

<b>Institution: London School of Economics and Political Science</b>
<b>Unit of Assessment: 22B: International Development</b>
<p><b>1. Unit context and structure, research and impact strategy</b></p> <p><b>a. Context and motivation</b></p> <p>Why have a department of International Development? Why so organise research and teaching in a university that has good departments of economics, political science, anthropology, etc? For the same reason universities with good departments of physics, chemistry and maths also invest in schools of engineering. Disciplinary departments tend to focus on questions, methods, and theories that are defined by the norms and boundaries of those disciplines. This gives disciplinary work rigour and consistency. But it also orients research inwards, more towards the progress of the discipline than the objects of their study. And it prioritises objects of research that lie clearly within those boundaries. Engineering schools, by contrast, tend to be problem-oriented. Objects of study are shaped more by the needs of the world – a stronger bridge, faster circuit, or greener energy – rather than the needs of the discipline.</p> <p>In a similar sense, LSE's Department of International Development is a problem-oriented department that seeks to answer specific questions given by the world, and clearly contextualized in time and place, with the best theoretical and methodological tools available across the social sciences. We choose concepts and methods according to the question to be answered, and not vice versa. And we combine qualitative and quantitative methods, and draw on theory from across a range of disciplines, to develop new approaches capable of engaging effectively with the complex constraints of developing countries.</p> <p>Bridge-building offers a relevant analogy. The engineer is tasked with designing a bridge for a particular place and time. A disciplinary response might be, 'Build the bridge downstream, where conditions are better suited to cutting-edge methods.' To which the engineer responds, 'The road segments that need connecting are not downstream. They are here. Hence we choose methods to suit this site.'</p> <p>This happened recently to a PhD student of ours studying the effects of Christian missionaries in Madagascar. Economists suggested he switch to far better Indian data. This was a good suggestion... for someone not too interested in Madagascar. But he, and we, were. Supported by his political scientist and economist supervisors, he designed an innovative Q<sup>2</sup> methodology and used it to identify important effects of missionary activities (distinguishing between Catholics and Anglicans) on human development. His work won APSA's Max Weber Best Paper Award, and was published in <i>World Development</i>. His name is Borge Wietzke, and he's now an Assistant Professor at IBEI-Barcelona.</p> <p>His case is not unique. Numerous colleagues have made innovations of this sort, deviating from disciplinary norms and standards to generate insights that have influenced directions in policy making, and fed back to inform conceptual developments in the social sciences. Further examples appear below.</p> <p><b>b. Research strategy and areas</b></p> <p><b>Vision</b></p> <p>Our research focuses on the economic, social, and political issues that shape processes of change in developing countries, at micro, meso, and macro levels. Our analyses start from a recognition that the dynamics of change are different in developing countries. Rather than following evolutionary paths that repeat those of the developed world, countries of the 'global south' deal with a range of local and international forces that generate distinctive trajectories. This insight has long been foundational to the field of development studies, and our work continues in that tradition.</p>

What makes ID distinctive are our firm roots in the constituent disciplines of development studies. Most of us have disciplinary degrees, and many of us occupy prominent roles in the main professional organisations and working groups of those disciplines. We publish our research not only in leading development and area studies journals, but also in highly visible and selective disciplinary journals, as well as books with leading academic presses.

Such a praxis is central to how we view our department and its strategic role in our field. For development studies to be vital, sustainable, and rigorous, it must:

1. Solve real-world intellectual problems through creative syntheses of cutting-edge insights from our constituent disciplines;
2. Systematise these theoretical and methodological innovations to help build the intellectual toolkit of development studies; and
3. Return novel insights and methods to the disciplines through contributions that push out their own frontiers.

Our research outputs feature many examples of this approach in action. A few examples of creative syntheses with significant disciplinary and policy impacts include:

- Allen and collaborators (2016, 2019) applied anthropological understandings of public authority to generate pioneering analyses of the Ebola crises in Sierra Leone and the Democratic Republic of Congo. These were taken up enthusiastically by public health specialists, who foregrounded their work in *The Lancet* and employed it to plan preparedness and design responses to Ebola, COVID-19, and other pandemics.
- Boone (2014, 2017, 2019) fused concepts from political science, geography, anthropology and sociology to demonstrate the existence of sub-national variation in state structure driven by patterns of landholding. Her 'political topography' model has influenced several generations of political science research on electoral politics, distributive politics, and state-building in Africa and other developing regions.
- Faguet (2014, 2015, 2019) integrated ideas from political science, anthropology and economics to explain subnational variation in local government effectiveness in a series of publications in development studies, economics, and political science outlets, cited 4,000+ times. This work developed a bottom-up understanding of local governance that enriched top-down understandings of decentralization in both economics, which traditionally focused on resource distribution and elite capture, and political science, which concentrated on electoral competition and interest group politics. It also played a key role in establishing 'large-N subnational analysis' as a cutting-edge, rapidly growing empirical method today.
- Fairfield (2017, 2019, forthcoming) borrows logical Bayesianism from physics, astrophysics, and geology to develop a new iterative method of case comparison that builds greater rigour into qualitative research by mitigating confirmation bias and ad-hoc hypothesizing. Born of the challenges of empirical fieldwork in developing contexts, her method is having a big impact on political science, where it was published in two leading journals, won APSA's Sage methodology award, and will soon appear as a book (Cambridge). Sociologists and philosophers of science are currently applying Bayesian process tracing to their fields.
- Kar's analysis (2017, 2018, 2020) of microfinance in India weaves together a multi-disciplinary understanding of financial networks and institutions. It has enriched anthropology, where microcredit research has tended to focus on dyadic relationships between borrowers and lenders, by showing how the everyday lives of poor borrowers and loan officers are, in fact, shaped by the larger flows and structures of global finance.

Put another way, we view development studies as a creative space of invention that lies above the disciplines, and interacts critically and intensely with them. We do not conceive of the field in negative terms – 'not economics, nor political science, nor anthropology...'. Rather, we believe

in a positive-sum approach that reaches deep into the disciplines for theories and methods, and then returns to them transgressive, cutting-edge insights in a constructive cycle of collaboration and growth. The distinction may seem subtle, but for us is fundamental. We do not turn our backs on the disciplines. We embrace them, and we teach them.

### Strategy

Our high-level objectives have remained much the same over the years: (i) to produce high-quality research per above, with (ii) abundant knowledge exchange and significant real-world and policy impacts outside academia. Substantial growth in staff numbers and range of research expertise over the past two REF cycles have created significant new opportunities, leading us to re-examine how best to organise our efforts to achieve these goals.

During the current evaluation period, the department engaged in an open process of critical reflection on strategy, with lively participation by junior and senior colleagues alike. The terms of the debate were constructed to give young colleagues (predominantly female) an outside role. A strategy emerged to address weaknesses and build on strengths via five key elements:

- i. Nurture the careers of junior colleagues and hire outstanding new researchers in robust, globally-open competitions;
- ii. Replicate our success with gender diversity (section 2b) by increasing the number of colleagues and students from developing-country and BAME backgrounds;
- iii. Develop major research funding for priority areas of research and policy engagement;
- iv. Increase the visibility, public engagement and impact of our research; and
- v. Disband some research clusters and re-orient others to improve their effectiveness and reflect the changing intellectual landscape.

The sections that follow detail specific actions we've taken during this assessment period to improve mentoring and recruitment (2b), diversity (2b), research funding (3a), impact and engagement (1c), and the operation of research clusters (next heading).

We operationalise our research strategy through departmental structures, finance and collegial advice.

Structures. The key structure is ID's Research Committee, whose overarching goal is to promote and celebrate research excellence in the department. It does this by overseeing mentorship of junior colleagues, and by promoting and financing conferences, workshops, seminar series, and informal reading groups to help spur individuals' careers and our collective output. It also runs the ID Working Paper series, which uses 'light-touch' internal peer review to build a positive, collaborative intellectual environment. Colleagues additionally participate in cross-disciplinary research projects, seminars, centres and institutes, and related initiatives with departments across LSE, as well as other universities in London and beyond. In many of these, ID colleagues play leading roles. Some examples follow below.

Finance. All colleagues receive identical, yearly research and conference grants, funded by LSE+ID core funds. Research Committee allocates supplementary funding to promote collaborations with other departments and universities, incubate multidisciplinary research networks, and facilitate the inclusion of colleagues in such initiatives. Research funds are prioritised to: (i) junior colleagues, and (ii) colleagues approaching promotion. Research funds have also supported the re-orientation of research clusters described below. In total, ID have funded 183 projects worth £389,000 since 2014.

Collegial advice. Through both formal Career Development Reviews and informal mentoring, the department supports colleagues' research trajectories, advising on everything from framing and outlets for a particular piece of research, to substantive issues of theory and method, to funding and staffing of research teams. We broadly guide colleagues to publish high-quality research in interdisciplinary journals, and also the most visible disciplinary journals relevant to their work. Retaining one foot in development studies and another in, e.g., economics or anthropology helps

ensure empirical rigour and theoretical relevance. It enables colleagues to continually test their work against two often different sets of standards. And it gives them access to the large audiences that the social science disciplines command.

### **Areas of research**

As a medium-size department compared to others in this UOA, we do not attempt to provide comprehensive coverage of all developing regions or themes. Instead, we concentrate on regions and topics that we consider critically important, and in which we have compelling strengths.

We have never chosen to divide the department into formal research groups with separate teaching arrangements, research programmes, or PhD supervision. Over time, more informal, fluid research clusters have emerged naturally, in some cases around problem-oriented agendas, and in other cases around methods and themes. Many individuals' work falls into two or more, allowing ~30 researchers to sustain 7 vibrant clusters, 2 centres, and a cross-departmental initiative. This strategy facilitates the collaboration and cross-fertilisation crucial to our interdisciplinary field.

Since 2014, one cluster has been abandoned, one significantly strengthened with the arrival of new researchers, and two new clusters formed. Two became institutionalised when major funding was secured. The rest have evolved organically. In the main, clusters operate informally, as groups of like-minded scholars who work on overlapping topics and occasionally co-author. Our experience is that both informal clusters and funded, formal units have proved highly productive, and so the department does not promote one over the other.

### **Informal Clusters**

#### ***Comparative Political Economy of Development (CPED)***

CPED is one of the larger research areas, examining phenomena within and across countries, at the intersection of political science and economics, with colleagues usually rooted in one or the other. Some of this research is primarily quantitative, other work is primarily qualitative, and much features fully blended methodologies. CPED colleagues organize the bi-weekly Land Politics and Development seminar jointly with UCL, the Comparative Politics/Comparative Political Economy seminar (joint with LSE Government, International Relations, and the European Institute), and the international Working Group on African Political Economy. A few examples of current research are: property rights, land tenure and territorial politics in Africa; instrumental incoherence in institutional reform; the politics of intellectual property; long-run effects of institutions and inequality on development in Colombia; and urbanisation and ethnicity in Africa.

#### ***Inclusive Economies (IE)***

This revamped group, strengthened with the arrival of two new colleagues, seeks to deepen analytical understanding of the recent inclusive turn in development policy. IE run a joint biweekly seminar with Anthropology focusing on inclusivity in markets, finance, social protection, and ICT engagement with the 'Bottom of the Pyramid'. Some examples of current research are: the financialization of social protection in India; taxation and the informal economy; trajectories of hybrid governance in Africa; and the role of ICTs in employment and healthcare in India.

#### ***Development Economics (DE)***

DE has flourished during the last decade, growing from one to four colleagues. Research employs large, sometimes bespoke databases and state-of-the-art quantitative methods, as well as experimental and quasi-experimental methods, to investigate issues of applied micro and macroeconomics, and economic policy. Current research topics include: infrastructure and growth; the dynamics of private sector development in LDCs; economic costs of bureaucratic corruption; state-building in DR Congo; colonisation and long-run development in Latin America; welfare programmes and labour markets in middle-income countries; and VAT efficiency in developing countries.

***Environment and Development (ED)***

This is a new cluster that achieved critical mass with the arrival of a colleague in 2016. ED research is both qualitative and quantitative, focusing on diverse issues ranging from global environmental governance and the discourse of contested debates, to national environmental movements and policy-making, to the microeconomics of deforestation. Current research topics include: landscape approaches to environmental governance; livelihood transitions, risk and environmental resilience in Myanmar and Nepal; the role of BASIC countries (Brazil, China, India, South Africa) in climate negotiations; and adoption of wind and solar power in Brazil and South Africa.

***Health and Development (HD)***

Health and development is a priority area in which the department and School are making large, long-term investments. It is also a transformed group, greatly strengthened by the arrival of five new colleagues between 2014 and 2020. HD research is enthusiastically multidisciplinary, integrating anthropology, demography, and political science, and typically employing a blend of quantitative and qualitative methods. Current research topics include: health care finance and universal health coverage; COVID-19 and abortion; HIV/AIDS; adolescent access to contraception and safe abortion in sub-Saharan Africa; female genital mutilation; migrant and refugee health; population and food supply; and pharmaceutical markets in developing countries.

***ICTs and Development (ICTD)***

ICTD is another new cluster in which ID is investing, with one new faculty member and significant research funding. Its research analyses the extraordinary penetration of computers and mobile devices across developing (and developed) societies, focusing on agriculture, industry, business services, healthcare, and education. Recent advances in digital payment systems, mobile platforms and biometric identifiers have opened up important new research avenues into the political economy of big data, as well as the digitisation of social welfare schemes and public policy platforms. Current research projects include: ICTs and governance reform; ICTs and primary healthcare; and the increasing integration of ICTs in global economic infrastructures and business processes.

***International Political Economy of Development (IPED)***

IPED research applies classical insights from international political economy to the systemic analysis of cross-national institutions and international development. It reminds us that all the issues studied in development occur in the context of – and are often shaped by – broader global interactions. Current topics of research include: the politics of multilateral institutions; dynamics of North-South trade agreements; global and regional politics of intellectual property; patterns of international inequality; South-South development finance; and international constraints on national development strategies.

**Formal Research Units**

ID staff have also used major funding to create formal, institutionalised research units. The **Firoz Lalji Centre for Africa (FLCA)** is a large and growing centre at LSE that promotes independent academic research and teaching, open and issue-oriented debate, and evidence-based policy-making on Africa. It integrates numerous research grants with teaching, outreach and engagement, and events and communications activities to connect Africa-focused social scientists across both LSE and Europe. FLCA works in partnership with Africa-based scholars and institutions to connect LSE to Africa and bring African voices to global debates.

The most important research programme within FLCA is the ESRC-funded **Centre for Public Authority and International Development (CPAID)**. Its research focuses on how societies are governed in impoverished and unstable places in Africa. Its main goals are to promote new ways of thinking about public authority, to investigate how governance and public service provision in fragile contexts actually function on the ground, and to help translate such findings into more effective policy responses. Taking the perspective of the everyday lived realities of ordinary people, CPAID seeks to move away from the assumption that only Western-style formal state



institutions can provide the structures necessary for thriving economic and social life. The director of both FLCA and CPAID is an ID colleague and former HOD (Allen), and research staff working there are affiliated to ID.

ID is also a founding member of the **Global Health Initiative**, an interdepartmental unit established to increase the coherence and visibility of Global Health research across LSE. GHI supports interdisciplinary engagement and promotes the application of LSE-style rigorous social science research to emerging global health challenges. Two ID colleagues sit on GHI's steering committee.

ID colleagues are leading members of institutes and centres throughout LSE, including nearly all the LSE regional centres (Africa, South Asia, etc.) and thematic units (Centre for the Study of Human Rights, Grantham Institute, International Growth Centre, etc), as well as many research centres, institutes and networks beyond LSE.

### **c. Knowledge exchange and impact Strategy**

The department's knowledge exchange and impact strategy works to enhance the engagement of colleagues and their research with public, private, and non-governmental actors in the developing and developed worlds. The nature of the knowledge that ID generates implies a wide variety, from policy engagements with multilateral agencies like the World Bank and UN organisations, featuring bird's-eye views and potentially sweeping implications, to ground-level engagements focusing on perceptions of authority and justice, in which individual citizens' voices are privileged and magnified.

We seek to support all of these via three elements: (a) funding for impact, (b) collegial support for networking/influencing decision-makers, and (c) direct dissemination. More impact is expected as colleagues' research outputs and experience increase, and they rise in seniority. These points are reinforced in formal and informal mentoring. In all of these ways, ID aim to be at the forefront of the School's efforts to be 'the world-leading social science institution with the greatest global impact' by 2030.

ID's strategy to magnify knowledge exchange and impact is a refined, boosted version of our strategy during the previous evaluation period. It's overseen by the department's Deputy Head for Research, and implemented by Research Committee. Item (a) is supported by the department's research budget, as well as School-level Knowledge Exchange and Impact funds. This has been boosted by increases in LSE funding as well as greater research reflows from our increasing success in generating grant revenue, compared to 2014. Item (b) is activated via research clusters, various internal and external seminars (co-)hosted by the department, and the informal reading groups mentioned above. The re-organisation of clusters, new research seminars initiated, and the introduction of reading groups have all served to boost collegial support for engagement and influence since 2014.

But the biggest change to our impact strategy has been the significant increase in direct dissemination (c). Simplifying slightly, during the 1990s and 2000s our departmental strategy for media dissemination relied on academic publications being noticed by the wider world, supplemented by print and broadcast interviews, and occasional op-eds. Beginning in 2013, the department launched a series of initiatives to revamp our website, revamp our dormant Working Paper series, build an 'International Development @LSE' blog (text, audio and video), and join these to a hugely expanded social media presence. The effect has been transformative. We now disseminate our research directly to the broader world, targeting audiences carefully, representing our research findings as we think best, and celebrating colleagues' publications. The link with social media multiplies our efforts through thriving networks of public officials, private entrepreneurs, academics, activists, and volunteers across all the world's developing regions. Many are ID graduates, and a surprising number are gifted communicators and 'digital influencers'.

**Knowledge exchange**

Through both individual members and the groups described above, the department has a dense web of formal and informal knowledge exchanges with a wide range of organizations, ranging from tiny NGOs working in African and Asian villages, to the World Bank, DFID, and other multilateral and bilateral agencies. Of special note are rapidly growing (from a small base) interactions with social enterprises/businesses.

Some of these are well-anchored institutionally. For example, Green is our resident ID Professor in Practice, and also Senior Strategic Advisor to Oxfam. Another example are the many agencies and organizations that participate every year in our applied consultancy project student exercises. Other examples include colleagues' formal appointments to advisory boards, as well as consulting relationships, informal advising and other contacts.

One example of knowledge exchange based on research expertise is Faguet, who chairs the Decentralization Task Force, a team of prominent economists, political scientists, and retired cabinet-level policymakers, who work to enhance the quality of policy dialogue on issues of decentralization and federalism, at Columbia University's Initiative for Policy Dialogue. IPD's goal is to help developing countries explore policy alternatives, and enable wider civic participation in public decision-making. The task force has sponsored high-level policy discussions of decentralization in countries as far afield as Bangladesh, China, Colombia, Ethiopia, India, Pakistan and South Africa.

Where direct dissemination is concerned, our strategy appears to be working. The ID website has 1,350 unique page views per day, and is updated daily. Our blog posts 2-3 new articles/week and receives 300-400 unique page views/day. Our sister Africa@LSE blog, launched in mid-2017, has already recorded over one million views. Our bi-monthly research newsletter has over 1,000 regular subscribers, with a 45% open rate and a 9% click-forward rate. ID's Facebook account has 12,200 followers and posts on average 3 times/week. And our Twitter feed has 10,500 followers and on average tweets 5 times/day. All of this flows from key departmental investments since 2014, including a dedicated Communications Manager/Editor and a Communications/Events Officer, without whom these initiatives could not have snowballed as they did.

**Impact**

Our view is that ID's impacts have significantly increased since 2014. The three ICSs submitted are good evidence of how our strategy can help cutting-edge research generate large, sustained impacts. But that spring runs much deeper; consider two ICSs we did not submit:

**Faguet's** research on decentralization in Bolivia was supported by departmental funds, and improved through multiple presentations in departmental and allied research seminars, as well as informal advice from the CPED and DE clusters. His research findings were key to convincing the Bolivian government not to re-centralise the country, but instead deepen decentralization by greatly increasing the revenues and authorities of subnational governments, democratising regional governments, and creating a fourth level of subnational government, as well as new types of indigenous and ethnic autonomy. This research, and the awards it has won, have been widely disseminated through all of ID's channels.

Likewise, **Shadlen et al.'s** research on intellectual property in the pharmaceutical industry was supported by departmental and LSE grants before winning a major ESRC award. The authors benefitted from multiple presentations, as well as support from the CPED and HD clusters. The use of secondary patents to block competition from generics has been amply studied in developed countries, where it raises the cost of medicines. But no one had previously examined these issues in developing countries. Shadlen and co-authors showed why the litigious American approach to combating secondary patent abuse is less appropriate in resource-constrained settings. Their work was the first to empirically assess how an alternative "pre-emptive" approach works in developing countries. They've since presented their work widely, including high-level events with industry officials, legislators, and policymakers in Argentina,

Brazil and India. In Argentina, their advice was key to preventing a proposed switch to a US-style system, in place of a home-grown regime that's more appropriate for local conditions and capacities.

#### **d. REF outputs selection**

Our overriding criterion in selecting outputs has been research quality. Because we're majority-female and junior colleagues are highly productive, portfolio balance in terms of gender and age/rank took care of itself. Junior colleagues (at the time of publication) represent 43% of REF outputs submitted, and female colleagues account for 63%. Beyond that, we have made a few decisions at the margins, amongst outputs judged of similar quality, on the basis of further EDI considerations, and to ensure the portfolio fairly represents our thematic, regional, and disciplinary/methodological range.

#### **e. Open research and open data**

ID has engaged with the Library to ensure research outputs are open access where possible. Over the current REF period the number of full-text open-access publications in LSE Research Online increased 15%. Our working paper series also makes pre-published research freely available. Green's book, "How Change Happens" (Oxford University Press) is open-access.

We're fully committed to the principles of open data and members regularly deposit data in recognised repositories. For example, Shadlen deposited with the UK Data Archive, Shami has deposited replicability data with Harvard Dataverse, and Faguet posts all his data on GovernanceFromBelow.net. Members have also engaged seriously with the Library around questions of data management.

#### **f. Research integrity**

ID is committed to ethical conduct in line with field-relevant ethical research codes and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) principles and practices set out in REF5a. Colleagues planning research must complete an ethics form which is then submitted to LSE's Research Ethics Committee when staff cannot self-certify that their research meets standard guidelines, such as around informed consent and anonymisation. Research Committee, PhD supervisors, and the Research Manager work to ensure that research and impact-related practices achieve the highest ethical standards.

## **2. People**

### **a. Introduction and context**

ID consists of 30 faculty, 17 of whom are women. Twenty-six have full appointments, 3 have joint appointments with other departments, and 1 other has a fractional appointment. We also employ LSE Fellows on full or fractional contracts, and occasionally guest teachers too. We also have 22 research staff, including research officers, research fellows, and Assistant and Associate Professorial Research Fellows, funded through grants from DFID and the ESRC. They are affiliated to ID through FLCA and CPAID, or indirectly through other LSE centres. Our seven members of professional services staff include 6 full-time and 1 with a fractional appointment.

Recent years have seen healthy promotion success amongst junior colleagues. Since REF2014, 14 faculty and research staff have passed major review and/or been promoted. As a result, the department now has a rich pool from which to choose future heads and deputy heads, as well as share out other important departmental and university-level roles.

It's also notable that ID has retained all core departmental staff during this assessment period. Fixed-term Fellows and research staff have moved on regularly, as we actively help them to do. But permanent staff hired since 2014 have come to the department, found a productive environment conducive to building satisfying careers, and – despite attractive outside offers – chosen to stay. This is at least in part because the department puts great emphasis on developing young talent, especially women.



**b. Faculty development****Mentoring and training**

All ID staff below professorial level are mentored by a Professor in the department. Mentors must meet their mentees at least once a year, and typically do so more often informally to provide support for ongoing research and career advice. Often this includes KEI issues, where the counsel of experience can be particularly useful. We have the privilege of working in a friendly, relaxed environment where spontaneous mentoring is the rule, not the exception.

The effectiveness of informal mentoring becomes evident during formal reviews. Yearly Career Development Reviews (CDRs) are conducted by a Professor other than a colleague's mentor. These are official HR processes, with written records of discussions structured to cover: recent publications, ongoing and future research, teaching results, collegiality, funding applications, and prospects for promotion. That said, we try hard to make CDRs friendly and constructive, in the spirit of helping colleagues reach their goals. Special attention is given to pre-major review colleagues. Through LSE's Annual Performance Review, Professors can also obtain feedback and support from a dedicated committee.

Colleagues also take advantage of the diverse opportunities for professional training. LSE has invested hugely in this area over the past 20 years. Colleagues can take free or subsidised training courses in everything from modern languages to quantitative methods, new software packages to public speaking, or interacting effectively with policymakers and the media. Courses last anywhere from 45 minutes to a year. Since 2016, 31 ID colleagues (including non-academic staff) have taken 73 such courses.

We take special pride in the successful mentoring and career development of post-doctoral researchers and of LSE Fellows – three year teaching positions in support of our larger courses. Since 2015, we've gone well beyond the LSE norm, assigning mentors, conducting CDRs, providing research funds, and otherwise treating Fellows and postdocs similarly to permanent staff. We choose them carefully, nurture them while they're with us, launch them into academic roles elsewhere, and then bask in the glow of their success. Former postdocs and Fellows are now at Bristol, Cambridge, City, Durham, Edinburgh, Loughborough, LSHTM, Manchester, Oxford, Sheffield, SOAS, Sussex, and UCL.

**Recruitment**

Recruitment ordinarily begins with a collective discussion of search objectives in terms of the always-changing research frontiers of development studies, and where we as a department stand in relation to them. All staff are invited to participate in long-listing and short-listing; we prioritise inclusion, and welcome staff participation in the process at different points. We're conscious of EDI objectives in making these decisions, particularly in moving from longlist to shortlist. We follow LSE guidelines and coordinate with HR to receive relevant data.

For candidate visits, we designate hosts and work hard to get to know candidates as colleagues and intellectuals, not just as seminar presenters, and also to make them feel welcome and wanted. We regard this as essential to recruitment in a highly competitive environment. It's a high-effort approach, but it has paid off in significant ways. For example, in a recent search for a political economist, our first-choice candidate chose our Assistant Professorship, despite having several higher-paying Senior Lecturer offers.

ID supports and fully implements LSE's research/sabbatical leave policy at all levels of seniority. Preference is given to junior colleagues and colleagues nearing major review or promotion. The department acknowledges the desire of colleagues to take research leave, and makes provisions to allow for flexibility in teaching and administrative duties. We also fully implement the School's parental leave policy regardless of seniority. Our very low 'leave overhang' shows that this approach is working. The department has readily agreed to all requests for parental leave during this assessment period, and as of end-2020 only 1 colleague had accumulated more than 1 year of sabbatical 'credit' (by choice).

**Equity, Diversity and Inclusion**

The department subscribes to LSE's EDI objectives and guidance, and is a School leader on EDI. We have worked hard over the years to institutionalise EDI objectives in our hiring practices. Specifically, we:

1. Provide unconscious bias training to all members of staff.
2. Explicitly acknowledge the potential for bias to affect decisions.
3. Judge how job applicants will cope at LSE in terms of appropriate levels of resources, reasonable teaching loads, high-quality mentoring, inspiring peers, etc.
4. Require chairs to document all steps taken to ensure open, unbiased searches.
5. Require accountability of colleagues, who must be prepared to explain every step of a hiring or assessment process.

Over the past two evaluation periods the results have been positive. Women have increased from 14% of core faculty in 2007, to 37% in 2014, to 57% today. Eight of our last 12 faculty appointments have been women. How was this achieved? Not by reserving positions for women, but by improving our searches. Two procedural innovations that drove change are: (i) nominating a triumvirate of junior colleagues to lead candidate selection onto long and short lists; and (ii) ensuring that long lists are balanced in terms of gender. From there, searches proceed on the basis of merit alone. But changing the pool of candidates on which colleagues focus was sufficient to break whatever unconscious bias may have suppressed top-quality female candidates in the past. With respect to other aspects of hiring, we have followed ID and LSE EDI guidelines and, on every occasion, chosen the best candidates we could find. We have also worked to rectify salary differentials between male and female colleagues, which are more equal now than ever before. And we have put in place reporting procedures, mentoring arrangements, and budget allowances to support colleagues facing special circumstances or unexpected personal or family issues.

Our position on BAME is less impressive but clearly improving. Nine of 30 colleagues are developing-country nationals, and 2 more are children of developing-country immigrants fluent in their home languages. Asians and Eastern Europeans are well represented. More importantly, the direction of travel is strongly positive. Of 9 colleagues recruited since 2014, 4 are developing-country nationals and BAME (3 Asian, 1 Latin American). But we have also suffered important setbacks. Prof Thandika Mkandawire, our inaugural Chair in African Development and a major international figure, passed away in March 2020. This last, sad fact underlines our lacuna, which is Africa.

We're keenly aware of this problem and determined to rebalance the department over the coming decade. Our plan is twofold: (i) to use methods similar to those described above, but adapted to these aspects of diversity, expanding our recruitment pool and bringing more outstanding young LDC and BAME candidates to the fore in our searches; and (ii) to work with donors to develop one or more dedicated chairs, including ideally an endowed assistant professorship for outstanding African researchers.

With respect to students, ID lead the School in recruiting from diverse regions of the world. In a strikingly international university, we are the most international department, with 63 countries represented amongst our 300+ MSc students, and more than 15 countries amongst 27 PhD students. In a typical year, overseas students comprise over 80% of our MSc intake. That said, we are committed to increasing further the number of students from Africa.

**Promotion**

Promotion is an LSE-wide function, mainly based on research excellence. New colleagues are recruited primarily for their research potential, and promoted when that potential is realized. Decisions to nominate colleagues for promotion are taken by the ID Professors, following advice from a reading sub-group (4-6 Professors) convened for each case. Although expensive, this procedure ensures that promotion decisions are well-informed, and provides junior colleagues

detailed research feedback and career advice. It's part of our commitment to a thriving, collegial research environment. Colleagues in difficulties are actively supported through mentoring, additional research feedback (e.g. specialist reading groups), and tailored research grants. Final decisions to support a promotion are based exclusively on the strength of that case; there is no pressure to 'wait your turn'.

### PhD Programme

The recruitment, training and professional mentoring of PhD students is one of the department's core priorities. Young researchers play a central role in our intellectual life as peers, co-authors, critics, and teachers. Our success in shaping young talent can be judged by our results. We have graduated 42 new PhDs since 2014, and are proud of our record in helping to launch promising academic careers at some of the world's most prestigious universities, and policy/practitioner careers with, e.g., government and multilateral agencies, NGOs, and as specialist consultants.

The department attracts an excellent calibre of PhD student. Of our current batch of 27, eight earned their master's degrees at LSE, 4 from Cambridge, 3 from Columbia, and 1 each from Oxford, Harvard, and the New School for Social Research. Their qualifications at arrival were excellent, all at Distinction or high Merit-equivalent level. Six of our new students in 2019-20 are funded by ESRC and LSE scholarships, and the remaining four are self-funded.

Our PhD programme underwent a major structural change since REF2014, from the traditional MPhil/PhD to a more rigorous and demanding MRes/PhD structure. The main elements of the change include: (i) additional required coursework, both thematic and methodological; (ii) more intense pre-fieldwork preparation via a PhD research seminar course; (iii) oversight and buy-in from Research Committee, of which the Doctoral Programme Director is now a member; and (iv) multiple supervision by senior colleagues with complementary expertise that matches a student's research needs. Examples of this last are thematic vs. methodological expertise, or complementary disciplines for a dissertation operating at their crux. While an ID student's first supervisor should be in-house, often the second is from another LSE department, or occasionally another university. One final element of preparation we provide is, (v) greater support for career development, including opportunities to present at seminars and conferences, significant help with dissertation publication, and a more supportive and intense job-market placement scheme.

This transition is now consolidated, and is showing results. Since 2014 our students' research has been published in outlets such as the *American Ethnologist*, *American Political Science Review*, *Governance*, *Journal of Development Economics*, *Journal of Politics*, *Development and Change*, *Lancet*, *Nature*, *Population and Development Review*, *Review of International Political Economy*, and *World Development*, and monographs with Cambridge and Oxford University Presses. It has also been named winner or runner-up for prizes such as the ESRC Future Leader award, African Politics Conference Group's Ralph Bunche Award, African Studies Association Herskovits Book Prize, and ESRC Writing Competition.

PhD completion rates, mixed in the past, are now excellent. Of the 21 students who entered since 2010, 20 completed on time or with short extensions due to extraordinary circumstances, and 1 transferred to another department. In 2019, all students upgraded to full PhD status within regulations, at their first attempt. Over the 2017-19 period, all students due to submit did so on time and passed their vivas with minor or no corrections. (In 2020, Covid created significant difficulties for several students. The department has been flexible and generous with them; we hope any ill-effects are short-lived.)

Historically, a number of factors made completion of an ID PhD difficult in four years. Three of the most important are: (i) Many students need additional training to do inter-disciplinary research; (ii) Nearly all students undertake considerable overseas fieldwork; (iii) Many need language training. Since REF 2014, we have put a number of measures in place to overcome these obstacles. One of the most important is more funding for fieldwork, which has relieved

students of having to interrupt their research to self-finance. Also, and against the LSE norm, we exempt students from teaching, research assistance, or other obligatory work as part of their financial awards. This leaves them more time and freedom to focus on training, fieldwork and writing. Students are still free to apply for part-time teaching and research roles on a paid basis, and many do. Between 2015-19, our four-year completion rate climbed from 70% to 100%.

PhD student welfare is supported by a structure the department put in place during the current evaluation period. This is led by the Doctoral Programme Director, and includes the PhD Manager, both Teaching and Research Committees, and the department's Head and Deputy Head for Research, in a general framework of rules and resources governed by LSE's PhD Academy. This structure has proved itself both responsive to students' needs and robust to unexpected shocks. For example, during the extraordinary (health and family) circumstances referenced above, appropriate amendments to deadlines, resources and pastoral and intellectual support were made, in close consultation with affected students, which gave them the time and mental space to overcome their difficulties and successfully resume their research.

A priority for coming years is to develop new PhD scholarships, enabling us to expand our programme to a steady ~10 students per year. LSE has increased total PhD scholarships; our guaranteed share is 3, with the possibility of more in any given year. But more needs to be done. The previous and current HODs have been working with LSE to secure scholarship funding, and other colleagues are doing likewise for specific regions.

Lastly, our placement record is strong. When our PhD programme began in the 1990s, most graduates went on to multilaterals, developing-country governments, NGOs and aid agencies as their first choice. Very few chose academia. More recently, the proportion of PhD graduates securing tenure-track posts has increased markedly. Examples include American University, Bristol, Cambridge, East Anglia, IBEI-Barcelona, ISS-the Hague, King's College London, Leeds, LSE, National University of Colombia, National University of Singapore, Northwestern, Open University, Oxford, Queen Mary, Sheffield, SOAS, Trinity College Dublin, Royal Holloway, the U. de los Andes (Colombia), and the U. of Sao Paulo. Graduating PhDs have also obtained research positions at the likes of ETH-Zurich, Harvard, LSHTM, and Oxford.

We support both types of destinations. Our PhD graduates always will – and should – include a healthy cohort in applied jobs. Improving the quality of development policy and practice through our PhD graduates are two important ways we contribute to the world. But a large cohort of rising academics trained by us is a sure sign of a vibrant research environment, and a network of thinkers through which our intellectual influence can only grow.

### 3. Income, infrastructure and facilities

#### a. Grants and Gifts

Since REF2014, 28 colleagues in the department were awarded 103 research grants, 73 of them externally funded. These include both major and minor research grants, funded by a diverse set of agencies, public bodies, and private firms. Some of the most prominent include: AXA S.A., Carnegie Corporation, DFID, ERC, ESRC, European Commission, Ford Foundation, FCO, Innovate UK, Newton Fund, Wellcome Trust, World Bank, and Zenith Bank. During this period, colleagues submitted bids worth more than £46 million, and were awarded £17.5 million. Grants quadrupled in value, from a total of £3.6 million during the first half of the assessment period, to £13.9 million during the second half.

These totals do not include philanthropic donations from the Lalji Family Foundation, which in 2016 established an endowment to create the Africa Centre at LSE (FLCA) with a gift of £10 million to support continued institutional engagement with the African continent. This gift is the largest ever received by the School from an alumnus, and – together with the previous ID Programme for African Leadership – takes the Lalji Family's donations to £13 million. Other donors have contributed an additional £400,000 to help fund specific Africa-centred activities at FLCA.



The department has also been highly successful with internal LSE funding applications. Since 2014, colleagues have won 30 awards from the International Inequalities Institute, Annual Fund, KEI fund, STICERD, and others, for a total of £440,000. This includes initiatives, like Allen's, Sequeira's (both REF3) and Shadlen's (above) that subsequently achieved significant knowledge exchange and impact. LSE additionally committed £100,000 in scholarship funds for African students in our various MSc programmes.

These grants and donations sum to £31.5 million over the past 7 years.

Extraordinarily, that is not all. The Lalji Family Foundation and other potential donors approached the School in 2019 about funding a new research and teaching building, which FLCA would then occupy. Discussions are ongoing; this single donation will likely exceed everything reported above.

#### **b. Operating Income**

Other operating income comes from teaching, and has increased consistently year after year since our founding thirty years ago. Since 2014, teaching income has increased by 3-4% per year, and currently stands at £7,040,000. Deducting direct staff and non-staff costs leaves a yearly surplus of £2.2 million, which we return to the School.

#### **c. Infrastructure and Facilities**

LSE's REF5a details the School's significant investment in, and upgrading of, infrastructure and facilities since REF2014. Enormous progress has been made in terms of new buildings, improved systems (e.g. computers, the internal network, the LSE website, and central blog platform), and services offered by the BLPES library, the PhD Academy, and LSE Life.

The ID department has benefited from these improvements in a number of ways. Most visibly, we have expanded from 2.5 to 3.5 floors of LSE's central Connaught House building, in the process gaining eight additional offices, a new seminar room, a new kitchen and faculty lounge, and a new, large shared research space. These new arrangements represent a significant improvement, allowing us to gather research colleagues previously scattered across LSE into one shared departmental site, and also upgrade the work spaces of part-time and guest faculty. We've also benefited greatly from the School's central blog platform, which hosts 'ID@LSE' and helped us design, fund and launch this important knowledge exchange tool.

In addition to our share of LSE's investment in improved information systems, the department has acquired specialist computer equipment with advanced, secure data handling and graphics capabilities required by some colleagues to process, for example, an immense Brazilian database of individual VAT transactions, or field experiments on state building in the Congo.

### **4. Collaboration and contribution to the research base, economy and society**

ID colleagues participate in a substantial number of significant partnerships, both formal and informal. The following lists some of the most important ones in terms of visibility and grant support.

**LSE-Stanford-Uniandes Conference Series on Long-Run Development in Latin America and Beyond**, 2017-present. This is a multi-disciplinary conference series probing the institutional, political, and economic drivers of long-run development in Latin America and – increasingly – the rest of the developing world. Political economy research is approaching a major breakthrough, based on deep collaborations between historians, political scientists, economists and natural scientists further afield. The research presented features new empirical approaches, exploiting novel datasets, subnational variation, and mixed methods to explain why some societies remain mired in poverty, disorder, and violence while others are highly productive, wealthy, and free. The goal of the initiative is rigorous, highly visible research that translates into policy ideas to reduce inequality, increase political inclusion, and broaden

opportunity amongst the poorer strata of society. LSE is supporting the latter with a Knowledge Exchange grant designed to facilitate translation of research insights into policy initiatives.

The conference is led for LSE by Faguet. With some of the most creative and prestigious figures in the political economy of development, for example Boix (Princeton), Dell (Harvard), Fukuyama (Stanford), Haber (Stanford), Przeworski (NYU), Soskice (LSE), and Wantchekon (Princeton), this partnership is a key force not only sustaining the field but driving it forward. Major partners include Stanford University and the Universidad de los Andes (Colombia). Key research users include the governments of Colombia and Mexico, the Interamerican Development Bank, academic researchers in Latin America and an increasing number of countries outside the region, and public policymakers especially in Latin America.

**Centre for Public Authority and International Development (CPAID)**, whose research agenda is described above. CPAID is funded by the ESRC-GCRF. Its partners include international academic, policy, and NGO actors at the highest level: the Social Science Research Council; Conflict Research Group (Ghent University); Oxfam; and the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine. Key research users include policymakers, civil society organisations, and other stakeholders in Uganda, Kenya, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Burundi, DR Congo, South Sudan, Sudan, Somalia, Ethiopia, and the Central African Republic.

**Justice and Security Research Programme (JSRP) 2011-2016**, produced primary evidence about the constellations of public authority governing the everyday lives of people in fragile and conflict-affected contexts: DR Congo, Central African Republic, South Sudan and northern Uganda. The JSRP explored three logics of governance: the political marketplace, moral populism, and public mutuality. Its partners included the Social Science Research Council, University of Ghent, World Peace Foundation, South-Eastern European Research Network, Justice Africa, and the VideoJournalism Movement. JSRP was funded by DFID, which was also its most important research user.

ID colleagues also make important contributions via individual engagements with policymakers and users. One example is Forsyth's work on the environment and development, on the basis of which the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services invited him to become a lead member, and the UK House of Commons Select Committee on International Development employed him as a specialist adviser. One strand of his livelihoods research shows how to acknowledge local contexts of risk and expertise within multi-scale policy frameworks. This is heavily cited in several reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, whose analysis it has significantly shaped.

Another example is research by Gordon, which identified how bank de-risking shapes the reach of humanitarian programmes, both globally and within specific conflicts, hindering access, reducing timeliness, and undermining the transparency of the emergency aid system. He has since given expert testimony to DFID, the Working Group on Counter Terrorist Legislation and the UK Response, UK Humanitarian Forum, a number of US Congressmen and Treasury and State Department Officials, and several other US and UK foundations and think-tanks.

Faculty are not the only ID colleagues involved in innovative partnerships and collaborations. Some of the most remarkable initiatives have been led by PhD students and graduates. For example, Blackmore curated *When We Return*, a project about 'art exile and the remaking of home'. Collaborating with Porter and MacDonald, the project invited artists to reflect on research related to forced migration, displacement, and the possibility of rebuilding 'home' in the aftermath of war. This is one example of how ID research is increasingly reaching beyond social science and development policy, into the worlds of art and memory studies.

As the role of the private sector has increased in international development, the department has sown a number of links with social enterprises, fintech firms, and impact investors. Delightfully, a growing number of these (e.g. Zoono, Instiglio) were founded by ID graduates, marking a new level of feedback intensity in our quest to shape development thinking in the 'real world'.

And finally, ID faculty are intellectual leaders beyond LSE. Kabeer was President of the International Association of Feminist Economics (2018-2019), and also named a *Key Thinker on Development* (Routledge, 2019). Shadlen was a Managing Editor of the *Journal of Development Studies* (2011-2020). Other colleagues serve as editors and on editorial boards of international journals such as *African Affairs*, *American Political Science Review*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Development and Change*, *Feminist Economics*, *Global Environmental Politics*, *Journal of Modern African Studies*, *Latin American Politics and Society*, *Nations and Nationalism*, *Review of African Political Economy*, *Review of International Political Economy*, *Third World Quarterly*, and *World Development*. Colleagues also help build developing countries' research traditions by serving on the editorial boards of newer journals like the *African Journal of Leadership and Development* (Ethiopia), and *Desarrollo y Sociedad* (Colombia). And colleagues serve as chief editors, or on editorial boards, of book series with leading publishers, like *African Studies*, *Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics*, and *Cambridge Elements* at Cambridge University Press.

Colleagues' research has received many prestigious awards. Boone's *Property and Political Order* (Cambridge) was awarded APSA's 2016 Gregory Luebbert Award, as well as the 2015 APSA-ASA African Politics Book Award. Fairfield's book, *Private Wealth and Public Revenue in Latin America* (CUP) won the Latin American Studies Association's Donna Lee Van Cott Award (2016). Kar's book *Financializing Poverty* (Stanford) won the 2020 Bernard S. Cohn Prize from the Association for Asian Studies. Shadlen was awarded the International Studies Association's Global Health Prize (2019) for his book, *Coalitions and Compliance*. Faguet's *Public Choice* paper (2014) won the Corporación Andina de Fomento's International Research Prize. Meagher's paper in the *Journal of Development Studies* won the 2019 Dudley Seers Memorial Prize. And Naritomi's research has received the Distinguished CESifo Affiliate Award for Public Sector Economics (2016), the International Institute of Public Finance's Musgrave Prize (2015), and Oxford's Young Scholar Prize for Research on Business Taxation (2014).

Colleagues serve on many grant committees, at for example the ESRC, Global Challenges Research Fund, International Centre for Tax and Development, National Science Foundation, and the Hong Kong and Portugal Research Councils.

And lastly, colleagues have given many internationally prestigious keynote lectures, such as the Adrian Leftwich Memorial Lecture (Manchester), Figuerola Lecture in Social Science History (Universidad Carlos III, Madrid), Hsieh Memorial Lecture (Stanford), Roemer Lecture on World Affairs (SUNY), and the Wynia Memorial Lecture (Carleton College). Colleagues have also delivered keynote lectures at developing-country venues, such as the 5th Annual Meeting of Bolivian Economists (Santa Cruz), Centro de Estudios del Desarrollo Económico (Colombia), Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Kerala Institute of Local Administration, and the LACEA Network on Inequality and Poverty.

These are only a few of many such examples. Between 2014-2020, ID's list of invited lectures at universities, think tanks, and multilateral agencies across the Global South and North runs to many hundreds.