Department of Political Science
Executive Summary

Mission
Well-functioning democracies require a well-educated citizenry. Accordingly, the department engages students in an exploration of political behavior, institutions, and public policy and provides the skills for interpreting and understanding politics and policy. Specifically, we (1) prepare undergraduates to be informed and critical citizens with the appropriate skills and knowledge for pursuit of graduate/professional studies in law, political science, public policy or international studies; (2) prepare graduate students for successful careers in academia or in research-related organizations; (3) contribute to the development of knowledge in the discipline through the generation of high quality research; and (4) enhance the functioning of the profession, the university, and the community through appropriate service activity.

Faculty
The department’s tenured or tenure-track faculty is recruited from major research universities with highly ranked doctoral programs in political science. Our expertise spans the diverse field of political science, including the study of international relations, institutions, political behavior and public policy in the United States and in countries around the world, and political philosophy. Teaching in KU’s political science department is largely handled by tenured or tenure track faculty rather than graduate students. The department is high on teaching productivity – for many years generating roughly 10,000 semester credit hours taught annually with no more than 23 FTE tenure-track faculty. The department has some of the most highly regarded teaching faculty in the College of Liberal Arts, with 11 members being awarded W. T. Kemper Fellowships for Teaching Excellence. The department’s faculty is very productive based on the volume of their publications in academic outlets. An independent analysis from 2006 shows that KU’s political science department had the 6th most research-productive political science faculty in the nation.

Programs
The Department of Political Science offers (or has offered within the review period) the following degree programs:
(1) an undergraduate major in Political Science, either for students pursuing a B.A. or a B.G.S. degree;
(2) a co-major in International Studies for students who have another major [this interdisciplinary program has, as of AY 2010-0-2011, been moved into the Center for Global and International Studies, which is developing it into a free-standing, full major].
(3) A minor in Public Policy
The major in political science is one of the largest in KU’s College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, generating roughly 170 graduating majors annually in recent years. Featuring an internship option, strong ties to the university’s Honor’s Program, and a rigorous 33 credit hour curriculum, the program provides a strong preparation for students wishing to study law or to enter a graduate program in political science, public policy or public affairs. In addition to its role for majors, the program is an integral part of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Kansas. The department also contributes in the relatively new, inter-disciplinary
minor in Research Methods and Data Analysis. Since 1984, well over a thousand students have participated in the department’s internship programs in Washington, DC or Topeka. Based on exit surveys of seniors roughly 80% of political science majors are satisfied with the overall quality of instruction in the major, the availability of major courses, ease of meeting with instructors, the intellectual challenge of courses in the major and integration of major courses.

(4) a Master of Arts (M.A.) degree

Our M.A. degree provides an important platform and proving ground for eventual acceptance of students into our own doctoral program, as a feeder for students seeking placement in a conventionally top-20 ranked doctoral program, and for students with specialty needs for graduate preparation prior to a career in public affairs and other disciplines at KU. About one third of our M.A. students receive the M.A. as a terminal degree. Each year, we typically produce at least a half dozen completed M.A. degrees. M.A. degree programs are not ranked in political science.

(5) and a Ph.D. in Political Science.

KU’s Ph.D. program in political science is the only doctoral program in political science in the state of Kansas. It prepares students for research and teaching careers in higher education and for research-based careers, especially in the public and non-profit sectors. Students are prepared for academic positions in Research I universities as well as for careers in institutions that emphasize undergraduate teaching. For nearly a decade, the number of graduate students actively pursuing a doctoral degree in Political Science at KU has typically been in the high twenties to low thirties; each year, the program typically produces somewhere between one and three completed doctorates. Based on research productivity and reputation the department is in the top quarter of all discipline Ph.D. programs. Among its peers in public institutions, it is typically ranked in the top 30. The external review was positive in regards to each program and did not suggest specific changes.

Response to the Review Process

The external review suggested the need for greater emphasis on external grant funding and faculty publication in the very highest-ranked journals and presses relative to an emphasis on quantity of publications. The review also suggested that teaching, research, and hiring should be more interdisciplinary and less focused on traditional sub-fields within the discipline. In response the department has started working groups that focus on research and teaching interests that cross sub-fields; indeed, the identity politics group has already developed its own minor. The department has also begun a long term conversation to encourage greater transparency and clearer standards for research evaluation that focus on quality. This is occurring in conjunction with a reassessment of the departmental mission in the context of shifting priorities within the University and the profession. The outcome will be a strategic plan the focuses on a shared vision of quality in every aspect of what the department does. The plan will also develop specific goals that will drive our hiring and student recruitment processes.

Overall Evaluation

Because the political science department exceeds its core mission, has very good to excellent programs, and is an integral part of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at KU the department and its programs should be maintained and enhanced whenever possible. The review process generated constructive criticism and an internal discussion that we are using to enhance our ability to achieve our mission and expand our contribution to KU and the state.
Department of Political Science
Program Highlights

The Department of Political Science at the University of Kansas offers three degree programs: (1) a Bachelor’s degree, (2) a Master of Arts degree, and (3) a Ph.D. in political science.

- The major in political science is one of the largest in KU’s College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, generating roughly 170 graduating majors annually in recent years.
- Through intern programs in Washington, D.C., and Topeka as well as in many other campaign and government internships, political science students have myriad opportunities to understand governance from the inside out. Since 1984, well over a thousand majors (and many non-majors) have spent a semester on Capitol Hill or at the White House or with an interest group. Their learning in such environments complements and builds upon their classroom work.
- In 2009-2010 alone 20 different papers authored or co-authored by KU Political Science graduate students (sometimes with faculty and often with other graduate students) were presented at major professional conferences; In addition, POLS graduate students have had success in publishing their work in quality journals, sometimes in collaboration with faculty members and sometimes on their own.
- There are over 200 Ph.D. programs nation-wide in political science and KU’s department is in the top quarter of all Ph.D. programs. Among its peers in public institutions, it is typically ranked in the top 30. Other rankings that control for faculty size and actual research productivity also convey the strength of the department, as when one analysis in 2006 suggested that KU’s political science department had the 6th most research-productive faculty in political science in the nation.
- The department has some of the most highly regarded teaching faculty in the College of Liberal Arts, with 11 members being awarded W. T. Kemper Fellowships for Teaching Excellence.
- Even in an academic job market decimated by the economic downturn, all three KU Political Science Ph.D.’s produced in 2010 found placement in academic positions, ranging from Missouri Southern State University to Korea National Defense University. Other recent Ph.D.’s have been placed at the U.S. Institute for Defense Analysis, California State University-Fullerton and Howard University.
- The richness of the political science undergraduate major experience is reflected in recent activity of our alums. A KU alumnus who graduated with a political science major and who is now the Dean of Social Sciences at the University of Chicago spearheaded a fundraising effort to endow a Fund for Enhancement of the Undergraduate Political Science Research Experience at KU. A steering committee of KU alums has reached out to other KU Political Science alums spanning several decades – alums that are now active in government, politics, and academia. Although the initiative was launched at the worst of times economic times, the fund has already achieved the size necessary to allow us to begin making awards to undergraduate students who need funding support.
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1. What we do and why we do it

A. Mission: Well-functioning democracies require a well-educated citizenry. Not all have to be political scientists, of course, but neither would it be desirable if publics are completely ignorant of what political scientists and philosophers have to say about the way that a democracy organizes its affairs. Accordingly, as part of our teaching mission, KU trains its students to become knowledgeable in many different areas, including the way that US and other democratic institutions work, how clashes of interests can be resolved peacefully, the way that different ethnic backgrounds affect our ability to act responsibly as citizens, and how other nations organize their pursuit of the common good. As part of our research mission, we aim to generate high quality research that advances our knowledge about political affairs. And as part of our service mission, we actively engage in the local community as well as the regional and national professional organizations.

Accordingly, the mission of the University of Kansas Department of Political Science is to (1) prepare undergraduates to be informed and critical citizens with the appropriate skills and accomplishments for pursuit of graduate / professional studies in law, political science, public policy or international studies; (2) to prepare graduate students for successful careers in academia or in research-related organizations; (3) to contribute to the development of knowledge in the discipline through the generation of high quality research; and (4) to enhance the functioning of the profession, the university, and the community through appropriate service activity.

Regarding the Undergraduate Teaching Mission

B. Goals and Priorities: Our goals are to prepare undergraduates to be informed and critical citizens with the appropriate skills and accomplishments for pursuit of graduate / professional studies in law, political science, public policy or international studies.

C. Short Mission Statement: KU has a Department of Political Science because the study of politics enhances our understanding of what successful governance requires in a world of diverse interests.

D., E., and F. Program Inventory, Role, Need and Demand

Program Inventory

At the undergraduate level, the Department of Political Science offers (or has offered within the review period) the following degree programs:

(1) an undergraduate major in Political Science, either for students pursuing a B.A. or a B.G.S. degree;

(2) a co-major in International Studies for students who have another major [this interdisciplinary program has, as of AY 2010-0-2011, been moved into the Center for Global and International Studies, which is developing it into a free-standing, full major].

(3) A minor in Public Policy

The department also participates in the relatively new, inter-disciplinary minor in Research Methods and Data Analysis. Political science contributes one course that can meet that minor’s pre-requisite, and is poised to offer one or more higher-level courses as undergraduates begin to take this new minor.
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The undergraduate major (33 credit hours) has three required introductory courses: Intro to U.S. Politics, Intro to Comparative Politics, and Intro to International Relations. Prospective majors must have a 2.3 grade point average in these three courses in order to be admitted to the major. In addition to these three introductory courses, majors must complete two required sophomore-junior courses (Introduction to Political Theory and Political Science Methods of Inquiry). The former covers major issues and concepts in political philosophy; the latter covers research design issues, major forms of data collection, and introductory statistical methods used in political science. The remaining 18 hours required for the major must be drawn from at least two of the five major subfields, and 15 of the 18 must be at the upper-division level.

The minor consists of 18 credit hours of course work including Intro to U.S. Politics, Introduction to Public Policy 111, and at least 12 hours of POLS courses at the Junior/Senior level from a list of about a dozen upper-division courses.

**Role and Need**

Between one quarter and one third of our majors plan to study law after graduation, while from 18 to 25% plan to study political science at the graduate level or pursue graduate study in a related field (see Appendix A). About one-fifth of our majors plan graduate study in an unrelated field. Students who do not have plans for graduate or professional degree programs nevertheless benefit from a core, liberal arts major that provides critical thinking and writing skills and information crucial for being an effective citizen in a global world.

In addition to its role for majors, the Department of Political Science is an integral part of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Kansas. We provide basic courses in public and international affairs for non-majors throughout the College and the University, informing them about politics, citizenship, and governance as practiced in the U.S., in other countries, and at the international level. Each semester the department offers three courses that fulfill College of Liberal Arts and Sciences requirements for a principal course in public affairs: POLS 110, Introduction to US Politics; POLS 150, Introduction to Comparative Politics; and POLS 170, Introduction to International Politics. In addition, the department offers courses that fulfill the College requirement for a nonwestern culture course, such as POLS 660, The Politics and Problems of Developing Countries; POLS 668, Reform in Contemporary China; and POLS 665, Politics in Africa. Because of their intellectual centrality, courses in Political Science are also required, cross-listed, or are among the listed options for meeting requirements for students pursuing majors other than political science. For example, POLS 624, Environmental Politics and Policy is cross-listed with the Environmental Studies program, where it is an important elective; POLS 562, Women and Politics is cross-listed with the Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies program, where it is among the core social science courses that must be taken. Additionally, our courses are included among the requirements of various degree options offered by other schools at the University. For example, many students in the School of Journalism fulfill a requirement to complete three courses in a social science discipline by enrolling in political science courses. Because of our faculty expertise in the politics of most regions of the world and in global politics and international relations, political science courses have constituted a mainstay for the Global and International Studies co-major that emerged in 2000 and will likely be mainstays for the new major being developed to replace it by the Center for Global and International Studies.

A number of students majoring in the natural sciences also have interests in the public affairs implications of science and technology; and for students pursuing a Bachelor of General Studies degree in the College a concentration or approved minor is required. The minor in Public Policy offered by the Department of Political Science serves the needs of these additional student constituencies.

In addition to our degree programs, Political Science administers a pair of semester-long internship programs, for both majors and non-majors. Each spring, the Washington Intern Program sends 20 KU students, mostly political science majors, to the capital for a full semester
of work in congressional offices, the White House, consulting firms, the State Department, and many other venues. Included in the experience are weekly seminars with a wide range of prominent Washingtonians, from journalists to senators to ambassadors. Closer to home, the department’s intern program dovetails with the state legislature’s January-to-May session. About 20 students intern in Topeka, twice a week, most often in legislators’ offices.

**Demand**

The minor in Public Policy is too new to have a meaningful track record vis a vis student demand. However, the major in political science is a longstanding one and is typically one of the four or five largest (by number of declared majors or number of graduating majors) in KU’s College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The number of political science majors grew from 450 in 2000 to a little over 700 in 2005, then declined to 538 in 2009 (see Appendix B). However, the number of those pursuing the major to completion has actually been growing rather than declining in recent years. Political Science Undergraduate degrees awarded grew from 102 in 2003-04 to 178 in 2007-08 and held steady at 179 in 2008-09 (also in Appendix B).

The number of students pursuing the co-major in Global and International Studies grew from 64 in 2000 to more than 150 in 2002, but for most of the years since, the number of student pursuing this co-major has been between about 100 and 140. During the period when the program was administered by one of our faculty members (Professors Reich and Yap), the number of students graduating with a co-major in the program grew from less than 20 to 49.

**Regarding the Graduate Teaching Mission**

**B. Goals and Priorities:** Our goal is to prepare graduate students for successful careers in academia or in research-related organizations.

**C. Short Mission Statement:** “KU has a Department of Political Science because the study of politics enhances our understanding of what successful governance requires in a world of diverse interests.”

**D., E., and F. Program Inventory, Role, Need and Demand**

The Department of Political Science offers both the Master of Arts (M.A.) degree and a Ph.D. in Political Science. In addition, during most of the review period one of our faculty members (Reich) was responsible for administering an interdisciplinary Masters of International Studies (M.A.I.S.) program at the Edwards Campus that was initiated in 2001; several of our faculty members contributed courses to the program as well. After nurturing that new program for several years with virtually no new resources, the dean’s office decided to move the program into the new Center for Global and International Studies.

Requirements for the M.A. degree are: (1) Research Methods coursework (typically two courses) covering basic research design and data collection and statistical analysis through multivariate regression; (2) 24 semester hours of graduate credit beyond the research methods courses; and either (3a) completion and certification of an acceptable thesis or (3b) a minimum of two, 800-900 level research seminars as part of the 30 hours required for the degree and a passing grade on a final master's written examination that is based on the coursework.

Requirements for the Ph.D. degree are: (1) a Master of Arts degree in political science or a closely related field for an accredited U.S. institution or its equivalent; (2) Foreign Language or Research Skill (FLORS) requirement to be met via the two basic graduate research methods courses offered by the department plus a choice of (a) an additional, duly approved research methods course or (b) foreign language proficiency; (3) two major fields of study, consisting of at least four courses (with a grade of B or better) in each of two of the sub-fields offered by the department {the sub-fields of study offered by the department are U.S. Political Institutions and Processes, Public Policy,
Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Philosophy/Empirical Theory; (4) a minor field of study, consisting of at least four courses either in one of the other department sub-fields, a field outside the department or an interdisciplinary program; (5) successful completion of written preliminary examinations in the two major subfields chosen by the student; (6) satisfactory completion of a comprehensive oral examination; (7) completion of dissertation showing the planning, conduct and results of original research and scholarship; and (8) acceptable performance on a final oral exam defending the dissertation.

Role and Need

The Ph.D. program in political science prepares students for research and teaching careers in higher education and for research-based careers, especially in the public and non-profit sectors. Ours is the only doctoral program in political science in the state of Kansas. Our students are prepared for academic positions in Research I universities as well as for careers in institutions that emphasize undergraduate teaching.

Our M.A. program serves a diverse set of purposes. Many students join the M.A. program to “test the water” of post-graduate study. We help them locate their areas of interest and then forge a plan to pursue them most successfully. We require all students to take survey courses in research design and methodology in order to make them aware of the broad range of possibilities in political and social science research. It often happens that students decide to pursue specialized fields in which we do not have sufficient faculty interest and we have been very successful in helping students to gain admission in Ph.D. programs that do. Many of our M.A. students have moved on to finish Ph.D.s at top-ranked universities and go on to become very well known scholars. Keith Krehbiel, for example, is an extremely well respected scholar at Stanford University and he has often expressed gratitude to K.U. for helping him to get his “academic legs” under him before he moved on to the University of Rochester. About one third of our M.A. students receive the M.A. as a terminal degree. Many of these students are seeking careers in the U.S. government (e.g., the Foreign Service or Congressional staff) or nongovernmental international organizations such as the United Nations. In recent years, we have had an increasingly vibrant relationship with the U.S. Army and the Command and General Staff College. Our Army students often assume positions as military attaché or support staff in the Department of Defense. In addition, graduate level courses offered by the department attract students majoring in other disciplines and area studies centers. For example, the Center for Russian, Eastern European, and Eurasian Studies (CREES) at KU lists political science as one of its disciplinary areas of concentration for CREES M.A. students. Political Science courses with at least 25% CREES-area content in the syllabus have been taken by many CREES students.

Demand

For nearly a decade, the number of graduate students actively pursuing a doctoral degree in Political Science at KU has typically been in the high twenties to low thirties while the number pursuing an M.A. has held throughout the period at just under twenty (see Appendix C). The larger counts for both the M.A. and Ph.D. (26 and 40 respectively) for Fall of 2009 may well be a temporary reflection of the unusually bad economy at that time point. Each year, we typically produce somewhere between one and three completed doctorates and at least a half dozen completed M.A. degrees – though occasionally the number of each spikes upwards noticeably (see Appendix C). The interdisciplinary M.A. program in International Studies enrolled its first 9 students in 2001 and quickly grew to have between 50 and 60 graduate majors by 2003 – a count that was sustained until the end of Prof. Reich’s term as director of the program.
2. Who Does It?

Teaching

Teaching Capacity and Workload. This is a small political science department relative to departments in our discipline ranked in the top 25 among state university programs nationally. Running at a headcount of 22-25 tenured/tenure-track faculty in recent years (see Appendix D), the department is about half the size of the 40+ faculty in the Department of Political Science at the University of North Carolina, for example, or the nearly 40 faculty in Indiana University’s Political Science Department. In addition, as Figure 1 (next page) shows, three faculty members have 50% joint appointments with other units. Although some of their course offerings are relevant to our majors and duly cross-listed, these joint appointments do nevertheless reduce our FTE and affect our teaching capacity.

Finally, our teaching capacity is affected by administrative appointments that various faculty members have taken on in recent years, as well as course releases that are commonly used as incentives/compensation at KU for getting other tasks accomplished. For example, during the review period, one faculty member served as the Director of the Center for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies while another served as an Associate Dean (for Humanities!) of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Currently, two faculty members have administrative appointments in units outside our department relating to international programs or global studies; these reduce their teaching presence in the department by 50%. With these appointments taken into account, our current faculty FTE is 21.5. If the course reductions given to the department chair, graduate studies and undergraduate studies directors are taken into account as well, our teaching FTE is 20.5. If we also take into account the one-course reductions given to two additional faculty members in exchange for special duties outside the department, our effective FTE for teaching for the next academic year is 20.

Figure 1 also shows that, while we have faculty representing each of the major sub-fields of political science, they are not equally distributed across the fields. Our political philosophy sub-field has always been quite small, as it is in the majority of political science departments. Public policy was the last of our sub-fields to be formally created, and has struggled to grow to its current size. The international relations sub-field has been reduced in size with the departure (within the past two years) of one full professor, one assistant professor, and the full professor who was serving as an associate dean.

Apart from those who have administrative appointments or the other course reductions noted above, faculty in the department have a 2-2 teaching load. All faculty members participate in graduate education with the normal pattern being one graduate offering out of every four courses taught. All faculty members are expected to share advising and mentoring duties for both undergraduate and graduate students. While there is noticeable variation in the magnitude of such advising and mentoring, all faculty do participate. For advising about degree requirements, enrollment and graduation, the department does have use of some portion of the time of a professional advising specialist hired by the College of Liberal Arts and shared with the Center for Global and International Studies and the Theater Department. Given the qualifications and overall research productivity of our faculty (see next section), not surprisingly all members of the faculty have regular graduate faculty status. Our criteria for dissertation chair status are that the individual faculty member has earned a Ph.D. and has a strong record of current scholarship. With one exception, all faculty members have dissertation chair status unless they have recently joined the faculty and the occasion to serve as a dissertation chair has not yet arisen.
FIGURE 1. A SCHEMATIC LAYOUT, BY SUBFIELD, OF THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY*

*Faculty are placed in sub-fields based upon their course offerings and their participation in grading of doctoral preliminary qualifying exams. Arrows indicate faculty who participate in more than one sub-field. (0.5) indicates a formal joint appointment with another academic unit at KU; bold-face type indicates an administrative appointment of at least 50% in another unit.
As the first two tables of Appendix E show, teaching in KU’s political science department is largely handled by tenured or tenure track faculty. Until very recently, very few graduate teaching assistants were assigned to teach their own courses; instead they have primarily been assigned to handle once-a-week discussion sections of one of the large introductory courses (with the lecture taught by a faculty member) or once-a-week discussion or lab sections of one of the 300-level courses required for the major. In part, the limited number of graduate students teaching their own courses stems from our commitment to provide experienced, excellent teaching to undergraduate students at all levels; in part, it stems from limitations in the size of our graduate teaching assistantship budget. Once the necessary discussion sections and labs are covered, there have been only enough funds left for 1-3 of the most experienced graduate students to teach their own full courses. Meanwhile, one lecturer regularly teaches the upper-division course on Constitutional Law; apart from that, lecturers are relatively rarely used – typically only when a faculty member receives grant-funding to buy out a course and the College office authorizes us to use the released funds for a lecturer.

With this pattern of deploying resources, we have historically generated a substantial volume of semester credit hours (SCH’s) taught. The second table of Appendix E reveals that we generate roughly 10,000 SCH’s each academic year. However, the fourth table of Appendix E reveals an important shift in the source of our undergraduate SCH production. SCH’s in lower division courses increased from about 5,800 to over 7,000 in the first half of the decade but began declining in FY 06-07; SCH’s generated in upper division courses have also declined from their high point, but at half the rate of the lower division decline. As a result, in recent years more than half of our total SCH production is coming from upper division courses rather than lower-division courses. Declining enrollments in lower-division courses such as Introduction to Comparative Politics, Introduction to International Relations, and Introduction to American Politics are almost assuredly due to increasing numbers of students taking such courses either as AP courses in high school, as community college course offerings prior to coming to KU (or during the summer while at KU), or as online course offerings from any number of other universities. This changing pattern of enrollments in our large, introductory courses has implications for our deployment of graduate teaching assistants. We have already begun to more frequently assign the most experienced teaching assistants to teach their own, independent sections of upper-division courses.

Demographics. Our faculty is slightly more diverse (see Appendix D) than it was a decade ago. The latest numbers officially posted (Fall of 2009) show the tenured faculty included 6 females (32%) and one minority member (5%) – a Latino; the group of 5 untenured, tenure-track faculty included 3 females (60%) and one minority member (20%), a Latina. Since then, we have had no new hires; one tenured male and one untenured female have left the university for positions elsewhere, and one untenured male has received tenure here.

Research (Scholarly Output, Grants and Contracts)

Each of the faculty members in the department have Ph.D.’s from prominent universities and bring a wide variety of research skills to the University. These skills include foreign language competencies, expertise in computer programming and advanced statistical analysis, survey research, content analysis, computer simulations, elite interviewing, ethnographic analysis, to suggest some of the diversity of our skills and approaches to conducting research.

Even a cursory examination of their vitae (see Appendix Q) reveals the extensive research productivity of our faculty. Table 1 presents simple counts of the research output during the past five years of each faculty member as listed on his or her vita and/or annual reports: the number of books, refereed articles, chapters in books, papers presented at conferences or by invitation to other audiences, and other publications and research products (such as book reviews, case studies analyses, computer programs, etc.). This table shows that with very few exceptions, our faculty
are highly productive and accomplished on the research front. Many of the listed articles are in highly respected journals in the discipline and the books are with very good presses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books Authored</th>
<th>Edited</th>
<th>Journal Articles</th>
<th>Book Chapters</th>
<th>Papers Presented</th>
<th>External Grants</th>
<th>Other Research Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bejarano*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigler</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haider-Markel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joslyn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaarbo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omelicheva*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohrschneider</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These assistant professors have only been faculty members for three years.

A continuing source of debate in the Department is how to value research contributions of different types – and most particularly whether research that is published in the most visible, prestigious, and extremely selective journals in political science per se should be valued more highly (and if so, how much more highly) than publications in journals that may have less of a disciplinary impact (though they may be important in interdisciplinary circles). Most departments whose faculty are all research-active will have such debates and face the same challenge we do of negotiating ways to prevent such discussions from becoming unduly corrosive.

The one category where the department does not have as strong a showing for the 2005-2010 period as we would like involves external grant funding. Less than half of the faculty had external funding to support their research during this period. A number of the grants that were obtained were relatively small grants (less than $6,000) for conference development or research travel. While even these small grants are important assets, they cannot fully support a faculty member’s pursuit of a research project and typically do not provide support for graduate students.

On the positive side, however, several members of our faculty have been involved in substantial grant-funded projects. These include a very large State Department Educational and Cultural Affairs grant just obtained by Prof. Britton and a colleague from another KU department, two substantial Robert Wood Johnson Health and Society Scholars grants obtained by Prof. Daley, Prof. Haider-Markel’s involvement in extension funding of a very large NSF grant (along with
co-investigators from KU’s Dept. of Public Administration) to study racial profiling, Prof. Herron’s work as a sub-contractor on a high-profile NSF grant (with PI’s Krauss, Pekkanen and Shugart), Prof. Kennedy’s collaborative work with scholars at Northwest University, Xian, China to establish the Northwest Socio-economic Development Research Center (NSDRC) with Ford Foundation funding, and Prof. Omelicheva taking on a PI role for the Political Instability Task Force initiated by Phil Schrodt and supported with funding from Science Applications International Corporation. Prof. Omelicheva is also one of the PIs for a grant funded by the Teagle and Spencer Foundations and administered by the Center for Teaching Excellence at KU with the goal of improving students’ writing and critical thinking skills at research universities. Meanwhile, several faculty members have received Fulbright fellowships in recent years.

Overall, even greater faculty involvement in external grant development is to be desired; and there is evidence of movement in a positive direction in this regard. Many faculty members, and especially those in the younger cohorts, have taken advantage of some of the grant development activities sponsored by KU’s Institute for Policy and Social Research; meanwhile Prof. Britton has recently taken on a grant development leadership role in the Institute’s Center for International Political Analysis. Other faculty members have been involved with the Hall Center for the Humanities in interdisciplinary projects that have the potential to lead to external grant proposals. The results are beginning to show. In 2009 alone, eight different faculty members submitted grant proposals, several of them major projects involving funding sources such as the National Science Foundation and the Environmental Protection Agency.

**Maintaining Quality**

**Recruiting and Retaining Faculty.** With respect to recruiting faculty, we have been fortunate to have been authorized by the dean’s office to recruit at least one and sometimes two positions in each of the past five years. We have also had the opportunity to recruit a distinguished professor because of a generous gift by a KU alum, and on one occasion we also used direct hire authorization to add a young minority faculty member to our tenure-track faculty. Those authorizations and opportunities have yielded:

(a) one junior faculty member recruited in 2005 (Brent Steele, international relations), who was promoted and tenured here at KU last year;

(b) an advanced junior faculty member recruited in 2006 (Alesha Doan; public policy), who is going up for promotion and tenure this coming fall;

(c) three junior faculty members recruited in 2007 – Michael Lynch (American politics; methodology), Mariya Omelicheva (International Relations) and Christina Bejarano (American Politics, Latino Politics), all of whom have navigated their way through the 3rd year Progress Toward Tenure review; and

(d) the first occupant of the Sir Robert Worcester Distinguished Professorship of International Public Opinion and Survey Research, Robert Rohrschneider, recruited in 2008 after only two years of searching (which we understand is noticeably less than the norm for such searches here at KU).

Authorizations to recruit (at the junior-level) an individual specializing in Middle East politics have so far not been successful (offers were made in AY 2007-08 and in AY 2009-2010 to individuals who chose other institutions instead; and in AY 2008-09 that search along with all others in the College was cancelled for budgetary reasons). The effort (in AY 2009-2010) to recruit an associate professor in international relations who would forge a link with an emergent M.A. program at Leavenworth was unsuccessful when the dean’s office cancelled the search due to concerns about the availability of funds from the federal earmark for Leavenworth that was to fund this position.

Our searches, from discussion of recruiting priorities underlying authorization requests through candidate interviews to decision-making about candidates to be offered the position, involve elaborately democratic processes (outlined in our by-laws) featuring both committee level
and full faculty review of applicants and candidates. Given the stakes involved, faculty involvement is extremely broad and deep and discussions are sometimes quite passionate.

With respect to faculty retention, our overall track record is quite good. Since 2005, four junior faculty members, representing three different sub-fields and with extremely diverse research approaches, have been successfully promoted and tenured (Britton, Daley, Kennedy and Steele); none have been denied tenure and promotion (although, at the end of AY 2007-08, one junior faculty member who was about to undergo mandatory tenure review chose instead to take up an offer from the LBJ School of Public Affairs at Texas). The results of Progress Toward Tenure reviews and annual performance information give us reason to expect that we may continue the pattern of success.

For some years, the department has assigned faculty mentors to each junior faculty member, with input from the latter. In many cases, we have found it useful for an individual to have more than one mentor. Some mentors are particularly helpful in providing advice and feedback on development of the teaching portfolio; others who do research in the relevant sub-field are helpful in reading papers and grant proposals or discussing publication outlets and strategies; still others are most helpful in providing advice about balancing teaching, research and service commitments or about the kinds of service duties that might be appropriate opportunities.

Meanwhile, every individual who has come up for review for promotion to full professor in the past decade has been successfully promoted. Although our by-laws do provide that the Advisory Committee has a role (as part of its annual merit portfolio review) in assessing progress toward promotion to full, we have no formalized process for mentoring associate professors and no evident demand among the associate professors for such. Instead, associate professors have traditionally sought advice about promotion and other career matters informally from the department chair and/or from colleagues with whom they are most simpatico.

In addition to the departure of the one junior faculty member noted two paragraphs above, the department has lost three senior colleagues in the past five years. Professor Deborah Gerner died in 2006. Paul D’Anieri had already moved from regular faculty status in the department to be Associate Dean for International Programs at Kansas from 1999 to 2003, Director of the Center for Russian and European Studies in 2003-2004, and Associate Dean of Humanities from 2004 until 2008 when he accepted a position as Dean of the College Liberal Arts and Sciences at Florida. Professor Phil Schrodt left KU at the end of 2009 to take a position in the Department of Political Science at Penn State. In addition, Lorraine Bayard de Volo, who had been promoted and tenured at KU in 2005, left in 2006 to take a position in the Women and Gender Studies Program at the University of Colorado.

**Age Profile and Succession Plan.**

Figure 2 once again shows the membership of the faculty by sub-field, but this time by rank as well. It is clear from the age profile of the department that the American Politics sub-field is highly vulnerable and will in the not too distant future lose viability if the College does not invest in this area. Six of the nine faculty members contributing to this sub-field are full professors; and given the age profile, it is quite likely that within six years four of those six full professors will have retired. It is very important that future recruitment decisions take into account the need to invest in this area. This sub-field is one of the truly core areas of the discipline and it is a field that has been crucial in building the reputation and success that KU’s department has enjoyed. Our department’s image and capacity to deliver its undergraduate and graduate programs will be severely compromised if this sub-field becomes emaciated.

Other sub-fields clearly need to be invested in as well, though those needs are not linked with the issue of age profile and the impact of looming retirements. This and related issues more generally are discussed in Section 5 of this self-study.
FIGURE 2. POLITICAL SCIENCE FACULTY, BY SUBFIELD AND RANK
(Assistant Professors are shown in italics; Associate Professors in plain font; Full Professors in bold font)
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3. How Well Do We Do It, and Who Thinks So

A. Undergraduate-Level

1) Students in Profile

Test Scores. ACT score averages (see first table of Appendix B) for juniors and seniors majoring in Political Science in the past five years have been about 26. This compares favorably with the mean ACT score for all junior-senior students in the College, which has ranged from 24.4 to 24.8 in the past five years.

Financial Support. About 60% of our majors receive financial aid of some sort (see Appendix F). In the past five years, the percentage of our majors receiving need-based loans has increased slightly from 28 or 29% to about 34%; the percentage receiving non-need-based loans has increased from 34% to 41%; the percentage receiving institutional grants and scholarships has held steady at 30%. Most of this financial support is provided outside the purview of the department. However, the department does provide some financial support in the form of awards to outstanding juniors and graduating seniors. The criteria for the awards are set by the fund-benefactors; generally, students have no less than 3.5 GPA following the completion of at least 15 hours in political science. The awards for juniors have ranged from $800 to $2500, to be used towards fees and tuition in the following year. Seniors are given awards from $200 to $400.

Clearly, finances are on the minds of our undergraduate students and an important part of the context for our teaching. This is dramatically underscored by evidence about the number of our majors who hold jobs while attending college, and the number of hours that they work. Each year the departmentally-administered senior survey asks about this. By 2010, two-thirds of senior majors indicated that they had worked at a paying job most of their junior and senior years. On average, they worked 22 hours per week; but nearly 18% worked 30 hours per week or more.

Demographics. When compared with summary information for undergraduates receiving degrees in KU’s College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (data not shown in tables), the data on those receiving the political science degree at KU (see Appendix B) reveals that our graduating majors are, on most characteristics, much like the overall population of students receiving degrees from the College. In the past five years, from 7-14% of our graduating majors are minority students compared with 11-13% for the College; 1-3% of our majors are international students compared with 2-4% for the College, the average age at graduation is about 23 for both, and the average GPA is 3.1 - 3.2 for political science graduates compared to 3.0 – 3.1 for all those getting undergraduate degrees in the College. Curiously, by 2008-09 our group of graduating majors was only about one-third female – down from 40% or more only a few years ago and noticeably less than the 51% of all graduates from the College who are female. It is unclear why this might be the case.

2) Program Productivity

Distribution of Size of Classes. The Department of Political Science has for many years offered three lower-division “large” lecture classes each semester, each of which is required for our majors and each of which can also serve as a principal course meeting a general education requirement for non-majors. The largest of these three has always been POLS 110 (Introduction to American Politics) which until very recently filled a 500-seat auditorium; the other two, POLS 150 (Intro to Comparative Politics) and POLS 170 (Intro to International Relations) have for many years been somewhat smaller. When resources allow, we also assign an experienced graduate student to teach their own, 45-seat independent section of one of these. As noted earlier, the demand for these introductory courses has slipped somewhat as a result of increasing student
use of high school AP courses, community college equivalents and on-line alternatives. We still
offer the three introductory courses each semester, but contemporary course enrollments for these
are reflected in the numbers for academic year 2009-2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLS 110 (Introduction to American Politics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-taught “large” section</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA taught independent section</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 150 (Intro to Comparative Politics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-taught “large” section</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 GTA taught independent sections totaling</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 170 (Intro to International Relations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-taught “large” section</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 GTA taught independent section</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most semesters, we also offer an Honors course equivalent for each of these introductory
courses. Enrollments in these have been quite varied recently, ranging from about 10 to about 30.

We also require our majors to complete two 300-level courses – POLS 301 (Introduction to
Political Theory) and POLS 306 (Political Science Methods of Inquiry) – offered each semester
in sections that enroll 80-100 each. Like the introductory courses, these typically have twice-
weekly lectures with once-per-week, GTA-staffed discussion sections (in the case of POLS 301)
or (in the case of POLS 306) computer lab sections.

The rest of our undergraduate offerings are upper-division courses, populated primarily by
majors but, as noted on pp. 1-2, also enrolling a variety of interested students from other
programs. Enrollments in these courses vary considerably, but typically range from the low 20’s
to room-size limits of 45. For example, in AY 2009-2010, our 40 upper-division courses enrolled
as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Enrollment</th>
<th># of Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 +</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses with less than 10 enrolled have been very rare in our department. When they do occur,
it is as the result of unusual circumstances – in the cases shown here, one is a unique honors
course for students preparing to write honors theses; the other is a new course offered by a new
distinguished professor that turned out to be in conflict with a rival course in another department
covering the same topical material.

In short, without making use of super-large sections to inflate our semester credit hour count
or imposing inappropriate teaching loads on our graduate students, we have been quite productive
on the teaching front.

**Time to Degree.** For those receiving their degree with a political science major, the average
number of years to complete the degree was 4.5 in 2005, increasing to 4.9 in 2009 (see Appendix B).
This compares favorably with the overall College of Liberal Arts and Sciences undergraduate
mean number of years to completion, which was either 4.9 or 5.0 in each of the past five years.
The median number of years to complete an undergraduate degree in the College has been 4.5 for
many years; after sitting at 4.0 for most of the past 8 years, the median for those graduating with a political science major increased to the College median of 4.5 in 2009.

**Degrees awarded and Credit Hour Productivity.** See Section 1 on Demand and Section 2 on Teaching Capacity and Workload.

### 3) Program Quality Outcomes

**Satisfaction Surveys.** Results from the exit survey of seniors conducted by the university (see Appendix G) reveal that on most questions referring to their major, graduating majors in political science on average were satisfied (on a scale from very dissatisfied through neutral to very satisfied), which is to say, about at the university average. In both the 2005 and 2009 surveys, over 80% of political science majors were satisfied with the overall quality of instruction in the major, the availability of major courses, and ease of meeting with instructors; and nearly 80% were satisfied with the intellectual challenge of courses in the major and integration of major courses. Less than 60% were satisfied with the helpfulness of their upper-division advisor in 2005, but this improved to about 65% satisfied in 2009, which is about the mean for all surveyed majors at the university.

**Student Awards.** The Department gives awards to especially meritorious students annually at the Political Science Banquet. The criteria for monetary awards are set by the respective fund-benefactors, to be given to “outstanding” juniors or seniors. This generally means that the recipients have no less than a 3.5 GPA and have completed at least 15 hours in the major. Generally, the awards for juniors carry additional stipulations or criteria that encourage research or specialization in fields of Political Science. For instance, the Guftafson Scholarship specifies that the recipients engage in or show a high aptitude for public service, while the Emmett Bennett award specifies that recipients demonstrate need, in addition to academic merit. The awards for seniors are based on outstanding achievement; this usually means that students awarded have among the highest GPAs of the graduating seniors. The Department awards an average of six monetary scholarships to juniors and four to seniors; in addition, the Department recognizes seniors graduating with honors with a Pi Sigma Alpha honors society medallion.

**Summary of Undergraduate Program Quality.** For the most part, we are very pleased with the quality of our undergraduate major. We believe that we do a good job of ensuring that our students understand the basics of all fields in the discipline, that they can develop areas of expertise, and that they have extensive opportunities for public service, international, and research experiences. Perhaps the most pressing issue in our undergraduate major is that there has been somewhat of a reduction in the number of students writing honors theses with us. Because of this concern, we developed a new course – Honors Seminar in Political Research. Small enrollments coupled with other teaching demands have constrained us from teaching the course as regularly as we would like, but when offered it has proved to be important in encouraging potential honors thesis writers.

We know of no national ranking of undergraduate programs in political science. We believe that if objective assessments of this kind were available, our program would rate highly. Each faculty member can cite examples of graduating majors that they have worked with who were highly recruited by our counterparts in more prestigious Universities and who are now highly regarded political scientists at other universities or students who have had effective careers in government and politics or in the field of law.
B. Graduate Level

1) Students in Profile

**Test Scores.** Students admitted to our graduate program (M.A. and Ph.D. combined) typically have had higher GRE scores than those of students admitted to graduate programs in KU’s social science division overall. For example, our graduate students’ mean verbal score on the GRE has increased from 530.7 in Fall, 2005 to 550 in Fall, 2009 (see Appendix C); for all College social science departments the comparable figures are 521.7 to 533.6. For all but the two most recent of the past five years, our students’ mean quantitative scores were above 635 – higher than the 610-620 average range for social science departments at KU; in the last two years, however, our graduate students’ mean quantitative scores have dropped a little while those for the College have increased, leaving our mean a bit below the social science average.

**Financial Support and Other Recruitment.** We have been slightly less selective than KU social science departments overall in our admission decisions for the M.A. program. In recent years, we have admitted 58 to 64 percent of those applying, compared with 53 to 57% for the social sciences overall (see Appendix C). It is at the doctoral level, however, where the gap in selectivity is more noticeable. We typically admit at least 40% of those who apply and in Fall, 2007 we admitted 58%; by comparison, Ph.D. program admission percentages for the social sciences overall are between 23% and 28%.

The primary means that we have for providing financial support for our graduate program is the award of a graduate teaching assistantship (see Appendix F). Our funding base from the College for this purpose is such that we are now able to support 15.5 GTA’s each academic year at a compensation level of from $ 16,000 for new GTA’s to $17,300 for the most experienced. A number of our graduate students have held graduate teaching assistant appointments in other units, most notably Western Civilization and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. The figures in Appendix F indicate that we may be relying upon this other-unit GTA funding of our graduate students somewhat more than is true for social science grad programs at KU overall.

On the other hand, it is quite rare for our students to be funded as graduate research assistants. This is because, as noted earlier, we do not have notable numbers of faculty members getting external funding of the type and size to support graduate students. The handful of students who have been supported as GRA’s in the past five years were mostly supported on Prof. Philip Schrodt’s external grants or contracts, and with his departure the GRA funding situation will be quite minimal until the number and size of external grants garnered by our faculty increase. Even with Schrodt’s grants here during the past five years, as few as two and no more than five graduate students have found support via GRA appointments.

This information about funding support and some of its limitations sheds some light on the matter of the seemingly low level of selectivity of our doctoral admissions, as noted above. As Appendix C shows, it is quite common for us to have only one out of four of those admitted to our doctoral program actually enroll in the program. This was the case in four of the last six years. By contrast, the overall “admitted to enrolled yield” for social science graduate programs at KU overall has been at least 40% in each of the last six years and over 50% in two of the last six years. In short, our more generous admissions process is a coping strategy to deal with the fact that we lose so many high-quality prospects to other doctoral programs.

**Demographics.** In most of the past six years, minority representation in our M.A. program ranged from 8-14% (see Appendix C); comparable figures for the M.A. population in the social sciences overall are 5.5 - 9.5%. {A cautionary aside: Program-specific percentages are based on quite small N’s.} Female representation in our M.A. program is extraordinarily varied, sometimes as low as 0 and sometimes as high as 50%, with no apparent trending pattern. For social science M.A.’s overall, female representation has ranged from 44 to 63% in the past five years. Our M.A. student population is noticeably less “international” than the other social
In any given recent year, from 9-25% of our M.A. students are international students. Comparable numbers for the social sciences overall are 18-33%.

Minority representation in our Ph.D. program ranged from 0-20% (see Appendix C) in the past six years; comparable figures for the Ph.D. population in the social sciences overall are 7-14%. Women comprise from one half to two-thirds of our doctoral students in three of the past six years, and from 0-29% in the other three of the past six years. Female representation in social science doctoral programs at KU ranges from 44-63%. International students constitute anywhere from 25-43% of our doctoral students; for social science doctoral students at KU, the comparable figures are 18-33%.

2) Program Productivity

Distribution of Classes by Size, Advising and Mentoring. A limited number of classes numbered in the 600-range can be taken by graduate students, though those classes tend to be dominated by undergraduate enrollees; hence, information on 600-level classes by size was shown in the previous section on Undergraduate Level Program Productivity. The distribution of our graduate-level offerings for 2009-2010 is typical, and is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall, 2008</th>
<th>Fall, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Design for Political Science 14</td>
<td>Research Design for Political Science 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods II 6</td>
<td>Research Methods II 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Law 4</td>
<td>Political Behavior 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics in International Relations 7</td>
<td>Scope of Public Policy 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Implementation &amp; Analysis 8</td>
<td>American Politics 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Comparative Politics 11</td>
<td>Intro to Comparative Politics 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations 11</td>
<td>International Relations 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections and Voting Behavior 10</td>
<td>U.S. Congress 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics in Comparative Pols 9</td>
<td>Pols Advanced Industrial Societies 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics in International Relations 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation for Comp Exam 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring, 2009</th>
<th>Spring, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods I 17</td>
<td>Research Methods I 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics in Political Theory 3</td>
<td>Topics in Amer Pol Institutions 16^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Politics 10</td>
<td>Topics in Amer Pol Institutions 23^^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Social Politics 12</td>
<td>Topics in International Relations 22^^^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct/Anlyz Fldwrk Dev Countr 9</td>
<td>Comparative Instit &amp; Govt 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Regression 11</td>
<td>Comparative Political Economy 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Political Parties 8</td>
<td>Comparative Social Politics 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Elector&amp;Party System 5</td>
<td>Foreign Policy Analysis 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Comp Exam 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{Courses in bold face font are core sub-field intros; courses in italics are in the research methods requirement sequence}

^ Course offered by Adjunct Prof at Leavenworth for their M.A. program 19 Army students; 0 KU
^^ Course offered by Prof Johnson at Leavenworth for their M.A. program + 4 of our students, enrollment = 23
^^^ Course offered by Prof Heilke at Leavenworth for their M.A. program + 4 of our students, enrollment = 22

In addition, in the fall semester of 2009, 7 different faculty members taught a total of 8 different students in POLS 899 (Thesis); 6 different faculty members taught a total of 10 different students in POLS 993 (Directed Readings) courses; and 11 different faculty members supervised a total of 16 students enrolled in POLS 999 (Doctoral Dissertation); similar numbers hold for fall, 2008. In the spring of 2010, eight different faculty members taught a total of 13 different students in POLS 899 (Thesis); 6 different faculty members taught a total of 8 different students in POLS 993 (Directed Readings) courses; and 14 different faculty members supervised a total of 20 students enrolled in POLS 999 (Doctoral Dissertation).
Several things are evident from this information on graduate course offerings. The first is that the relatively small size of our faculty coupled with the teaching capacity reductions outlined in Section 2 of this report limit the number of graduate course offerings that we can put on in any academic year, especially in sub-fields other than comparative politics. This situation may be either assisted or further complicated in future by the new M.A. program in Leavenworth – an interdisciplinary M.A. in Global and International Studies that has been launched with federal funding support. Some members of our faculty have agreed to participate in the new M.A. program and a handful of our students went to Leavenworth to partake of the courses offered for that program in its first year. As of this writing, there is still a need for clarification on curricular content and hence the kinds of courses we would be expected to contribute, as well as a need to deal with peculiar scheduling arrangements on the Leavenworth end that compromised the capacity of our students to take advantage of those courses.

**Time to Degree.** Since AY 2004-05, the average time to completion for M.A. degrees awarded in Political Science has been 1.9 or 2.0 years, except for one year when it was 2.6 years (see Appendix C). The median time to complete the M.A. has held steady at 1.7-1.9 years from 2005 onward. These figures compare favorably with those for all M.A. degrees awarded in the Social Science division of the College during the same period, figures which show an average of 2.6 years to complete the M.A. (median = 2.0).

Since AY 2004-05, the average time to completion for Ph.D.’s awarded in Political Science has vacillated between 7.5 and 8.9 for the five or fewer students each year receiving the Ph.D. By comparison, time to completion for all Ph.D.’s awarded in the social science division has averaged roughly at or a little over 7.0 years (median = 5.9 – 6.3).

**Degrees awarded.** See Section 1 on Demand.

**Student Research Productivity.** One of our proudest achievements is the increased level of graduate student research productivity over the past decade. It is now very much the norm for graduate students to present papers at professional political science meetings, sometimes as early as their second year in the program. As Appendix I shows, in 2009-2010 alone 20 different papers authored or co-authored by our graduate students (sometimes with faculty and often with other graduate students) were presented at major professional conferences. In addition, Appendix I shows that our graduate students have had success in publishing their work in quality journals, sometimes in collaboration with faculty members and sometimes on their own.

### 3) Program Quality Outcomes

**Satisfaction Surveys.** Results from the 2005 and 2009 graduate student surveys (see Appendix H) conducted by the central administration show that, especially in 2009, responses from our graduate students are very close to the overall College mean on most items. Our graduate students on average rated the quality of graduate teaching by faculty as very good, they rated the quality of academic advising as between good and very good, they are on average somewhere between generally satisfied and very satisfied with the advice they received on how to search for a job, they agree that the overall climate of the program is positive, they rated overall program quality as between good and very good, and they are somewhere between the “maybe” and the “probably” category in response to whether or not they would choose KU if starting their graduate career over. Only on the last of these item has our program been rated by graduate students noticeably less favorably than other programs were rated, and that was only in 2005 – a year when, for reasons that are unclear to us, the number of students surveyed from our program was only 18 (compared with the 32 surveyed in 2009). By 2009, our rating on this item was, like all the other items, very close to the College-wide average.

The graduate student surveys also reveal what graduate students see as the obstacles to
academic progress. In both 2005 and 2009 the most frequently cited obstacle was “work/financial commitments” – re-echoing a theme that has already been pointed to in the section on Financial Support and Recruitment. For about half of our students this is a minor obstacle and for another quarter it is a major obstacle. The roughly three-quarters of our students who see work/financial commitments as an obstacle is noticeably higher than the College-wide mean. In a related vein, family obligations were at least a minor obstacle for a little over half of our students in both 2005 and 2009. Course scheduling is also at least a minor obstacle for about half of our students. Program structure is also a notable obstacle, moreso in 2009 than in 2005, but the availability of faculty is rarely cited as a problem.

**Placement Outcomes.** Table 2 reveals the placement outcomes for those receiving doctorates in Political Science during the review period. It suggests that the products of our doctoral program have found their way into a wide array of academic positions as well as the occasional research or management position. We are particularly pleased that all three of the students defending their dissertations this year found placements at a time when the academic job market was in near-collapse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Will Delehanty</td>
<td>Missouri Southern State University</td>
<td>(US-Theory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Andrea Vieux</td>
<td>University of Houston – Victoria</td>
<td>(US-Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Major Byeonggu Lee</td>
<td>Korea National Defense University</td>
<td>(US-IR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Peter Picucci</td>
<td>Institute for Defense Analysis</td>
<td>(Comp-IR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Omur Yilmaz</td>
<td>Kamer Foundation</td>
<td>(IR-Comp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Justin Tucker</td>
<td>California State, Fullerton</td>
<td>(US-Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Holona Leanne Ochs</td>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>(US-Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Bonnie Johnson</td>
<td>University of Kansas (Urban &amp; Regl Planning)</td>
<td>(US-Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Cheng-Shan Frank Liu</td>
<td>National Sun-Yet San University</td>
<td>(US-Comp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Carly Hayden Foster</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>(US-Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>David Bunch</td>
<td>no placement</td>
<td>(IR-Comp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Jeremy Walling</td>
<td>Southeast Missouri State University</td>
<td>(US-Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Robert Rodriguez</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University – Commerce</td>
<td>(US-Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Taehyon Nam</td>
<td>Salisbury University (Maryland)</td>
<td>(IR-Comp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Mahallely Allen</td>
<td>University of California, Chico</td>
<td>(US-Policy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Awards.** Our graduate students have garnered some highly prestigious awards during the review period. In 2009-2010 Ryan Gibb got support for dissertation fieldwork in Uganda from a US Dept of Education Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) award; Kenneth Aikens received a Summer Research Award from KU’s Graduate School and also received the Baumgartel Peace and Justice Award; Cody Brown was the winner of the 16th annual Roy and Betty Laird Russian and East European Studies Essay Competition; Laura Dean received a Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) award for Summer 2010 to study advanced Russian at St. Petersburg State University as well as a FLAS fellowship to study Intermediate Russian in 2009-10 and an American Latvian Association Scholarship; Kevin Freudenburg received a Tinker Grant for exploratory field research from KU’s Department of Latin American Studies for summer fieldwork in Madrid, Spain. In 2008-09, our graduate students received competitive fellowships including the Truman Good Neighbor Scholarship, FLAS fellowships, and the Tinker Field Research Grant. Baris Kesgin has won the Margaret G. Hermann Award for Best Paper Utilizing Analysis in Leadership Studies for his paper “How Do ‘Secular’ and ‘Religious’ Leaders Shape Foreign Policy Behavior Towards the United States?” presented at the ISA Midwest 2009 meeting.
4. Overall Quality

A. External Indicators of Quality

Several external indicators attest to the high quality overall of KU’s Department of Political Science.

First, KU’s doctoral program is evaluated well in external rankings. In 2009, the latest ranking from the influential U.S. News & World report, KU’s political science department ranked at the 51st position overall. Since there are over 200 Ph.D. programs nation-wide in political science, this places KU’s department in the top quarter of all Ph.D. programs. Moreover, among its peers in public institutions, it is typically ranked in the top 30 as KU’s public affairs website indicates. Other rankings using different methods also convey the strength of the department, as when one analysis in 2006 suggested that KU’s political science department had the 6th most research-productive faculty in political science in the nation.\(^1\)

Second, in addition to the numerous on-campus teaching awards won by our faculty, several have won major awards testifying to their national and international reputations for research, teaching, or both. In 2007, Elaine Sharp received the Norton Long Career Achievement Award given by the Urban Politics section of the American Political Science Association. In that same year Ron Francisco receive the Best Dataset Award given by the Comparative Politics section of the American Political Science Association and Erik Herron received the International Political Science Association’s Website Award. In 2006 Don Haider-Markel won an outstanding teaching award given by the American Political Science Association and its honorary society, and Robert Rohrschneider has been awarded the prestigious Stein Rokkan prize for Comparative Social Science Research given by the European Consortium for Political Research. He was recently awarded a research fellowship with the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies. Many of our faculty members have won individual best-paper awards for articles in visible professional journals or for papers presented at conferences.

Third, several of our current (Sharp, Loomis, Haider-Markel) or recent (Schrodt) members have presided over organized sections of the American Political Science Association or the International Studies Association (Kaarbo).

Fourth, our ability to recruit Prof. Rohrschneider away from Indiana University to be the first occupant of the Sir Robert Worcester Distinguished Professorship in Public Opinion and Survey Research is an externally validated indicator of quality.

Finally, several faculty members have won prestigious fellowships (e.g., Fulbright, National Studies Institutes) or national grants which are awarded after a rigorous peer review during national competition. These rankings and awards suggest that the KU faculty is productive and generates scholarship that is noticed around the country.

\(^{1}\)http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-political-science-schools/rankings

\(^{2}\)http://www.stonybrook.edu/polsci/grad/phdrankings.html
B. Examples of How Program Realizes Mission

Example #1: Teaching Undergraduates about Governance in a World of Diverse Interests - Across the Generations

Professor Cigler has had a long and distinguished career, marked especially by excellence in teaching undergraduate students. That excellence has been recognized by his being named a Chancellors Club Teaching Professor in 1992, a “Chancellors Distinguished Teaching Award” (AMOCO Foundation Award) winner in 1993, a Mortar Board Outstanding Educator award recipient on three occasions, and the recipient of numerous other teaching and advising awards at KU. But now it is being marked in another special way. One of the undergraduates who worked closely with him is J. Mark Hansen, one of the nation’s leading scholars of interest groups in America (not surprisingly, Prof. Cigler’ primary research focus). Hansen, now the Dean of Social Sciences at the University of Chicago, has taken the initiative to launch a fundraising effort to endow the Cigler Fund for Enhancement of the Undergraduate Research Experience at KU. A steering committee of KU alums has reached out to other KU Political Science alums spanning several decades – alums who are now active in government, politics, and academia. Although the initiative was launched at the worst of times (just as the recent economic downturn was on a steep downhill slide), the fund has already achieved the size necessary to begin making awards to undergraduate students who need funding support in order to visit a presidential library or other archive, to do interviews or other fieldwork for an Honor’s thesis, or engage in similar research activities that have enriched the undergraduate experience of so many of our undergraduate majors. Best of all, while this fund is now available to expand our students’ access to such opportunities, we also have a collection of young and mid-career faculty whose teaching excellence and dedicated commitment to working with students rival those of Prof. Cigler. For example Prof. Britton, herself a teaching award winner, included an undergraduate mentee in a fieldwork trip to South Africa and Namibia, thereby providing the student with the opportunity to see first-hand the role of women in developing successful governing institutions in a democratizing nation.

Example #2: Although the department includes many award-winning teachers, it also provides substantial opportunities for students to participate actively in politics and policy making. Through intern programs in Washington, D.C., and Topeka, as well as in many other campaign and government internships, political science students take advantage of myriad opportunities to understand governance from the inside out. Since 1984, well over a thousand majors (and many non-majors) have spent a semester on Capitol Hill or at the White House or with an interest group. Their learning in such environments complements and builds upon their classroom work, and their understanding becomes more nuanced and based in reality.

Upon graduation, many students work in politics or policy-making positions, based in large part upon their intern experiences. Indeed, some internships – such as those with the State Department – provide both an excellent immediate experience and a real potential for a long-term professional career. Other students, while learning a lot from their D.C. experience, come to understand that a political life may not be as appealing as they initially expected. Still, they return to the University and to the state with a much fuller understanding of the political process and their roles as citizens.

Burdett Loomis, who has directed the intern program for more than 25 years, often uses contacts from various research projects to enhance the students’ intern experiences. In turn, his teaching and research have been enhanced by the relationships he has formed with state and national legislators, lobbyists, and other political figures.
C. Overall Assessment of Quality of Academic Programs

Based upon the various considerations outlined in this report, our overall assessment of the quality of academic programming at the present time is between very good and excellent.

It is at the undergraduate level (for both the B.A. and B.G.S. degrees) that we would rate our degree programs as exceptional. We teach a relatively large number of majors and, based on individual course evaluations, teaching awards, student satisfaction surveys, and the other evidence presented here, we consistently provide a very high quality program for them. At the same time, we have a long-standing and continuing presence in the Honors program, a commitment to continued offering of Honors courses, and notable examples of faculty supervision of Honors students and Honors student successes.

At the graduate level, we would rate each of our degree programs (M.A. and Ph.D.) as very good. We provide the only comprehensive Ph.D. in Political Science in the state of Kansas – a program that is typically ranked in the top quartile of doctoral programs in the country and that has been ranked even higher with a ranking that uses a methodology that counts faculty research productivity rather than subjective ratings. By consistently providing high-quality course offerings (albeit not as many specialty courses as we would like), along with meaningful opportunities for teaching and research experiences, and substantial access to the faculty, we are able to prepare a small but steady number of completed doctorates. Our alums primarily find rewarding careers either in teaching-oriented colleges and universities or in governmental or non-profit research organizations. Our M.A. degree provides an important platform and proving ground for eventual acceptance of students into our own doctoral program, as a feeder for students seeking placement in a conventionally top-20 ranked doctoral program, and for students with specialty needs for graduate preparation prior to a career in public affairs.

5. Plans to Advance the Program

A. Enhancing Department Flexibility and Capacity via Cross-Subfield Connections

We are a relatively small department yet one that has always offered comprehensive programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels – i.e., programs involving a teaching and research presence in all the major sub-fields of the discipline. We plan to continue offering such comprehensive programs, even though we realize the tension involved in being both small and comprehensive. However, we are developing some initiatives to deal with that tension and related issues, such as the sometimes uneven student demand across subfields for graduate courses. One initiative emerging from this involves enhanced collaboration across our disciplinary sub-fields. For example, Professor Lynch would in other institutions simply offer a graduate seminar on the U.S. Congress and the executive branch and it would have a suitable number of students; Professor Herron meanwhile has been offering courses that compare political institutions in nation-states other than the U.S. Recognizing that both involve an institutions-focused analysis of domestic politics and that a course combining the two individuals’ interests would usefully serve two pools of graduate student demand, the two individuals have collaborated on the development of a new graduate seminar that does just that. It will be offered for the first time in the spring of 2011.

There are other cross-subfield connections with respect to teaching as well – some further along than others. This coming fall, Professors Kaarbo and Bejarano will team teach our graduate course on Political Psychology. Prof. Kaarbo’s research using psychological approaches to understanding foreign policy in the International Relations sub-field is nicely complemented by Prof. Bejarano’s training in the American politics subfield focusing on identity politics. Again,
by agreeing to team teach, these two faculty members are taking advantage of an intellectual fusion and pooling graduate student demand at the same time. Professors Daley and Britton were participants in the International Seminar for Faculty on Global Health this spring, sponsored by the Office of International Programs. They completed an interdisciplinary literature review and research agenda entitled "Global Health and Governance: Examining the Intersection between HIV/AIDS and Governance." This collaboration promises to be the framework for eventual publications, grant applications, and possibly new course development focusing on the impact of HIV/AIDS on governance capacity, as well as the impact of different governance systems on the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS. Finally, Prof. Doan has used small grant program for “internationalizing the curriculum” to transform her course on reproductive health policy and politics in the U.S. into one that reflects reproductive health issues across the globe.

These cross-subfield connections allow us to pool student demand in ways that would otherwise not be possible as well as taking advantage of intellectual developments in the field that invite the cross-connections and which could result in research collaborations.

B. Building on a Key Department Strength.

As we noted in the mission statement that we submitted to the dean’s office in January of 2007, one of the substantive strengths of our department is the shared thematic core tying together the research specialties of numerous faculty members across various subfields. Specifically, we have a strong core of people who study how mass political attitudes and behavior (voting, protest, local civic engagement) are shaped by political institutions, both in the U.S. and abroad. To further heighten the strength of this thematic core, we have recently had the good fortune to be able to recruit Prof. Rohrschneider as the first holder of the Sir Robert Worcester Distinguished Professorship in Public Opinion and Survey Research.

We plan to build on this multifaceted strength. Building on this strength means that front and center in our succession plans for the American politics subfield and for our recruitment request planning generally must be a focus on those who can contribute to the comparative study of political behavior (voting, protest, interest group mobilization) either through a focus on the U.S. context, advanced industrial democracies, or democratizing areas of the globe.

In a related vein, building on this strength means considering the possibility of developing new courses and possibly special tracks in the graduate curriculum focusing on study of attitudes and political behaviors of the mass public, the associated collection and use of survey data, and special issues involved in public opinion and survey research in either democratizing areas of the globe. Groundwork in this direction has already been laid. Prof. Kennedy has developed and taught a new graduate course on “Conducting and Analyzing Fieldwork in Developing Countries”; and Prof. Daley’s work on Kansas City’s Green Impact Zone (via the Institute for Policy and Social Research) involves cutting-edge methods for data collection in high-poverty neighborhoods.

C. What to Do About the International Relations Field

As noted in earlier sections of this document, the international relations sub-field has experienced several faculty losses in the last few years. At the time that the initial draft of this self-study was being prepared over the summer and then being formally reviewed and discussed by all departmental faculty members in a meeting on August 17, the self-study called for rebuilding the international relations field in the department. Similarly, in response to the dean’s call for recruitment requests last spring, the department chair had articulated as a departmental priority a renewed attempt to hire in the international relations field (along with a request that we
renew our search for a Middle East specialist).

However, immediately after the faculty meeting it became known that senior members of the international relations sub-field had some months previously drafted a formal proposal to the dean to create a Department of International Studies—a department that would initially be staffed with current international relations faculty and later expanded via new faculty lines. (The possibility of faculty lines within CGIS was first broached last year, when the College office authorized a joint search between Political Science and CGIS for a position at the associate professor level with a half-time appointment in each unit; the College office canceled the search prior to candidates being invited onto campus for interviews.) The document proposed that the new department be housed in the Center for Global and International Studies, a unit created last year whose director is one of the senior members of the POLS international relations field. The proposal emphasized that “international studies is a separate area of scholarship” that is “distinct from the traditional social sciences” and it emphasized the multi-disciplinary character of international studies. It also refers to “complaints and misgivings [from POLS faculty] about departmental priorities being too heavily skewed toward international themes at the expense of domestic political questions.” Via the emergence of this proposal, the remainder of the faculty were put on notice that their colleagues in the IR sub-field were not only discontented with life in the POLS department but had also formally gone on record with a preference to split off from the department.

With the final self-study due in the College within three weeks, the department obviously had scant time to digest the situation. However, the Advisory Committee met to craft one or more options that the department should consider. These options, which are outlined below, were presented to the full faculty as part of the finalization of the self-study. They replace a section of text on rebuilding the international relations field in the department that was initially in the self study (see Appendix L).

But we do not believe it appropriate to rush to a conclusion about the matter; and the dean’s office has made clear that they hope that the external review process will provide both them and us with some feedback on the matter. Hence, we have not called for a vote on the options shown below at this point.

The primary options, along with various considerations surrounding them, are as follows.

**Option #1: Support the IR faculty proposal.** Existing IR faculty are, with the support of the POLS faculty, authorized by the dean to split off into a separate Department of International Studies. After a transitional period to accommodate ongoing graduate students pursuing IR as one of their sub-fields, the Political Science Department would either cease having an IR examining field or an IR component in the undergraduate program, or else offer those elements only via affiliate connections with faculty in the new International Studies department. During the period that this option unfolds, the Department of Political Science would not pursue authorization to recruit new international relations faculty members or in other ways give priority to the rebuilding of the IR sub-field within POLS.

**Positive Considerations:**
(a) The IR faculty in this department have a strong sense of the distinctiveness of their sub-field. Among other things, they have articulated the importance of multi-disciplinary linkages relative to disciplinary ones and have as a set developed stronger connections to the International Studies Association than to professional associations in political science. They wish to grow in a direction that diverges from the preferences of many of those in other fields in our department. Despite concerted efforts over a number of years to accommodate this distinctiveness, members of the IR field are still clearly dissatisfied. Differences in views have made it difficult for the department to function optimally, especially when faculty recruitment is at issue. And faculty not in the IR field have less than an optimal working environment because of the conflict being generated. No one wishes to see their IR colleagues unhappily constrained from pursuing what they value
a separate venue appropriate for their vision would empower them to grow an international relations group without having to compromise that vision. Meanwhile, the remainder of the department could focus on building upon its strengths (as, for example, in item B above). Both the IR group and the remainder of the department could be more productive in separate venues.

(b) It is not difficult to imagine many remaining members of the department working with IR colleagues as they pursue their vision and grow into a new International Studies department. Such cooperation may be facilitated by a structural arrangement that removes the necessity for repeated revisiting of differences in vision every time a personnel decision is made.

(c) Even with the subtraction of the IR component, the remainder of the Dept. of Political Science actually features a great deal of inter-disciplinary connectedness, both at KU and in the broader academic world, vis a vis women’s studies/gender studies, environmental studies, urban studies, and every one of the area studies programs at KU, not to mention already emergent affiliate involvements with the Center for Global and International Studies. The departure of the IR group would therefore not compromise the capacity of the remainder of the department to contribute to the university’s international mission and to have a central role in the College through inter-disciplinary connections.

(d) With the departure of the IR component, the remainder of the department is nevertheless very diverse on substantive, theoretical, and methodological grounds. Indeed, the remainder of the department arguably has greater methodological diversity than the IR component, and certainly would have a great deal of substantive diversity, albeit not as comprehensive a set of fields. There would of course be disagreements and debates about various matters. Nevertheless, recent history suggests that the remainder of the department would have more disciplinary coherence than is the case now.

(e) Perhaps most important, there is a strategic planning reality that has to be acknowledged. Now that it is known that the IR group has formally gone on record in favor of splitting from the Department of Political Science, it will be very difficult for many individuals in the remainder of the faculty to be convinced that the POLS department should make international relations hiring and other IR needs a priority. Even if current budgetary circumstances and/or other considerations prevent the current dean from authorizing the proposed Dept. of International Studies, IR faculty committed to the idea of a separate department may find a more positive response in the future with changed budgetary or College leadership circumstances. POLS department efforts and investments in international relations in the intervening period could readily disappear out the door. Meanwhile, there are other non-footloose areas of the department that could have been developed. One could argue that it would be illogical and irresponsible for the POLS department to give a priority to rebuilding the international relations field under these circumstances.

Negative Considerations

(a) As noted elsewhere in this report, the existing Political Science department is relatively small. With the departure of an entire sub-field of 5 colleagues out of our current headcount of 23, we would become even smaller as well as less comprehensive. Additionally, if budgetary or other considerations are such that College commitments of resources to replace them is delayed, a wave of impending retirements focused in the U.S. politics field could very quickly make the department so small as to be a non-contender for national prominence, possibly even non-viable as a major presence on campus.

(b) One might argue that while there are differences in vision that lead current members of the IR field to perceive themselves as distinct from the remainder of the department, those differences are not substantial enough to warrant separation. Rather, they seem more stark only because of personal experiences, discontents, and the like that are
Option 2: An “autonomous” IR sub-field within the Political Science Department. Along the lines of the structure in the Psychology Department, the international relations faculty could remain in the department, but the department would be re-structured to provide authority for the IR sub-field to make its own decisions about personnel, and possibly academic program matters.

Positive Considerations.
   a) At least some of the advantages articulated for a separate Department of International Studies might be realized; this could go a long way toward satisfying the discontents of IR field members.
   b) At the same time, the POLS department would not have to cede one of its traditional fields of study nor become organizationally smaller.
   c) Conflict in the department over IR needs and preferences might be reduced.

Negative Considerations.
   a) Could an autonomous sub-field actually succeed in recruiting new faculty without the active involvement and support of the broader POLS faculty, especially if faculty being recruited would technically be in a Dept. of Political Science?
   b) How could sub-field autonomy extend to promotion and tenure decision-making? If candidates must satisfy not only the standards of their sub-field but also stand up to the scrutiny of the College and University Committees on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, does it make sense that the broader faculty in their own discipline are sequestered as irrelevant to such review?
   c) How could budget requests, including recruitment requests, be formulated by the department chair without invoking conflicts between the autonomous sub-field and the remainder of the department? Would the IR sub-field be given authority to develop its own budget request that would have standing equivalent to that of the department chair’s requests for the remainder of the department?
   d) Given these and other “devil-is-in-the-details” issues surrounding the concept of an autonomous IR subfield, it is possible that conflict in the department over IR needs and preferences would be exacerbated rather than reduced.
   e) One argument noted for Option #2 is that the discontents of the IR subfield are not substantial enough on intellectual grounds to warrant separation and instead stem in large part from personal experiences and discontents. Just as this can be argued to be insufficient grounds for creation of a separate department, it also can be an argument of insufficient grounds for the lesser realignment of a sub-field autonomy structure.

Option #3: Keep IR within political science but hire 1-2 quantitative IR scholars.

Positive Considerations:
   a) Given the high profile that former KU Professor Phil Schrodt enjoys within IR, the discipline will see that KU is committed to the IR field if our rebuilding features someone with his specialty and approach.
   b) Many in the department outside of the IR field would find this investment to be an excellent use of resources.
   c) None of the above-mentioned costs regarding the department’s reputation, organization, and credibility would arise.

Negative Considerations:
   a) Some faculty members in the department, including the IR subfield, may oppose a hire of a scholar with this profile.
Option #4. Status Quo with a Pledge to Do Better. The last option is essentially the status quo, in that it entails no organizational reconfigurations. The IR field would remain within the department and work to rebuild the sub-field within a shared departmental and disciplinary context. The IR sub-field would be expected to identify some points of compromise that would allay their concerns without forcing a vision of a rebuilt IR field that does not mesh well with the views of others in the department. The remainder of the department would be expected to identify accommodations that can be made to sustain the cooperative and constructive involvement of international relations faculty in the department, given (a) the sub-field’s distinctiveness on methodological and other grounds and (b) the many opportunities (and pressures) for faculty in this sub-field to contribute to units and agendas beyond the department’s.

Positive Considerations.
  a) Avoids the costs and risks of organizational reconfiguration, including the risks associated with shrinking the size of the POLS department.
  b) Possibly the direction or vision that the IR sub-field has for its future is not perfect and could be improved or tempered through a process that involves responsiveness to the views of the remainder of the department.

Negative Considerations.
  a) As with any essentially status quo option, this one holds the real potential that problems would not be resolved and discontents/conflict would continue, to the detriment of both the IR field and the remainder of the department.
6. Where We Want To Be in the Near Future

Rankings suggest that the KU’s department of political science is usually placed in the top quartile of all Ph.D. programs in political science in the U.S. As noted earlier, the *U.S. News & World Report* 2009 ranking places KU’s political science department at 51. Another study based on journal articles published between 1998 and 2002 ranks KU’s department 64th in productivity.\(^3\) This is the most comprehensive recent study based on the actual number of articles published by a departmental faculty and thus one good indication of what we do and how well we do it. Results for a set of peer political science departments are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hix Ranking</th>
<th>Number of Faculty Listed on Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would like to improve our ranking because we are not satisfied with our current position. However, the table reflects what more systematic analyses clearly show – that on average, a critical component of departmental ranking and reputation is faculty size. This is not a perfect correlation; but, in addition to faculty citation record and how well graduate students do, faculty size is an important factor in driving departmental reputation.

Meeting this goal of an improved ranking requires (at an absolute minimum) that we be able to replenish the American politics field as the wave of impending retirements engulfs it. It also requires an appropriate resolution of the international relations sub-field issue that is laid out in Item 5.C. above. If these two items are not realized, we are in jeopardy of sliding backwards in the rankings rather than moving forward in our aspirations.

In addition, although there has been a tendency in recent years for searches to be defined quite narrowly (i.e., specifying very particular research specialties within a broad sub-field of the discipline) it will be greatly to our advantage if future searches are broader so that high-performing prospects are not weeded out because they do not fit a pre-judged niche in their broad area of expertise.

We realize that we are articulating investment needs for the department at a time of very constrained resources College-wide; but the undeniable reality is that our department is already on the small side by national standards. This document reveals in a number of ways that our small department is very productive; we get a lot of mileage out of our comparatively small-sized staff. However, maintaining our position – let alone improving it – will require some planned investments in personnel.


\(^4\) These rankings exclude non-U.S. institutions.