along the way that come with building a new, interdisciplinary enterprise. Other units – most notably JSIS, Geography, Anthropology, Philosophy, AES, Sociology, and Law – also have done their part to make all this work. That many units have recognized the value of our interdisciplinary experiment is a gratifying and invaluable fact of our history.

The only real stumbling block has concerned relationships with one unit – Sociology – noted previously. We still do not fully understand this, but the tension surely has to do with the fact that the old SoJu program was highly dependent on Sociology; tensions began to develop when Political Science, in the early 1990s, was “forced” to assume administrative responsibility for the de-funded SoJu program. As the new LSJ project was reborn as an independent unit once more, it reduced its links to Sociology further, which perhaps increased strains. The tensions became most palpable and intense around two faculty appointments, one in LSJ and one in Sociology, which eventually were swapped. All this is lamentable, for cooperation would seem to benefit both units. The good news is that wounds seem to have been dressed, healing has progressed, and a healthy new relationship is growing. We want to believe that (to shift metaphors again) this bump in relations remains only in our rear view mirror.

Beyond Joint Faculty: Broader Intellectual Interactions. CLASS/LSJ have developed strong working relationships with other units on campus in a wide variety of

ways. We have reached out and successfully solicited support for a number of our initiatives, including especially collaboration on our “Human Rights from the Ground Up” speaker series in fall and winter, 2003-4, followed by our conference in spring. We also have collaborated on bringing in a wide variety of speakers chosen by both us and by other units, including several Stice, Walker Ames, and other lecturers on campus. This cooperation is especially strong in our relationship with the Institute for Transnational Studies, JSIS, Political Science, and, increasingly, the Law School. This dates back to our collaboration on our founding conference on “Globalization and the Law” enlisting many faculty and graduate students in 1998, the later two-day student and community oriented Free Speech on Campus conference with Ralph Nader, and the highly successful speaker series on “Law and Transitional Governance” organized by Susan Whiting in 2002-3 – all events initiated exclusively or in large part by CLASS faculty. Assistant Professor Rachel Cichowski has generated much collaboration among CLASS, the European Union Center, and the Law School in organizing visiting speakers as well as a conference in spring, 2004, on “Courts, Civil Society, and Governance: European and International Perspectives.” We have begun to develop close ties as well to the Simpson Center for the Humanities, which provided funding for the human rights speaker series and other activities where we have shared resources. All in all, CLASS has become a major player on campus in generating intellectual dialogue and sponsoring speakers in the last five years. Much of this sponsorship was funded by UIF funds, but we have found ways to generate funding for such activities independent of that source.

Limits and Challenges to Inter-Unit Relations. Another relationship, or lack thereof, deserves mention. Several of the most prestigious and successful law and society programs in the nation -- UC Berkeley, Wisconsin, SUNY Buffalo, Northwestern, to name the most prominent -- have thrived on strong law school connections. By contrast, many other programs -- mostly at liberal arts schools, but also several at research universities with graduate programs (UC Irvine, Arizona State) -- have thrived in the absence of any law school. At the University of Washington, we have the benefit of a fine law school, but we were very aware that developing substantial linkages to that unit would be difficult. We thus designed LSJ and CLASS to be grounded in the social sciences and able to thrive with few or no law school linkages, although our endeavor could be greatly enhanced with law school connections. For several years, CLASS faculty in the social sciences have built some degree of working relationship with several law school faculty members, most notably Veronica Taylor, Anita Ramasastry, Walter Walsh, Louis Wolcher, and Joan Fitzpatrick (who recently died). With a new Law School dean and a new building just five minutes away on the campus, there is much reason for optimism that linkages can be fortified and expanded. We are hoping and working toward that latter end.

Finally, we briefly note that our original aim to build bridges to the humanities has not been realized. The original informal “LSJ vision group” in the mid-1990s included several very interesting scholars from the English department whose teaching and research addressed law and society themes. We had great hopes to include in our curriculum courses on law in fiction, fictional texts as sources of legal knowledge, law and film, and law and popular culture. Although enthusiastic contributors to early activities, both of these scholars left the UW before LSJ was funded by the UIF. The LSJ

faculty continue to integrate humanities scholarship into their teaching and research activities, and we have recently developed very good relationships with the Simpson Center for the Humanities, who funded our human rights speaker series. However, we lament that we have not been able to find or mobilize humanities scholars with interests in the law and society field.

D. Diversity

This report noted earlier that the LSJ faculty group considers the commitment to diversity as one of our greatest strengths. We elaborate further here, drawing on language from reports submitted elsewhere.

The LSJ program from the start has been committed to the ideal of promoting education about, and respect for, diversity. Indeed, the politically charged character of the program focus on law, power, and justice ensures that confronting these issues of diversity is unavoidable. Given the basic premise of "equal justice for all" that is at the heart of the rule of law ideal, addressing what "differences make a difference" among citizens, their situations, and their actions is at the very heart of program study. Moreover, the faculty and staff of LSJ have long shared a commitment that diversity can be a very positive achievement, and that certain types of diversity and respect for that diversity are essential to democratic, legally constituted societies.

The very development of LSJ reflects these commitments. The new curriculum was conceived and planned in coordination with the Curriculum Transformation Project funded by Ford Foundation and led by Betty Schmitz in the mid 1990s. Michael McCann, who led the program reform effort, participated in that initial faculty group and used the experience to rethink what LSJ could become in light of commitments to diversity. This history has been sustained by initiatives from Andrea Simpson, Arzoo Osanloo, and others promoting continued curricular transformation to enhance diversity. In addition, the director sponsored no less than four open forums soliciting student input about the program, led a diverse focus group seminar on the new program, and invited comment from faculty in a variety of ways. In all these discussions, the commitment to teaching about and promoting the ideal of diversity was prominent. The resulting program reflected these commitments in a variety of ways outlined below.

Diversity Among People in the Program. We have believed that the commitment to diversity is not simply an abstract matter for reflection and deliberation. Understanding and developing respect for differences among people must emanate from practical interaction and relationships. As such we have been committed to welcoming and promoting diversity along the lines of race, gender, ethnicity, class, religion, sexual difference, and the like among the people in our program -- the faculty, the staff, the students. As such, we not only link our words to our actions, but when the program fosters attention to issues of diversity, such discourse in part builds on recognized differences among *us* as a community.

For one thing, the SoJu program historically attracted one of the most diverse *student constituencies* of any program on campus. In particular, our undergraduate constituency long has included many members of minority racial and ethnic groups –

generally approaching 25% of our majors -- as well as female students. LSJ has continued in this tradition. A look at recent data from the Registrar's Office reveals the following data about minority students (African American, American Indian, Hispanic, Asian American) who are declared majors in LSJ classes: 23% in Autumn 2002; 24% in Winter 2003; 24% in Spring 2003; 48% (including 27% African American) in Summer 2003. Even in the post I-200 era, the LSJ program has actively and successfully recruited a diverse group of students on and to our campus.

The newly hired and affiliated faculty members in LSJ likewise represent one of the most diverse groups on campus. Not only do our faculty affiliate with half a dozen different disciplines, but our demographic profiles are highly unique. All three faculty members hired with UIF or College funds for LSJ were female; two are members of minority ethnic communities born outside the U.S. Of our program faculty, roughly one-half are female, three are African American, one is Latina, one is of Iranian descent; affiliate faculty include women of Native American and East Indian descent. This mix is far more diverse than the UW faculty as a whole, than the social sciences as a whole, and probably than any single unit outside of AES. Moreover, we are actively pursuing connections with other new and existing faculty who will even further increase this diversity of faculty members. Finally, we have actively initiated and supported efforts to bring in speakers from academic and political life around the world that reflect the fundamental differences enumerated above.

Diversity as a Curricular Commitment. The LSJ curriculum addresses at great length issues of race, gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality, religion, and other fundamental lines of difference among citizens. Our curriculum highlights attention to these issues in at least three ways. *First*, our curriculum rigorously focuses attention not only to demographic features but, more importantly, to the "socially constructed" differences in identity, worth, inclination, and power of variously categorized citizens or traits. These often pliable categories and markers of identity hold huge implications for differential citizenship status, power, inclusion/exclusion, and justice/injustice. *Second*, our defining commitment to comparative cross-national and transnational study further advances attention to diversity. The revised LSJ curriculum takes a giant step in expanding attention to differences among nations and regions in an increasingly globalized world, beyond a narrow focus on differences among citizens within the United States. The new program specifically addresses both the trends toward "convergence" or homogeneity and the persistence of differences or creation of new differentiation that attend globalization, and in which law is playing a huge role.

Finally, the LSJ curriculum is committed to ideals of citizen tolerance and genuine respect for difference. Concepts such as justice, rights, equality, and the like are interrogated throughout the LSJ curriculum as normative standards that are both internal and external to law. In this pursuit, questions of difference prominently arise at every point. The faculty are united by commitments to basic principles of justice and rights as essential foundations of citizenship while they individually approach those norms from a variety of different substantive and pedagogical angles. Our very title – Law, Societies, and Justice – expresses all these linkages in unmistakable terms. The willingness of LSJ to work with a campus group in developing a three-course sequence on disabilities studies is yet another strong expression of this commitment.

Diversity in Ways of Knowing. The new LSJ program also emphasizes relentless interrogation of different forms of knowledge and different ways of knowing as a substantive component of contemporary education. This focus addresses both issues of different knowledge forms themselves and their linkages to different citizens' social situation or traditions. To understand differences among people, we believe, we must become more attentive to the different ways in which people know, the different modes of thought, the different sources of knowledge, and the different types of normative claims that separate and, potentially, enrich us. This commitment has a variety of implications, including attention to: various epistemological and methodological issues in our courses; the many sources and types of knowledge that saturate our lives in mass-mediated, increasingly electronic society; how plural perspectives from differently situated experiences and “standpoints” can enhance our understanding of social issues and relations; and the confrontations between “academic” and “practical” knowledge in classrooms and, especially, in the required internship exercises. Our deeply interdisciplinary approach to research and teaching itself reflects this profound sensitivity to and curiosity about different ways of knowing at the heart of our enterprise.

The above outline only scratches the surface regarding how faculty, staff, and students focus on issues related to diversity in the LSJ program. Moreover, we want to emphasize that this is an ongoing project. We are continually working on curricular development, faculty recruitment, and program design. In each of the last three years, faculty members have been awarded small grants by the Curriculum Transformation Project to promote diversity content in LSJ individual and linked courses. Our year-long speaker series and culminating conference on “Human Rights from the Bottom Up” likewise expresses the same dedication. We would like to think that LSJ and CLASS have made fundamental contributions to this ideal on the UW campus.

E. Degree Programs

The only degrees offered by our programmatic venture are the undergraduate B.A. degrees through LSJ. This includes an LSJ major and minor as well as a minor in Human Rights. These will be the focus of the following discussion, but some attention to graduate education will conclude the section as well.

The LSJ Bachelor of Arts Degree. Our overview of the intellectual vision informing our entire programmatic endeavor goes a long way toward capturing the ideas at the heart of the LSJ curriculum. Relative to the older SoJu program, the new LSJ program curriculum is: far more *interdisciplinary* in character, both in that it draws widely on virtually all the social sciences and some humanities, and in that the faculty and courses truly integrate these various disciplinary threads; it is far *broader in the socio-legal terrain* it covers, adding healthy doses of civil disputing, constitutional law, administrative law, human rights, and reform-oriented legal mobilization to the criminal justice focus of SoJu; more attentive to *law as practices and relationships in society* along with the more conventional focus on official state institutions; more *comparative* in

that cross-national and transnational arenas as well as experiences of differently situated social groups are emphasized very prominently; and more *theoretically sophisticated* in its attention to both modern and post-structural social theory, methodologies, and epistemologies. All in all, the LSJ curriculum offers a highly ambitious, cutting edge approach to the study of law and legality in a changing world.

We emphasize further that the core requirements and other prominently featured classes in LSJ tend to be quite different in their primary *aim* from those in the SoJu program. Not only are they substantively different, but they tend to be more *rigorously analytical and intellectually challenging* in their orientation. In particular, the entire curriculum is oriented to analyzing the complexities of power relationships in various social contexts and the possibilities and challenges for advancing social justice, a concept which itself is regularly interrogated. Consistent with this focus, all of our classes require students to do much writing – including in-class essay exams, take-home essay papers, and longer research papers. We are committed to the proposition that the key skills necessary for critical, analytical thinking and for effective writing are inseparable. That even our internship classes prominently feature writing requirements, including an “analytical paper” along with a paper on “organization” of the internship context, evidences this commitment. Of course, we expect that students will gain much knowledge along the way, but it is these skills of critical thinking, analytical rigor, disciplined writing (and oral presentation) that we emphasize most. We believe that these skills are those most appropriately generated in a good liberal arts program and will serve our students best in their subsequent adult lives.

The *institutional design of LSJ curriculum* likewise builds on but far surpasses in quality that of the SoJu program. Some elements are derivative but upgraded and improved in delivery; other elements are entirely new. To begin with, the undergraduate major requires students to take four core classes, three of which must be taken before entry into the program and all four required for graduation: LSJ 363 Law in Society; LSJ 375 Introduction to Criminal Justice; LSJ 367 Comparative Law and Courts; and LSJ 320 or 321 Introduction to Human Rights. These courses are offered at least twice each year; 363 is usually offered every quarter, including summer. While retaining fairly conventional titles, each class is newly constructed for the major to exemplify our sophisticated and novel program vision of socio-legal study; all are coordinated and taught by our core program faculty members. These classes are intended to provide the common introductory foundation and conceptual maps for students as they begin and progress through the major. Beyond this, students are required to take at least two additional class in one of our three thematic subfields – Criminal Justice and Social Control, Comparative Legal Institutions, and Rights, Resistances, and Reconstructions in Law – and one class from each of the other two subfields. In this way, we seek to balance some subfield concentration with the more fundamental goal of breadth – a commitment that is quite different from the criminology-based SoJu program. We emphasize again for students the classes taught by our core faculty, although the electives list features selected classes taught by other faculty across campus. Students must also complete an internship (LSJ 401). The internship requires at least 100 hours of service in a public or private legal organization (offices of public defenders, prosecutors, courts, police, lawyers, the local bar association, public interest law firms, legally-oriented NGOs like Amnesty International, etc. are the most popular) and two papers that link

academic study to this practical service activity. The internships are a widely praised part of the program; many students continue in the internships after the requirement is completed, confirming the heavy emphasis on public/community service in the program. Finally, students must complete at least one capstone senior seminar, which usually is in the area of the student's subfield concentration. A different menu of 7-8 senior seminar options – at least two each quarter – is offered every year.

One of the great virtues of a relatively small program like LSJ is that students have much greater opportunity to know the faculty and one another as well as to individualize their educational experience. Most students take at least two upper division seminar-sized classes in pursuit of their major. The required internship, the honors thesis option, and opportunities for independent studies and research all provide students incentives for rich personal experiences and contact with faculty members. Virtually all of our faculty have been very active in working with students in these individualized ways, both for LSJ credit and for credit in disciplinary units. Moreover, our great flexibility in accommodating student needs in meeting our requirements also provides room for a much more individualized educational experience than is offered by many majors. No doubt these features and the modestly elite status of our selective admission provide many of our majors a great deal of gratification.

Along with the standard LSJ major outlined above, students may take a minor in LSJ or in Human Rights, the latter coordinated with the three-campus human rights initiative. A few students take the LSJ major with a concentration in the human rights subfield plus the Human Rights minor. We also offer an Honors option; students must earn a cumulative GPA of no less than 3.5, take a second senior seminar, and complete a senior thesis paper earning a grade of 3.5 or better for 10 credits. LSJ students commonly double-up on their majors; the most common pairings in the SoJu program were Sociology and Psychology; equally common now in LSJ are pairings with Political Science, International Studies, and Comparative History of Ideas. This reflects that the profiles of our majors are changing, largely by design. While we still serve many of the traditional SoJu students interested in a wide range of law enforcement and criminal justice careers, LSJ attracts many more students with interests in other types of careers as lawyers, policy makers, political actors, and scholars. By far the largest growth area of student interest has been human rights, which includes attention to the legacies of rights struggles in the US as well as around the world. One recent dimension of this rights curriculum is a three-class sequence on disability rights, which has been taught by a terrific group of specialists on campus whom LSJ has been very happy to include in our class listings and to help secure funding.

Many indicators suggest that our classes have been quite successful so far. For one thing, individual class evaluations are quite high. We list below the adjusted median of the first four items (a) or median “course as a whole” (b) on the standard evaluations for our core and other select classes over the last two years:⁸

⁸ These two indicators reflect two different sources from which we derived teaching evaluations. Both use a five point scale, with “5” as the best.

LSJ 320 Intro to Human Rights (Mayerfeld, 200 students)	4.10 (a)
LSJ 363 Law in Society (McCann, 200 students)	4.44 (a)
LSJ 367 Legal Institutions (Cichowski, 150 students)	3.70 (a)
LSJ 375 Intro. to Criminal Justice (Herbert, 100 Students)	4.77 (b)
Soc/LSJ 271 Deviance and Social Control (Beckett, 200 students)	4.15 (b)
LSJ 355 Courts (Walsh, 40 students)	4.05 (b)
LSJ 360 Constitutional Law (Lovell, 150 students)	4.23 (b)
LSJ 361 Civil Liberties (Lovell, 100 students)	4.38 (b)
LSJ 376 Drugs and Society (Beckett, 50 students)	4.40 (b)
LSJ 378 Policing the City (Herbert, 100 students)	4.50 (b)
LSJ 421 Women's Rights in Islamic Soc. (Osanloo, 25 students)	4.50 (b)
LSJ 425 Seeking Refuge in the US (Osanloo 40)	4.60 (a)
LSJ 428 Women's Rights in Europe (Cichowski, 15 students)	4.88 (b)
LSJ 440 Criminal Procedure and Law (Redkey, 35 students)	4.81 (b)
LSJ 474 Geography and Law (Herbert, 20 students)	4.79 (b)
LSJ/Soc 490 Privacy and Technology (Marx, 30 students)	4.17 (b)
LSJ 316 Law and Social Theory (Godoy, 30 students)	4.50 (a)
LSJ 490 Human Rights in Latin America (Godoy, 18 students)	4.63 (b)

These numbers are particularly impressive when one realizes that many of these courses were the first offerings by new junior faculty. Moreover, the several important courses taught each year by our stable corps of temporary instructors also generate very high ratings (note Redkey's 440 above). The department summary evaluation, compiled by the Office of Educational Assessment, can be found in Appendix B. Moreover, we have organized focus groups for input about changes in our curriculum at regular intervals, especially in early stages of development. Such informal but important forms of student assessment have been very positive, including from students in the more traditional criminal justice and law enforcement modes.

It is likewise relevant that student demand for LSJ classes is extremely high; virtually every class closes out quickly, regardless of its initial size (up to 200 students), and scrambling to add TAs to our larger classes has become a routine challenge. For example, the Student Database reveals 372 denials (!) for our four core courses in 2002-03; 187 denials were registered for our two core courses this past fall (2003) alone.⁹ An official university study showed that several LSJ courses were among the most high in demand on campus, admitting only 35-45% of students who tried to register. This excessive demand is perhaps the most dramatic way that we have been challenged by our rapid success. We have requested and been given at least three extra TAs on top of our allotted 11 budgeted TAs each of the last two years. The demand for entry into the LSJ major is rising as well. We have always experienced demand that exceeds our capacity to accept majors; as a result, it is also clear that demand from students is limited by their own perceptions about the difficulty of admission to the major, which often requires a 3.2 GPA or better. As late as 2000, the program was limited to about 60 majors per year (of about 75 applicants), graduating about 45 per year. This academic year, we have grown

⁹ These numbers overestimate demand, in that they may reflect some students who repeatedly try to enter a class. But they also underestimate those students who do not even try when the class is filled.

to about 100 majors; we have graduated 66-72 students in each of the last two years.¹⁰ We continue to turn away about 20-25% of applicants, although many reapply and some eventually are admitted to the program. The primary reason that we limit majors is to assure that student aptitudes and interests fit our program. We presently are acting more aggressively in sorting out students whose interests and inclinations better fit the criminology-based offerings of Sociology than the LSJ program. We also must limit the total number of students to sustain our curriculum, which includes senior seminars, internships, and other student-intensive features.

Despite the complex structure of our major and the high demand for our classes, we seem to move students through the program to graduation very efficiently. Even amidst all the transformation and turnover problems, our staff advisors have done a terrific job of leading students through the labyrinth of complex course requirements and options. One great advantage of our relatively small program is that students know the staff, director, and faculty, and thus are usually fairly active in seeking counsel. Moreover, the program director (McCann) and undergraduate faculty coordinator (Herbert) work closely with the advising staff to find solutions to problems, at every point exercising discretion to balance overall goals with individual student needs, including timely graduation. Our process of curriculum transformation has made programmatic flexibility a necessity, and we have been happy to be as creative as seems warranted in particular cases. Students appreciate the individualized treatment we accord them as well as the more intimate learning environment cultivated by the program generally. Indeed, apart from some of the staffing breakdowns, students seem to love the program and are excited by the changes that they have witnessed in the curriculum and the faculty that produce it.

Four key issues remain challenges for the program at this point. Our biggest ongoing problem has resulted from high demand for core classes. Simply put, our efforts to map out an extensive core program of study has been plagued by *lack of control over entry of students* into those classes (required before they are majors) and lack of resources to expand class offerings to meet demands. As a result, students have great trouble gaining admission to entry requirement courses; some students do not complete the core entry requirements until their senior year, while our core classes are full of students who lack the common exposure to LSJ classes, methodologies, and logics of analysis. We have explored many options to address this problem; reducing our list of entry courses to 1-2 new classes, and making the remaining entry requirements into exit requirements, seems the best option. But this means that certain core classes may not be taken before upper division electives. Our small number of faculty and TAs as well as the cross-listed status of many courses limits our options in this regard.

A second related problem is that *students are often not prepared intellectually* for our program. Two limitations in particular are quite palpable – first, that students lack the conceptual tools for discussing politics, power, and social inequality (especially race, gender, and class as complexes of power relations rather than matters of merely prejudice); second, most students lack basic knowledge of world history, especially regarding large scale changes in socio-economic relations, colonialism, and regime types

¹⁰ Our high ration of graduating students to majors reflects the fact that many students are not admitted to the major until their senior year, either because they cannot gain entry into core classes or because their applications are denied until after several tries

over time. Faculty who teach non-US related courses in particular are aware of the latter issues, but we all share concerns about the lack of conceptual sophistication. This is one reason why we have moved to encourage students to take LSJ classes early on, rather than other electives which contribute little to these aspects of knowledge and thought. We also have discussed creating one new large gateway course that will introduce students to the basic conceptual frameworks we utilize (law and social power) while at least familiarizing students with studying non-U.S. socio-legal contexts. At the least, we are looking at our core classes to see if we can integrate some more basic content along these lines. Again, our lack of faculty and TAs presents a challenge for this plan.

Third, we have not yet done enough to *engage students in faculty research* as well as research of students' choosing. This is largely because of the program's youth and, even more, the junior status of our faculty, who are still sorting out their required teaching, research, and service duties. We have no doubt that advances will be made on this activity over time.

Finally, the undergraduate curriculum has been undermined by the recent diminution and *transformation of the Evening Degree Program*. The EDP had provided critical funding for key courses – mostly in the criminal justice area -- taught by several terrific off-campus instructors in the SoJu program. These classes were popular in content and in the evening time slots for many of our students. Hence we built the new LSJ curriculum around keeping the several best of these courses. The new EDP program has reduced available resources and undone the flexible options available to our students, however. As a result, we have had to shrink a key part of our curriculum, cut loose the services of good teachers long loyal to our program, and do more with fewer resources. Our students and the menu of options available to them have been the losers. We probably have few options but to accept the losses from this transformation. The necessary diversion of our inherited curricular budget for other needs (staff, travel, etc) together with the lost of EDP connection has been a serious problem.

In conclusion, the LSJ program has advanced a long way toward what we have imagined and far beyond the old SoJu program, but there is more work to do on some key fronts. Progress will require both additional TA resources and making some difficult curricular choices about use of available resources in the near future.

CLASS Graduate Fellows and Certificate Program. The initial CLASS faculty decided to resist the strong temptation to develop an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program. The primary reason was that we lacked the key resources – TAs, RAs, fellowships – to fund a top-rate graduate program. We do not want to start a program if we cannot quickly compete with the very best programs in the nation. Moreover, the few interdisciplinary graduate programs in law and society studies at other institutions have had a difficult time placing students well; by far the most successful, the JSP program at UC Berkeley, is embedded within Boalt Law School and has done better placing Ph.D.s with J.D.s in law schools than in placing graduates in the social sciences at research universities. For both reasons, we chose a less costly, less ambitious route – providing supplementary mentoring, intellectual, and modest financial support to Ph.D. students working primarily in disciplinary programs.

We are submitting a proposal to grant a certificate in interdisciplinary law and society studies to Ph.D. students, which includes a core graduate course, a menu of

additional courses, and graduate mentoring at every level through dissertation completion. But, in many ways, this simply formalizes what we have done for some years now. The CLASS Fellows program has provided a number of formal courses, mentoring, support for grant applications, and dissertation supervision to nearly a dozen students over the last five years. McCann, Migdal, Cichowski, Lovell, Whiting, Mayerfeld and Simpson in particular have worked closely with many graduate students in the Political Science Department, adding new areas of research expertise formerly unavailable.

Students at or past the dissertation stage and closely connected with CLASS include: Patricia Woods, the first Ph.D. in the interdisciplinary student Jewish Studies program, now on post-doc at Harvard, while an Assistant Professor at University of Florida; Lennie Feldman, a Political Science graduate, now an Assistant Professor at University of Oregon; Tamir Moustafa, a Political Science graduate now at University of Wisconsin, after post-doc at UC Berkeley; Anne Bloom, a Political Science Ph.D. at Occidental, who just took job at McGeorge Law School; Claire Rasmussen, an Assistant Professor at University of Delaware; Bruce Hoffman, an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Ohio University; and Jeff Dudas, Political Science, about to begin a position as Assistant Professor at University of Connecticut. Our most recent product is Scott Lemieux, who plans to finish his dissertation this coming summer and has secured a tenure track job at Hunter College. These students have also done very well in securing grants – including NSF, SSRC, Fulbright, and various foundation fellowships -- for their dissertation and subsequent research. The all-time winner in this regard is Yuksel Sezgin, who is early in the dissertation, but has landed 8 research grants for his study of legal pluralism in Egypt, India, and Israel. A host of graduate students at earlier stages of development in a wider variety of departments likewise work closely with CLASS faculty. We also have found that the existence of CLASS and LSJ have proved very helpful in recruiting graduate students into several disciplinary units – again, most directly in Political Science, but also in Sociology, Anthropology, and Geography. In many ways, therefore, the CLASS Center’s contributions to graduate education over the last five years (since the Center activities preceded the UIF grant and LSJ reforms to some degree) so far have been very significant. At the same time, most of these terrific graduate students contributed as teaching assistants or graduate instructors in LSJ classes as well as participants in CLASS sponsored reading groups, colloquia, conferences, and the like.

The key challenges before us again are clear. Most important is the need to recruit more students from beyond Political Science. This should follow directly from the increased research productivity and visibility of our junior and middle level faculty. We also need to increase the level of graduate student funding, especially through RAs. This support is especially important for our junior faculty. This need is most acute for Angelina Godoy, as her home unit, JSIS, has no Ph.D. program and the Latin American studies program is generally weak and generates almost no graduate students. Godoy is an outstanding scholar, and finding a way to support her efforts to contribute to graduate studies is important for us. This issue is relevant for other of our faculty members as well. Our commitment to generating more federal and foundation grants generally should help on this front. Finally, a physical office complex of our own would contribute greatly

to capacity to meet collectively and routinely with graduate students, thus facilitating a stronger sense of intellectual community.

F. Service to University, Profession, and Community.

We add to this study a separate short section concerning our intellectual impact on the university and in the community. This matters to us, because we have worked to make some important contributions to the overall intellectual and civic culture of the university along several lines. These efforts include the general commitments to diversity and interdisciplinarity discussed earlier, for which we have tried to become influential models. Specifically, we hope to show by our example that, contrary to many voices in academic and political life, excellence and rigor can be consistent with, and actually enhanced by, these commitments. We have demonstrated this in our own teaching and research as well as in the speakers that we have brought and sponsored on campus, in the collaboration with other similarly-committed units and groups, and in our participation in various enterprises like the Curriculum Transformation Project.

More specifically, we are very proud of the great contributions made in a very short time by our efforts to issues of human rights. We have provided in earlier pages evidence of what we have done to put the issue of human rights into the curriculum and the larger intellectual agenda of the campus. It is worth adding that we also send undergraduate interns to work with human rights groups, and we connect with those groups more and more on various types of publicity and service activities.

Moreover, virtually all of our faculty members have been active as public lecturers with community groups and interviewees in mass media formats. Arzoo Osanloo has spoken widely in many different venues on issues related to Islamic politics; Joel Migdal is a major public figure on issues regarding the Middle East; Katherine Beckett recently conducted a much publicized study of racial disparities in drug arrests in Seattle and has talked to many community groups and media outlets about the subject; Michael McCann has spoken to many community groups on a wide range of issues, and to the media many times over the years on many topics, in the last few years most often about the “lawsuit crisis” in the U.S.; Angelina Godoy has engaged in extensive outreach to the local Latino community and addressed the press often on issues concerning the Latino community; Rachel Cichowski has regularly talked to community groups about women’s rights; virtually everyone in the faculty group has participated on and beyond campus in forums on post-9/11 era issues.

All in all, it is not surprising that the dynamic, articulate group of faculty associated with CLASS have become increasingly prominent as public intellectuals on the UW campus and in the larger Puget Sound community. This is an important aspect of who we are individually and collectively as scholars.

G. Conclusion

Our self-study has been frank and far-reaching; we have little to add at this end point. Overall, we again state our view that the LSJ/CLASS faculty have done a tremendous amount in a short time to realize the goals articulated in the UIF proposal, but we also realize that more remains to be done if we are to fulfill our promise as teachers of undergraduates, as mentors to graduate students, as research scholars, and as public intellectuals. Much progress will follow simply from our continuation on the tracks we have laid so far, while other challenges will require new strategies, choices, and commitments.

Finally, moving forward also requires additional resources. We mention four needs in particular that have arisen repeatedly in our narrative:

- 1) **a central office complex** with faculty, staff, and RA/TA offices as well as a meeting room;
- 2) **additional staff support**, either in the form of a 50% classified office worker or, preferably, four quarters of TA support for a grad advisor and office worker each year;
- 3) **additional permanent Teaching Assistantships** to meet high demand for classes, especially our core entry requirements;
- 4) **supplementary budgetary allocations** for faculty travel, supplies, office expenses, and faculty administrative support (half month salary) as well as for guest speakers, none of which were provided by the inherited SoJu budget or the UIF grant (we need at least \$18,000/yr)

It is relevant to emphasize the extraordinary efficiency of the LSJ unit: Just several years after its initial funding, a program with 3.0 faculty lines and a tiny operating budget offers over 100 majors a first-rate interdisciplinary liberal arts education, graduates 75 seniors each year, offers a substantial supplementary resource for graduate students, and enhances significantly the overall intellectual activity and status of the university. The additional monetary support we need is quite modest; the office complex will be a challenge on our campus, but we have been extended general commitments to that end. These are the forms of additional assistance we require to realize the vision we proposed a few years ago; we will do the rest to put these resources to good use.

