



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

2013 Program Review Self-Study

Academic unit: Political Science _____

College: Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) _____

Date of last review 2010 _____

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) n/a _____

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: Bachelor of Arts in Political Science CIP* code: 45.1001

Degree: _____ CIP code: _____

Degree: _____ CIP code: _____

*To look up, go to: Classification of Instructional Programs Website, <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?v=55>

Faculty of the academic unit

Name:

	Signature
Neal Allen <u>Neal Allen</u>	<u>3/31/14</u>
Dinorah Azpuru <u>Dinorah Azpuru</u>	<u>3/31/14</u>
Kenneth Ciboski <u>Kenneth N. Ciboski</u>	<u>03/31/14</u>
Michael Hall <u>Michael S. Hall</u>	<u>4/1/14</u>
Melvin Kahn <u>Melvin Kahn</u>	<u>3/31/14</u>
Carolyn Shaw <u>Carolyn Shaw</u>	<u>4/1/14</u>

Submitted by: Carolyn Shaw, Department Chair

Date: 1 April 2014

Appendix 1: Self Study Data from WSU Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA)

Appendix 2: Alumni Survey (2013)

Appendix 3: Department Senior exit survey (2013)

Appendix 4: External Program Review Report (2014)

1. Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

a. University Mission:

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.

b. Program Mission (if more than one program, list each mission):

The mission of the Political Science Department is to foster curiosity, understanding, and critical thinking about politics and public life in the United States and the world.

c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.

The department's core focus is to provide quality undergraduate courses for majors and non-majors and to serve the general education needs of the larger campus community. The department offers a broad program of study, which introduces students to the major areas of the discipline with courses in American politics, comparative politics, international politics, and political theory. One goal is to help students develop an understanding of the forces shaping the political world, both domestically and internationally, and to develop skills in interpreting past, present, and future political events. Students develop a set of writing, researching and critical thinking skills that are applicable in many different careers. In addition, the study of political science prepares students for further study and for entry into a variety of career opportunities such as law, government, journalism, teaching, business, public service, and the military.

d. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? ☐ Yes ☒ No

i. If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

The Mission Statement was modified by the faculty last year as a part of the University-wide Strategic Planning process. The previous statement was more of a 'mission paragraph'. The new one is more concise and helps the department stay focused. The actual mission of the department however, has not changed.

e. Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (programmatic). Have they changed since the last review?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

Yes. Program goals were adopted by the faculty last year as a part of the University-wide Strategic Planning process. Previous KBOR guidelines did not require specific program goals, so these goals were the product of our annual department retreat in 2013.

Program Goal 1: To provide students with experiential learning opportunities in order to develop skills in some of the following areas: oral communication, problem solving, working in teams, consensus building, project development, and professional leadership.

Program Goal 2: To cultivate students' civic education and their awareness and knowledge of politics and government, including current events locally, nationally, and internationally that impact their lives.

Program Goal 3: To help students develop career plans

2. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates, and scholarly/creative activity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Performances			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	\$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref				Juried		Juried	Non-Juried				
Year 1 2011	1	1	4	2											1	2	35,000*
Year 2 2012	1	7	7	2											3	2	1,000
Year 3 2013	3	2	7	2											2	6	24,000

*Fulbright Scholarship

There are currently six faculty in the department: One Assistant Professor, three Associate Professors, and two Professors. All six are tenured or tenure track. In addition, we have two adjunct lecturers who have MA's in Political Science and are on renewable contracts (See Appendix 1, Table 4). Our tenure-track faculty produce the majority of our credit hours (83%)¹ (See Appendix 1, Table 3). The tenured faculty Department ratio of credit hours to FTE (235) is higher than the College and University ratios (228 and 219 respectively), and our lecturer ratio is lower (275 Dept, 339 College, 281 University) (See Appendix 1, Table 5). This indicates that our faculty are directly and significantly engaged in the classroom. The standard teaching load in the department is 3-3 with the assumption of an active research agenda. One faculty member carries a 4-4 load based on inactive research agenda. The Department Chair carries a 2-2 load for administrative duties. Our department teaches a large number of general education classes for non-majors at the lower level, generating 67% of our total credit hours, with the remaining courses being taught at the upper level largely for our majors (See Appendix 1, Table 1). The number of majors in the department has varied from 97 – 121 in the last six years, with a flat five year rolling average of 104. We graduate 15 students a year on average (see Appendix 1, Tables 6 and 7). We do not have a graduate program, but some of our courses are numbered at the 500+ level, and we occasionally teach a special directed reading class with an MA student in LAS (see Appendix 1, Table 1).

The table above reflects the cumulative research of department members. The numbers generated in the past three years reflect the efforts of four of the six faculty members. The most frequent publications are in the form of book chapters and refereed and non-refereed articles, although members have produced monographs in the past. Five of our six faculty members have an active research agenda and continue to attend conferences and produce publishable work on a regular basis. Two members actively apply for and receive grant funding for their research, including a standing appointment as principle investigator for a major survey and data analysis project. A third member has served as a Fulbright Scholar. Research specialties include: American Politics (Law and Courts, American Political Development), Latin America, democracy, public opinion, international political economy, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL), presidential politics, elections, conflict resolution, international organizations, and human rights.

Because of the small size of the department, faculty frequently have multiple service responsibilities to the Department and University. In addition, some faculty engage in significant service commitments to the discipline through professional associations. Our faculty serve in the following ways on campus: LAS College Council Representative, Pre-Law Advisor, Coop Education Advisor, College Republican Advisor, College Democrats Advisor, Honors Committee Member, Internship Advisor, Political Science Club Advisor, Department Undergraduate Advisor, International Studies Advisor, Model UN Faculty Advisor, UNICEF club Advisor, Pi Gamma Mu Social Sciences Honor Society Advisor.

¹ All numbers provided are from the 5-year rolling average unless otherwise stated.

3. **Academic Program: Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).**

- a. **For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole.**

Political Science majors' ACT scores (23.4 for the most recent five year average) are slightly above the university five-year average (22.7). These scores have largely remained flat in the in the seven years for which data is available (See Appendix 1, Table 8).

- b. **For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs.**
N/A.

- c. **Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes in the table below. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.**

The results below are in two different tables based on significantly revised Learning Outcomes. Our annual reports have been due in the Fall semester for the previous academic year, but in Fall 2013 we were anticipating a full report due in Spring 2014, so we did not complete a report for the full 2012-13 academic year.

Senior Seminar (POLS 600) data is provided for: Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, Fall 2013.

Political Inquiry (Methods) POLS 365 data is provided for: Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 (not offered in Fall 2012).

Goal 3 became part of our Program Goals, not a learning objective.

Learning Outcomes 2011-13	Assessment Tool	Target/Criteria	Results	Analysis
Students will demonstrate their general knowledge of political science in the following ways:				
1. have an acquaintance with the methods of political inquiry	Take the Political methods class (POLS 365)	• Receive a "C" or better	• Fall 2011: 29 political science majors enrolled; 28 completed the course with a C or better. • Spring 2012: 29 of 30 received a C or better.	This class does a good job introducing students to research methods.
2. have the ability to employ certain concepts in analyzing and thinking about politics at all levels of government.	• Take the Senior Seminar course and research, write and defend their paper in class before faculty and students. • complete senior exit survey	• Receive a "C" or better on their senior seminar papers and for their research presentations.	• Fall 2011: 6 political science majors enrolled; 5 completed course with C or better, 1 took an incomplete (finished in the spring 2012). • Spring 2012: 8 political science majors enrolled; 6 completed course with C or better; 2 took incompletes. • Fall 2012: 17 students exceeded or met expectations; 4 students did not meet expectations	Students who complete the work in the course demonstrate good analytical skills; there are regularly students who fail to complete the course. They get behind on the assignments and cannot complete the final paper on time. Efforts are made to assist these students, but their challenges are often not academically based.

3. participate in activities that will provide the opportunity to learn about the world of practical politics.	• participate in some of the following opportunities: Model UN, internship program, and cooperative education.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •2011-12: 24 students participated in MUN; 7 interns went to DC; 2 students participated in co-op ed. •2012-13: 23 students participated in MUN; 4 interns when to DC; 2 students participated in Coop. 	MUN is well funded and can expand to support more students. This is done through word of mouth by students; the number of interns is largely limited by available funding. Students are encouraged to seek paying internships to help defer their expenses of participating; there is room to expand co-op experiences with closer collaboration with the co-op office.
--	--	--	--	---

Fall 2013 Senior Seminar papers (Goals 1 - 3)

Fall 2013 Political Methods class assignments (Goal 4)

Learning Outcomes 2013-14	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
<p>Goal 1: To hone students' writing skills. Students will demonstrate effective control of syntax and mechanics of writing</p> <p>Students will use straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the writing sample has few errors. (Written Communication Rubric from AACU)</p>	Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.	75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.	8 of 9 students met or exceed expectations.	Current individual mentoring process combined with regular writing assignments in courses earlier in the sequence is working well to help students become better writers.
<p>Goal 2a: To develop students' research skills with regard to information literacy. Access and use information ethically and legally. Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing. (Info Literacy Rubric from AACU)</p>	Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.	75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.	9 of 9 students met or exceeded expectations.	Faculty mentoring in combination with close collaboration with the library support staff is helping students identify and use credible sources for their research.
<p>Goal 2b: To develop students' research skills with regard to information literacy. Students demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/ or proprietary information; and will correctly use three of the following strategies: a) use of citations and references; b) choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; c) using information in ways that are true to original context; d)</p>	Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.	75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.	9 of 9 students met or exceeded expectations	Faculty mentoring in combination with close collaboration with the library support staff is helping students accurately cite and quote the literature in their research papers.

distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution (Info Literacy Rubric from AACU)				
Goal 3a: To promote critical/analytical thinking in our students. Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. (Inquiry and Analysis Rubric from AACU)	Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.	75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.	8 of 9 students met or exceeded expectations.	Current individual mentoring process combined with course assignments that require critical thinking and peer review is working well to help students become better more analytical thinkers.
Goal 3b: To promote critical/analytical thinking in our students. States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings. (Inquiry and Analysis Rubric from AACU)	Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.	75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.	8 of 9 students met or exceeded expectations.	Current individual mentoring process combined with course assignments that require critical thinking and peer review is working well to help students become better more analytical thinkers.
Goal 4a: Quantitative Literacy: Interpretation	The instructor of POLS 365 (Political Research Methods) will include a set of four questions in the final exam measuring interpretative skills (frequency, average, correlation, regression). All exams will be assessed using a Department rubric to determine if each student exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does NOT meet expectations.	75% of students will meet or exceed expectations according to the established rubric.	6 of 8 students met or exceeded expectations	Instructor will continue to explore new ways to instruct students on the most challenges aspects of quantitative research.
Goal 4b: Quantitative Literacy: Application/Analysis	The instructor of POLS 365 (Political Research Methods) will assign and assess an exercise for all enrolled students each semester that asks them to make an analysis based on country-level data.	75% of students will meet or exceed expectations according to the established rubric.	8 of 8 students met or exceeded expectations	

- d. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results (if applicable), employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the outcomes of the program as listed in 3c).

Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
2012	13	Univ exit survey	76.9% satisfied or very satisfied	Univ avg 79.5%; college avg 83.7%
2013	34	Univ exit survey	94.1% satisfied or very satisfied	Univ avg 82.9%; college avg 89%
2013	134	Dept Alumni survey	8.26 on 10 pt scale for overall satisfaction with Political Science degree	See Appendix 2 for full survey results
2012-13	8	Senior exit survey (dept)	8 of 8 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their political science degree...helped them to develop a greater understanding of the American political system, the international political system, the domestic politics of other countries; to understand and analyze public policy, and to become more engaged in the political process.	See Appendix 3 for full survey results
2012-13	8	Senior exit survey (dept)	8 of 8 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their political science degree....equipped them to express themselves coherently and articulately, helped them to write clearly and lucidly, and taught them how to collect data and conduct research.	See Appendix 3 for full survey results

The Department's score on student satisfaction based on exit surveys is quite strong (See data from Appendix 1, Table 10. Data only available for the previous two years). The Department's score on student satisfaction is increasing and is 5% above the college average and 12% above the university average for 2013. This data is also reflected in our department senior exit surveys (See Appendix 3)

- e. Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the *WSU General Education Program* and *KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills* are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).

Outcomes:	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences Think critically and independently Write and speak effectively Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques 		
See 3.c for specific assessment goals and outcomes.		Our current assessment plan largely assesses performance of majors only because the two courses are required for majors (POLS 365 and 600) and are not general education courses

Note: Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at: <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/>

- f. For programs/departments with concurrent enrollment courses (per KBOR policy), provide the assessment of such courses over the last three years (disaggregated by each year) that assures grading standards (e.g., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) course management, instructional delivery, and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.

Provide information here:

Each year, students from local high schools write short essays on ten key topic areas: US Constitution, Civil Liberties and Civil Rights, Federalism, Public Opinion, Political Participation, Political Parties, Interest Groups, Presidency, Congress, and the Judiciary. When the courses are complete, the instructors submit the student essays to be read by two WSU professors. The decision points are as follows: 90% - Exceeds expectations; At or above 70% - Meets expectations; Below 70% - Does not meet expectations. Due to time constraints, 3-6 essay topics are selected for evaluation each year. We conclude from the results below that the concurrent enrollment students are receiving solid instruction in American Government from our partner high schools.

2011

Goddard	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT meet expectations
Public Opinion	10 (26%)	28 (73%)	0
Participation	3 (7%)	32 (84%)	3 (7%)
Int groups	7 (20%)	25 (71%)	3 (8%)
Federalism	10 (27%)	24 (66%)	2 (5%)
Constitution	12 (31%)	24 (63%)	2 (6%)

2012

Participation	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT meet expectations
Campus High	40%	60%	0%
Goddard I	0%	60%	40%
Goddard II	20%	60%	20%

Presidency	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT meet expectations
Campus High	0%	100%	0%
Goddard I	20%	70%	10%
Goddard II	0%	60%	40%

Constit	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT meet expectations
Campus High	20%	60%	20%
Goddard I	20%	60%	20%
Goddard II	20%	80%	0%

2013

Participation	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT meet expectations
Campus High	0	100%	0
Goddard	0	60%	40%
Eisenhower	0	80%	20%
Heights	28%	42%	28%

Congress	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT meet expectations
Campus High	20%	80%	0
Goddard	0	100%	0
Eisenhower	0	100%	0
Heights	14%	86%	0

Constit	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does NOT meet expectations
Campus High	0	80%	20%
Goddard	0	60%	40%
Eisenhower	10%	70%	20%
Heights	0	86%	14%

- g. Indicate whether the program is accredited by a specialty accrediting body including the next review date and concerns from the last review.

Provide information here:

N/A

- h. Provide the process the department uses to assure assignment of credit hours (per WSU policy 2.18) to all courses has been reviewed over the last three years.

We are in compliance with policy 2.18. All syllabi reflect the requisite language for credit hours.

- i. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from 3a – 3e and other information you may collect, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention).

The overall academic quality of the program is strong. Students are gaining skills in our areas of emphasis including writing skills, research and information literacy skills, critical and analytical skills, and quantitative literacy skills in interpretation, application and analysis. Students and alumni express a high level of satisfaction with the program, noting that in exit surveys that they have acquired the same skills identified and assessed as part of our learner outcomes. Our partner high schools are providing good instruction for our introductory American Politics course.

Additional evidence of the strength of our program includes awards at the annual Undergraduate Research and Creativity Academic Forum (URCAF) awards: 1st place (2011); 2nd place (2013); Honors society initiates: Pi Sigma Alpha initiates 2 (2011); 11 (2012); 9 (2013); Best paper award: Millett-Young Mentor-Scholar award given to an outstanding student and his/her faculty mentor each year starting in 2012; and the award of 10-12 department merit scholarships each year.

4. Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

- a. Evaluate tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning Analysis for number of applicants, admits, and enrollments and percent URM students by student level and degrees conferred.

The University's five-year average number of admissions for Political Science students is 39. Approximately 20% of our freshmen and sophomore declared majors are URM students. This percentage is slightly higher than the University average of 16%, and slightly lower than the College average of 22%. (See Appendix 1, tables 11 and 12). The largest minority group is black non-hispanic, followed by Hispanic, but the variation of each race/ethnic category is only a difference of one students. (See Appendix 1, Table 13). Minorities consist of 13% of the department's graduating majors (three of nineteen students) in the five-year average (See Appendix 1, table 14 and 15). This percentage is slightly higher than the University average of 11.9% for the BA degree.

- b. Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.

Employment of Majors							Projected growth from BLS** Current year only
	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment % related to the field	Employment % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	
2013 alumni survey	With MA, \$102,000 in 2012 according to BLS.	Approx 55% of our alumni are KS residents	36%	32%	31%	118 out of 143*	
2012 BLS							21% job outlook prediction (faster than average)

*Count may include multiple degrees received by one person.

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: <http://www.bls.gov/oco/> and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

- Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis and from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find.

Many of our majors go on to law school or pursue an MA in Political Science or an MPA. Others are prepared for entry into a variety of career opportunities such as government, journalism, teaching, business, public service, and the military. The degree provides students with skills that travel beyond the discipline, including writing, research and analytical skills that are useful in many different careers. We do not have specific placement data on our alumni, nor does the alumni office provide such reports.

5. Analyze the service the Program provides to the discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

- a. Provide a brief assessment of the service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors, nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond.

The Department provides considerable service hours to the university's general education program, with 73% of our SCH being generated by non-majors (this number has remained flat when looking at our five year rolling averages) (see Appendix 1, Table 16). These general education courses include American Government (POLS 121), which fulfills a special general education requirement for all LAS majors. Additional introductory general education courses include our core courses for our majors (Comparative Politics, International Politics, and Political Theory). Many of our upper division courses are Further Studies general education courses. All of our international politics courses count toward the International Studies field major and we consequently serve many of those majors through our course offerings. We also are committed to the Honors Program and offer at least one honors section course every semester.

6. Report on the Program's goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

The previous format of KBOR reports did not require program goals and we did not have any specified in our 2010 report. The table below retroactively applies the goals developed at our 2013 retreat with data available for 2011, 2012 and 2013.

Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome
<i>To provide students with experiential learning opportunities in order to develop skills in some of the following areas: oral communication, problem solving, working in teams, consensus building, project development, and professional leadership.</i>	Opportunities provided: Model United Nations, DC/Topeka internships, Cooperative education, role playing and simulation exercises used in the classroom. Expectation for satisfactory performance: Every faculty member will try to incorporate at least one experiential learning opportunity into each course that they teach.	2011: 21 MUN students, 4 DC interns, 3 coop students, 2012: 24 MUN students, 7 DC interns, 2 coop students; 14 students traveled to Europe with the travel seminar 2013: 23 MUN students, 4 DC interns, 2 coop students; 5 students traveled to Ecuador with Model UN. Each year, all six faculty incorporated experiential learning into their classes, including simulations, role playing, interviews of public officials, collective problem solving exercises, etc.
Program Goal 2: <i>To cultivate students' civic education and their awareness and knowledge of politics and government, including current events locally, nationally, and</i>	Incorporation of current events (local, national, international) in class and department events (Times topics), issue invitations to students to local civic organizations, Constitution Day events. Expectation for satisfactory performance: Current event fora will take place at least once a month.	The department has sponsored weekly current events discussion with lunch for the past two years. It has sponsored Constitution Day events every September. Faculty invite students to lunch at local civic organizations such

<i>internationally that impact their lives.</i>		as the Pachyderm Club and others.
Program Goal 3: <i>To help students develop career plans</i>	Opportunities: advising of majors, provide career and graduate school presentations, club-sponsored professional development events, Air Academy conference attendance, invited speakers in classrooms, and internship participation. Expectation for satisfactory performance: Provide at least one career event each year; Support at least five interns to DC or Topeka each year; Send at least one student to the Academy conference annually.	Each year the department provides a career day panel (often one on the legal professions and one without a law focus). In 2011 the Academy conference was not held. In 2012 four students attended the Air Force Academy forum, and in 2013 one student attended. Guest speakers to the department in the last three years have included a State Department Liaison, various local elected officials, Dan Glickman, and members of the Kansas Supreme Court.

7. Summary and Recommendations

- a. Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e). Identify three-year goal (s) for the Program to be accomplished in time for the next review.
 Provide assessment here:

Based on the data provided in this report and appendices, including the recommendations of Dr. Kerstin Hamann who served as an external reviewer, Departmental strengths include: 1) committed faculty who devote much effort to incorporating active learning techniques in the classroom, thus providing students with many applied learning and research experiences, 2) a strong curriculum that allows for personal attention to students with a variety of enrichment opportunities, 3) close connections with our alumni and leaders in the community at large.

The Department recognizes that it does not have enough faculty strength in the area of quantitative methods to provide additional quantitative research opportunities at this time. We also do not offer as many pre-law preparatory opportunities as we might since faculty are stretched thin covering both pre-law and theory courses. An additional faculty member, as recommended by Dr. Hamann, would help address both of these weaknesses and improve our ability to serve our students (recognizing that many use quantitative skills upon graduation and many choose to go on to law school). If we were given the opportunity to make such a hire, we would likely include such skills in the search criteria.

Given our existing strengths, our plans for the next three years closely reflect the recommendations of Dr. Hamann:

- Several additional faculty would like to undertake training to offer online courses that could expand our curriculum to reach students who cannot easily come to campus for face to face classes.
- We plan to continue to build relationships with alumni and have already scheduled two career panels featuring our local alumni who are in different career fields. The recommendation to promote local internship opportunities through an alumni network is an excellent one that we would like to follow up on. Likewise, a special alumni feature on the webpage would be a simple and effective step to take to highlight the work of our impressive alumni network.
- Out of necessity we will continue to make adjustments to course sizes as university enrollments grow. We have already made some of the adjustments suggested by enlarging our introductory courses. This can have the

negative effect of making it more difficult to recruit majors, however. So by providing these large service classes where personal connections with students are difficult, we may lose the opportunity to attract new majors as we have with smaller classes in the past.

- Although the department does not actively market itself based on the existing institutional structure, we will take additional steps to communicate with Admissions and LAS Advising that part of our strength is in our active learning methods of instruction. This will hopefully attract students that find this approach appealing.
- The Department will continue to explore ways that we can develop a culture that better supports faculty research and is perhaps structured so that senior students can more readily be a part of that culture.

Program Review Self Study FY2013

College: LAS Social Sciences

Department: Political Science

Program: Political Science

Tables 1 through 7 provide data for Section 2 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 1: Fiscal Year Summation of Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production

Course level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
Total	2,744	3,158	3,598	3,318	2,914	3,444	3,358	3,146	3,286	3,326
100-299	1,869	2,100	2,535	2,253	1,968	2,286	2,169	2,145	2,228	2,242
300-499	707	836	895	906	757	903	1,051	820	859	902
500-699	168	216	168	156	174	234	132	176	190	173
700-799	0	6	0	3	9	18	6	4	7	7
800-899	0	3	12	3	11	6	0	6	7	6
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings summated by FY for each census day. In some cases department level SCH includes entire department offerings.

Table 2: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production at Fall Census Day

Course level:	Year of Fall Census Day											Rolling 5 year average
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012		
Total	1,248	1,424	1,695	1,662	1,437	1,527	1,452	1,493	1,549	1,555		
100-299	882	972	1,170	1,164	918	1,008	810	1,021	1,046	1,014		
300-499	261	323	438	360	450	426	594	366	399	454		
500-699	105	129	87	138	66	93	42	105	103	85		
700-799	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	1	1	2		
800-899	0	3	3	0	8	0	0	3	3	2		
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings at Fall census day.

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings at Fall census day.

Table 3: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production among Department Instructional Faculty on November Employee Census Day (entire term SCH)

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Program total	n/a	n/a	1,746	1,677	1,446	1,536	1,458	n/a	n/a	1,573			
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	1,462	1,359	1,065	1,440	1,260	n/a	n/a	1,315			
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0			
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	294	318	381	96	198	n/a	n/a	257			
GTA	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0			
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0			
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0			
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0			

note: faculty/staff with active class assignments and employment at November freeze; employee type based on ecis and egpr matrix.

note: faculty/staff with active class assignments and employment at November freeze; employee type based on ecis and egrp matrix.

Table 4: Instructional FTE Employed on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day											Rolling 5 year average
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012		
Program total	n/a	n/a	7.0	6.0	6.2	6.5	6.7	n/a	n/a	6.5		
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	n/a	n/a	5.6		
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0.0		
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	1.0	1.0	1.2	0.5	0.7	n/a	n/a	0.9		
GTA	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0.0		
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0.0		
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0.0		
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0		

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze; employee type based on ecis and egrp matrix; fte of 1 based on 80 hour bi-week appointment; employee type based on ecis and egrp matrix; KBOR minima for faculty (TTF) 3 for UG, plus 3 for masters, plus 2 for doctoral.

Program Review Self Study FY2013 College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Political Science Program: Political Science

Table 5a: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for University Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day										Rolling 5 year average	
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2010-2011	2007-2011	2008-2012		
(University level) Total	n/a	n/a	225	247	236	231	222	n/a	n/a	232		
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	214	240	228	216	194	n/a	n/a	219		
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	298	330	301	286	290	n/a	n/a	301		
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	280	287	274	269	295	n/a	n/a	281		
GTA	n/a	n/a	190	201	214	210	204	n/a	n/a	204		
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	116	121	106	149	121	n/a	n/a	123		
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	14	n/a	n/a	3		
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5b: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for College Division Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day										Rolling 5 year average	
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2010-2011	2007-2011	2008-2012		
(College Division level) Total	n/a	n/a	241	255	249	256	238	n/a	n/a	248		
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	220	245	232	252	189	n/a	n/a	228		
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	251	263	251	244	284	n/a	n/a	259		
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	327	367	353	313	335	n/a	n/a	339		
GTA	n/a	n/a	266	242	265	265	295	n/a	n/a	267		
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	149	148	109	99	119	n/a	n/a	125		
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5c: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for Program Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day										Rolling 5 year average	
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2010-2011	2007-2011	2008-2012		
(Program level) Total	n/a	n/a	249	280	231	236	216	n/a	n/a	243		
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	242	272	213	240	210	n/a	n/a	235		
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	294	318	305	192	264	n/a	n/a	275		
GTA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0		

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Program Review Self Study FY2013

College: LAS Social Sciences

Department: Political Science

Program: Political Science

Table 6: Program Majors (including double majors) on Fall Census Day

Student Class	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Total	98	97	105	121	100	98	96	104	104	104			
freshmen	26	19	24	29	25	8	6	25	21	18			
sophomore	19	20	13	21	24	31	21	19	22	22			
junior	22	29	29	23	25	23	29	26	26	26			
senior	31	29	39	48	26	36	40	35	36	38			
masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
post masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: majors include all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; other includes guest or non degree students; KBOR minima 25 UG, 20 GR masters and 5 GR doctoral.

Table 7: Degree Production by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)										Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013			
Total	10	11	19	18	14	19	23	14	16	19			
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Bachelor	10	11	19	18	14	19	23	14	16	19			
Associate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; KBOR minima 10 UG, 5 GR masters & 2 GR doctoral.

Program Review Self Study FY2013 College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Political Science Program: Political Science

Tables 8 provides data for Section 3a of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 8: Mean ACT score of Juniors and Seniors Enrolled on Fall Census Day (source=Fall Census Day)

Statistic:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
University level	22.1	22.3	22.5	22.5	22.7	22.8	23.0	22.4	22.6	22.7
Program majors	24.0	23.7	23.5	23.4	23.5	23.3	23.4	23.6	23.5	23.4
Program majors count	53	58	67	71	51	59	69	60	61	63
Percent reporting ACT	30	35	37	34	32	34	41	34	34	36
Percent reporting	56.6%	60.3%	55.2%	47.9%	62.7%	57.9%	59.4%	58.0%	56.2%	56.2%

note: If ACT missing and SAT available, SAT is used converted to ACT metric; KBOR captures ACT data for enrolled Juniors & seniors only; KBOR minima >=20.

Table 9 provides data for Section 3b of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 9: Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications)

Statistic:	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
University level	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Program majors	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program majors count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent reporting GR gpa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent reporting	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: graduate student application gpa based on last 60 hours of course work earned.

Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit

Student level:	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
University Undergraduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	82.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a
College/Division Undergraduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	89.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program Undergraduate majors:										
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	75.0%	92.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a
mean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.1	4.4	n/a	n/a	n/a
median	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12	28	n/a	n/a	n/a
University Graduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0%	0.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
College/Division Graduates level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0%	0.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program Graduate majors:										
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0%	0.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
mean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a
median	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: primary majors only; data from the Application For Degree Exit Survey; scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high (very satisfied).

Program Review Self Study FY2013 College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Political Science Program: Political Science

Tables 11 through Table 15 provide data for Section 4 of the Program Review Self Study Template.
Table 11: Applications, Admits and Enrollment for Undergraduate and Graduate Applicants

Student level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)										Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013			
Undergraduates:													
Applicants	41	36	41	52	39	33	41	42	40	41			
Admitted	37	34	39	48	39	32	35	39	38	39			
Census day	23	17	27	31	22	17	11	24	23	22			
Graduates:													
Applicants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Admitted	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Census day	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: unduplicated count as last record of FY; applicants exclude incomplete or cancelled applications.

Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day

Student level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
University level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	15.3%	14.5%	15.0%	15.7%	17.0%	18.0%	18.5%	15.5%	16.0%	16.8%			
Juniors & Seniors	12.3%	12.0%	12.3%	13.0%	14.0%	14.9%	15.4%	12.7%	13.2%	13.9%			
Masters	5.8%	6.6%	6.8%	7.8%	8.2%	9.7%	11.3%	7.1%	7.8%	8.8%			
Doctoral	6.0%	6.9%	6.8%	5.6%	6.6%	5.4%	6.7%	6.2%	6.2%	6.2%			
College division level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	23.7%	20.7%	19.9%	20.9%	20.9%	27.1%	26.0%	21.2%	21.9%	22.9%			
Juniors & Seniors	20.5%	20.1%	19.1%	20.6%	22.5%	22.3%	22.2%	20.6%	20.9%	21.3%			
Masters	10.8%	15.7%	15.7%	17.1%	17.4%	18.9%	20.6%	15.3%	16.9%	17.9%			
Doctoral	14.1%	15.5%	14.3%	11.4%	16.0%	10.7%	11.8%	13.4%	13.3%	13.0%			
Program level:													
Freshmen & Sophomores	13.3%	12.8%	21.6%	18.0%	18.4%	28.2%	14.8%	16.8%	19.8%	20.2%			
Juniors & Seniors	17.0%	17.2%	13.4%	16.9%	15.7%	22.0%	26.1%	16.0%	17.1%	18.8%			
Masters	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			

note: Includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

Program Review Self Study FY2013 College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Political Science Program: Political Science

Table 13: Race/Ethnicity on Fall Census Day

Student level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Total	98	97	105	121	100	98	96	104	104	104
Total URM	15	15	17	21	17	24	22	17	19	20
Freshmen & Sophomores	45	39	37	50	49	39	27	44	43	40
Total	37	30	22	32	34	23	19	31	28	26
white non-hispanic	3	5	5	4	2	4	2	4	4	3
black non-hispanic	2	0	3	4	7	5	2	3	4	4
hispanic	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
asian non-hispanic	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1
american indian/alaskan native	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	1	0	3	2	2	2	1	2	2
multiple race	0	0	4	3	2	1	1	2	2	2
unknown	53	58	68	71	51	59	69	60	61	64
Juniors & Seniors	35	41	52	49	36	36	41	43	43	43
Total	2	3	4	6	4	7	7	4	5	6
white non-hispanic	5	5	4	5	4	6	8	5	5	5
black non-hispanic	4	0	1	3	4	1	2	2	2	2
hispanic	2	2	1	1	0	0	3	1	1	1
asian non-hispanic	2	3	2	2	1	1	3	2	2	2
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	1	2	2
hawaiian	3	4	3	3	1	4	1	3	3	2
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Master	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Program Review Self Study FY2013 College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Political Science Program: Political Science

Table 14: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
<u>University level:</u>													
Doctoral	8.7%	1.5%	7.2%	6.1%	6.3%	6.5%	6.5%	6.0%	5.5%	6.5%			
Masters	4.9%	6.0%	6.4%	6.1%	6.4%	8.7%	10.5%	6.0%	6.7%	7.6%			
Bachelor	10.2%	10.7%	11.3%	11.1%	12.0%	12.7%	12.7%	11.1%	11.5%	11.9%			
Associate	21.4%	13.8%	11.8%	16.0%	18.8%	18.4%	23.1%	16.4%	15.8%	17.6%			
<u>College division level:</u>													
Doctoral	12.5%	14.3%	13.3%	0.0%	30.0%	8.3%	20.0%	14.1%	13.2%	14.3%			
Masters	10.9%	10.7%	17.3%	14.9%	13.8%	18.6%	13.1%	13.5%	15.1%	15.5%			
Bachelor	18.1%	17.4%	15.5%	15.5%	18.6%	22.2%	19.9%	17.0%	17.9%	18.3%			
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
<u>Program level:</u>													
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Masters	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Bachelor	20.0%	18.2%	0.0%	16.7%	7.1%	10.5%	30.4%	12.4%	10.5%	13.0%			
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			

note: Includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes: URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

note: Includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes: URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

Table 15: Race/Ethnicity of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Doctoral	Total	10	11	19	18	14	19	23	14	16	19		
	Total URM	2	2	0	3	1	2	7	2	2	3		
	white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

Table continued on next page)

(Table continued on next page)

Program Review Self Study FY2013 College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Political Science Program: Political Science

(Table 15 continued)

Degree level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Bachelor Total	10	11	19	18	14	19	23	14	14	16
white non-hispanic	5	9	16	12	9	15	12	10	12	13
black non-hispanic	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	1
hispanic	1	2	0	3	0	0	3	1	1	1
asian non-hispanic	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	1
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1
unknown	2	0	2	3	1	1	0	2	1	1
Associate Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Tables 16 provides data for Section 5 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 16: Department Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Student Department Affiliation on Fall Census Day

Major & student level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Total	1,248	1,424	1,695	1,662	1,437	1,527	1,452	1,493	1,549	1,555
Program UG majors	315	421	399	495	381	369	423	402	413	413
Program GR majors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-program majors	933	1,003	1,296	1,167	1,056	1,158	1,029	1,091	1,136	1,141
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Program UG major	25.2%	29.6%	23.5%	29.8%	26.5%	24.2%	29.1%	26.9%	26.7%	26.6%
Program GR major	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-program majors	74.8%	70.4%	76.5%	70.2%	73.5%	75.8%	70.9%	73.1%	73.3%	73.4%

note: program majors includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Appendix 2 Alumni Survey

My Report

Last Modified: 12/11/2013

1. What year did you receive your BA from WSU?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Before 1970	28	20%
2	1970-1980	20	14%
3	1981-1990	17	12%
4	1991-2000	24	17%
5	2001-2005	15	10%
6	2006-2010	22	15%
7	2011-2012	17	12%
Total		143	100%




Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	7
Mean	3.78
Variance	4.21
Standard Deviation	2.05
Total Responses	143

2. Gender

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Male	105	73%
2	Female	38	27%
Total		143	100%








Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	2
Mean	1.27
Variance	0.20
Standard Deviation	0.44
Total Responses	143

4. Would you say that you are working in a field related to your Political Science major?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		51	36%
2	No		45	32%
3	Indirectly		44	31%
	Total		140	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	3
Mean	1.95
Variance	0.68
Standard Deviation	0.83
Total Responses	140

5. If you received an advanced degree, click on all that apply:

#	Answer		Response	%
1	MA in Political Science		19	20%
2	MPA (Masters of Public Administration		21	22%
3	MA in another field		27	28%
4	JD		32	33%
5	PhD in Political Science		4	4%
6	PhD in another field		4	4%
7	LLD or JSD		0	0%
8	Other		9	9%

7. MY POLITICAL SCIENCE DEGREE...

#	Question	strongly agree	somewhat agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Responses	Mean
1	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the AMERICAN political system.	99	32	0	2	1	134	1.31
2	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM.	63	57	8	5	1	134	1.69
3	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the DOMESTIC POLITICS OF OTHER COUNTRIES.	44	69	15	5	1	134	1.88
4	...enabled me to understand and analyze and PUBLIC POLICY.	63	57	6	6	2	134	1.71
5	...encouraged me to BE MORE ENGAGED in the political process.	77	37	16	1	2	133	1.60
6	...prepared me for a GRADUATE PROGRAM or LAW SCHOOL.	56	33	35	5	4	133	2.01
7	...equipped me to EXPRESS	61	59	12	2	0	134	1.66

Statistic	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the AMERICAN political system.	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM.	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the DOMESTIC POLITICS OF OTHER COUNTRIES	...enabled me to understand and analyze and PUBLIC POLICY.	...encouraged me to BE MORE ENGAGED in the political process.	...prepared me for a GRADUATE PROGRAM or LAW SCHOOL.	...equipped me to EXPRESS MYSELF coherently and articulately.	...helped me to WRITE CLEARLY and lucidly	...helped me to understand and INTERPRET BASIC QUANTITATIVE DATA related to politics and government.	...taught me how to COLLECT DATA and CONDUCT RESEARCH.
Min Value	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Max Value	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5
Mean	1.31	1.69	1.88	1.71	1.60	2.01	1.66	1.67	2.09	2.16
Variance	0.40	0.65	0.65	0.75	0.71	1.11	0.50	0.52	1.00	1.15
Standard Deviation	0.63	0.81	0.80	0.87	0.84	1.06	0.70	0.72	1.00	1.07
Total Responses	134	134	134	134	133	133	134	134	134	134

8. Please rate your OVERALL satisfaction with your Political Science degree. 1 = poor; 10 = excellent

#	Answer	Min Value	Max Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation	Responses
1		1.00	10.00	8.26	1.55	134

Other
sdfgsdfg
Wichita
Wichita
Wichita
City of Cheney
Wichita KS

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	3
Mean	2.07
Variance	0.84
Standard Deviation	0.92
Total Responses	14

12. Rate your INTERNSHIP experience. 1 = poor; 10 = excellent

#	Answer	Min Value	Max Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation	Responses
1		7.90	10.00	9.57	0.68	13

13. Did you participate in a POLITICAL CAMPAIGN while enrolled at WSU?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Yes	83	59%
2	No	58	41%
	Total	141	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	2
Mean	1.41
Variance	0.24
Standard Deviation	0.49
Total Responses	141

14. What level campaign(s) did you participate in as a WSU student?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Local (City/County)	35	44%
2	State	47	59%
3	Federal	42	53%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	4
Mean	2.14
Variance	0.93
Standard Deviation	0.97
Total Responses	43

19. Did you participate in any Department sponsored clubs?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Yes	55	39%
2	No	85	61%
	Total	140	100%

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	2
Mean	1.61
Variance	0.24
Standard Deviation	0.49
Total Responses	140

Club		
political science		
honor society		
College Democrats		
Political Science	College Democrats	
Department		
Pol Sci Natl Honor		
Society		
Political Science	Model United	
Club	Nations	
Political science	College democrats	
club		
POLY SCI	YOUNG DEMS	
Honors Society		
Political Science	President, College	
Club	Dems	
Political Science		
Honor Society		
pi sigma alpha		
poli sci club	pi sigma alpha?	
Political science		
club		
honors program	senior project/paper	Pol. Sc. Fraternity
Times Topics	Political Science	College Democrats
	Club	
College		
Republicans		
Political Science		
Club		
Political Science	Pi Sigma Alpha	
Club		
College		
Republicans		
Political Science	Pi Sigma Alpha	
Club		
Young Republicans	Political Science	
	Club	

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	51

21. Rate your Department CLUB experience. 1 = poor; 10 = excellent.

#	Answer	Min Value	Max Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation	Responses
1		2.00	10.00	7.86	2.06	48

25. Please share with us any additional thoughts or information that may help us improve the Political Science program in the future.

Text Response

Continued emphasis on internship and co-op education opportunities. More prominent promotion of those opportunities. More experiences designed to prepare for grad school. Greater emphasis on quantitative research methods in courses.

More presentations from professionals in Wichita and surrounding areas would be beneficial to the learning experience.

I benefitted greatly from my education in the Political Science program at WSU. My professors were outstanding. I had a good mix of young and old. The variety of classes that I took were excellent. I would recommend the Political Science program at WSU to anyone.

At some point during the last decade, basic civics has apparently ceased to be functionally taught in the secondary schools and in many university degree programs. This led KU Law School, probably seven or more years ago now, to initiate a special orientation program that could accurately have been called remedial civics. This was needed to address the problem of students coming in without enough basic understanding of the federal and state systems, or the interrelation of those systems, to even begin their efforts at a legal education. I believe this situation elevates the value of a political science degree in the sense that university graduates with such a degree do not need to pause for remedial civics before starting law school.

I realize that the predominant staff is largely liberal, (to be expected at a University). I do feel that both sides should be presented equally and without bias. I know it is too much to be expected, but since the general population is on "both sides of the political spectrum" it would better prepare graduates to be assimilated into society.

Most of the professors were very helpful

I feel the undergraduate degree lacks a serious analytical core. Statistics and economics/political economy should be a core requirement for graduation. I sincerely believe in the value of a political science degree but without a graduate degree a political science degree is difficult to market by itself.

Despite some very politically active professors, I do not think the program did much to get students actively involved in political campaigns. Most of my involvement ended up handing out campaign buttons and making phone calls. I think there should have been a way to help get students more involved, so that we could actually apply some of our education to a campaign.

I'm now retired but a Pol. Sci Major did help me get a job and advance in the Federal Government. I worked at the IRS and the Navy Department (as a Civil Service employee) in Washington, D.C. and later in California.

Some questions do not apply to me. I graduated before many of them were started. Also in retirement I do weddings which do not fit the questions in the survey. I especially think the department is fortunate to have Mel Kahn. He is an extraordinary teacher and doer.

Keith Sanborn '50

My experience was 60 years ago and greatly enhanced by my graduate experience and my years as a professor of political science, public administration, urban studies and as president of a small college. My classes and other interaction, especially with Mike Harder and Hugo Wall were essential building blocks for me.

I was one of the first intern groups which the Department created. I went to work for the City of Wichita City Manager's Office for a one year internship. This was part of my

I transferred into the department from another university. By the time I transferred in, the clubs and programs were full. To this day, I wish I would have been more involved and would have applied and worked in DC with the Federal Government immediately after graduation.

I appreciate receiving your Political Science department newsletters in the mail, and receiving them via e-mail would be even better. I am also available to meet with students you send to DC for internships or as you have students who are interested in law school. I have met students through Mr. Kahn, but unfortunately we've lost touch. Please say hi to him for me. Here is my contact info: Tina Drake Zimmerman
Georgetown Law Office of Graduate Programs 600 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001 202-662-9660 draket@law.georgetown.edu Take care,
Tina

I went into the career field very prepared thanks to the Poli Sci education I received at WSU.

No additional comments.

Providing information to students on a variety of levels, including local, state, national and international relations and policies is so valuable to them. It allows students to comprehend what they will face in the real world, and hopefully, encourage them to participate in politics, vote, and express themselves on current laws and policies. Political science degrees and a political education in general can transition well into work done for the non-profit sector.

The information on this survey regarding quantitative data and conducting research is outdated, as I came in during a time when political inquiry was not a required class. I have heard from those who have taken it that it gave them a good grasp on conducting research and analyzing quantitative data. Other requirements that have been put into place by the department for have also been good steps in the right direction to give political science majors a more diverse and rounded outlook on the field.

My biggest issue with the political science program is the lack of specialized areas. I came to WSU as a pre-law/government major and found myself stuck in theory based political science classes that I really found to be too broad for what I wanted to learn. The second biggest issue I have is the lack of data analysis and political understanding associated with prepping students for the senior seminar paper. Granted I did not take the Senior Seminar pre-req at WSU, I felt largely unprepared for writing a senior seminar paper because my understanding of statistics and data analysis were not at the appropriate level to create my own data for my senior paper. Additionally, I did not have the sufficient skills to use SPSS and find legitimate data. I felt that I could manipulate my variables to create a data field that supported whatever I wanted to prove in my paper whether it was actually correct or not.

I had to work full time in order to go to school, so I didn't have an opportunity to get involved in activities like the Model U.N. The additional opportunities would have been very helpful in terms of understanding and deepening my knowledge of politics.

Probably the best classes I had in terms of building future skills were the law courses taught by John Stanga. They combined logic, debate, writing, and research to provide an intensive experience that has served me well first as an analyst and now as a division director.

I thought I was there in the department's "heyday"....we had our own building which was a great community-building asset. And we had, overall, a wonderful faculty. My sense is today that the faculty is even stronger, though I suspect the loss of the building is, indeed, a loss. The department's leadership seems quite strong and very high profile; the Model UN program also appears noteworthy. I split my time b/t Model UN and SGA - well - there were a number of us who did both in those days (early / mid 70s), but it

a plus.

THE LEVEL OF PROFESSOR ENGAGEMENT IS THE DETERMINING FACTOR. TEACHER ENGAGING WITH STUDENTS IS CRITICAL! PRESENTATION OF BOTH SIDES AND STIMULATION OF STUDENT INTERCOURSE IS A MUST. OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN LOCAL POLITICS IS CRITICAL TO UNDERSTAND THE INNER CONFLICTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS NEEDED. INTRODUCTION TO STATE GOVT DEPTS AND VISITS IMPORTANT. STRAIGHT LECTURES ARE BORING. EXCITING TEACHER EXPERIENCES WET THE APPETITE OF STUDENTS. PROFESSORS MUST, MUST, MUST, BE AVAILABLE ON A ONE TO ONE BASIS. STUDENTS ARE DIVERSE!

I would encourage the Political Science Department to do more outreach activities in the high schools in particular. Its also encouraging to see a former LAS professor in the presidency. I hope he and Mel Kahn can still get along.

Wish I could do it over again.

Imagine that a large number of political science graduates do not end up in a related field. General skills of expression, writing and logical problem solving then become much more important.

I am almost ashamed to admit that my major was pol sci.. I feel that most all University systems are far too liberal illn representing our constitution interpretations and etc Most professors that I see on tv are not far from flaming socialists and thir devout railing the mis-guided programs of the National Democratic party.. My thought --- if anyone remembers Hugo Wall have someone tell the whole staff the type department he ran and I learned from.. Sorry for that but I am really concerned about what I term as a tragedy in our institutions for higher learning. Thank you, Charles B. Douglas.

It would be interesting to make recommendations and suggestions to new graduates in what which private sector areas they can leverage their newly acquired degree.

Loved the department and instructors, most especially Dr. Kahn and Shaw. My internship in DC was fantastic and continues to be a source of many great memories and sustained friendships. while it didn't do much for my current profession (and i'll paying for the internship with the rest of my education for the next 22 years) it was a life changing experience that has made me a more well-rounded person. Model UN was also great! Dr. Shaw put a lot of effort into the program that helped make myself and our group successful. Public speaking plays a huge role in my current profession and I cut my teeth in Model UN. Prior to MU I mumbled constantly. Plus I'm pretty good at really random trivia questions. Keep funding the internship program and MUN! Global issues was great too. Thanks for the education!

The quantitative elements of my political science education -- the hard sciences -- were sorely lacking. Far too much emphasis on policy and too little on the hard work behind determining policy choices. Hopefully that has changed by now. I did receive a robust exposure to policy issues. My biggest complaint, however, is that the department was and is hugely slanted toward a liberal/progressive viewpoint, and was downright antagonistic and derisive toward a conservative view of politics. The department needs a lot more balance. I also had a very bad experience in a course taught by Dr. Ciboski, who had an eye for cute co-eds and was far too subjective in his grading. That in itself was a pretty good education in politics.

I had a number of opportunities at WSU that were invaluable ranging from an undergraduate fellowship within the department to running for the local CPO while an undergraduate and serving as chair of that organization during my senior year. The opportunity to take graduate level seminars as a freshman and sophomore (particularly John Stanga's constitutional law seminars) were outstanding opportunities that I will always cherish. The opportunity to work closely with professors on research projects

added many programs since 1969. You are applauded. If I could give one bit of reflection that may or may not be applicable or help today's department: in 1968 and 1969 the Department had many of the best minds on campus in its Junior and Senior level classes, perhaps not Political Science majors but certainly engaged and socially aware minds . . . all of whom were destined to advanced degrees and social contribution after their bachelor's degree. However, I am not sure how much that department contributed to that potential for success. The full time professors seemed to pick only one or two of these students to mentor. One of the gifts to a department that still graduates a limited number of majors is the opportunity to mentor each and every major and not just a select few, to teach each and every student how to prepare for the advance placement testing, and to challenge each and every student to enter and achieve at the very best post graduate programs around the country. As the director of admissions at the law school that I attended told me in 1972: "the secondary education of students from Kansas is as good as any, they have learned the basic skills, it doesn't only matter what university they attended . . . we choose several each year because they elevate the class performance." It goes without saying, you have those very same students in your classes . . . they need a faculty that invests in them, and doesn't simply tread water. Your graduates from the 1968 to 1971 era are at the peak of their professions. Perhaps engage those seasoned graduates to participate in your mentoring program by inviting them to visit the department for a two day weekend in the fall, develop an intense seminar program with 15 to 20 minute talks w/ papers, discussion panels, and even mentoring groups . . . closing with a dinner for all participants where the students can visit informally with the graduates and faculty of their choice. My guess is that after a couple years, if the program is developed properly, some of those graduates might be interesting in funding the Political Science Department Mentoring Program. The Department may already have a program for mentoring each and every major . . . in that event, ignore these comments, but please engage your alumni. -fred shiver

At the time I graduated, the degree was a joint political science/police science program, one of the few in the nation at that time. The education I received from the program facilitated me in my career as a federal law enforcement agent and an intelligence agent for thirty years on a worldwide basis. The political science degree also led to an MA (public administration) from the University of San Francisco.

It's all about the quality of teaching, not whether or not the department teaches the flavor of the day (eg quantitative analysis). I had several professors who made my experience deep and rich: Sam Yeager (sp?), John Stanga, Mel Khan, John Millett. I don't remember a lame second in any of their classes. They were clearly interested in the material they were teaching and clearly enjoyed the company of students. A friend and I still trade quotes from John Millett and admire his prescience in choice of topics and texts. If the department teaches the fundamentals richly students will be well served. Cooperative education and the intern program were the keys to launching my career post graduation. Participation in either program should be strongly encouraged or required for all political science majors.

It is a good, small, cozy department which has maintained good quality! And yes..let's bring back Dr Farnsworth for some guest lectures: the man knows everything that is worth knowing in the world...and I exaggerate only slightly.

1. MY POLITICAL SCIENCE DEGREE...

#	Question	strongl y agree	somewha t agree	Neither Agree nor Disagre e	somewha t disagree	Strongl y Disagre e	Total Response s	Mea n
1	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the AMERICAN political system.	6	2	0	0	0	8	1.25
2	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM.	7	1	0	0	0	8	1.13
3	...helped me to develop a greater understanding of the DOMESTIC POLITICS OF OTHER COUNTRIES.	6	2	0	0	0	8	1.25
4	...enabled me to understand and analyze and PUBLIC POLICY.	4	4	0	0	0	8	1.50
5	...encouraged me to BE MORE ENGAGED in the political process.	8	0	0	0	0	8	1.00

2. Did you participate in the Political Science Department INTERNSHIP PROGRAM?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Yes	2	22%
2	No	7	78%
	Total	9	100%

8. Where did you complete your intern experience?

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Washington DC	2	100%
2	Topeka	0	0%
3	Other	0	0%
	Total	2	100%

3. What agency or political leader did you intern with?

Text Response



Senator Harry Reid

Council of State Governments

4. Rate your INTERNSHIP experience. 1 = poor; 10 = excellent

#	Answer	Min Value	Max Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation	Responses
1		9.70	10.00	9.85	0.21	2



10. Did you participate in the MODEL UNITED NATIONS program?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		4	44%
2	No		5	56%
	Total		9	100%

11. Rate your MODEL UNITED NATIONS experience. 1 = poor; 10 = excellent.

#	Answer	Min Value	Max Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation	Responses
1		9.50	10.00	9.88	0.25	4

15. Did you participate in the COOPERATIVE EDUCATION program?

#	Answer		Response	%
1	Yes		4	44%
2	No		5	56%
	Total		9	100%

16. Where did you do your Coop experience?

Text Response

Kansas City - Obama for America - Missouri

The Salvation Army

Accounting Firm

Kansas Democratic Party

17. Rate your Department COOPERATIVE EDUCATION experience. 1 = poor; 10 = excellent.

#	Answer	Min Value	Max Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation	Responses
1		8.10	10.00	8.90	0.82	4

19. What experiences have you undergone as a WSU political science major which you believe will affect your prospects for success following graduation?

Text Response

The variety of classes, the quality of professors, and the research and writing skills I have been taught have equipped me for success in law school.

I think the Model United Nations program by far was something far more than I expected. I never intended to get as involved as I did, and I don't regret that decision at all- the experience, professionals I met, the knowledge I gained from it are second to none in any other collegiate experience I've had. I am so grateful. I have already met several people and developed relationships with them simply because of our shared background with MUN. I think also the personalized care we received from the political science professors is something that isn't found at other schools, and will highlight why my experience with WSU gives me something most other Poli-Sci students will not get.

I think the diverse classes and being able to do simulations. The simulation experience I think is the most beneficial. It is coupled with research and delving deeper into the given topics of the simulation. As a student you are able to put yourself in real life political situations. The discussions and follow ups were also important.

The research project required for senior seminar has been very helpful in developing my ability to complete research at my current place of employment.

Senior seminar class.

Working in senior positions for local, state, and federal elections has shown prospective employers that I am capable of coordinating a large number of people and tasks to produce results.

21. What do you consider to be the WEAKNESSES of the Political Science Department?

Text Response

I cannot think of any.

Clubs. They need a little work. Advising- working in tandem with LAS advising. My advising at my other college seemed far more personalized and thought-out.

I think consistency in the general education classes. American Politics, Comparative Politics, and Theory. I didn't have a clear understanding of the expectations of the classes when I took them. Finishing the classes I didn't feel like I walked away more of an understanding on the topics (other than what I did myself). Throughout the program and in other classes I learned a lot regarding those topics.

With exception of mock trials, i felt the class activities or "games" that most of the professors are adopting were not particularly helpful and took away valuable class time.

The age of tenured professors such as Kahn. They're knowledge is undeniable but if you want to attract students and create passion there needs to be better teaching to help maintain focus.

I believe that Political Inquiry should be recommended as a first year class, as it basically shows one how to do a research paper. By the time I took it, much of the class was just review from things I had already learned writing papers in other classes.

22. Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with the Department?

Text Response

I think it's a fantastic department. There's no doubt about it, and I can't be happier with my decision to have it on my diploma.

I enjoyed my time as a polsci student and it prepared me for my future studies. I think students should be told and maybe helped to mold their own path. It seemed to be most beneficial to me.

I would have liked to have had more information and access to internship opportunities

Program Review

**Department of Political Science
Wichita State University**

Report prepared by

Kerstin Hamann
Professor and Chair
Department of Political Science
University of Central Florida
Kerstin.Hamann@ucf.edu

March 2014

Curriculum

In addition to serving the university and college through general education courses, the department offers a strong standard political science curriculum. All students have to take a research methods course as well as a senior seminar course, where they have to complete a research project. Students also have the opportunity to present their research at various venues, including professional conferences. Classes are small, which affords students personal attention and advisement. There are also some opportunities for students to enrich their classroom education through practical experiences, such as internships, participation in study abroad programs, and a strong Model UN program. Courses in the program also feed into the International Studies program.

Students

Students appreciate the active learning approaches offered by the departmental faculty. The students I met spoke highly of the faculty, the department, and the program. In surveys, alumni expressed satisfaction with the education they received in the program. The department's list of alumni includes several notables in public office and academia.

Other:

The department maintains active connections to alumni and the community, for example through an alumni newsletter and invited speakers to classes. These networks and partnerships are important for opening opportunities for students, for example through guest lectures, and for potential fundraising opportunities.

Recommendations

At the same time, the department could build on these existing strength to build an overall stronger curriculum, develop additional opportunities for students, and plan strategically for the future, especially in light of the university's immediate and aggressive growth plans. All these points are linked to the general issue of an apparent lack of vision for the department's future. In particular, some areas in which the department could improve include:

1. The pedagogy of active learning is not clearly articulated as a core strength of the department.
2. Opportunities for students to gain practical experience outside the classroom as part of their education are limited.
3. Limited activities and opportunities to prepare students for grad school, law school, or other careers.
4. An expansion of the online component of the curriculum should be considered.
5. No clear plan is articulated on how to grow the major and how to meet the demands of university-wide student growth.
6. Research expectations for faculty not clearly thought through.
7. Develop more institutionalized ties to the community and alumni.
8. Resources and other considerations.

I will discuss these points in more detail below.

faculty resources) or partner with the Philosophy department to create a more focused pre-law program to prepare students for law school.

Similarly, the curriculum could strategically identify some courses where students could hone their research skills in preparation for graduate school, including in quantitative analysis. The survey data supplied in the self-study point to the importance of analytical skills, including research methods, and this was echoed by several students I spoke to during my campus visit. The curriculum already requires majors to take a research methods course, which is important for skill building and for preparing students for future careers as well as graduate school. However, the number of faculty that teach the research methods course is too small given that faculty members may go on sabbatical and have other teaching obligations as well. Furthermore, students who would like to do a senior project including quantitative analysis are limited in their choice of faculty advisor, and faculty members, in turn, can easily get overloaded with supervising too many student projects. When talking to students, several mentioned that they missed additional opportunities to practice quantitative research skills and analysis throughout the curriculum to deepen what they learned in their research methods course. Alumni similarly expressed the view that quantitative analytical skills were immensely helpful for their careers. Given that almost 80% of the alumni responding to the survey indicated that they received an advanced degree upon graduation, expanding on research and data analysis skills would be one way in which the department could further prepare its graduates for future careers.

Possible Expansion of Online Course Offerings

The department offers several courses online. An expansion of these offerings might be considered, especially in light of the student demographics with a relatively high number of local, non-traditional students who might benefit from additional online offerings. It appears that online courses tend to enroll quickly and students appreciate the flexibility afforded to them by online courses. As other universities are expanding their online offerings, the department should think about whether, and how, some expansion in the offering of online courses might fit into the curriculum.

Student Growth

Currently, the department serves a large number of students in the general education program and has a modest number of majors. The number of majors has experienced some fluctuation, which is not unusual for political science departments nationally. The current dip in the number of majors allows for smaller class sizes, personal attention to individual students, and writing-intensive course assessments, all of which contribute to the high quality of education of the department's majors. At the same time, the department is under some pressure to grow the major; the university's aggressive growth plan is also likely to have an effect on the program. Thus, it is crucial that the department develops a plan on how to grow the major, but also how to meet the instructional demands of additional students and structure the curriculum in such a way that the instructional quality is maintained. Some possibilities might include having larger enrollment numbers for some courses that students have to take while maintaining smaller classes for the electives; hiring additional adjuncts; increasing the class size of the introductory general education courses; or some combination of these. If the student numbers in the major, but also in the general education courses, grow significantly,

and expand on these strengths and articulate a mission that supports the University's vision, mission, and strategic plan, such as an explicit and clearly articulated focus on student engagement pedagogies. The department is well situated to support all of the university's seven strategic goals and makes a valuable contribution to the university's mission, servicing a large number of students beyond Political Science majors.

Program Review

**Department of Political Science
Wichita State University**

Report prepared by

Kerstin Hamann
Professor and Chair
Department of Political Science
University of Central Florida
Kerstin.Hamann@ucf.edu

March 2014

This report details my findings and observations in response to an invitation to serve as external reviewer of the Political Science program at Wichita State University. The information reviewed for this report includes the materials supplied by the department, including a self-study, curriculum information, faculty vitae, alumni survey, and assessment. In addition, I visited the campus on February 12-14, 2014 to meet with all faculty members, the Interim Dean of the College, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and students. I would like to thank all those involved for supplying me with information and taking the time to meet with me and sharing their thoughts and observations.

The report first outlines some general observations, then discusses what I perceive as strengths, and finishes with some detailed recommendations and areas of potential improvements.

Overall Observations:

Based on my visit as well as the information provided to me, I am impressed by how well the department meets its core mission. Since losing its Master's program in 2001, the program has been an exclusively undergraduate one. It serves a fluctuating number of majors, which has declined in recent years, mirroring a trend present at many other institutions across the country. It also serves the General Education program with several of its courses, thus being a service department as well as one training majors. The faculty members appear to be comfortable with serving the undergraduate program and are all enthusiastic teachers, striving to provide an outstanding education to the undergraduate students and putting much effort into their teaching. Much of the instructional pedagogy appears to revolve around active learning strategies, and the classroom instruction students receive is excellent, as recognized by the students and alumni. In addition, faculty members are engaged in extra-curricular activities in the department and provide university service. At the same time, the department could build on these strengths and improve in several areas, as detailed below.

Strengths:

Faculty:

The departmental faculty stand out for their commitment to teaching and engagement with students, as well as for their varied approaches to learning, including different active learning approaches. Most faculty members also have an active research agenda and publish regularly. Although the department is small with just six full-time faculty members, the faculty composition is diverse and includes women as well as a faculty member belonging to an ethnic minority. The department chair, Dr. Shaw, is professionally very active in the International Studies Association (ISA) and currently serves as Vice President of that association, which raises the national and international visibility and reputation of the department. Several faculty members have also pursued grant opportunities, including Fulbright grants. Some faculty members are active in the Scholarship on Teaching and Learning, which reflects and contributes to the high standard of teaching in the department.

Curriculum

In addition to serving the university and college through general education courses, the department offers a strong standard political science curriculum. All students have to take a research methods course as well as a senior seminar course, where they have to complete a research project. Students also have the opportunity to present their research at various venues, including professional conferences. Classes are small, which affords students personal attention and advisement. There are also some opportunities for students to enrich their classroom education through practical experiences, such as internships, participation in study abroad programs, and a strong Model UN program. Courses in the program also feed into the International Studies program.

Students

Students appreciate the active learning approaches offered by the departmental faculty. The students I met spoke highly of the faculty, the department, and the program. In surveys, alumni expressed satisfaction with the education they received in the program. The department's list of alumni includes several notables in public office and academia.

Other:

The department maintains active connections to alumni and the community, for example through an alumni newsletter and invited speakers to classes. These networks and partnerships are important for opening opportunities for students, for example through guest lectures, and for potential fundraising opportunities.

Recommendations

At the same time, the department could build on these existing strength to build an overall stronger curriculum, develop additional opportunities for students, and plan strategically for the future, especially in light of the university's immediate and aggressive growth plans. All these points are linked to the general issue of an apparent lack of vision for the department's future. In particular, some areas in which the department could improve include:

1. The pedagogy of active learning is not clearly articulated as a core strength of the department.
2. Opportunities for students to gain practical experience outside the classroom as part of their education are limited.
3. Limited activities and opportunities to prepare students for grad school, law school, or other careers.
4. An expansion of the online component of the curriculum should be considered.
5. No clear plan is articulated on how to grow the major and how to meet the demands of university-wide student growth.
6. Research expectations for faculty not clearly thought through.
7. Develop more institutionalized ties to the community and alumni.
8. Resources and other considerations.

I will discuss these points in more detail below.

Focus on Active Learning:

Most faculty members embrace active learning strategies in their instruction, an approach that the pedagogical literature tends to favor due to demonstrated effectiveness in improving learner outcomes. These active learning strategies include, for example, simulations, interviews with political leaders, and completing a senior research project. Students are thus introduced to a variety of teaching strategies. The Department also has a strong Model UN program as well as opportunities for study abroad, student clubs, and some internships, primarily in Washington, D.C. Given the existing use of active learning strategies in many of the department's courses, the department could make this approach part of its mission and recruit students based on the theme of student engagement. This would set it apart from competing programs, for example in other Kansas public universities, and could potentially attract students that would otherwise choose to go elsewhere. When talking to students, they rated the active learning strategies employed in their classes as positive, and structuring the curriculum explicitly around active learning strategies would certainly give visibility to the department in comparison with other departments. The department might also consider expanding active learning opportunities, for example through Moot Court activities, perhaps in conjunction with the Philosophy Department, which appears to have a strong pre-law program, or by establishing a Model Senate program. An explicit branding of the program around the concept of engaged learning would support the University's vision of a "model of applied learning and research."

Create Additional Opportunities for Students to Gain Practical Experience

Opportunities for students to gain practical experience outside of the university that could prepare them for future employment are currently limited and focus on out-of-town internships. Given the urban setting of the university, it would make sense to establish additional partnerships with local employers to create internship opportunities for the students, many of whom appear to be place bound and who might not be able to go to Washington to intern for a semester. Local internship sites could include law firms, political and administrative offices, non-profit organizations, private employers, etc. Students might be able to identify local internship opportunities themselves and have them approved by the department (internship coordinator), or the department might be able to identify internship opportunities that can be suggested to interested students, or both. Local internships would add to the "active learning" theme and also support the university's mission of "applied learning," potentially attract additional students, help the department develop external partnerships, and may improve the employability of majors.

Limited Opportunities to Prepare Students for Graduate School and Law School

Certainly, liberal arts degrees are not professional degrees, and Political Science is a discipline that opens the doors to a wide range of careers for students. At the same time, many of the majors I spoke to and alumni surveyed for the self-study mentioned that they were interested in attending graduate school or law school. The department offers some opportunities for this student group to prepare for their post-graduate education, but these opportunities could be strengthened. I already mentioned programs such as Moot Court for those interest in attending law school, or internships in that area. In addition, the department might consider expanding its pre-law course offerings (which will likely require additional

faculty resources) or partner with the Philosophy department to create a more focused pre-law program to prepare students for law school.

Similarly, the curriculum could strategically identify some courses where students could hone their research skills in preparation for graduate school, including in quantitative analysis. The survey data supplied in the self-study point to the importance of analytical skills, including research methods, and this was echoed by several students I spoke to during my campus visit. The curriculum already requires majors to take a research methods course, which is important for skill building and for preparing students for future careers as well as graduate school. However, the number of faculty that teach the research methods course is too small given that faculty members may go on sabbatical and have other teaching obligations as well. Furthermore, students who would like to do a senior project including quantitative analysis are limited in their choice of faculty advisor, and faculty members, in turn, can easily get overloaded with supervising too many student projects. When talking to students, several mentioned that they missed additional opportunities to practice quantitative research skills and analysis throughout the curriculum to deepen what they learned in their research methods course. Alumni similarly expressed the view that quantitative analytical skills were immensely helpful for their careers. Given that almost 80% of the alumni responding to the survey indicated that they received an advanced degree upon graduation, expanding on research and data analysis skills would be one way in which the department could further prepare its graduates for future careers.

Possible Expansion of Online Course Offerings

The department offers several courses online. An expansion of these offerings might be considered, especially in light of the student demographics with a relatively high number of local, non-traditional students who might benefit from additional online offerings. It appears that online courses tend to enroll quickly and students appreciate the flexibility afforded to them by online courses. As other universities are expanding their online offerings, the department should think about whether, and how, some expansion in the offering of online courses might fit into the curriculum.

Student Growth

Currently, the department serves a large number of students in the general education program and has a modest number of majors. The number of majors has experienced some fluctuation, which is not unusual for political science departments nationally. The current dip in the number of majors allows for smaller class sizes, personal attention to individual students, and writing-intensive course assessments, all of which contribute to the high quality of education of the department's majors. At the same time, the department is under some pressure to grow the major; the university's aggressive growth plan is also likely to have an effect on the program. Thus, it is crucial that the department develops a plan on how to grow the major, but also how to meet the instructional demands of additional students and structure the curriculum in such a way that the instructional quality is maintained. Some possibilities might include having larger enrollment numbers for some courses that students have to take while maintaining smaller classes for the electives; hiring additional adjuncts; increasing the class size of the introductory general education courses; or some combination of these. If the student numbers in the major, but also in the general education courses, grow significantly,

additional faculty resources will be necessary to meet the student demand while maintaining the high level of instructional quality.

Research Expectations

The department might be able to articulate more clearly a reasonable expectation for research for its faculty members. These expectations need to be aligned with the demands of a 3/3 teaching load, including expected quantity, type of publications, and journal quality. While the mission of the department is centered on undergraduate education, continued faculty activity in research is essential to keep teaching current, to support student research, and to maintain and improve the national visibility of the department. A culture of research could be nourished, for example, by regular faculty colloquia, to which advanced students could also be invited (e.g. those in the senior seminar or research methods course). The department makes resources available for faculty to support research, such as conference attendance, and it is important that faculty members continue to present their research at national and international conferences in their area and take advantage of professional development opportunities at these conferences, including those focusing on developing pedagogies.

Develop more Institutionalized Ties to the Community and Alumni (Partnerships)

The department has begun to establish regular ties to alumni, for example by sending out a newsletter, which is positive. The self-study contains the results of an alumni survey, further evidence of positive relationships with former students. These efforts can be strengthened, for example by asking alumni to be featured on an alumni section of the departmental website, inviting them to give presentations or meeting with students when in town (which can include, for example, career-advice and mentoring talks), or asking whether they might consider proposing an internship opportunity with their employer.

Some faculty members also have valuable personal contacts to individual leaders in the community. These contacts could be institutionalized, for example, by sending official departmental thank-you letters after they have met with students.

Resources and Other Considerations

The department has a highly competent and efficient staff member. Additional support could be provided by work-study students, who might be able to assist in administrative tasks by compiling lists of possible internship sites, assist with office tasks, and so forth.

To meet anticipated growth, the department should also think strategically in what area it would need to recruit additional faculty members to strengthen the existing curriculum and to accommodate significantly higher enrollment numbers while maintaining instructional quality. Several areas lend themselves to expansion in curricular offerings, such as theory, pre-law, or other areas in American politics. My recommendation is that regardless of the substantive area, any additional hire should have solid quantitative methods skills to be able to teach the research methods course and also to assist senior projects that employ quantitative analysis.

Summary

In sum, the Political Science Department provides its students with an excellent education, has a clear focus on its undergraduate program, and applies pedagogies that have been found to be effective in promoting student learning. Moving forward, the department should build

and expand on these strengths and articulate a mission that supports the University's vision, mission, and strategic plan, such as an explicit and clearly articulated focus on student engagement pedagogies. The department is well situated to support all of the university's seven strategic goals and makes a valuable contribution to the university's mission, servicing a large number of students beyond Political Science majors.

