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The mission of the Department of Political Science at Georgia State University is to produce excellent scholarship befitting a nationally ranked political science department while educating our students to be critical thinkers, creative problem solvers and responsible citizens who are well prepared through a liberal arts education to live and work in an increasingly interdisciplinary, intercultural and international world. Capitalizing on our location in Atlanta, a major urban, political, business, and media center, the Department is dedicated to providing an environment of teaching, learning, scholarship and service that contributes to the civic, professional, social, educational and cultural vitality of our city, our state, our country and the world.

Section A: Unit Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses

Quality of Research, Instruction, and Service

The Department of Political Science has made significant progress toward its goals by demonstrably increasing the quality of research, instruction and service by the department since the completion of its last self study in 1996. In the area of research productivity the Department has undergone a radical transformation increasing its scholarly output by over 100 percent (see Section F). This was accomplished with a net increase of only four tenure track faculty members between 1996 and 2005. A recent study ranked 400 political science departments across the world on the basis of their publishing impact on the discipline. Political Science rose from 320th to 112th –an increase greater than any other department included in the study (Hix, 2004, Political Studies Review 2: 293-313). Another indicator of improvements in the research quality of the department is reflected by increases in the level of the Department’s extramural funding sources. The previous self study described extramural funding as “minimal”. During the past three fiscal years the Department received more than $200,000 in external grants. A grant seeking culture is beginning to emerge in the department to support increasingly productive and ambitious research agendas.

The increases in research productivity are significant given the Department’s contemporaneous accomplishments improving the quality of its undergraduate and graduate instruction. At the undergraduate level the number of political science majors and the number of majors graduated has increased nearly threefold (see section E). As part of our assessment process, exiting seniors were asked to compare their ability to write, speak, reason and analyze data upon entering college to their level as they prepare to graduate. In every category of direct comparison there was a noticeable and significant increase in mean response averaging from one half to almost one point higher in the examined categories. Student learning outcomes are encouraging because they occur despite the large numbers of students in most political science courses. For example, in the Spring of 2006, the average class size in Political Science was nearly double the number of students per class in the College (see Section D). This highlights a major weakness in the instructional program of the political science department: it is difficult for us to meet student demand. Not only are our classes large, students convey the need for more and more varied course offerings. In the student survey completed by GSU Institutional Research for this Self Study Report more than 2/3 or respondents complained of not being able to take courses and more than half of these respondents cited as the reason that classes were either full or not offered. We have increasingly had to rely on the less than optimal solution of Part Time and Graduate Teaching Instructors to address un-met student demand.
Instructionally our graduate program has also become more robust as the faculty has worked on improving our MA and PhD programs. As a result, our students have dramatically increased their research productivity in recent years. Faculty student co-authorship of published papers has increased. Current GSU graduate students presented nearly 50 papers at professional conferences between FY2004 and FY 2006. Political Science graduates from the past three years have produced a number of refereed articles and book chapters and two books—one published with Routledge and the other under contract with Cambridge University Press. We have obtained two Fulbright grant offers and have seen more external grants awarded to our students. We have also experienced increasing success with the placement of our PhD students in academic positions not just in the Southeast but nationally and internationally as well.

Finally, the Department of Political Science provides continuing service to the University, community and to the profession. Beyond required representation on College committees, faculty are involved (and many hold leadership positions in) state, national and international professional associations. Members of the Department are in demand for their national and international expertise. They are often called on to provide expert assessment of political developments by consulting with government and non profit agencies and providing interviews for scores of media outlets. The Department of Political Science also actively serves the community by providing educational forums about current political events. Within the last three years the department has sponsored and participated in colloquia and presentations on many political topics. Additionally faculty members have made dozens of presentations to community groups in the Atlanta metropolitan area on a wide range of political issues of interest.

**Centrality of Programs to the University**

Through the teaching and research activities of its faculty, the Department of Political Science contributes to several facets of the mission of Georgia State University as identified in the Strategic Plan.

1. First, the University is dedicated to undergraduate programs based on a core curriculum that promotes interdisciplinary, intercultural and international perspectives. The Department of Political Science offers two courses that enable students to fulfill core requirements both of which emphasize the increasingly integrated nature of the world in which we live. All students enrolled at a University System of Georgia College are required to take American Government (POLS 1101). Additionally Global Issues (POLS 2401) helps students fulfill the social science foundation requirement in Area E of the undergraduate core curriculum. The perspective offered in these classes, as well as others in our undergraduate International Affairs Concentration, helps to provide an intellectual foundation for achieving an important general education goal, namely to effectively analyze and understand contemporary politics in a multicultural and global environment.

2. Second, the University is dedicated to providing a curriculum that provides options emphasizing an urban focus. Through the courses that the Political Science Department offers in state and local government, Georgia Politics, urban politics, African American politics, policy analysis and much of the American Government curriculum students are provided the tools to see how diverse perspectives impact not only global politics but the neighborhoods and communities in which we live.

3. Third, the University is committed to the enhancement of interdisciplinary research programs and centers. Although the Political Science Department does not have its own center, political science faculty are vital to and supportive of the cross disciplinary approach to
learning that these efforts represent. Political Science faculty are valuable contributors to the Blumenfeld Center for Ethics as well as the Centers for Asian Studies, Hellenic Studies, Middle East Studies, Latino Studies and Neighborhood Metropolitan Studies, the EU Certificate Program, the Latin American Certificate Program, the Department of African American Studies, the Department of Philosophy, and the Department of Women’s Studies. The Political Science department also coordinates exchange programs or research collaborations with universities in the United Kingdom and Korea. As part of the GSU’s Strategic Initiatives Grant the Department was provided with resources to develop research collaborations and student exchanges with the University of Pretoria in South Africa.

4. Fourth, the University proposes to contribute to the vitality of our city and the world. The Department’s research on democratic theory and processes is basic to this objective. Faculty publish and present this research at meetings of regional, national and international associations. Faculty members have been asked to consult nationally and internationally on how to support democratic governance through election administration, systems and monitoring. The Department exposes our students to these issues of governance through the curriculum and through our student clubs and teams. Our student clubs serve to create excitement and awareness about politics on campus and in the community. Our student teams including Mock Trial, Model UN and Model Arab League have been recognized in regional and national competition for their understanding of the political environment. The Department also sponsors more than 100 internships every year in government, political and public service organizations.

5. Fifth, the University is committed to graduate students who are proficient in their discipline as trained and talented professionals and who can lead in a global society. At both the MA and PhD level the Department is developing these professionals. We have maintained our terminal MA program because of student demand from career oriented people who benefit from the degree. At the doctoral level, while focused on producing academics, several of our international graduate students have returned to their home countries to assume leadership positions in government.

Viability of Programs

Both the undergraduate, master’s (MA) and doctoral (PhD) programs in the Political Science Department are viable. At the undergraduate level in the past 3 years the Department has experienced significant growth in majors, hours, head counts and graduation rates. At the MA level the Department of Political Science fills a unique professional niche. Because Atlanta is a governmental, business and media center many people are interested in obtaining an advanced degree in political science to enhance their professional stature. As a result demand for our MA program remains strong and because of this demand we have maintained our terminal MA. Master’s level enrollments for the self study period averaged nearly 70 students per year with 15 graduations annually. The Political Science Department is excited about the growth and development of its PhD program. The Department has increased its emphasis on the PhD program and has had some success attracting promising, fulltime students. During the self study period we have averaged about 35 students each year pursuing the PhD. Between FY 2003-FY 2005 we graduated 11 doctoral students and had a good record of placements for these students in post doctoral fellowships and tenure track positions including schools like Vanderbilt and University of Maryland Baltimore County. Although we are pleased with the progress of the students in the program, we need additional resources to more fully develop and enhance our
doctoral program. Only recently have we been able to increase stipends to minimally competitive levels and have not been able to grow more quickly because of previous resource constraints.

**Strategic focus**

The Department of Political Science offers four concentrations at the undergraduate level—a general degree, and programs in pre-law, in international affairs, and in pre-education for those planning to teach social science at the middle or highschool level. The general concentration provides students with broad understanding of the principles of governance and how people utilize political institutions to address societal conflicts and concerns nationally and internationally. The pre-law concentration has experienced tremendous growth since the last self study and is extremely popular with students interested in advanced degrees in the legal field. The Department has become the place on campus for pre law majors meeting a significant student demand. Last year 137 GSU pre-law students were accepted at dozens of law schools throughout the country. Student demand remains high for our International Affairs concentration as well. Infused with a global perspective this concentration serves to internationalize our curriculum and increase student appreciation of the diversity and complexity of the contemporary world. Completion of the pre-education concentration (along with allied social science fields) helps to train teachers who generally go on to seek admittance to the alternative master of education program in the social sciences at the GSU College of Education or a comparable program at another institution.

At the graduate level, the Department provides the most comprehensive political science program in the state of Georgia. We offer doctoral concentrations in 5 areas: American Government, International Relations, Comparative Politics, Political Theory and Public Policy and Administration. We have often collaborated with the Department of Public Administration in the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies through joint appointments, the cross listing of courses, and graduate faculty appointments to provide students with the opportunity to earn a PhD in public administration. The public administration department does not offer a doctoral degree. However, the School of Policy Studies does offer a joint PhD in Public Policy with Georgia Tech. Students desiring a Doctorate in Public Policy generally are seeking a more applied degree than the PhD in political science. Some have chosen to pursue the degree in Policy Studies. We need to clarify whether our current relationship with PAUS will continue, whether we will hire a public policy person in Political Science or whether we will drop this subfield at the PhD level. We have also had to look to the Philosophy Department to supplement our specialization in Political Theory. At the MA level we offer a general MA as well as specialized concentrations in American Politics, Comparative and International Politics and in Professional Governmental and Political Practices as well as a Joint Degree with International Business. Many of our master’s students seek the degree to enhance their careers. The variety of degree programs afford them the opportunity to focus on the aspects of political science that are most useful to their professional advancement.

**Financial Resource Analysis**

As a result of the Action Plan implemented after the previous self study, significant resources were devoted to increasing the number of tenure track faculty in the department. We grew from 15 full time faculty in 1996 to our current 19 full time faculty with 2 vacant positions. As called for in the Action Plan we were able to increase senior positions in the Department by hiring one Associate Professor and promoting two to full (including that hire). However, we lost
one full professor to retirement and have had trouble retaining people because of salary concerns. Two of our most productive recently tenured professors, as well as one who likely would have earned tenure, left the Department because of salary considerations. Political science remains below recommended staffing levels and by almost any measure handles a large student load. One indication of this load is revealed in a recent analysis of cross-subsidies released by the University. The Department’s revenue/expense ratio at 4.2 is well over the required “break even point” of 2.6 and is in fact the 2nd highest ratio of all revenue generating departments in the University. Political science is one of the most under-resourced credit hours on the entire campus.

The Action Plan also led to additional funding for the graduate program. This funding has allowed the Department to increase PhD stipends 50%. In our last self study our orientation was toward producing “teacher-scholars” who would likely get jobs in 4 year teaching colleges and engage in little continuing research. Today with more competitive graduate stipends we are increasingly able to attract students who want to be researchers, train them to do so and place them in research environments. Still even with this improvement, we remain below average in doctoral funding for southeastern universities [Data distributed at meeting of SPSA Chairs, Jan. 2006].

The third major expenditure called for in the Action Plan was greater physical space. Greater physical space has been allocated. Ten years ago the Department was divided between the 5th and 10th floors. Today it is integrated with greater meeting and office space. However there is still insufficient space for GTAs/PTIs, insufficient space to grow the faculty, and insufficient space for the faculty to take on additional staff responsibilities for example the editorship of a journal.

Section B: Historical and Current Contexts

It has been ten years since the Department of Political Science underwent academic program review. In that time the Political Science Department has changed significantly purposing to remake itself into a “department of distinction” worthy of a major research university. In FY 2006, the department had 11 tenured and 8 tenure track professors with one fulltime instructor and one fulltime lecturer. One fourth of the tenured and tenured track faculty are female. Three members of the department are racial minorities. One tenured and one tenure track professor is African American, another is of mixed racial heritage (Table B-1).

Compared to our previous self study, the tenure and tenure track faculty has significantly increased its research productivity more than doubling its output compared to the earlier period. During 2003-2005 the faculty published a total of 42 refereed journal articles, 15 non-refereed journal articles, 23 book chapters, 2 refereed books, 5 edited books, 34 book reviews and 113 conference papers. During this time period this amounts to an average 2.15 journal articles per faculty member and 5.65 conference presentations over the three year period. The growth in productivity greatly outpaced the growth in faculty, from 15 to 19 over this time period. The Department generated $202,400 in external and $38,000 in internal grants. The external awards included prestigious grants by the German Marshall Fund of the United States, the Fulbright Commission and the US Institute of Peace as well as a continuing disbursement of a previously awarded grant from the National Science Foundation. Despite these notable successes the average external direct funding per faculty member in Political Science during the self study period was just $10,120 (please see Table B-2 for data).
At the undergraduate level the Political Science department offers a general degree as well concentrations in International Affairs and Pre-Law. Majors in political science have increased by more than 50% since the Fall of 2001 and 10% since 2004. The growth in majors means that Political Science ranks 5th (out of 22) in majors for the College of Arts and Sciences. At the graduate level the Department offers a general MA as well as concentrations in International and Comparative Politics, Professional Practices and a Joint Degree with International Business. Enrollments at the MA have have been stable averaging nearly 70 students per year. Enrollments in our doctoral program have also been steady with about 35 students in the program each year (please see Table B-3 for data). Undergraduate graduation rates have grown significantly by more than 30% since FY 2004. Graduation rates at the MA and PhD have been consistent over the past 3 years averaging nearly 15 MAs and 4 PhDs annually (see Table B-3 for data).

The number of credit hours generated by the Political Science Department has been trending upward. The Department produced 26,806 credit hours in FY 2006. This was the largest number of credit hours generated by the Department in the last 10 years. Comparing credit hours in Spring 2005 with Spring 2006, Political Science ranked first in the College of Arts and Sciences in total number of new credit hours generated (6%) [data from Dean’s office, 3/10/06]. In FY2006 nearly 2/3 of all political science credit hours were taught at the upper division. To meet student demand the department has increasingly had to rely on PTIs and GTAs to teach even its upper division courses. In FY 2006 nearly a third of the credit hours in these classes were taught by non FTE instructors (see Table B-5). Data obtained from the 2005 Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity finds Political Science at Georgia State had the lowest ratio of direct instructional expenditure per student credit hour, and per FTE of any of the Regents identified peer and aspirational institutions included in the analysis (see Table B-7 for data). Comparsion schools included Arizona State, Florida State, Temple, and SUNY-Binghamton as well as southeastern universities like University of Georgia, UNC Chapel Hill, University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa and UT Knoxville [information on the Delaware Study is available at www.udel.edu/IR/cost/].

Despite these constraints the Department of Political Science has increased its relevance to its students, the profession and to the community since the last self study. Students increasingly have made the political science department their department of choice for Pre-law and International Affairs. Placement of students provides some external validation of the quality and substance of our efforts. Nearly 140 pre-law students were admitted to some of the best schools in the southeast and throughout the country. The Political Science program also directs nearly 100 collegiate internships each year including the Legislative Internship Program for students at GSU and other schools through out the state. Many of our students obtain full time employment through these experiences. At the graduate level many of our MA students enroll in the program to enhance credentials for career advancement. Within the past 3 years we have trained students working at CNN, the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, The Georgia Commissioner of Labor, CARE, the Carter Center, Senator Zell Miller’s office, and many other places. Professionally, our faculty is more active than at any time in its history. In addition to publishing in leading books and journals, faculty routinely are called upon to share their expertise with media outlets and as consultants for government agencies and non governmental institutions. Members of the department also seek to be relevant to the community through participation in colloquia, roundtables and presentations designed to increase understanding of current political events.
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Section C: Progress toward Goals and Objectives

Ten years ago (1996-97 Self-Study) we dreamed of becoming a nationally recognized faculty with a coherent set of specializations to offer a select graduate program able to place graduate students nation-wide, and a high quality and larger undergraduate program that would be the place on campus for pre-law and international studies majors.

Specifically, we aimed in 1996 to meet the objectives below. A short description of how we have met or changed each of these objectives chosen in the 1996 assessment, follows each one.

1. Meet the recommended Regent’s faculty/student ratio of 19 full-time faculty. We increased from 15 full-time faculty in 1996 to our current 19 full-time faculty, two vacant positions, and two full-time lecturer positions. Still the number of majors that we have has increased more than 2 and a half times since 1996 and enrollments have grown by almost 60% since 2001—a tremendous increase. In FY 2005, Political Science produced more credit hours than 13 other department in the College of Arts and Sciences. We also ranked 1st in the number of students per class having an average class size of 53.4 in Spring 2006. The Department offered 25,619 credit hours in the academic year 2004-2005 and 26,423 in 2005-2006, sixth highest in the College of Arts and Sciences.

2. Increase senior positions in the department from one by hiring 1-2 Full Professors. In the last decade we hired one Associate Professor and had two promotions (including that hire) to Full. We lost one full professor to retirement, as well as several other lower ranking ones. Two recently tenured faculty left for higher salaried positions, as well as one earlier who has since earned tenure elsewhere.

3. Nationally-recognized faculty. We have significantly enhanced our reputation through a dramatic increase in publications (1993-96 we produced only 1 book, 3 edited volumes, 6 journal articles, 9 book chapters, and 54 conference papers) and professional service. In the past three years we have produced 7 books, 42 refereed journal articles, 15 non-refereed journal articles, 23 book chapters, 34 book reviews and 113 conference papers.) We conducted 153 manuscript reviews, received 19 external grants and had a member invited to join the Council on Foreign Relations.

4. Create research foci in Political Economy and in Democratic Theory and Process. We envisioned research foci as a way to attract high-caliber graduate students and to increase research synergies among faculty and between faculty and grad students. Because of the departure of one professor, we have not focused as much on political economy as expected, though we have hired one junior faculty member who retains a focus on comparative political economy, and two who teach comparative political economy. We do have one faculty member who works on international political economy, one whose scholarship encompasses public choice theory and several who address political economy questions in their work on development. Nevertheless, our expected hiring additions in public policy have not materialized, and our expected links to the School of Policy Studies have had a slow start, though remain possible following some initial meetings.
We continue to work on a PhD testing area in Political Economy with the Economics Department.

On the other hand, our strength in Democratic Processes and Democratization has grown and is substantial, though it too did not result in a Center for Democratic Studies, which had been envisioned ten years ago. We have developed a niche in comparative elections, election administration, systems, and monitoring. Several of our faculty members have been called on to provide this kind of expertise for elections throughout the world. More broadly, we have additional faculty working on questions of democratization and almost all members of the faculty have something to contribute to the subject of democratic processes. The Department is also developing increasing strength in the area of public law and has a strong record of publication, teaching, and graduate student placement in this area. While not envisioned in the previous strategic plan, it is consistent with the University goal of “continu[ing] to develop programs and curricula that bring legal theory and practice together”.

5. **Enhance graduate program – caliber of students and stipends.** We envisioned maintaining a strong terminal M.A. program, and maintaining a PhD program dedicated to training well-rounded teacher-scholars who would be placed in four-year colleges in the Southeast by 2001 and national-wide by 2006. We have achieved some of these goals – increased our PhD stipends from $8000 in 1996 to $12,000 in 2006-2007, increasing GRE scores from an average for MA students of 981 in 2001 to 1089 in 2005 and for PhD students from 1018 in 2001 to 1061 in 2005; and placing our students in four-year colleges and universities, primarily still in the Southeast, but also including Loyola University in Chicago, University of Maryland at Baltimore County, Bridgewater College, Virginia, and Vanderbilt University. We thus reached our goal of placing Ph.D.’s in nationally ranked universities, as well as those outside the region, within a decade. Our graduate students have also become more proficient at obtaining grants. One received $45,000 in dissertation research on democratization promotion in Africa. Another was a finalist in the 2005 Fulbright dissertation competition, while a previous student was awarded a Fulbright for that same country and another for Brussels, Belgium.

In addition, our graduate students have increasingly participated in professional conferences and begun to publish journal articles and book chapters, both individually and as co-authors with our faculty. Our terminal M.A. program continues to be strong, with about 70 MA students and 35 doctoral students enrolled in any given year.

6. **Quality undergrad program by placing full-time professors in 2000-level courses, expanding our internship program, developing colloquia series and student clubs, and replacing the BIS Law and Society and BIS International Relations programs.** We have largely met these goals by increasing our majors nearly 3 fold; placing full-time professors in the 2000-level courses; sponsoring and advising several student clubs; and replacing the BIS interdisciplinary degree programs with special concentrations in Political Science in pre-law and international relations/comparative politics.
In working to achieve these goals the Department has sought to advance the University’s objectives detailed in its Strategic Plan. Increasing the number of faculty (Goal 1) served to enhance and improve the teaching mission of the department. Specifically it has helped us meet the University’s goal of “creating an academic environment conducive to effective and inspired teaching, learning and scholarship”. Additional faculty positions have allowed us to address growing student demand while preparing our students to understand contemporary politics in an increasingly diverse, multicultural and global environment.

The increase in senior positions, development of nationally recognized faculty and the creation of research foci (Goals 2, 3, 4) have all positioned the Department to have the kind of productivity and focus that allows the Department to contribute to the Georgia State’s primary goal of becoming “one of the nation’s premier research universities”. As the University has dedicated itself to the “enhancement of scholarship”, over the past 10 years the faculty in Political Science has focused on academic excellence by significantly improving their publication record.

Finally, the University proposes both to increase the number of graduate students and to “increase the number, value and benefits of graduate assistantships”. Consistent with this objective, Political Science has worked to enhance its graduate program (Goal 5). Though we still need additional resources, some progress has been made in supporting our graduate students. Greater support has allowed us to professionalize our program and train students who are proficient in our discipline and prepared to research, teach and work in political science related fields.

Section D: Curricula Quality

Undergraduate Program

Undergraduate education is a strong and vital component of the Department of Political Science. The department scores very high on measures of teaching effectiveness and curricula quality on surveys done for this self study and reinforced by other measures such as the University’s survey of exiting graduates and student evaluations of core courses. The department has seen very significant improvements in the number of courses offered and breadth of coverage of major fields of political science and geographic regions of the world since the last self study of 1996.

The department offers several unique opportunities for its undergraduates designed to enrich the curriculum. There are four variations of the undergraduate degree: the General Political Science concentration; International Affairs Concentration; Pre-law Concentration; and Pre-Education Concentration and Certificate in Pre-Education Broad Field Social Science. Each concentration has its own set of core and elective courses that allow students to customize their undergraduate experience based on their area of interest. In addition, the department provides credit for and encourages students to take up a wide variety of internships. A representative list of such internships would include internships at the United States State Department, Department of the Interior, Georgia Legislative Assembly (average of 15 students a year), Georgia Department of Labor, Carter Center, Amnesty International, International Rescue Committee, and various political campaigns. The department also offers simulation courses on the United Nations, Arab League, US Congress, and Mock Trial which are designed to develop substantive knowledge and practical diplomatic and political skills.

Undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes
Program goals established by the department are designed to achieve the following learning outcomes:

- Understanding of the structures and processes of American and Georgian government commensurate with the needs of citizenship and an effective civil society
- Recognition of the universality of politics in human experience: an understanding of political issues from a global perspective, and of global issues from a political perspective
- Understanding of the scientific method, including the formulation of hypotheses and the role of independent, control, and dependent variables
- Understanding of the difference between normative and descriptive explanations of political behavior
- Ability to recognize appropriate supporting and contrary evidence and assess evidence using principles of logical analysis
- Ability to write a paper or make an oral presentation with a clearly supported thesis statement and logical conclusions drawn from findings
- Basic knowledge of the use of social statistics and an ability to conduct research using traditional and new technological resources
- Ability to effectively analyze contemporary issues within the context of diverse disciplinary perspectives
- Ability to effectively analyze contemporary multicultural questions
- Ability to effectively analyze contemporary global and international questions

Undergraduate Learning Outcome Assessment Plan
The department has developed a detailed assessment plan to track the achievement of the above learning outcomes. It has also instituted learning outcome testing procedures in two core courses—POLS 2401 (Global Issues) and POLS 1101 (American Government)—as well as in the methods course required of all undergraduates (POLS 3800). In 2006 the department developed a Retention Progress and Graduation Proposal that won funding from the office of the Provost. It also developed a retention plan which has been offered as an example for other units. Finally the Department’s 2006 plan of action for undergraduate, graduate, and core student learning outcome assessment has been nominated for a university-wide award.

Evidence of Student Learning
Results from the self study surveys show that among faculty there is a strong commitment to undergraduate teaching, and this is reflected in both the yearly student teaching evaluations and the positive ratings from the self study survey of alumni, graduating seniors and current undergraduates. The survey shows significant satisfaction with undergraduate teaching among undergraduates, undergraduate alumni, and exiting seniors (at or above the mean for the university). This satisfaction is encouraging because the average grades given by departmental instructors are significantly below that of many other departments within the college. However, problems remain, including large class sections, lack of faculty to meet teaching demand, and the subsequent impact on student advisement. These are linked to the additional instructional resource needs of the department brought out in other aspects of this self study (Appendix D7).

The high survey rating on academics relative to the University is supported by recent student evaluations for the two main introductory courses, American Government—POL S 1101, and Global Issues—POLS 2401 (Appendix D8). Since many non-majors must take these courses in large class sections, one would expect evaluations to be among the lowest of all courses offered by the Department. In fact the evaluations are quite high across the board and the large sections show no discernable difference in evaluations than the smaller sections. These evaluation numbers would be even higher if limited to faculty evaluations instead of including evaluations of Graduate Teaching Assistant-led courses.

The evaluations from Spring 2006 from the one required course for all political science majors, Political Methodology, POLS 3800, continues this pattern of high student evaluations (Appendix D9). Again, one would expect lower evaluations in this course than in other upper
division courses because it is both a requirement and a mathematics-oriented course, and thus at variance from the strengths and interests of most political science majors.

These evaluations take on greater significance when one compares the average grades of the Department compared to the other departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. The Department average grade for Fall semester 2005 was 2.7. This ranks as the fifth lowest G.P.A. among 21 departments in the College of Arts and Sciences reporting more than 100 total grades. Three out of the four lower G.P.A.’s were reported by physical and natural science departments. In addition, the means G.P.A. for exiting seniors in the Department (3.12) was also lower than the mean G.P.A. for the University’s exiting seniors (3.22).

Most of the comments on academics support the positive survey responses. Several current faculty were singled out for praise as excellent teachers, caring individuals and for providing valuable advice both during and after the college years. Many students commented on the positive experience and the value of the education. For example one student commented, “I had a great experience attending Georgia State. The political science department helped me to prepare for life after graduation.” Another commented, “The academics were excellent; i.e., they were challenging and interesting,” while a third noted, “My experience at Georgia State and [the] Political Science department was an excellent one. Every course that I have taken has helped me tremendously in my new career.” These are representative of many of the comments of students. A few students complained of the perception of ideological bias among faculty, while an equivalent number stressed the need for greater racial diversity, particularly the need for more African American male faculty.

Georgia State University’s exiting undergraduate survey results further underline the quality of student experience as political science majors in terms of quality of courses, instruction, scholarly quality of faculty, and preparation for advanced study. Once more this survey highlighted the department’s weaknesses in terms of variety and number of courses available (see Table D-4 below). More than two-thirds complained of not being able to take courses, and fifty percent of these respondents cited the reason as that the classes were either full or not offered. These last items once more draw attention to the need for more faculty lines. Significant percentages of student sought, but were unable, to take extra courses across all the subfields of political science.

Exiting seniors were also asked to assess learning outcomes in several categories and in particular were asked to compare their ability to write, speak, reason, and analyze data and information upon entering college and then exiting college. In every category of direct comparison there was a noticeable and significant increase in mean response, averaging one half to almost one point higher on such things as “ability to write clearly and effectively” (mean increase of .73), “ability to speak clearly and effectively” (mean increase of .46), “organize and interpret data appropriately” (mean increase of .79), “ability to locate and organize information from multiple sources” (.92), “apply scientific reasoning in problem solving” (.72), “ability to integrate new information with past knowledge” (.69) and “ability to analyze quantitative problems” (.71).

**Undergraduate Advisement and Mentoring**

While students report general satisfaction with faculty advising, the Department suffered slightly in comparison to the University in the area of advising. Undergraduates gave a mean rating of 3.15 when asked about the availability of academic advising within the Department as compared to a mean rating of 3.47 for the university. Career advisement also suffered in
comparison (2.96 to 3.24). Exiting seniors gave similar ratings. Mean ratings for academic advising in the Department (2.82) were lower than the mean ratings for the University (2.92). These lower ratings exist despite the fact the Department faculty are rated higher in availability outside the classroom (3.73) than the University (3.70). Clearly, despite the positive assessment of teaching there still exists a need for improvement in the areas of course offerings and advisement. As explained in the next section, much of the lack of course offerings and advisement is due to significant demand for political science courses, the inadequate number of faculty available to teach, and the high student load of each faculty member.

**Faculty Teaching and Course Load**

By almost any measure the faculty of the Department of Political Science handles a large student load. The Department has experienced significant growth in majors, hours, head counts, and graduation rates. The number of undergraduate majors has risen from 378 in the fall of 2001 to 620 in the fall of 2005, while the number of total enrolled students has likewise increased from 433 to 690 during this same period. Graduation numbers have seen a similar increase. In 2002, 63 undergraduate political science majors were graduated, while in 2005, graduating seniors numbered 155. Teaching duty hours in the Department have grown from 18,294 in 2001 to 26,806 in 2006. Thus enrollment grew by almost 60 percent, graduation rates grew by 146 percent, and teaching hours grew by 46 percent.

The percentage of growth of the Department of Political Science during this period (60%) is significantly larger than the growth in most other departments within the College of Arts and Science. For example, Biology, one of the largest departments in the College, saw those majoring in Biology increase by 20 percent. Psychology, another large department, grew by 13 percent, and Sociology by 43 percent in this area.

All of this is coupled with very small actual growth in the number of faculty in the Department. In 2001 the Department had 19 tenured, tenure track, full time visiting, or permanent instructor faculty members. In 2005 the number of these lines had increased to 21, a ten percent increase. The Department continues to lead the College in the number of students per class, averaging over 50 per class in 2001 and 2006. Several upper division courses are always filled to capacity and would significantly benefit from reduced class size.

The revenues currently generated by enrollments in political science courses far outweigh expenditures consumed by the Department, according to a recent analysis of cross-subsidies released by the University. According to the report, the Department’s revenue/expense ratio is 4.2, which is well over the required “break-even” point of 2.6 and is in fact the second-highest ratio of all revenue-generating departments in the University (only Physical Therapy is slightly higher, at 4.3).

**Measures taken to improve curriculum and undergraduate learning outcomes**

The Department has taken steps to address the problems identified above, including many “stop gap” teaching measures. The Department has instituted its own Undergraduate advisement program which assigns majors to specific faculty members as advisees as part of its plan to improve retention, progression and graduation (RPG). Also in an effort to improve RPG the Department would like to implement a series of sophomore seminars designed to increase faculty student interaction at a critical time in the student’s academic career. Generous funding has been provided by the Provost to support a pilot program in this area. Additional resources would be needed to expand and develop this effort. To address some of the shortage in faculty teaching
prelaw courses, the Department recently hired a third scholar in this area. In addition, the Department has relied on a number of Part Time Instructors and Graduate Teaching Assistants. The Department has been fortunate to have had three graduate students with law degrees to handle the overflow in prelaw instruction. In the sub-fields of international relations and comparative politics the department has utilized adjunct and visiting faculty to teach survey courses and some specialized courses. The department has also utilized ABD graduate students to teach some upper division survey courses. In FY 2006 nearly a third of our upper division credit hours were taught by these non FTE faculty.

However, the Department cannot rely on such measures indefinitely. Since the Department is subsidizing many other departments in the University, it will be all but impossible to expand its course offerings or address most of the advising issues in the absence of a more equitable distribution of resources which would allow a significant increase in the number of tenure track lines available. Additional faculty are needed across all subfields of political science to meet student demand for more and more varied classes in American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Public Administration, and Political Theory. This would not only allow the department to offer more and more varied courses as sought by the students, but would allow smaller upper division classes and more time and more faculty for student advisement. The benefit to the College and University is that with more course offerings, a greater variety of course offerings, better advisement, and smaller classes, departmental majors and all those interested in taking Political Science courses will have a greater reason to remain at Georgia State rather than continue their education elsewhere. In short, increased faculty should significantly help retention.

Given that the Department has some of the largest class sizes on campus, our stated objective of developing effective communication through writing is a significant challenge. In order to realize the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan the Department will need to designate two writing intensive courses for its more than 800 majors. The Department is prepared to designate the mandatory POLS 3800 Research Methods course as writing intensive, and it wishes to create a series of senior capstone seminars that would also be writing intensive. However, at present because of a lack of faculty resources we are unable to realize these objectives. In addition the department offers eight courses that are part of the Writing Across the Curriculum Program.

Graduate Program
Degree requirements and curricular goals
The department offers an MA degree and a PhD in political science. The MA program serves two different student populations – those interested in a terminal MA degree, and students intending to continue on to the PhD program at Georgia State or another institution. The course offerings and degree requirements are the same for both types of student.

MA students may opt to follow a general course of study in political science, or they may specialize in one of the following areas: American politics, international and comparative politics, or professional practices of government and politics. The department also offers a joint Master of Arts in Political Science and Master of International Business. There is a thesis and a non-thesis option for MA students. The thesis option requires a minimum of 30 hours of coursework, plus six hours of thesis research and a thesis written and defended in accordance with departmental guidelines. The non-thesis option requires 33 hours of coursework and a research paper completed in accordance with departmental guidelines.
As noted above, the department generally does not accept students directly into the PhD program without an MA in hand. Doctoral students must take 30 hours of coursework beyond the MA degree, plus an additional 20 hours of thesis research. Concentrations are offered in American Politics, International Politics, Comparative Politics, Public Policy and Administration, and Political Theory. The PhD program aims to produce scholars who are experts in their substantive field of study and who are able to combine theoretical sophistication with methodological rigor.

One of the department’s goals from the last self-study was to enhance the quality of the graduate program, in part by raising stipends for doctoral students to a more competitive level and by tightening requirements for admission to the graduate programs. Both actions have been taken. Doctoral stipends are up from $8000 to $12,000 annually, which makes the department competitive with other public universities in the Southeast, but is still somewhat below what is likely to draw the top students. Admission requirements were also tightened and average GRE scores, especially on the quantitative side, have seen a modest increase. However, we still admit roughly 50% of applicants to the MA program and around 40-45% of PhD applicants, and the credentials of our applicant pool have not changed substantially in recent years. What has improved is student performance, both within the program and after graduation, as measured by placements and productivity. The push to draw more fulltime students with full-time status, now the norm for doctoral students, is partly responsible for these positive changes.

Graduate program learning outcomes

As detailed in Appendix D1, program learning goals for PhD and MA students are as follows. Doctoral students should:

- Demonstrate familiarity with the breadth and diversity of models, approaches, and intellectual traditions within that student’s major sub-field of expertise.
- Demonstrate competency in at least a second substantive area of political science.
- Demonstrate a high level of competency in appropriate research skills and a full understanding of the research enterprise.
- Demonstrate an ability to teach courses in his or her primary field and subfields of the discipline.

MA students should:

- Demonstrate research skills and knowledge of the research literature commensurate with their area of specialization.
- Demonstrate ability to write a professional report or thesis in their area of specialization, as detailed in Appendix D1.

Assessment of learning outcomes

Learning outcomes for the MA program are assessed chiefly through evaluations done by the student’s thesis or non-thesis committee members, who provide a written assessment of the degree to which the thesis or non-thesis paper provides evidence of achievement of the desired outcomes.

For the doctoral program, there are three mechanisms for assessment. First, committee members provide a written evaluation of the degree to which each student’s dissertation meets the learning outcomes described above. Second, the lead reader for each of the student’s three comprehensive exams provides a written assessment of the degree to which the exams exhibit evidence that the desired learning outcomes were achieved. Finally, the graduate director assembles evidence of students’ teaching ability through annual review of syllabi and student evaluations of courses taught by graduate students.

Analysis of learning outcomes
The Department has produced learning outcomes assessments for the last two years. Broadly speaking, annual assessment reports indicate that MA students are meeting the learning outcomes to a fairly high degree, with scores in each category ranging from 3.7 to 4.6 on a 5-point scale. MA graduates seem best able to effectively formulate research questions but are somewhat less adept at analyzing data and integrating their findings with the extant literature. Faculty feedback on MA projects indicates that some studies are indeed outstanding, while some only minimally meet the target goals. There is also faculty concern that the non-thesis option for MA students too frequently results in papers that are of only minimally acceptable quality.

For PhD students, assessments by dissertation committees also indicate that students are meeting most learning goals to a high degree. On four of five standard learning outcome indicators, faculty committee members judged the achievement of learning outcomes to be greater than 4.0 on a 5-point scale. Dissertation projects effectively demonstrate familiarity with intellectual traditions in the students’ major fields, a high degree of competency in research methodologies, a clear capacity to make original scholarly contributions, and the preparedness to teach in the field. The demonstration of competency in a second substantive field was an area that received lower scores in this assessment.

An analysis of student performance on comprehensive exams reinforces the sense that this is an area of relative weakness. In the area of teaching competence, students did extremely well, suggesting that the department is producing effective and well-prepared college-level instructors. Average scores on standardized student evaluations ranged between 4.4 and 4.9 on overall instructor effectiveness. There are still areas of weakness, mainly in classroom management and organization, which are clear from student comments. (See Appendix D1 for details).

**Changes implemented to improve learning outcomes**

A number of changes have been implemented to improve learning outcomes. One is the creation of written guidelines clarifying expectations for student performance on the comprehensive exams. A second is the formalization of expectations and regulations regarding progress toward the degree, particularly for doctoral students, along with identification of penalties for failing to meet expectations. These changes are consistent with the move toward a more fulltime model of doctoral study that has occurred in the department over the past few years. Along with this has come more systematic advisement of graduate students and review of their performance for compliance with these benchmarks. Finally, the Department has prioritized fulltime doctoral student funding over the provision of assistantship for MA students, although a select number of MA students, primarily those who seem likely to continue in the program, are also funded. It is hoped that these changes will improve retention rates and move students toward completion in a more timely fashion. There has also been more collaboration between faculty and graduate students on publication and a concerted effort, backed by funding for travel, to encourage students to make conference presentations and encourage their professional socialization and development.

**Evaluative Statements about Curricular Quality**

Based on evaluative statement in the survey of graduate students and alumni done for the self study students had one common complaint about the curriculum -- insufficient variety of course offerings. The most common positive comment was the collegial relationship between faculty and students, though several students called for more structured mentoring by faculty.
Section E: Student Quality

Admissions Requirements

Undergraduate Program
The Department has no specific undergraduate admissions requirements beyond Georgia State University requirements that a student have at least a C (2.00 GPA) average. To graduate with an undergraduate major in political science, students must take 27 credit hours in 3000-4000 level political science courses, with the types of courses dependent upon concentration, and earn a C or better in each course for credit towards the major.

Graduate Program
The department’s graduate committee looks at a range of factors in evaluating applications to the MA and doctoral programs. Applicants to the PhD program should have an MA in political science or a related field, a GPA of at least 3.3 and combined verbal and quantitative GRE scores of 1250, with a 5.0 on the analytical section.

For MA applicants, the department seeks combined verbal and quantitative GRE scores of at least 1100, with a 4.5 on the analytical section, and an undergraduate GPA of at least 3.0. Applicants should have an undergraduate major in political science or a related field. The committee also looks for a compelling personal statement and strong letters of recommendation for both MA and PhD applicants. Combined target GRE scores were raised by 1000 points each for MA and PhD applicants over target scores prior to Fall 2005.

Acceptance Rates

Undergraduate Program
Average annual SAT scores and Freshman Indexes for undergraduate majors were comparable to those for all GSU students. SAT scores of political science majors were slightly higher than for the University as a whole.

Graduate Program
Table E-1 compares GRE scores of applicants, accepted students and enrolled students for the MA and PhD programs from 2001-2006. Looking at average combined scores over time provides little indication of a clear upward trend in the test performance of applicants or admitted students.

However, for each year and in both degree programs, we note that admitted students had substantially higher scores than those for the applicant pool as a whole. Moreover, there has been a slight increase over time in average combined scores for admitted and enrolled students. Scores on the quantitative side show particular improvement among doctoral students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE E-1</th>
<th>MEAN STANDARDIZED GRADUATE ADMISSION TEST SCORES</th>
<th>FY 2001 - FY 2006</th>
<th>POLITICAL SCIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPLIED</td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td>ENROLLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>GRE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Three key points help to put this data in context.

First, the applicant pool for our graduate programs represents an extremely wide range of ability levels. For example, in 2004 MA applicant scores on either verbal or quantitative sections ranged from a low of 200 to a high of 800. Similarly, for PhD applicants the range was from 210 to 770 on a single section of the GRE. In 2006, the range was from 290-750 on the verbal section and 200-800 on the quantitative portion.

Second, a detailed look at the individual scores for incoming graduate cohorts indicates that scores for accepted students entering the MA program on the heels of a GSU BA, or for GSU political science MA students entering the PhD program are often at the low end of the scale. These are students who have performed well in class and have earned the respect of faculty members who have come to know them during their time at Georgia State, and these considerations have tended to outweigh lower than average GRE scores.

Finally, our program tends to attract a significant number of international students who often pair lower scores on the verbal section of the GRE with strong quantitative scores. They thus meet the target for combined scores, but pull down average verbal scores. This is reflected in higher average quantitative than verbal scores over the last five years and little improvement on the verbal side.

As Table E-2 shows, the ratio of applicants to admitted students fluctuates considerably from year to year with no discernible trend for either degree program. Again, this reflects the very wide range of ability levels in the applicant pool rather than an indiscriminate admissions policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>QUAN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>QUAN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>QUAN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY02</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY03</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>QUAN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>QUAN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>QUAN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY02</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY03</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th># OF APPLICANTS</th>
<th># OF ACCEPTED</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY02</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY03</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY02</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY03</td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While there is still no clear trend on aggregate GRE scores or acceptance rates that indicates growing selectivity in the program, indicators of student performance such as job placements, external recognition, and research productivity all point to the growing strength and increasing quality of the graduate programs.

Enrollment and Graduation Rates

Undergraduate
The Department of Political Science serves more than 800 undergraduate majors, ranking 5th in the College of Arts and Sciences. The number of declared majors has grown 64% since Fall 2001. The Department has boosted its undergraduate graduation rate from 63 students in FY02 to 155 students in FY05, an increase of 146%. While most departments have grown over this time period, the percentage growth of the Department of Political Science is significantly larger than the growth in most other departments within the College of Arts and Sciences. For example, Biology, one of the largest departments in the College, saw an increase in majors of 20%. Psychology, another large department, grew by 13% and Sociology by 43%.

Graduate
As was the case at the time of the last self-study, the terminal MA program remains the department’s bread and butter. In the last three years (FY2004-FY2006), the department has graduated 11 PhD and 44 MA students. In any given year, we have an average of approximately 70 MA students and 35 doctoral students enrolled. Thus the MA program is roughly twice the size of the doctoral program.

However, it should be noted that the MA program constitutes an increasingly important feeder for the doctoral program. In the last self-study, about 3 in 4 applications for graduate study in political science were for entry into the MA program. In the last three years, this ratio has shifted in favor of applications to the doctoral program. In 2006, roughly 38% of applications for graduate study were for the doctoral program. This actually underestimates the number of applicants who apply to Georgia State with the intention of pursuing doctoral study with us, since we do not accept applicants to the PhD program without the MA in hand. Thus a significant share of MA applicants will in fact end up as doctoral students in our program. For example, 15 of the 28 doctoral students who were enrolled in 2005 came up through our MA program.

As Table E-3a indicates, an increasing share of MA students graduate within two years, which is the average time for degree completion expected by the department for full-time students. For the Fall 2000 cohort, only 25% had graduated within two years. By 2003, the figure was 40%.

Table E-3a
Master's Level Retention and Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 00 Cohort</th>
<th>Retained Fall 01</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 01</th>
<th>1-Yr Ret Rate</th>
<th>Retained Fall 02</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 02</th>
<th>2-Yr Ret Rate</th>
<th>Retained Fall 03</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 03</th>
<th>3-Yr Ret Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In recent years we have increased our emphasis on the PhD program and have increasing success in attracting promising full-time students as well as in placing them in academic positions. This is a significant change from the last self-study, when it was noted that “very few of our graduate students are intent upon becoming professional political scientists.” Now, the opposite is true. The overwhelming majority of students currently enrolled in our PhD program intend to pursue academic careers. Virtually all of them (84%) are full-time students, a marked contrast to what was true even as late as 2002. In Fall 1998, 58% of PhD students were full-time; in 2002 it was still just 60%.

For PhD students, recently developed departmental benchmarks for progress toward the degree for fulltime students indicate coursework completion after four semesters (2 years) and degree completion in four years. The retention and graduation data summarized below for cohorts beginning in Fall 1996-Fall 1998 indicate reasonable four-year and five-year retention rates for those cohorts, but time to graduation is roughly twice what we aspire to for fulltime students.

**Table E-3b**

Ph.D Retention and Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 96 Cohort</th>
<th>Retained Fall 97</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 98</th>
<th>2-Yr Ret Rate</th>
<th>Retained Fall 99</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 99</th>
<th>3-Yr Ret Rate</th>
<th>Retained Fall 00</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 00</th>
<th>4-Yr Ret Rate</th>
<th>Retained Fall 01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 97 Cohort</th>
<th>Retained Fall 98</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 99</th>
<th>2-Yr Ret Rate</th>
<th>Retained Fall 00</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 00</th>
<th>3-Yr Ret Rate</th>
<th>Retained Fall 01</th>
<th>Graduated by Fall 01</th>
<th>4-Yr Ret Rate</th>
<th>Retained Fall 02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accordingly, we have prioritized full-time students in the awarding of graduate assistantships, and are currently funding virtually all of our fulltime PhD students. (Students receive a full tuition waiver and an average annual stipend of $12,000). Our expectation is that this will improve both graduation and retention rates. In Fall 2005 we had 28 PhD students enrolled; 24 were funded. This year we were able to retain all continuing full-time PhD students on assistantships from the previous year and offer assistantships to all incoming PhDs who intended to be fulltime students. Our expectation is that we will fund these students for four years.

As for the level of stipends, since our last self-study doctoral stipends have increased from $8000 to $12000 annually. However, our stipends at both MA and PhD levels only just meet the maximum thresholds required by Georgia State in order to grant these students full tuition waivers. Our doctoral level stipends are slightly below average for comparable southeastern universities (average is just over $13,000), but are in line with those offered at public universities in the region.

We offer assistantships to MA students on a competitive basis, consisting of a full tuition waiver and an academic year stipend of $5600.

Output Quality Indicators

Undergraduate

One key measure of output quality for the undergraduate program is contained in the learning outcome assessments, which are discussed elsewhere in this report. The Department is also proud of the scope and level of our majors’ achievements beyond the classroom and after graduation. We believe these achievements speak to the quality of undergraduate education our majors receive in the discipline, as well as the dedication and enthusiasm of faculty.

The Department’s Model United Nations Team – powered by undergraduate GSU political science majors and advised by a political science faculty member -- has put in award-winning performances for the last four years. The team took honors at both national and regional
competitions for 4 out of the 5 years that the team has been in existence. The delegation’s third place award in national competitions for each of the last four years placed it in the top 15% of teams from 245 universities and colleges around the world.

In the last two years, the Department’s Model UN team won financial support for a program to work with local high school teams. The Department’s team now organizes the regional high school Model UN competition in the southeast and coaches high school teams on rules and procedures as they prepare for competition. The size of the regional high school Model UN competition has doubled since it came under the management of the Department’s team. Next year’s regional competition will be held at Georgia State and will again be organized by our team.

The Model Arab League team, advised by a Political Science faculty member, has won 32 outstanding delegate awards in the last five years. The team has also won the top award at the annual Southeast Regional competition for the last four years (Outstanding Delegation). The Mock Trial Team has also enjoyed success, and this year one of the team members won Outstanding Attorney in the regional competition.

Undergraduates held internships in 36 different organizations during the 2005-06 academic year. In the same period, GSU pre-law undergraduates received 137 admit decisions from law schools. Seventy-one students were admitted to at least one law school, including such places as Emory, American University, University of Michigan, Rutgers, DePaul, Tulane and Wake Forest, Howard, Mercer, George Mason, Tulane, University of Georgia, Washington and Lee, Hofstra, Maryland, Miami, and South Carolina.

In Fall 2006 in recognition of the Department’s commitment to teaching excellence, Political Science was awarded Georgia State’s Instructional Effectiveness Award.

Graduate

Although the quality of the applicant pool for graduate programs, as measured by GRE scores, has not changed dramatically over the years since 2001, recent years have seen notable achievements in output quality indicators such as placements, research productivity, and external recognition for our graduate students.

GSU’s MA program in recent years has graduated a number of students who went on to prestigious graduate programs, including Emory, Emory Law, Brown University, SUNY Stonybrook, and University of Alberta. Two MA graduates entered the U.S. Foreign Service after earning their degrees at Georgia State, while a number of others returned to careers in public service and private sector. This marks a change from the last self-study period, when it was noted that “more often than not, our students are using their graduate degrees as a way to enhance their professional stature in fields in which they are already employed.” While a number of students do still pursue the terminal MA in order to acquire a professional credential, we are increasingly seeing students who are using the MA as a springboard to professional school or further graduate study.

Our ability to place doctoral graduates in competitive tenure-track positions at research universities has improved dramatically in recent years, in keeping with one of our leading goals from the last self-study. The Department graduated 14 doctoral students between Fall 2002 and Spring 2006. We have placement information for 11 of these graduates. Five are in tenure-track positions at four-year colleges and universities, including Vanderbilt, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Loyola University (Chicago), Bridgewater College (Virginia), Kennesaw State University, and the University of Zagreb. Three hold non-tenure track academic appointments at schools in the southeast. GSU graduates have been awarded post-docs at the
London School of Economics and Central European University. Three took or returned to nonacademic positions. Of these, one is Assistant Secretary to the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research in Mauritius, one is a senior official at the Georgia Department of Labor, and one is Director of Enrollment Management at a local college. This compares to four of eight tenure track academic positions reported in the last self-study. Two of those earlier appointments were in Georgia, one in Guam and one in Jordan.

Both current students and recent graduates have dramatically increased their research productivity in recent years. The department has actively sought to encourage this by offering financial support to present papers at conferences. Faculty-student coauthorship of published articles has also increased, with four of these in the last two years alone. Students have published articles co-authored with faculty members in the *Journal of Democracy, Electoral Studies* and *Government and Opposition*, among others, and have contributed several book chapters and essays as solo authors this year and in previous years.

Current GSU graduate students presented 30 papers at conferences and professional meetings in academic year 2005-06 alone. This included multiple presentations at the most prestigious meetings, including the American Political Science Association, the Midwestern Political Science Association, and the International Studies Association. This compares to 42 papers presented over three years during the last self-study period.

In the last three years, our graduate students have had considerable success in attracting external support and recognition. One current graduate student has attracted external grants totaling $45,000 for dissertation research on democracy promotion in Africa. Another was a finalist in the 2005 Fulbright dissertation grant competition for research in Romania. Yet another was selected to pursue intensive Arabic language study in Beirut and Cairo for this academic year. Another student recently won the Malcolm Jewell Award for outstanding graduate student paper at the 2005 Southern Political Science Association Conference.

A quick survey of a handful of graduates from the past three years turned up seven refereed articles, two book chapters and two books – one published with Routledge, the other under contract with Cambridge University Press.

Finally, a review of the teaching abilities of doctoral students demonstrates that the program is producing effective and well-prepared college-level instructors. Averages of scores on standardized student evaluations ranged between 4.4 and 4.9 (5 point scale) on overall instructor effectiveness. A 2004 graduate won Teacher of the Year in his first year at the University of Maryland Baltimore County.

**Section F: Faculty Quality**

The quality of the faculty of the Department of Political Science for the three-year review period has been high, and certainly much higher than during the three-year period covered by the previous Academic Program Review. The quality of the faculty is evidenced in particular by the quality and quantity of the faculty’s scholarly and creative productivity, the results of promotion and tenure reviews, faculty honors received and the faculty’s service and outreach contributions.

**Quality and Quantity of Scholarly and Creative Productivity**

During calendar years 2003-2005, the tenure-track faculty published a total of 42 refereed journal articles, 15 non-refereed journal articles, 23 book chapters, 2 refereed books, 5 edited books, and 34 book reviews, and presented approximately 113 conference papers. These figures
represent a nearly ten-fold jump in the number of journal articles and an increase of approximately 100 percent in the amount of other forms of scholarly and creative productivity over the previous three-year review period (1993-1996), when the faculty produced just 6 journal articles, 1 book, 3 edited volumes, 9 book chapters, and 54 conference papers. Moreover, this increase in productivity greatly outpaced the growth in the average number of full-time tenure track faculty, from 15 to 19, over the same period.

Not only has the quantity of scholarly productivity increased substantially, but a high percentage of the faculty publications during the review period are of the highest quality:

- the two refereed books were published by two of the most prestigious university presses for books in political science (Princeton and Cambridge)
- 12 of the refereed journal articles appeared in the 27 (of well over 100) most highly rated political science journals, as determined by the most comprehensive survey of political scientists yet undertaken (Garand and Giles 2003 *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36(2003): 293-308)

Unfortunately, two of the most productive faculty members, who accounted for both refereed books and six of the 42 refereed journal articles, including three of the 12 most highly placed, have recently left Georgia State for higher paying positions.

This improvement in the quantity and quality of scholarly productivity is further suggested by a comprehensive international ranking of political science departments published in 2004 (Hix 2004). Using data gathered on publications in 63 peer-reviewed journals by faculty in 400 departments, the study found that the political science department at Georgia State rose from 320th for the period 1993-97 to 112th for the period 1998-2002. This increase is greater than that of any other department included in the study. The study also ranked the political science department at Georgia State as tied with that of the University of Kentucky and measurably ahead of those at Notre Dame, Brown University, the University of Florida, the University of Tennessee, the University of Oklahoma, Boston University, SUNY-Albany, Tulane University, Iowa State University, the University of Connecticut, and Georgia Tech for the 1998-2002 period.

**Results of Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

The results of departmental promotion and tenure reviews have been highly successful. During the three-year review period (FY 2004 - 2006), eight assistant professors sought promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure, and two associate professors sought promotion to the rank of professor. (Two other assistant professors were promoted and tenured during the 2003 fiscal year.) All but one of the eight assistant professors were promoted and tenured, although two have subsequently left Georgia State University, and both of the associate professors were promoted.

**Faculty Honors**

At the beginning of the three-year review period, the department faculty was very junior. It included only one professor and seven associate professors, with two of the latter having just been promoted. Nevertheless, faculty members have received some noteworthy honors:
one faculty member (McCoy) received the GSU Exceptional Service Award and was invited to join the Council on Foreign Relations

one faculty member (Lindsay) received the College of Arts and Sciences Outstanding Teaching Award, Distinguished Honors Professor Award, and the University System of Georgia Board of Regents’ Teaching Excellence Award

one faculty member (Smith) received the College of Arts and Sciences Outstanding Junior Faculty Award;

one faculty member (Naim) received the GSU International Education Excellence Award; and

three faculty members were awarded prestigious grants by the Fulbright Commission (Manning), the United States Institute of Peace and the Rockefeller Center in Bellagio (McCoy), and the German Marshall Fund of the United States (Duffield).

Dollar Level and Source of Sponsored Research

   i) Internal Sources: During the three-year review period, four faculty members (Duffield, Howard, Lazarus, and Nixon) received separate Research Initiation Grants from Georgia State University totaling $38,300
   ii) External Sources: During the three-year review period, 10 faculty members were awarded or received a total of 12 grants and fellowships from external sources totaling $202,400, of which $12,600 constituted indirect costs. For a list of external grants please see Appendix F5.

Service and Outreach Contributions

   During the three-year review period, the service and outreach contributions of the faculty have been substantial and outstanding. Indeed, these contributions are too numerous to describe in their entirety. The department engages in significant services at the College, University and System Levels. For a list of service roles by faculty members please see Appendix F6. Faculty members have also provided substantial service to the profession of political science

   o as chair, officer, or member of numerous committees in professional organizations. For a complete list of organizations please see Appendix F7.
   o as editorial board member, book review editor, or notes editor of political science journals, including the National Political Science Review, the Justice System Journal, and the European Journal of Public Policy;
   o as manuscript reviewers for dozens of scholarly journals and presses; and
   o as reviewers for a number of grant, fellowship, and award programs, including the National Science Foundation, the Social Science Research Council, the National Security Education Program, the Grawemeyer Award for Ideas for Improving World Order, the UK Economic and Social Research Council, and the Swiss National Federation for Scientific Research.

   Not least important, faculty members have made substantial service and outreach contributions to the local, national, and global communities. For a representative list of these activities please see Appendix F8.

Section G: Resource Adequacy

1. Faculty Resources
Since our last academic review the department has grown by five tenure track positions to 19 with 2 fulltime lecturers (2 positions are currently unfilled). In faculty size (23 FTE) we are comparable to some of our Regents-defined peer institutions (Houston: 20. Temple 23, but not others (South Florida 26, Arizona State 29). We are likewise currently smaller than many of our Regents-defined aspirational institutions (Iowa: 25, Florida State: 28, Pitt:36, Rutgers: 40, Maryland: 46). Moreover, our size has not kept pace with the burgeoning number of students in our classes. For example, the number of undergraduate majors has grown from 378 in fall 2001 to 842 today (see Table G-1). During that time period our teaching duty hours grew by 25% [Statware 6000, September 21,2006]. The Department’s undergraduate major/tenure track faculty ratio at 42:1 (FY 2006) is one of the highest in the College and our average class size (53.4 in Spring 2006) is larger than all other departments. To meet student demand we have increased the number of hours GTAs teach in the undergraduate core by 60% since 2004 alone (See Table B-5abc). In 2006 PTIs and GTAs taught nearly a third of our credit hours at the upper division (See Table B-5c). Simply put we have insufficient faculty resources to meet student demand or optimally realize learning priorities such as writing enhancement in our courses.

2. Administrative Resources
The Department currently has three full-time staff (a business manager, an assistant to the graduate director, and administrative assistant). This equates to 7 FTE per fulltime administrative staff member. In addition we have 20 hours per week of clerical support from a student assistant. Still with the current distribution of administrative duties there is no staff person to advise an ever growing number of undergraduate majors and an overburdened business manager is responsible for administering the department’s sizeable internship program in addition to the department’s finances, budgets, scheduling and grants. An additional staff person to work with grants, interns and undergraduate advisement would be a tremendous asset to the department.

3. Technological Resources
Currently all faculty members have up-to-date office computers. This equipment is on par with other departments in the social sciences. A technological support person (shared with departments of Sociology, Women’s Studies, and Modern and Classical Languages) is helpful to the maintenance of our equipment. However, there is a lack of technological resources available to our undergraduate and graduate students. We currently have no lab facilities and the computers in PTI/GTA offices are outdated and prone to problems.

4. Space Resources
Office space is at a premium. The faculty, instructors and lecturers occupy offices on the 10th floor of the General Classroom Building. There is however no room for growth. As we add tenure track faculty we will have to “evict” other types of instructors if we do not increase the physical space our department occupies. In addition to not having any room to grow, the GTAs and PTIs occupy severely overcrowded offices. Often three or four people are assigned to an office designed for one person. This makes scheduling meetings with students difficult. Beyond the over-crowded offices assigned to those teaching classes we have only eight cubicles assigned to the remaining GTA/GRAs who are working with faculty as teaching or research assistants. The Department needs more space.
5. **Laboratory Resources**
The department currently has no laboratory resources. This significantly detracts from our ability to provide a place for our students to study individually and in groups and undermines our capacity to teach our graduate and undergraduate students how to engage in research. The College has attempted to meet the need for computing facilities through an open computing lab on the 6th floor of GCB. However, because of the open nature of the lab it is not useful for instruction or for providing a collaborative research environment for our graduate students. Moreover, the lab’s hours of operation have not met the needs of our graduate students. Currently this lab is slated to close and another (with 25 computers to be shared among 5 departments) is scheduled to open on the 8th floor. While this new lab represents a stop-gap solution it does not alleviate the need for dedicated space to support student research. A lab is basic to the research environment. It supports instruction, collaboration, camaraderie, peer based learning, and technological and analytical proficiency. These components of the research environment are not well supported in a general use graduate laboratory.

6. **GSU Foundation Resources**
The department currently has an account through the GSU Research Foundation. Donation to this accounts provide for expenses not otherwise covered by our budget including plaques, awards and refreshments at departmental functions. The Department’s level of external support from alumni and friends for these foundation resources is lower than we desire and the Department is working to strengthen these relationships.

7. **Library Resources**
As Appendix G2 indicates, library resources are currently adequate to support departmental needs. We have adequate coverage of holdings in key areas of the discipline. The library subscribes to the majority of periodicals available in political science and research databases provide good access to research materials.

**Section H: Goals and Objectives**

As noted in Section C above the Department has made substantial progress toward achieving the goals and objectives established in the 1996 program review. Moreover, whether measured by student enrollments, graduation rates, student output quality, scholarly productivity, external funding or service and linkages to the community, Political Science is a much stronger department today than it was just 10 years ago. Now, Political Science proposes to become a department of distinction through further advances in research, external and internal funding and teaching methods and content. In consideration of the strengths and weaknesses noted in this Self Study Report, the Department establishes the following goals and objectives as desirable and achievable for the next academic program review cycles. These goals and objectives are also specified in Table H-1.

1. **Goal: Further improve the quality of undergraduate instruction and the undergraduate program.**
   **Objective 1.1** Increase the frequency and variety of undergraduate course offerings, including upper division courses, dedicated honors courses, sophomore seminars, and a new
senior level capstone course, while reducing the average class size and the percentage of upper division course taught by PTIs and GTAs.

Rationale: Since the last self study, the number of political science majors has increased 3 fold, and it has nearly doubled in the past 5 years. Likewise, the number of graduates has risen by 150 percent since FY 2002. The Department currently has the highest number of students per class of any department in the college with an average class size of 53.4 in Spring 2006, and many upper division classes filled to capacity. As a result, the undergraduate student survey found that more than two-thirds of students complained about the availability of classes. At the same time the Department is currently using PTIs and GTAs to teach a third of its upper division credit hours. This heavy student load undermines the Department’s ability to fulfill the University’s stated vision of providing “an academic environment conducive to effective and inspired teaching, learning and scholarship”. It also prevents the department from meeting the University’s goals of providing two writing intensive courses for every student or offering the kind of sophomore seminars specified in our QEP grant to decrease attrition and improve the retention, progress and graduation rates of our students.

Resources required: The Department requires additional tenure track and lecturer lines commensurate with our teaching load.

Implementation: Given agreement on the part of the University and the Dean, the Department would proceed to hire additional faculty at a rate of at least one per year until all new lines have been filled.”

Objective 1.2 Increase opportunities for “out of the classroom” learning experiences.

Rationale: The University has a goal to “increase student engagement in the university through student organizations… and to measure student learning through such involvement”. One of the innovative ways that the Department of Political Science is accomplishing this goal is through its academic teams including Mock Trial, the Model UN and Model Arab League. Last year each of these teams excelled in intercollegiate competition. The Model Arab League Team won Outstanding Delegation, the top award at the Southeast Regional and the Model UN team won Honorable Mention (3rd place) at the national competition. These Model programs also represent a way that the Department is meeting the University goal to “infuse its curriculum with a global perspective”.

Resources required: This year the expenses of our model teams were off set by a generous ($25,000) allocation from the Provost. While this ameliorates current budget concerns, additional resources are needed to support, grow and develop our academic teams. More student involvement in these teams, international competition, or the addition of other model programs to the curriculum (for example the African or European Union) will require additional resources to support the kind of innovative opportunity for student learning that these programs represent.
Implementation: The Undergraduate Program Committee in conjunction with the Chair and the Model team advisors will work to determine how the Model programs can be expanded and developed.

**Objective 1.3: Enhance undergraduate advisement within the Department**

Rationale: The University currently provides a centralized Student Advisement Center that assists students until they have completed areas A-F of the University System Core curriculum. Nevertheless, advisement for declared majors must be effectively handled in the Department. Before this year, our students were not assigned to particular professors for advisement but were handled by whichever professor was available at the time. This year as part of our RPG efforts we overhauled advisement procedures to assign each of our majors to an individual professor during an advisement week each semester so that students could better plan and choose their courses. However, the Department has no staff resources dedicated to coordinating this advisement effort and no resources to handle graduation audits or the other types of advisement needs that students have throughout the semester.

Resources required: Additional staff to support undergraduate advisement

Implementation: If allocated, the Undergraduate Program Committee and the Department Chair will work to develop specific time resources and responsibilities for more effective advisement of our undergraduate students.

**Goal 2: Further increase the quality and quantity of scholarly productivity as part of a strategy of building a nationally recognized research faculty.**

**Objective 2.1: Improve faculty recruitment and retention and provide greater support for highly productive scholars**

Rationale: The Department has been transformed over the past decade. Where 10 years ago many of the faculty engaged in minimal scholarship, most individual members now have active and productive research agendas. We believe that the department is now making a major contribution to achieving GSU’s overarching aspiration to become “one of the nation’s premier research universities”. Nevertheless, we have been unable to retain several of our most productive and promising members, who have left for higher paying positions, and we have frequently had difficulty filling open positions for reasons that have much to do with compensation.

Resources required: Greater resources for faculty recruitment and retention in order to hire and keep faculty with strong research agendas. Higher salaries and more substantial summer support would be particularly useful for this purpose.

Implementation: The Chair will work with the Dean and other administrators to identify competitive salary ranges based on rank. The Chair, Dean and other administrators will work to increase funds allocated to hiring new faculty in the department. In addition, they will work to increase the funds available to reward existing faculty for outstanding scholarly
productivity and to retain those productive faculty who have opportunities to receive competitive salaries at other institutions.

Objective 2.2: Increase amount of external funding including sponsored research and foundation fundraising

Rationale: The Department has made substantial progress over the past decade with regard to the amount of sponsored research. Yet the level of sponsored research remains lower than we desire. Political Science currently has no endowed chairs and relies on limited foundation account gifts to provide money for awards and fellowships

Resources required: Greater institutional support particularly in the form of a dedicated staff person to support grant seeking activities and to develop alumni relations.

Implementation: Encourage, facilitate and reward faculty for applying for and receiving external grants. If funded, the Chair will work with the Department Business Manager to develop a staff structure that would support faculty identifying and applying for external grants. The Department also needs support to develop an outreach program for alumni to connect them more effectively to the department.

Goal 3: Further enhance the quality of our graduate program and our doctoral students.

Objective 3.1: Offer a greater variety of graduate courses on a regular basis and develop greater differentiation between MA and PhD coursework

Rationale: The most frequent complaint expressed in the surveys of graduate students and alumni conducted for the self study was an insufficient variety of graduate courses. Above, we have noted the ability to offer no more than a very limited number of courses particularly in the areas of political theory and public policy. We have also been unable to offer core courses critical to the training of doctoral candidates as often as every two years. As the doctoral program continues to strengthen, it is increasingly desirable to offer a larger number of courses that are specifically tailored to the disparate needs of doctoral students who aspire to careers in university research and teaching and those in the terminal MA program. Currently, we almost always need to teach MA and PhD students together. Indeed, too many course taken by doctoral students are taught as mixed graduate/undergraduate classes. This situation impairs our ability to help the University meets its commitment to “graduate students who are proficient in their discipline as trained and talented professionals.”

Resources required: Please see Objective 1.1.

Implementation: Please see Objective 1.1.

Objective 3.2: Increase the number of doctoral students and their quality while reducing time toward degree completion for doctoral students
Rationale: In the last decade, graduate student scholarly productivity (conference presentations, journal articles, book chapters etc.) has increased substantially. We have also had increasing success placing our graduate students at research universities. Nevertheless, the number of enrolled doctoral students and our success in attracting highly qualified graduate students, as measured by grade point averages and standardized test scores remains lower than our objectives. In additional, several of the MA students with the greatest promise as doctoral candidates have left to earn their PhDs elsewhere. Finally, the time to graduation for PhD students has been longer than we aspire for full time students. These weaknesses will be remedied in part by offering a greater variety of graduate course and reducing the need to teach MA and PhD students together (Objective 3.1), but we believe that they are also the result of insufficiently competitive stipends. Time to complete the dissertation will also improve if we can reduce the teaching burden we currently place on our PhD students to meet undergraduate demand.

Resources required: Although funding for the graduate program has increased in the past several years, additional resources are still needed to increase the number and size of graduate stipends. These additional funds would improve recruitment and retention and allow for a reduction in PhD candidate teaching loads. Additional tenure track faculty lines (Objective 1.1) will also serve to enhance the doctoral program.

Implementation: If funded, the Graduate Director, Graduate Committee and the Chair will work on a model for increasing the number of doctoral students in the department and setting progress standards over a 3-5 year period.

Goal 4: Address current and anticipated physical space constraints

Objective 4.1: Obtain greater contiguous office space to accommodate current and anticipated needs of the department

Rationale: Currently our GTAs and PTI are crammed three or more to an office, which makes it difficult for them to use these facilities for class preparation or consultations with students. In addition, the remaining GTAs and GRAs are forced to share just 8 carrels in the graduate student lounge. This situation undermines the teaching mission of the department and detracts from teaching excellence as well as research productivity from our graduate students and part-time faculty members. Finally, we do not have office space in our current area for additional faculty we are proposing to hire. We also currently have no space for a datalab which would be a substantial asset in teaching our graduate and undergraduate students how to engage in scholarly research.

Resources required: Additional office space. Ideally this space would be contiguous to the existing departmental facilities. The department also requires a small computer lab to enhance the research environment for our undergraduate and graduate students.

Implementation: A committee representing the Political Science Department, the Dean’s Office and other interested parties should be formed to determine the Department’s space needs and how they might be met.