

## **2019 Political Science Program Review**

# Program Review Guidebook for Academic Departments 2018-2019

## Political Science

### INTRODUCTION

Reviews begin with an introduction that provides a context for the review. In contrast to the rest of the self-study report, this portion is primarily descriptive and should include:

#### 1. INTERNAL CONTEXT

This begins with an overview of the program describing (as appropriate).

- a. where the program is situated (school/division),
- b. degrees granted, concentrations available, programs offered
- c. where is the program located (campus location)
- d. Provide a brief history of the program
- e. Describe the changes made to the program since the last review.

The Political Science program at Pepperdine University is part of the Social Science Division within Seaver College. The program offers a major in Political Science leading to the Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree. There are no concentrations offered within the Political Science major. A number of courses offered by Political Science faculty, particularly in the sub-disciplines of comparative politics and international relations, are included in the interdisciplinary International Studies major. Conversely, some courses taught by International Studies faculty are cross-listed with Political Science.

The Political Science faculty are housed with other Social Science Division faculty in the Appleby Center, an academic building adjacent to Mullin Town Square—the center of the undergraduate campus—and a short walk to Payson Library and the Tyler Campus Center. Most Political Science classes are in the same building, but the program also uses a classroom in the Black Family Plaza Building and, for large sections of *American People and Politics* (POSC 104), Elkins Auditorium.

Since the establishment of a Washington, D.C. program in 1992, the Political Science program has encouraged students to spend a semester or a summer term studying and interning in the nation's capital. This program moved to a permanent facility, owned by the University and located at 2011 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, in 2007. Some Political Science courses are also taught in various Pepperdine-owned and –operated programs abroad, including Buenos Aires, Florence, Heidelberg, Lausanne, London, and Shanghai.

#### History

At its founding in 1937, George Pepperdine College offered a major in Social Sciences, which required a course focused on the U.S. Constitution. Two years later, the Social Science Department had grown from one to three faculty members and was offering a “major interest” in Political Science. There were two lower-division courses offered—*American Government* and *Comparative Government*—and one upper-division course—*International Relations*.

A major in Political Science was first offered in 1949. It required 36 units of coursework in the major, including at least 24 upper-division units. Lower-division courses included *American Government*, *Comparative Government*, *Law in Civilization*, and *World Affairs Forum*. Upper-division courses included *Modern Technics of Human Relationships* (a survey of the principles of communication), *State and Local Governments*, *International Relations*, *Public Opinion and News Analysis*, *Development and Status of the American Labor Movement*, *American Political Parties*, *Constitutional History of the US*, *Diplomatic History of the US*, *Principles and Problems of Public Administration*, *Modern and Contemporary Political Thought*, *Seminar on Civil Liberties*, and *Readings and Research in Political Science*. Dr. Kenneth W. Grisingher, a Ph.D. graduate of Claremont Graduate School who arrived in 1950, was the first faculty member listed in the Pepperdine College catalog as a professor of political science (as opposed to social science).

In 1966, the Pepperdine Research Institute was established as a think tank designed to compete for government contracts related to international affairs generally and nuclear strategy more specifically. In its first year of operation, the independent institute directed by Jerry E. Pournelle brought in \$100,000 in grants, 80 percent of which were attributable to a single Air Force contract. Pournelle, in 1949, had envisioned a space-based weapons system that some would later call "Rods from God." Pournelle, in the 1970s, would go on to write science fiction. Two of his books co-authored with Larry Niven reached the *New York Times* bestseller list.

The modern era of Political Science at Pepperdine may be said to have begun in September 1972 when classes were first held on the Malibu campus. Under pressure created by unfavorable accreditation reviews in 1970 and 1974 and a low ranking by *College Rater* in 1973 (443rd out of 470 private colleges and universities), Pepperdine attempted to enhance its academic reputation by luring better faculty members to the new campus. In Political Science, these included Stephen McHargue (1971), Stanley Moore (1973), and Dan Caldwell (1978). Another important hire occurred in 1987 when Stephen V. Monsma, a professor at Calvin College and a former member of the Michigan legislature, came to Pepperdine. Monsma served a term as chair of the Social Science Division before returning to Calvin in 2004.

The current faculty began to take shape in 1992 with the addition of Chris Soper and Robert Williams. Joel Fetzer arrived with a visiting appointment in 1996 and then returned on a tenure-track appointment in 2001. Brian Newman and Candice Ortvals both arrived in 2004. In 2013, following several hires (Jeanne Heffernan, Brian McGraw, and Nate Klemp) that had brought promising political theorists who stayed briefly before moving on to other universities, Jason Blakely arrived to solidify the left side of the infield (so to speak). Dan Caldwell, of course, has been at Pepperdine continuously since 1978, except for a two-year stint in the early 1980s at Brown University.

Each member of the Political Science faculty is tenured. Three (Caldwell, Soper, and Fetzer) have achieved the rank of distinguished professor. Three (Williams, Ortvals, and Newman) are full professors. Blakely is an associate professor.

### **Development of the Curriculum**

The curriculum of the Political Science program has always been structured around the subfields of political science. Currently, the subfields of political science are understood to be American Government and Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, and Methodology.

The major has few formal prerequisites and, in comparison with other majors at Pepperdine, a small number of required courses. Political Science majors must complete a four-unit introductory

course on American politics (POSC 104), but this course also serves as a required general education course for all undergraduates. Students wanting to take upper-level international relations courses must take an introductory course (POSC 344). Otherwise, students take upper-level courses in the order that they choose. Thirty-two upper-division units (eight courses) are required. (See Appendix 1: Political Science Major Program Requirement.)

The political science major is structured to insure that the students are broadly trained and become well acquainted with the different areas of study associated with politics. Therefore, majors in political science must take at least one course in four out of the five distinct subfields noted above.

The understanding of subfields in the program's curriculum has changed over time. Whereas five subfields are represented today, the program in the 1970s included seven subfields: Political Theory, Political Dynamics, American Politics, International Relations, Comparative Politics, Public Administration and Local Government, and Public Law. In the 1970s and 1980s, students were required to take courses in four of these seven subfields. Political Dynamics as a subfield was dropped following the 1987-88 academic year; during the same year, the subfield of Public Administration and Local Government was renamed Public Administration and Public Policy. However, this subfield was no longer in the academic catalog following the 1994-95 academic year.

In addition to being structured by the Political Science subfields, the political science curriculum has been shaped by (1) global and national events and (2) faculty expertise. First, the end of the Cold War changed the way that faculty design and teach comparative politics courses. During the Cold War, comparative politics offerings included courses regarding the first world, third world, and the communist world (second world). Following the Cold War, these courses morphed into courses titled *Comparative European Politics*, *Government and Politics of Developing Areas*, and *Communist and Post-Communist States*. The Political Science faculty agreed to drop the latter from the academic catalog as of 2012, with the agreement that post-communist politics will be discussed in the program's *Comparative European Politics* course. (This change also reflects global events, given that several post-communists states in Europe are now members of the European Union). Arguably, other courses taught at Pepperdine, such as *Immigration Politics and Ethnic Relations* (POSC 455), represent the faculty's effort to address salient issues in American and world politics.

Second, courses have been developed (and dropped) based on faculty expertise. For example, upon joining the faculty in 2004, Candice Orbals developed a course called *The Politics of Revolution and Protest* (POSC 451) that draws from her expertise in social movement research. Similarly, Joel Fetzer has developed *Modern Asian Political Philosophy* (POSC 461) that corresponds to one of his research interests.

In addition to options (noted above) to study in one or more of Pepperdine's International Programs, students have the opportunity to earn academic credit toward their major in internships (supervised fieldwork) related to local, state, federal or international politics. Many Political Science majors spend a semester interning in Pepperdine's Washington, DC program.

An important part of the Political Science program's curriculum is the Political Science Honors Program, which was formalized in the 2008-2009 academic catalog. The Honors Program "is aimed at providing students with insight into how professional political scientists design research projects, collect and analyze data or interpret philosophical texts." The goal of the program is to produce a research product that can be presented at an academic conference and/or published in an academic venue. The Honors Program is considered a High-Impact Practice (HIP). (See the section below labeled "High Impact Practices.")

Overall, there have been few curricular changes since the last program review in 2013. The structure of the major, the number of units required, the distribution requirement among the subfields, and the presence of the Honors Program are all just as they were in 2013. Certain questions that were raised then—Should there be optional “tracks” within the major? Should more units be required? Should there be more required courses in the major?—remain on the table today.

## **2. THE EXTERNAL CONTEXT**

**This should explain how the program responds to the needs of the area in which it serves: this can include the community, region, field, or discipline.**

### **The External Context**

At Pepperdine, Political Science is both an integral part of an intensive general-education program befitting a liberal arts college and one of the largest undergraduate majors. For almost twenty years (since the last major revision of the GE curriculum), *American People and Politics* (POSC 104) has been a required course for all students at Seaver College. But while the GE curriculum compels all students to take a single Political Science course, the major draws roughly 30 to 40 per year for a variety of reasons, beginning with its connection to their career aspirations. It is, in fact, in the career choices of our majors that the Political Science program at Pepperdine has some of its most significant impacts on the external environment.

### **The Law School Pipeline**

Political science is, by far, the most common major for students applying to and entering law school in the United States. In the 2016-2017 application cycle, there were 12,046 political science majors who applied to law school. (The next largest major category, after “Other,” was psychology with 3,669 applicants.) In that same cycle, 80.5 percent of political science majors who applied to law school were admitted and 70.5 percent actually enrolled.

**[https://www.lsac.org/sites/default/files/media/2016-17\\_applicants-major.pdf](https://www.lsac.org/sites/default/files/media/2016-17_applicants-major.pdf)**

The years following the economic recession of 2008-2009 saw a precipitous decline in the number of lawyers being hired in all sectors. With a slight lag, this impacted law school admissions and, in turn, the number of political science majors nationwide. After a significant period of retrenchment for law schools, a different picture is emerging—one with salutary effects for political science programs everywhere.

After peaking at 171,514 in the 2009-2010 testing year, the number of LSATs administered steadily declined to a low of 101,689 in the 2014-2015 testing year (shortly after our last program review). Since then, however, interest in law school (as indicated by the number of LSATs administered) has been rebounding. The most recent year for which data are available, 2017-2018, saw an 18.1 percent increase over the prior year to 129,165 LSATs.

**<https://www.lsac.org/data-research/data/lsat-trends-total-lsats-administered-admin-year>**

The ABA reports that the first-year class at all U.S. law schools was at 38,390 in 2018, an increase of 2.87 percent over 2017. While the draw of law school may never be as powerful as it was a generation ago, the law school pipeline for political science majors appears much stronger than it was at the time of our last program review. This may be a significant factor in a nationwide

rebound for political science enrollments: According to the APSA, almost 40 percent of political science departments reported a *slight* increase in enrollments from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 while 10 percent of departments reported a *significant* increase in enrollments in the same period.

[https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal\\_education/resources/statistics/](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/statistics/)

### **Other Careers**

Besides a career in law, political science majors also pursue graduate studies in a variety of fields (including political science, public policy, and international relations, among others) or move straight into jobs in a variety of fields. The American Political Science Association states, "A bachelor's degree in political science can lead to exciting careers in federal, state and local governments; law; business; international organizations; nonprofit associations and organizations; campaign management and polling; journalism; precollegiate education; electoral politics; research and university and college teaching. Political science majors gain analytical skills, administrative competence and communication abilities that are valued in a wide spectrum of potential career areas."

The Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, in its 2015 publication *What's It Worth? The Economic Value of College Majors*, notes that political science majors with a bachelor's degree have a median annual income of \$64,000; those with a graduate degree have a median annual income of \$96,000. In the social sciences, only economics majors have higher incomes on average.

Of course, salaries are a poor proxy for impact on the world. Graduates of Pepperdine's Political Science program are at work in a wide variety of fields: non-profit organizations, education, government service (including diplomacy and the military), campaigns and elections, journalism (print, television, and new media), law, and business. One of our graduates surfed professionally. (We claim no direct contribution to that career choice.)

The program's impact on the discipline can be discerned in a steady stream of scholarship presented and published by the faculty, consistent service to journals and book publishers as manuscript reviewers, service to professional associations and to the Council on Foreign Relations, and, on occasion, to the work of organizing conferences. Some of our faculty have successfully translated scholarly work into articles (on *The Atlantic* online and the *Washington Post's* Monkey Cage blog) and public lectures.

## OUTCOMES & MAPPING

Identifier	Description
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPOLISCI-1	Demonstrate knowledge and analytical proficiency across the political science subfields.
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPOLISCI-2	Use writing skills to communicate theoretical perspectives, findings, and interpretations of political issues.
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPOLISCI-3	Apply theoretical perspectives and research methods to generate positions about contemporary political issues and/or explanations of political phenomena.
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPOLISCI-4	Utilize critical thinking skills to assess political ideas and events.
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPOLISCI-5	Identify opportunities for civic engagement and participation in political processes.
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPOLISCI-6	Integrate political knowledge with faith, ethnic, race, and/or gender identities.

Please attach your Curriculum Map, PLO to ILO map, PLO to Core Competency map, and 5 Year Assessment Plan.

Attachment

[Political Science Assessment Maps.pdf](#)

## MISSION

### MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

#### 3. MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

A key component in providing the context for the review is a description of the program's mission, purpose, goals, and outcomes.

- a. Mission - This should be a general explanation of why the program exists, what it hopes to achieve in the future, and the program's essential nature, its values, and its work.
- b. Goals are general statements of what the program wants to achieve.
- c. Outcomes are the specific results that should be observed if the goals are being met.

The program's purpose, goals, and outcomes should relate to and align with the mission and goals of the college and of the University.

## A. Mission

The political science program at Seaver College reflects the University's commitment to the fearless pursuit of truth in every discipline through an in-depth understanding of the political world, rooted in careful analysis and critical thinking. As part of a Christian liberal arts college, the program has a unique opportunity to engage the latest scholarship in political science in a space where questions can be posed about its relationship to the Christian tradition. Where other institutions of higher learning might not always have a shared ethical source for dialogue, the political science program hopes to wrestle critically with the world of politics and the Christian commandment to love one's neighbor as oneself. This allows the department to prepare students for very different vocations, including practical political life (for example, public service, law, administration, and diplomacy) as well as further inquiry into understanding politics (for example, graduate school, academia, and journalistic research). Pepperdine's political science program hopes to combine the very highest standards in academic scholarship with an integral vision of Christian service.

## B. Goals

1. Educate students on how to critically think about politics in light of the state of the art in scholarship across the various subfields.
2. Educate students on how to write, speak, and present on politics by employing the latest available methods, concepts, models, histories, theories, and frameworks.
3. Propose a uniquely Christian way of approaching political life—one that offers love of neighbor and a special concern for the poor and marginalized as part of a more integral comprehension of the world.

## C. Program Learning Outcomes

1. Demonstrate knowledge and analytical proficiency across the political science subfields.
2. Use writing skills to communicate theoretical perspectives, findings, and interpretations of political issues.
3. Apply theoretical perspectives and research methods to generate positions about contemporary political issues and/or explanations of political phenomena.
4. Utilize critical thinking skills to assess political ideas and events.
5. Identify opportunities for civic engagement and participation in political processes.
6. Integrate political knowledge with faith, ethnic, race, and/or gender identities.

## ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Meaning

### Meaning

#### Analysis of Direct Student Learning: Meaning Quality and Integrity

**The university is required to define and ensure a distinctive and coherent educational experience for each of its degree programs. The findings from the program assessment and analysis process should explain how effectively courses, curricula, the co-curriculum, and other experiences are structured, sequenced, and delivered so that students achieve learning outcomes at the expected levels of performance in core competencies in their majors or fields of specialization, in general education, and in areas distinctive to the**

**institution. It means ensuring alignment among all these elements, and maintaining an assessment infrastructure that enables the institution to diagnose problems and make improvements when needed. Direct student learning, an examination of how well students are meeting the program learning outcomes, should come from the past four years of annual assessments.**

**(2013 WSCUC Accreditation Handbook.)**

**Meaning of the Degree: Describe how the program ensures a holistic experience by answering the following questions about the coherence and alignment within the program:**

**4. What are the learning outcomes and how does the degree support the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes? How does the degree embody the distinct values, basic commitment, and traditions of the institution?**

### **Political Science Learning Outcomes (PLOs)**

A student who graduates with a major in Political Science should be able to:

- **PLO #1** Demonstrate knowledge and analytical proficiency across the political science subfields.
- **PLO #2** Use writing skills to communicate theoretical perspectives, findings, and interpretations of political issues.
- **PLO #3** Apply theoretical perspectives and research methods to generate positions about contemporary political issues and/or explanations of political phenomena.
- **PLO #4** Utilize critical thinking skills to assess political ideas and events.
- **PLO #5** Identify opportunities for civic engagement and participation in political processes.
- **PLO #6** Integrate political knowledge with faith, ethnic, race, and/or gender identities.

### **Support for University Mission**

The university's mission: "Pepperdine is a Christian university committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership."

The political science major supports the mission in several significant ways. Ours is a Christian university. The political science faculty personally hold this mission in the highest regard. Each of the full-time faculty regularly attend local churches and engage in various leadership and service opportunities (e.g., serving as deacons, small group leaders, children's teaching volunteers, and committee members). Several courses in the major directly emphasize the connections between the university's Christian commitments and the political realm (e.g., we offer courses in Christian Political Thought, Religion and Politics in Comparative Perspective, Ethics and International Politics) and virtually all of our courses include discussions of the significance of faith in the course's topic area (e.g., in American People and Politics, students discuss the moral and ethical dimensions of major issues in American politics, in The Legislative Process, students engage questions of how Christianity affects the ways people vote in elections and how members of Congress act in the halls of power, in Religion and Politics students consider their own understanding for how faith should inform political decisions). It is important to note that we do not force students to adopt Christianity. Rather, we aim to help students wrestle with their own faith

(or lack of faith) and its implications for their own political activity along with the implications of their faith for political institutions and systems.

We strive to hold students to the highest standards of academic excellence, relying on rubrics to clarify our own expectations and to hold students to the high standards of the PLOs. By the time they graduate, our majors have read and discussed many nuanced arguments, written several research papers, crafted a number of analyses and memos, participated in in-class debates, and delivered presentations. By connecting our demands for academic rigor to the university's Christian mission, we aim to strengthen students for lives of purpose, service, and leadership.

### Support for Institutional Learning Outcomes

- **ILO1:** Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity. PLOs 1, 2, and 6 align such that gaining knowledge about and the ability to analyze political phenomena, along with the ability to convey this knowledge and analysis clearly in writing supports the objective of thinking critically and creatively and communicating clearly. PLO 6's emphasis on connecting that knowledge and analysis to students' faith connects to acting with integrity.
- **ILO2:** Demonstrate value-centered leadership. PLOs 5 and 6 most clearly align. PLO 5 relates to identifying opportunities to exercise leadership, while PLO 6 focuses on integrating that leadership with faith.
- **ILO3:** Demonstrate global awareness. PLOs 1, 3, and 4 each align. Two of the five subfields in the major directly deal with global awareness (international relations and comparative politics). As such, the knowledge and analysis across the political science subfields referenced in PLO 1 explicitly means enhancing global awareness. PLO 3 means that global awareness is developed in a systematic way through theoretical perspectives and research methods. Students don't just learn a set of discrete facts that are true today but are destined to change in the dynamic global political environment. Instead, students learn how to think about new developments in systematic and theoretically-grounded ways. PLO 4 relates in a similar way—rather than just learning facts about other countries, the major's emphasis on critical thinking promotes global awareness, not just global facts.
- **ILO4:** Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery. PLOs 1 and 3 align in straightforward ways. PLO 1 speaks to intellectual proficiency in the discipline. PLO 3's focus on research methods relates to the process of academic discovery.
- **ILO5:** Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice. PLOs 5 and 6 align. Civic engagement is the most obvious form of practice stemming from the political science major. Practicing political analysis and engagement flowing from an understanding of politics informed by faith (PLO 6) connects directly to this ILO.
- **ILO6:** Understand and value diversity. PLO 3 and 6 align. Much of what students learn in our classes relates to how governments and societies deal with diversity. The contemporary issues and political phenomena (PLO3) our courses examine (e.g., protests and revolution, international efforts to minimize human trafficking and nuclear proliferation, current ideological conflict in U.S. politics) are often the direct consequence of diversity (e.g., of ethnic/racial, religious, and economic backgrounds, of national interests). Our efforts to encourage students to integrate their learning and their faith, ethnic, racial, and/or gender identities (PLO6) also directly relate to understanding and valuing diversity.
- **ILO7:** Apply knowledge to real-world challenges. PLOs 3 and 4 directly align—in fact they basically restate ILO7. We seek to encourage students to use social science theory, research methods, and critical thinking to understand and engage with real-world challenges.

- **ILO8:** Incorporate faith into service to others. PLOs 5 and 6 align. PLO 5 relates to identifying areas of political engagement and PLO 6 to integrating faith into this engagement. Given the Christian faith's emphasis on loving one's neighbor as one's self, a faithful Christian political engagement will certainly mean serving others.
- **ILO9:** Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement. PLO 5, identifying opportunities for civic engagement basically restates this ILO.

### **Support for Distinct Values, Basic Commitment, and Traditions of the Institution**

To sum up the discussion of the university's Christian mission and institutional learning outcomes, the political science major's PLOs emphasize seeking the highest standards of academic excellence (e.g., using the best theoretical perspectives, research methods, and critical thinking to craft clearly written arguments) with the goal of engaging in the public square in a Christ-honoring way (i.e., by seeking the good of our neighbors in all their uniqueness and diversity).

### **5. Is there a coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities? Does the degree offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular major or program? Please explain.**

The political science major is somewhat unique in this regard. In contrast to many majors, where there is a natural and necessary sequence of learning (e.g., one must master calculus 1 before moving to calculus 2), in political science there is less sequencing. There is no clear rationale for taking a class on Congress before taking a class on the presidency (or vice versa). Nor is there a clear reason for taking Latin American Politics before taking Christian Political Thought.

That is not to say there is no sequencing. The general education requirement (POSC 104: American People and Politics) is a prerequisite for many of the upper division political science courses. We offer a set of 300 level courses, each more or less intended to serve as introductions to the fields of political science. POSC 353 (European Politics) serves as the introduction to the field of comparative politics, POSC 344 (International Relations) for the field of international relations, and POSC 311 (Foundations of Political Theory) for the field of political theory. In some cases, these 300 level courses are prerequisites for 400-level courses in those fields (this is the case for POSC 446 International Organizations and Law, POSC 448 Arms Control and International Security, and POSC 449 Ethics and International Politics), but not in all cases.

We have done some assessment work trying to gauge whether the major requirements should require more sequencing. The faculty have discussed options among ourselves. We have also engaged this question with students and alumni in focus groups and informal conversations. These conversations, regardless of who is participating in them, almost always point out the downsides of relatively few sequencing requirements (e.g., some upper division courses that do not have many prerequisites enroll students with varying degrees of background information and analytical skills; the lack of sequencing can make it feel to students that the major has little structure) and then the benefits of the minimal sequencing, which include logistical/convenience benefits to students (it's easy to double major and/or study abroad because the requirements are relatively flexible), logistical benefits for staffing (since students could take several different courses in a given semester instead of being forced to take a specific course, the number of students in each course can be more consistent across courses), and substantive benefits (students often report it was great to be able to take 3 courses in subfield X, which helped me really understand a particular field). In short, we have discussed the possibility of requiring more sequencing and have never been convinced that doing so would provide net benefits to students. As noted below, our peer institutions do not require much sequencing and the American Political

Science Association offers no best practices, requirements, or even suggestions for sequencing courses within the major.

The questions about depth and breadth are easier to answer. The American Political Science Association provides no guidance as to what courses should be required for a political science major. The discipline is broad and its practitioners have not imposed a set of substantive requirements. For example, the APSA does not say a school cannot possibly have a political science major that doesn't require a course on Russian politics or continental political philosophy, or Constitutional law, etc.

What we have done is keep watch on what other programs are requiring. We have surveyed peer and aspirational schools' major requirements periodically (during our last program review, for this program review, and once in the interim). See below for more.

We offer sufficient breadth of courses to meet the demands of the major requirements. Students have several options of political science courses to take each semester. Virtually every semester since our last program review we offered courses in each of the five subfields and typically multiple courses in each subfield.

**6. How current is the program curriculum? How has the curriculum changed (if at all) over the last five years including the reasons for the change (e.g., the result of a learning outcome assessment) and evidence used as a basis for change?**

The major requirements have not changed during the past five years, though our course offerings and the contents of specific courses have changed. Based on our previous program review, the full-time faculty have engaged in several conversations about whether the requirements should be adjusted. Two of our actions stemming from that report relate to such discussions. First, we discussed requiring a research design and/or statistics course. Second, we discussed requiring introductory courses in three of our subfields (Western European politics, international relations, and foundations of political theory, each of which is a 300 level course) before students can take 400 level courses in these fields.

In our formal and informal discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of changing the curriculum, we reached the conclusion that a change is not obviously better than the status quo. We base these judgments on various assessment data, including focus groups with current students, focus groups with alumni, and comparisons of our curriculum to those of our peer and aspirational institutions. Student feedback we receive is generally quite positive about the major requirements as they stand currently.

In terms of requiring a research methods or statistics class, our assessment data from students has shown us that some students are attracted to the major because it required no math beyond the general education requirement, while others appreciate that the general education math requirement can be fulfilled within the major (by taking POSC 250 Introduction to Statistics). As a faculty, we have so far determined that the major does not require a basic understanding of statistics. Many of the major arguments and theories in several fields do not rely on statistical or other quantitative evidence. For example, virtually all of our political theory courses, and much of the content covered in international relations courses does not include quantitative or statistical evidence. As is common in undergraduate political science education, faculty in fields that employ quantitative evidence tend to assign readings that explain the evidence in terms any intelligent undergraduate could understand (our faculty regularly monitor syllabi from various courses that faculty at other institutions post on their websites and a collection of syllabi hosted on the American Political Science Association's website). In short, we do not see from our assessment

data a significant student demand for this change or a significant need to make the change from a curricular standpoint. As we detail below, our major requirements are in line with the requirements at our peer institutions.

When we raise the possibility of requiring the 300-level courses before students can take the 400-level courses, student focus groups typically outline the advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of the change would be the potential for a more structured major where students are systematically introduced to important concepts and theories in 300-level courses. In addition, adding more structure may introduce a bit more of a cohort feel as more students would take multiple classes with each other. Though we should note that the potential for cohort feel is fairly strongly limited by the flexibility of the major requirements, which mean students can take any number of 400-level courses in any sequence. Consequently, we do not anticipate that requiring 300-level courses would dramatically increase the number of students who take multiple courses together.

The disadvantages to the change largely relate to the proposed requirement's limiting the flexibility of taking courses that fit with schedules. The current flexibility allows us to attract majors because they can add a political science major to another major and students can participate in international programs without falling behind on their political science major requirements. If we require more sequencing, some students, especially those who think about the political science major in their second year or later, may not be able to complete the requirements in four years. In addition to scheduling flexibility, students appreciate the intellectual freedom to explore topics of great interest. As currently written, the major requirements only stipulate that students have to take at least one course from four of the five subfields. Several students mentioned that, in seeking to fulfill this distribution requirement, they were excited to take a more specialized course (e.g., Latin American Politics or Christian Political Thought) and were less interested in the 300-level course in that subfield. One specific disadvantage to requiring the 300-level Western European Politics course before students can take the 400-level courses is that the 400-level courses include courses that emphasize diversity and inclusion (e.g., East Asian Politics, Latin American Politics) while the 300-level course is Western European Politics. Thus, a student who wanted to take additional coursework in another field and only planned to take one comparative politics course would be forced to take Western European Politics. Based on student feedback, we fear that a more generic "Introduction to Comparative Politics" course would be relatively unattractive.

Based on our own expertise in the areas in which we teach, the content and skills we convey in each course, and student feedback, we have so far concluded that the benefits of requiring 300-level courses before students can take 400-level courses do not outweigh the costs of making the change. It is important to note that some 400-level courses require the 300-level course in their field as a prerequisite. It is also important to know that the faculty have examined each 400-level course that does not have a 300-level prerequisite and determined that a student could enroll in the 400-level course and not be at a disadvantage in that course for not having taken a 300-level course in the subfield. This is largely because the knowledge base in undergraduate political science tends to be quite broad.

Despite our current decisions not to change the major requirements, we continue to discuss the requirements and debate the possibilities of change. These conversations will remain ongoing.

As noted above, while the major requirements have not changed, we have engaged in a dynamic and invigorating reappraisal of our course offerings and the content of existing courses. The primary drivers of this process have been our previous program review (especially suggestions from our external reviewer), the student body's increasing interest in the politics of diversity and inclusion, and the rapidly changing real world of politics.

Our previous program review suggested that “research, writing, presentation, and debate should become common elements in each of these courses.” While most of our courses already included these elements, the external reviewer suggested that we might emphasize the major’s writing and research training. As part of our ongoing assessment, Joel Fetzer collected data on each course’s research and writing requirements. Each faculty member has also reevaluated each course’s requirements and now each 400-level course includes significant writing and research.

Our courses and course offerings have expanded the major’s attention to diversity and inclusion. Faculty members have developed new courses (Native American Politics, East Asian Political Thought) and added significantly to existing courses. For example, Chris Soper developed a module on the interplay of politics and Jewish identity to his Religion and Politics course, and Brian Newman updated each of his course syllabi to include more diverse voices (e.g., he added 16 new readings to the GE American People and Politics course that speak to some angle of politics from various racial/ethnic, gender, economic, and religious identities). Each of the faculty have done similar things in their courses, though we will not detail each of them.

If you asked us during our last program review if 1) same-sex marriage would be legal everywhere in the U.S., 2) the UK would leave the EU, 3) a radical group of Islamists named ISIS would take control of large swaths of territory in Syria and Iraq, and 4) Donald Trump would be president, we would not have been excellent prognosticators. Our courses are flexible enough to incorporate these massive changes. For example, change 1 is treated in the American People and Politics course, change 2 in Western European Politics, change 3 in various courses (e.g., International Relations, American Foreign Policy, Arms Control, Politics of Protest and Revolution), and change 4 in various courses (e.g., American People and Politics, The Presidency, and frankly I’d be surprised if any course we offer totally excludes a significant discussion of the Trump presidency).

In short, our major remains dynamic, fresh, and current, even though our major requirements have not changed. We will continue to innovate in our existing courses and discuss the possibility of developing new courses and reform the major requirements.

**7. Please present a curriculum comparison with at least three peer institutions and with national disciplinary or professional standards if available.**

We compared our major requirements to those of eleven peer institutions: 1) Baylor University, 2) Calvin College, 3) Loyola Marymount University, 4) Macalester College, 5) Occidental College, 6) Santa Clara University, 7) Southern Methodist University, 8) St. Olaf College, 9) University of San Diego, 10) Valparaiso College, and 11) Wheaton College.

In general, we found some variation in major requirements over these 11 institutions and that our requirements fit nicely within this variation. In particular, none of the institutions require much sequencing (similar to our requirements). Most have distribution requirements across the discipline’s major subfields (similar to our requirements), though the particulars of these requirements vary a bit (e.g., some require students to take at least one course in 4 of 5 subfields like we do, others require taking either a course in comparative or international relations).

We were especially interested in several specific questions.

1. How many institutions require a methods and/or statistics course? By the letter of the catalog, our major does not. However, in practice, the GE’s RM/PS requirement means most students take either POSC 310 Introduction to Research Methodology or POSC 250 Introduction to Statistics as the only other POSC course designated to fulfill the RM/PS

requirement is POSC 460 Public Opinion and Voting. 7 of the 11 peer institutions require either a methods course or a statistics course (5 require a methods course, 1 requires a statistics course, and 1 requires one or the other of these courses).

2. How many institutions require introductory courses in subfields (e.g., introduction to comparative politics, introduction to international relations, introduction to political philosophy). We currently encourage but do not require 300-level courses in these fields before taking 400-level courses (though some 400-level courses have 300-level prerequisites). Only 4 of the 11 peer institutions include a requirement like this.
3. How many institutions require classes in a particular subfield? We do not specifically require upper-division courses in any field. Students must take at least one course in 4 of the 5 fields. Our practice is generally aligned with requirements elsewhere.
  1. **Political theory:** 9 of the 11 require a course in political theory (another requires students to take at least one course from two of the following fields: IR, comparative politics, political theory).
  2. **International relations:** 4 of 11 require a course. 3 others offer a choice between IR and other fields (often allowing students to choose 2 of 3 fields to take a course in).
  3. **Comparative politics:** 5 of 11 require a course. 3 others offer a choice between comparative and other fields (often allowing students to choose 2 of 3 fields to take a course in).
  4. **American politics:** 9 of 11 require an upper division course in American politics. One other offers some choice between American and other fields.
4. How many institutions require a capstone experience? We currently do not, though a handful of students (typically 6-9) participate in the honors program. 7 of 11 institutions require a capstone. What the capstone entails (at least based on descriptions available online) vary considerably. For example, USD requires a capstone, but allows students to choose between classes with a research paper, a community project, or a simulation project. Calvin College's capstone course is described as half reading (including Reformed theology) and half devoted to a research project.
5. How many institutions require an internship or other practicum? We currently do not (though students can earn up to 4 upper division units that count toward the major for internships). Only 2 of the 11 schools have a requirement.
6. How many institutions offer specialized tracks or concentrations within the political science major? We currently do not. Only 3 of the 11 schools offer tracks or concentrations. Baylor offers a pre-law track (which consists of a list of upper division political science courses that students can choose from). Calvin offers a Policy Studies and Civic Leadership Concentration, which requires various policy, state & local, and urban politics classes, along with two classes in business/econ or two classes in policy perspectives taught in other majors. Valparaiso offers concentrations in legal studies, public policy, and public administration.

<b>Curriculum Comparison</b>	
<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Institutions</i>
Require Methods	C, LMU, M, O, SC, SO
Require statistics	M*, W
Require intro courses	B, SMU*, SO, SC
Require theory	C, LMU, M, O, SC, SMU*, SO, SC, V, W
Require IR	LMU*, O, SC, SMU*, SO, USD, W*
Require comparative	LMU*, O, SC, SMU*, SO, USD, V, W*
Require American	B, C, LMU*, O, SC, SMU, SO, USD, V, W
Require capstone	C, M, O, SC, USD*, V, W
Require practicum/internship	M, W
Offers tracks/concentrations	B, C, V

**Notes:****Baylor (B)**

- Offers a pre-law track (just a list of specific POSC courses to choose from)

**Calvin College (C)**

- Capstone is half reading (including Reformed theology) and half a research project.
- Offers a Policy Studies and Civic Leadership Concentration (requires various policy, state & local, urban classes, along with two classes in business/econ or two classes in policy perspectives taught in other majors)

**Loyola Marymount (LMU)**

- Requires 2 of 3 (Intro American, Comparative, IR)

**Macalester (M)**

- \* Can take either stats or research methods (including the possibility of interpretive methods)

**Occidental (O)****Santa Clara (SC)**

- Requires an upper division in 4 of 5 fields like us

**SMU (SMU)**

- Must take intro courses in 2 of 3 non-American fields (comparative, IR, theory)

**St. Olaf (SO)**

- Must take at least 2 level III courses (seminars, maybe similar to capstones). These courses have prerequisites of methods course and two other courses in that field.

### USD

- Capstone options included classes with a research paper, a community project, or a simulation project.

### Valpraiso (V)

- Legal studies concentration, public policy and public admin concentration

### Wheaton (W)

- Requires either comparative or IR

## PEDAGOGY

### **8. Please present measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching or implementing, scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty, survey measures, participation rates, and student satisfaction surveys).**

All political science department instructors receive a course assessment at the conclusion of each semester. This evaluation—which is managed independently by the Seaver Dean’s office—is comprised of anonymous student responses to multiple choice and short answer questions. Many factors are evaluated including instructor effectiveness, course organization, clarity, and classroom experience. As is the norm in higher education, the results of these evaluations are only distributed after final grades have been submitted to the Office of the Registrar. These evaluations go on to play a key role in faculty promotions, tenure decisions, and annual reviews by divisional deans. In this way student assessment of courses allows the university to provide substantive feedback and oversight on the department’s teaching practices.

In addition, faculty members receive regular peer-to-peer based assessments of their teaching. Specifically, members of the department who are seeking tenure or promotion must name no fewer than five colleagues to provide an evaluation of their instruction. This peer-to-peer evaluation includes classroom observation and critical analysis of pedagogical materials including: syllabi, assignments, tests, rubrics, texts, and other resources. Peer evaluation culminates in a confidential written report that is in turn independently assessed by the deans, provost, and the faculty committees in charge of tenure and promotion.

The political science faculty also holds informal discussions about pedagogy. In the past five years, these have included in-depth exchanges on topics such as the role of the honor’s program, student recruitment, pedagogical inclusion of student veterans, and the role of the various subfields in the overall discipline.

A strong assessment indicator of the quality of pedagogy in the political science department is provided by comparing the aggregate student evaluations of political science courses with those of the rest of Pepperdine’s social science division. The most recent data from 2015 to 2018 shows the political science department consistently received higher aggregate marks from

students for the quality of courses and instruction than those of the social science division as a whole (see appendix “POSC Course Eval Averages.xlsx”). Where the social science division score during this time period hovers between a 4.1 and a 4.2 (on a 5 point scale) political science’s evaluations consistently stay close to 4.3. In fact, the actual discrepancy between political science and the rest of the division is presumably higher since the former’s averages help raise the latter’s numbers.

As a complement to the above more quantitative data the political science faculty has also gathered more qualitative feedback for political science pedagogy in the form of interviews via an alumni focus group discussion held in November 2018 (see appendix “POSC Alumni Focus Group notes excerpt 2018.pdf”). Participants in this focus group reported that among the best factors of a political science major were the quality and accessibility of faculty pedagogy, including “personal investments in [students’] intellectual, professional, and personal development.”

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[POSC Alumni Focus Group notes excerpt 2018\\_1\\_.pdf](#)

[POSC Course Eval Averages.pdf](#)

## **ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Quality**

**Quality of the Degree: In meaning of the degree student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the quality of the program.**

**9. Describe the high impact practices which enrich the learning experiences (How are they integrated in the curriculum? Are they assessed?)**

- a. Service learning**
- b. Research opportunities**
- c. Internships**
- d. Other high-impact practices**

Seaver College has a number of high impact practices that benefit the Political Science Department. These include the general education program, first-year seminars, writing intensive courses, and international programs. In addition to these opportunities, the Political Science Department has specific programs that enrich the learning environment. These include research opportunities, internships, and our honors program.

Students in political science are strongly encouraged to participate in internship programs, either in a local organization or through our Washington, DC program. A majority of our majors complete an internship during their time at Pepperdine. Their internships provide students the opportunity to combine their classroom learning in a work-related environment. In addition, they provided students with knowledge of and experience in the workplace. We have listed below some of the internships held by our students in recent years.

- **U.S. Federal Government:** Department of State, The White House, U.S. Trade Representative's Office, U.S. House of Representative, U.S. Senate, Various presidential campaigns
- **State Government:** California Capital Fellows Program, Illinois State Internship Program, California State Assembly, California State Senate
- **Local Government:** City of Malibu, Los Angeles Mayor's Office, Los Angeles County Commissioners Office
- **Nongovernmental:** Heal the Bay, American Enterprise Institute, Organization of American States

An additional high impact program for the most highly motivated and best qualified political science students is participation in a two-semester, eight unit honors program. During the first semester, honors candidates take a small seminar to develop their research designs and literature reviews of a topic chosen in consultation with a faculty member. During the second semester, students work intensively with a member of the faculty to write an honors thesis, which is presently publicly at the Seaver College Honors Symposium in the spring semester. Two faculty members, in addition to the supervising professor, read and evaluate the thesis and determine whether the thesis qualified the student for graduating with political science honors.

**10. Co-Curricular : How intentional are the co-curricular experiences which are provided and how are they integrated into the curricular plan?**

- a. Academic and career advising programs and resources**
- b. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and teaching assistants**
- c. Orientation and transition programs**
- d. Financial support for obtaining scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.**
- e. Support for engagement in the campus community**
- f. Support for emotional and psychological variables of success**
- g. Spiritual development programs and opportunities**
- h. Multicultural opportunities which support diversity**
- i. Plays, musicals, art exhibits, and lectures**
- j. the Sophomore Experience**
- k. Study Abroad**

Career advising takes place in three principal ways. First, individual faculty members counsel students about internship and career opportunities in political science. Second, the Seaver College Career Center is an excellent source of job listings and periodic programs specifically tailored for political science students such as the annual "Careers in Government" program. Third, the department prepared and distributes a brief introduction, "Careers, Internships, and Graduate School in Political Science and International Relations," to students (copy attached).

Seaver College has two excellent resources for students needing additional academic help: the Center for Academic Excellence and the Writing Center. The only course that uses a teaching assistant is the general education political science class (104) that we teach each term in Elkins Auditorium. The faculty teaching those courses recruit senior political science majors to help run review sessions before exams, meet individually with students, and provide assistance with some of the bureaucratic work involved with a class of 200 students.

Political science majors are introduced to our program during New Student Orientation that takes place before the start of the Fall and Spring semesters.

Individual faculty members call students' attention to various financial aid and fellowship opportunities both within and external to Seaver College. Within the college, divisional scholarships are available, and in 2019, that amount was \$22,000 for the Social Science Division. Externally, Seaver College maintains a robust program to advise and support students applying for nationally-competitive scholarships and fellowships. The political science faculty works very closely with Dana Dudley, Assistant Dean of Special Programs, who coordinates all of the post-graduate fellowship programs for the college.

A number of political science students and all faculty members are active in various political and international relations organizations and activities. During the past several years, symposia have been held on race relations, foreign policy issues, and the role of student-veterans at Seaver College. Many of these programs are organized and led by students and have proved to be very popular.

Political science faculty have the advantage of being part of the same academic division as psychology, so they may easily consult with their colleagues who are educated in and have experience with counseling. Beyond that, faculty refer students who may be facing challenging situations, such as the loss of a family member or friend, depression, or eating disorder, to the Counseling Center. In cases where faculty are concerned about the safety of a student to themselves or others, faculty may contact the Student Care Team that will contact and work with troubled students. All political science faculty complete mandatory sexual harassment training every other year. In addition, the Title IX Director has provided a comprehensive description of the program to faculty.

There are numerous opportunities for students to attend on-campus lectures, some of which are planned and organized by political science faculty, while others are part of the annual David Baird lecture series. In the past several years, as an example, students have had the opportunity to hear David Brooks on moral leadership, Bryan Stevenson on race and the criminal justice system, Katharine Hayhoe on a Christian response to global warming, to name a few. Political science faculty often make these lectures a part of the classes that they are teaching that semester. Students also have myriad opportunities to attend lectures and films that focus on multi-cultural issues.

Political science majors are strongly encouraged to go abroad during their sophomore year since General Studies courses are usually offered overseas. Many of our majors spend a semester that year in one of our "overseas" programs and the second semester in our Washington, DC program. Students who choose not to go abroad may participate in the special "Sophomore Experience" activities organized by Seaver College.

#### **11. Please describe evidence of students' research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments.**

Political science engages in a number of independent research activities, and our students have been remarkably successful in getting their work published, either by themselves or with a faculty co-author. Many of these publications grew out of academic work completed by students in our honors program, while other students published these articles based on work they accomplished in particular political science classes. The following is a list of those publications in undergraduate peer-reviewed journals, including the Pepperdine student-edited journal, *Global Tides*, referred journals, or in edited books (see also link to full publications list).

### Articles Published in Undergraduate Peer-Reviewed Journals

Bourke, Tyler J. "The Role of NGOs in the International Human Rights System: Case Study--IJM in Thailand." *Global Tides*, vol. 4, article 2 (2010). Available at <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol4/iss1/2/>.

Clayton, Taylor, Billy Cole, and Paul Henderson. "God, Politics, and the Environment: Religious Affiliation and Voting Patterns by Congress on Environmental Legislation, 1970-2010." *Global Tides*, vol. 6, article 9 (2012). Available at <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol6/iss1/>.

Ditmore, Tyler. "Russia's Policies in the Arctic and Ukraine: The Endurance of Russian Cooperation in the High North." *Columbia University Journal of Politics & Society*, Web Feature, October 21, 2014. Available at [http://www.helvidius.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Russia\\_Arctic-Politics.pdf](http://www.helvidius.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Russia_Arctic-Politics.pdf).

Elwy, Kayla. "Differences in Media Framing of Otto Warmbier." *Global Tides*, vol. 12, article 7 (2018). Available at <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol12/iss1/7/>.

Farber, Justin. "A Legal Analysis of North Korea's Nuclear Weapons Program." *Global Tides*, vol. 6, article 1 (2012). Available at <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol6/iss1/1/>.

Gordon, Kevin, Gordon, Ryanne E., and Nabor, Anthony. "The Reinforcement of Hegemonic Masculinity Through Gender Frames During the 2016 Election," *Global Tides*, vol. 11, article 8 (2017). Available at <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol11/iss1/8>.

Kitsmarishvili, Anna. "The Rise of the Unilateral Executive." *Global Tides*, vol. 10, article 8 (2016). Available at <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol10/iss1/8/>.

Mills, Kevin. "Israeli Immigration: An Analysis." *Global Tides*, vol. 1, article 4 (2007). Available at <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol1/iss1/4/>.

Morton, Catherine. "Reconciling American Marijuana Policy in a Federal System." *Global Tides*, vol. 7, article 11 (2013). Available at <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol7/iss1/>.

Mull, Kelleen R. "The Pitfalls of the Microfinance Promise." *Global Tides*, vol. 10, article 9 (2016). Available at <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol10/iss1/9/>.

Myers, Christine N. "Tribalism and Democratic Transition in Libya: Lessons from Iraq." *Global Tides*, vol. 7, article 5 (2013). Available at <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol7/iss1/5/>.

Rear, Patrick G. "Ataturk's Balancing Act: The Role of Secularism in Turkey." *Global Tides*, vol. 8, article 9. Available at <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol8/iss1/9/>.

Rear, Patrick G. "Democratic Peace Theory as Applied to Europe and the Middle East." *Global Tides*, vol. 7, article 4 (2013). Available at <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol7/iss1/4/>.

Winn, Meredith Katherine. "Women in Higher Education in Iran: How the Islamic Revolution Contributed to an Increase in Female Enrollment." *Global Tides*, vol. 10, article 10 (2016). Available at <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/globaltides/vol10/iss1/10/>.

### Articles Published in Professional Peer-Reviewed Journals

Bilsborough, Shane. "The Strategic Implications of China's Rare Earths Policy." *Journal of Strategic Security*, vol. 5, 3 (fall 2012): 1-12. [ARTICLE]

Dan Caldwell and Andrew Shute. "What Admissions Officers Know (and Don't Know) About Military Service". *Inside Higher Ed*, (Nov. 6, 2017). [ARTICLE]

Fetzer, Joel S., and Brandon Alexander Millan. "The Causes of Emigration from Singapore: How Much is Still Political?" *Critical Asian Studies*, vol. 47, 2 (July 2015).

Marshall, Mason, and Shane A. Bilsborough. "The Republic's Ambiguous Democracy." *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, vol. 27, 4 (October 2010): 301-316. [ABSTRACT]

Millan, Brandon Alexander and Joel S. Fetzer. "Public Support for the 1990 Student Democracy Movement and Emigration from Taiwan: Exit and Voice or Exit or Voice?" *American Journal of Chinese Studies*, vol. 15, 2 (October 2008): 111-122.

Newman, Brian and Adrian Davis. "Character and Political Time as Sources of Presidential Greatness." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 46(2): 411-433. [ABSTRACT]

Newman, Brian and Andrew Forcehimes. "'Rally Round the Flag' Events for Presidential Approval Research." *Electoral Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1 (March 2010): 144-54. [ABSTRACT]

Newman, Brian and Kevin Lammert. "Polls and Elections: Divided Government and Foreign Relations Approval." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 2 (June 2011): 375-92. [ABSTRACT]

Newman, Brian and Emerson Siegle. "The Polarized Presidency: Depth and Breadth of Public Partisanship." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 2 (June 2010): 342-363. [ABSTRACT]

Newman, Brian, James L. Guth, William Cole, Chris Doran, and Edward Larson. "Religion and Environmental Politics in the U.S. House of Representatives." *Environmental Politics*, vol. 25 (2): 289-314. [ABSTRACT]

Ocepek, Melissa G. and Joel S. Fetzer. "The Causes of Pro-Immigration Voting in the United States Supreme Court." *International Migration Review*, vol. 44, no. 3 (Fall 2010): 659-96. [ABSTRACT]

Rainwater, Shiloh. "Race to the North: China's Arctic Strategy and Its Implications," *Naval War College Review*, vol. 66, no. 2 (Spring 2013): 62-82. [ARTICLE]

### Articles Published in Editor-Reviewed Journals

Shane Bilsborough, "Counterlawfare in Counterinsurgency." *Small Wars Journal*, December 14, 2011, available at <http://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/counterlawfare-in-counterinsurgency>.

Dan Caldwell and Andrew Shute. "What Admissions Officers Know (and Don't Know) About Military Service". *Inside Higher Ed*, (Nov. 6, 2017). [ARTICLE]

### **Essays Published in Edited Books**

Miller, Matthew G.. "Helen Caldicott," in *Arms Control: History, Theory, and Policy*, 2 vols., ed. Robert E. Williams, Jr. and Paul R. Viotti (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2012), 312-14.

Miller, Scott A. "Randall Forsberg," in *Arms Control: History, Theory, and Policy*, 2 vols., ed. Robert E. Williams, Jr. and Paul R. Viotti (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2012), 317-20.

Scott, Calvin M. "Mikhail Gorbachev," in *Arms Control: History, Theory, and Policy*, 2 vols., ed. Robert E. Williams, Jr. and Paul R. Viotti (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2012), 322-25.

Scott, Calvin M. "Woodrow Wilson," in *Arms Control: History, Theory, and Policy*, 2 vols., ed. Robert E. Williams, Jr. and Paul R. Viotti (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2012), 295-97.

Siegle, Emerson. "J. Robert Oppenheimer," in *Arms Control: History, Theory, and Policy*, 2 vols., ed. Robert E. Williams, Jr. and Paul R. Viotti (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2012), 302-305.

Young, Benjamin M. "Andrei Sakharov," in *Arms Control: History, Theory, and Policy*, 2 vols., ed. Robert E. Williams, Jr. and Paul R. Viotti (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2012), 307-309.

Young, Benjamin M. "Nicholas II," in *Arms Control: History, Theory, and Policy*, 2 vols., ed. Robert E. Williams, Jr. and Paul R. Viotti (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2012), 297-99.

Finally, a number of our students have won awards for their research.

### **Award-Winning Papers**

Baly, Marissa A. "Life, Liberty, and the Lack of Paid Parental Leave: Media Framing of Parental Leave in the United States." Pepperdine Library Undergraduate Research Award, Honorable Mention, 2016. [PAPER]

Bilsborough, Shane. "The Strategic Implications of China's Rare Earth Policy." ISA-West Best Undergraduate Paper Award, 2011.

Booker, Alexander. "Finding a Frame that Fits: Analyzing Rival Framing of American Gun Control Policy in 2013." Pepperdine Library Undergraduate Research Award, Honorable Mention, 2014. [PAPER]

Clausen, Taylor. "Policy towards the Private Military Industry: A Focused Comparison of Sierra Leone, Croatia, and Iraq." Pepperdine Library Undergraduate Research Award, Honorable Mention, 2015.

Fisher, Wil. "Public Opinion towards Bicycle Lanes: The Case of New York." Pepperdine Library Undergraduate Research Award, 2014. [PAPER]

Galik, Alyssa. "Water Poverty in Disadvantaged Communities in California" Pepperdine Library Undergraduate Research Award, 2015. [PAPER]

Ryon, Rachel. "The Applicability of the Uniting for Peace Resolution to the Crisis in Burma." ISA-West Best Undergraduate Paper Award, 2010.

**Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[Political Science Student Publications.pdf](#)

[Careers in POSC and IR.Feb. 2019.doc](#)

## STUDENT SUCCESS, ALUMNI, AND ASSESSMENT DATA

### Student success data

**12. What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the purpose and goals of the program?**

**Please explain your student success data (enrollment and retention data). Evidence should include student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories such as race, gender, first-generation students, etc.).**

**OIE provides this data annually and houses the reports on the OIE website and LiveText site.**

### Student Success Data

*Attached is the student success data for your program.*

[Enrollment Data Political Science Fall2013 17.xlsx](#)

[Political Science Graduation Retention.xlsx](#)

The narrative for this section is based on the data from the retention and enrollment data files.

There has been tremendous continuity in the political science program over the past five years in terms of student enrollment, the demographic background of our students, and our retention rates. We had 150 majors in the fall of 2013 and 151 in 2017. There was a slight drop in the intervening years (a low of 128 in 2014) but overall our major remains robust and one of the largest in the college. Continuity is equally apparent in the backgrounds of our students. We have slightly more women than men majoring in political science (on average 55 percent women to 45 percent men). However, we have greater gender balance than the college as a whole, which is closer to 60 percent women to 40 percent men. Nearly half of our majors are white [non-Hispanic], one fifth are Hispanic, just under 10 percent are Asian, a similar percentage are African-American, and the remainder are international students and persons with more than one race. These percentages have remained reasonably steady in recent years and provided a rich level of diversity. High school grade point averages for students entering at the beginning of the review period (3.54 in 2013) are nearly identical to that at the end of the period (3.51 in 2017). Our retention rates are reasonably good, but not as strong as we would like them to be. The one-year retention rate has fluctuated from a high of 90 percent in 2017 to a low of 81 percent in 2014.

## Student and Alumni Data

**13. Please present your student and alumni survey data examining student attitudes, satisfaction levels and dispositions. OIE will provide the data in tables and graphs in their Educational Effectiveness Report. Programs are responsible for explaining the survey results. Survey data includes: UCLA/CIRP satisfaction survey data, alumni data.**

### Student and alumni survey data

*Attached is the student and alumni survey data for your program.*

[Survey Report OIE Alumni Survey SOSC 08 03 18 redacted .pdf](#)  
[EEIs Survey.pdf](#)

The narrative for this section is based on data from the 2018 OIE alumni survey and the survey of Pepperdine graduating seniors from 2012-2016.

The OIE Alumni Survey covers alumni going back more than 50 years, though most respondents graduated in the past 15 years. 93 percent of the respondents in the survey indicated that the political science major prepared them reasonably well or extremely well for “their primary activity” (p.5). On the four-point Likert scale used in the survey, this works out to an average score of 3.20, or somewhere between reasonably and extremely well. While political science is not a pre-professional program whose primary aim is to prepare students for a particular career, nearly half of those who participated in the survey (46 percent) noted that they had employment “in their field of study” (p. 7). Those alumni respondents were nearly unanimous (96 percent) in claiming that Pepperdine did “reasonably or extremely well” in preparing them for “employment in your area of study” (p. 8). The average score for this measure was 3.16. More than two-thirds of the political science alumni respondents (69.9 percent) noted that they had attended or were attending a graduate program, and they indicated that Pepperdine had well prepared them for their graduate program (3.35 average score. See p. 13).

Two areas of concern in the survey are academic advising and job placement services provided to students in the program. On a five-point scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied (p. 51), political science alumni were less than satisfied with the job placement services that they received (2.68). The overall level of satisfaction with the “advising I received” was 2.83 on a four-point scale. This was lower than the mean score for the other majors in the division (p. 19). Seaver College has a career services center and alumni office, but the Political Science Program might consider being more proactive in offering career counseling to our students. The same might be said for academic advising, where much of onus is put on the students to contact professors. Because our major is fairly straightforward students might not see the need to contact us for advising. Going forward it might be beneficial for faculty to reach out to students for advising, understanding that advising sessions often become an opportunity for more informal conversations about life and career options.

With an average score of 4.43 on a 5 point scale for “satisfaction with the overall college experience,” (p. 51) it seems reasonable to conclude that the political science alumni who participated in the survey were happy with their time at Pepperdine. This compares well with the numbers for the other majors in our division. But, in the absence of comparative data from the college as a whole, or other colleges or universities, it is hard for us to conclude that we are doing better or worse than others on this key measure.

The survey data on graduating seniors does not break down the data by major, but instead includes responses for all of the majors in the Social Science Division. As a result, our reflections on this data will be more about the division as a whole than political science specifically. We

noted above some concern about academic advising and job placement among in the alumni survey. While identical questions were not asked of recent graduates, a somewhat related question asked them to rate their level of satisfaction with “student-faculty interactions and mentorships.” On a scale from 1-5 (very dissatisfied to very satisfied) respondents in each year had a mean score well above 4. In short, our more recent alumni report high levels of satisfaction with faculty mentorship, which we see as somewhat synonymous with advising. Our more recent graduates also very report high levels of satisfaction with courses in the major and overall quality of instruction.

## **Assessment Data**

### **14. Other relevant data. e.g. General education data, special reports.**

#### **Assessment Data**

*Attached is the assessment data for your program.*

[general\\_education\\_american\\_experience\\_final.pdf](#)

[GE\\_American\\_Experience\\_in\\_Political\\_Science\\_2015\\_1\\_.docx](#)

The Political Science Department teaches one of the two required courses in the American Experience portion of the general education program. This course, American People and Politics (POSC 104), is the first in the two-course sequence. The second is History of the American Peoples (HIST 204) and is offered through the History Department.

As this is a required course for most of our students (a few can substitute Great Books sequence classes) we offer several sections of the class each semester. However, a majority of the students taking this class do so in our large lecture classroom, Elkins Auditorium. In the 2017-2018 academic year, as an example, just over two-thirds (68 percent) of the students enrolled in POSC 104 class took the class in Elkins. POSC 104 is the only class that we offer in a large lecture format

We have attached two assessments of the American Experience portion of the GE program from 2015 and 2016. For the 2015 report, political science faculty assessed a writing assignment (short essay) from exams from two of the smaller sections of our POSC 104 class. Because of the size of our Elkins classes (190-235), it is not possible to assign short answer or essay questions on the exams. The students in this assessment scored well in some areas (context and content development) but poorly on others (sources and evidence).

For the 2016 report, faculty identified multiple choice exam questions that were linked to the learning outcomes for this GE. Based on the data from the enclosed report, the respondents did well on most, but not all of the assigned rubrics. A possible problem with this data and the results of the assessment is that an analysis of multiple-choice questions may not be the ideal way to assess a learning outcome as nuanced as “develops an understanding of the history and challenges of maintaining democratic governance in a pluralistic, ethnically diverse society.”

As a faculty, we are not certain about the utility of having so large a percentage of the students taking this GE class in Elkins Auditorium. While we understand the fiscal advantages of that approach, it is not apparent that it is the best environment to promote the learning outcomes linked to the American Experience part of the general education program.

## ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Integrity

**In meaning of the degree (section four) student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the rigor of the program.**

**15. Are the assessment methods comprehensive allowing for a triangulation of data using primarily direct student data supported by indirect student data? Are the assessment methods and tools quantified and robust enough to assess student learning? Is the student sample used for assessment adequate in size and representative of the student population?**

The political science department uses direct and indirect data to assess its program learning outcomes. The direct data used consists of evaluating student papers and student exam essays with rubrics that measure components of the program learning outcome (see attached document: "Rubrics for Political Science Program Learning Outcomes"). Indirect data consist of data from focus groups with students and alumni or questionnaires completed by the political science faculty. Our authentic data come from honors student projects and presentations, student research publications and presentations, and a focus group of students who went on a field trip with classmates in an upper-level political science course.

On average, we used 30 samples of student work to evaluate each political learning outcome. Typically, this included students from two upper-level courses, as upper-level courses enroll approximately 12 to 20 students. We chose data from upper-level courses in which we believe students gain mastery of PLOs. It must be recalled at this point that the political science major does not require a capstone experience. As a result, there is no one piece of data from graduating seniors that can be used to assess all or many PLOs at once. Thus, appropriate courses for each PLO were identified and samples of student artifacts came from those classes. The samples included all students in the identified courses; thus, no students were randomly selected or left out of our samples. Honors student projects and publications by students (honors and non-honors) demonstrate political science learning in action, i.e., authentic data. These data are not representative of all political students in that the most motivated and talented students conduct research, independently and with professors, and go on to present it at conferences (see our extensive list of Student Publications and Presentations, attached in another part of this report).

The direct and indirect assessment data we have collected allow for triangulation in that the indirect data inform us of how and why we are using various pedagogical approaches. The indirect data, as a result, can help interpret conclusions extrapolated from the direct assessment data. For example, PLO 2 addresses writing proficiency and we assessed it directly with an AAC&U rubric and student writing samples. Our direct data about PLO 2 (see following discussion about analysis of assessment and see document, "Direct Assessment Tables") tell us that students satisfactorily write in the genre required of political science but that they do not excel to the same extent in terms of their writing syntax and mechanics. Questionnaire data from our faculty showed that we tend to prioritize norms of our profession when we teach writing and grade upper-level writing projects, but that we do not extensively focus on teaching basic writing skills related to mechanics, as we assume those are skills developed in general education courses. Therefore, the indirect data explain the direct data. Our focus groups with students serve a similar purpose of triangulation. Our assessment of critical thinking (PLO 4), based on a

rubric analysis of essay exams, showed that our students needed to improve in their ability to express their own position about the evidence at hand. The students in a focus group asked about critical thinking told us that they believe they best develop critical thinking skills in our courses when they practice the following activities: debates, research assignments, discussions, and simulations. They did not mention that essay exams best represent their attempts at critical thinking in our courses. Therefore, our focus groups showed us that the essay exam prompts were not the most robust data for evaluating critical thinking. If the students believe they are doing critical thinking at their best in debates or simulations, the faculty should be looking to assess those activities in some way. In short, the indirect data about PLO 4 help us to explain the results in the direct data and encourage us to retool our assessment approach in the future. Although we gleaned much insight from indirect data from faculty questionnaires, we could have conducted even more student focus groups like the one mentioned here. We conducted focus groups with students for PLO 1, PLO 4, and PLO 6. For PLO 5, we relied on a pre- and post-test for students in one upper-level course as indirect data. And, for PLO 2 and 3, we relied on results from a faculty questionnaire as indirect data.

We believe that the data are appropriate for the assessment of PLOs. Because we do not have a capstone course, we were very deliberate in choosing courses in which student artifacts could gauge the PLOs. The courses stressed mastery of the PLOs, and the student artifacts synced well with the rubrics we created or used/modified from the AAC&U. However, we identify a few ways in which data could have been even more robust. First, we wanted to assess student journals from the internship class we offer (POSC 495 Supervised Field Work). We believed this would be a good source of authentic data about citizen engagement (PLO 5), diversity (PLO 6), as well as writing skills (PLO 2). However, we lacked the coordination to gather such data given that students take the course with many different professors and on different campus (and, particularly, the Pepperdine Washington DC campus). Not all professors require a journal for POSC 495, and not all journal assignments would effortlessly sync with one rubric. Proper assessment of POSC 495 is a goal to address in the future of political science assessment. Second, we could not determine the appropriate direct data for PLO 1. Our indirect data for PLO 1 (see later discussion of integrated analysis of assessment data) demonstrated a degree of student learning; however, in the future, we seek robust, direct data for PLO 1. Third, as mentioned above, we need to assess different forms of student learning/various artifacts related to critical thinking (PLO 4). Using essay exams for PLO 4 assessment was insightful, but we could gain more extensive conclusions by assessing student debates or simulation experiences.

**16. Are the graduates achieving the student learning outcomes at the expected level? How was the threshold determined? How do you know your expectations are appropriate? Do you use comparisons based on national standards or benchmarking? How have your assessment findings supported this? Is there assurance that students consistently meet the standards of performance that the major has established? What happens to students that don't meet the standards?**

There are no national benchmarking standards for political science degrees. The American Political Science Association provides assessment resources on its webpage (<https://www.apsanet.org/programs/teaching/assessment>). These resources include examples of assessment at various institutions around the country. We used these examples when we re-wrote our program learning outcomes following our last program review. Given the lack of benchmarking in our discipline, we have generally set the expectation that 60 percent of our upper-level students would score "mastery" or "developed" on our assessment rubrics (see "Rubrics for Political Science Program Learning Outcomes" document). That is, the assessment

rubrics offer four levels of achievement (mastery/highly developed (4), developed (3), emerging (2), and poor (1)), and we expected 60 percent of our upper-level students to score in the top two categories. These expectations are realistic for our assessment because we are not always evaluating students who are graduating and about to finish their degrees. Recall, we do not have a capstone course in which to gauge learning outcomes for students who are finishing degrees. Rather, we assess in upper-level courses, some of which will include students in their second or third years of the degree. It is reasonable to assume that some of the younger students would perform higher in later years. Thus, if 60% of the students (which are a mix of seniors, juniors, and sophomores) can perform at “mastery” or “developed,” we arguably are achieving our goals for student learning.

The students (who are not solely graduates) are largely achieving the student learning outcomes at our expected level (see PLO Indicator Results Table). Of all the components embedded in our PLOs, 60 percent of components meet our 60% threshold. An additional 15% of components that were not at the expected level only barely miss the 60% threshold (i.e., scoring 55-59 percent). The PLO components with the highest scores are all PLO 3 Research skills components; Knowledge about diversity (PLO 6) and civic engagement (PLO 5); and Integration/responses to diversity (PLO 6).

The components (and their corresponding PLO) that *miss the threshold by a significant amount*, are listed here: Critical thinking – explanation of issues; Critical thinking – evidence; Critical thinking – student position; Civic engagement – engaging personal identity; Diversity – self-knowledge/personal application.

The largest take-home point, as a result, is that our students succeed in achieving knowledge about a variety of topics and using research skills. They need more practice with critical thinking skills and understanding their identity and own positions and how they relate to topics at hand. Recall, however, that we do not think we used the most robust data for the critical thinking assessment. Thus, it is possible that our students would be assessed higher if using other data (i.e., we used exam data and perhaps should have used discussion or debate data).

We have no institutionalized actions for students who do not meet these standards. However, when standards have not been met we have discussed learning outcomes in email correspondence and faculty meetings in an effort to brainstorm how better to teach skills. We have also discussed the importance of political theory in our curriculum as we see it as an important link to developing critical thinking skills.

**17. Please present an integrated analysis of the data collected from the assessment of direct learning and indirect learning ( survey data, focus group, alumni data, and authentic evidence). Please report on the findings from the last comprehensive program review. In summary please explain how the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the students' educational experience.**

Our conclusions from our last program review centered on the following ideas for growth. These ideas arose from our own analysis of strengths and weaknesses as well as the comments from our outside reviewer. The analysis of our various assessment data is embedded in the following discussion.

- *New PLOs:* Our outside reviewer suggested that we rewrite our PLOs to make them reflect the PLOs of highly ranked political science programs.

RESPONSE: We wrote new PLOs and have since assessed them. Through student focus groups, we have determined that students agree with the new PLOs. That is, they agree that our courses focus on the six PLOs we have identified. Students have commented that we could put more emphasis on teaching-related PLO 5 (civic engagement) and PLO 6 (diversity), yet our direct data analysis show that students demonstrate learning outcomes for these PLOs. Our alumni focus group emphasized the need for research skills and data analysis. Thus, the focus group confirms the importance of PLO 3 (research skills), and it suggests an even greater emphasis on these skills. Note, however, our direct data assessment shows that we excel in student learning of research skills.

- *Student collaboration on faculty research:* Our previous program review emphasized our faculty's notable research experiences and publications, and our outside reviewer stressed that we should incorporate students in our research endeavors to an even greater extent. To this end, he suggested that we have funds for students to work with faculty as research assistants

RESPONSE: We continue to produce research and we engage students in the process. We have used university funds through the Faculty-Student Research Program, which allow faculty to work with students who are compensated for their research assistance (see:[https://community.pepperdine.edu/seaver/dean/faculty-research-resources/faculty\\_student\\_mentor.htm](https://community.pepperdine.edu/seaver/dean/faculty-research-resources/faculty_student_mentor.htm)). Faculty, for example, developed a dataset and presented a conference paper with students in this program. Utilizing other programs/funds, faculty have published with students. The faculty often make use of AYURI, SURP, and CDIUR funds (see:<https://community.pepperdine.edu/seaver/dean/faculty-research-resources/>).

The alumni focus group reported appreciation for faculty modeling and mentoring. A few students mentioned that they appreciate the faculty's willingness to be demanding. Some said they worked hard to not let faculty down, which helped them develop work-ethic. One person mentioned the honors cohort as a place to develop trust and reliance. Recall, the honors program requires students to work closely with a faculty mentor to complete an honors thesis, which is a form of political science research.

- *Emphasis on teaching writing and research skills:* Our outside reviewer and our assessment data since that time confirm that we need to stress writing skills and research skills in all, or nearly all, upper-level courses.

RESPONSE: Our assessment of research skills perhaps was our strongest example of student learning. Students met our expectations on research skills for all rubric indicators. Writing skills were also assessed positively, though some indicators barely missed our 60 % threshold (see "PLO Indicator Results Table"). Thus, our assessment shows that we have met this goal set by the previous outside reviewer. Moreover, we have begun discussions amongst the faculty about best practices in these areas. Some faculty are now assigning writing assignments geared to these student learning outcomes, and they are more consciously teaching these skills. For example, in Media and Politics, the professor assigns critical thinking scenarios (i.e., hypothetical data regarding the influence of media and the students must analyze them). Another professor, in International Relations courses, requires students to write a blog entry in addition to a research paper.

A focus group with alumni revealed a desire for our faculty to continue to teach research skills. Alumni suggested that the curriculum put even more emphasis on quantitative and data analytical skills. Several reported working with data in their jobs, often to a degree they had not anticipated.

- *Obtaining a research lab:* In looking for ways to further institutionalize undergraduate research, we sought space to set up a political science research lab.

RESPONSE: We pursued this goal with the Social Science Chair, but the room/space we were offered was deemed insufficient for our goals (it was not in close vicinity to our offices nor did it have the appeal to become a community space). In the end, we decided to forgo this goal. We have access to the Psychology Lab at given times and we will make do with this arrangement.

- *Consider curriculum changes:* These potential changes were particularly aimed at creating specializations in the political science major that students can earn on their diploma, such as a political science degree with an emphasis in political economy. Our outside reviewer perceived this as a way to market our major and increase enrollments, that had been declining at the time of the past program review.

RESPONSE: We have discussed this in faculty meetings and in focus groups with graduating seniors or alumni. Many students (and some alumni) have expressed interest in obtaining political science specializations, but there has been no unanimous agreement among faculty as to the particular specializations we would develop. We intend to maintain the discussion, as the idea is appealing to some faculty and some students.

Our yearly assessment reports, in addition, suggested that we focus on:

- *Improving critical thinking skills and writing skills.* To this end, we intended to discuss how to tweak curriculum to further develop these skills. Particularly, we want to understand the role of political theory in developing critical thinking skills and in assessing critical thinking and writing competency.

EXPECTED RESPONSE: We have two action items related to these findings: (1) as stated in this report, we will begin to assess more robust data related to critical thinking. We will use data from discussions, debates, or simulations, and we will use data from political theory courses, and (2) we will continue to discuss the role of political theory in developing our students' critical thinking skills. We have discussed making political theory a requirement for our students, and we will revisit this conversation as it relates to critical thinking development in political theory courses.

- *Student engagement of identity/personal beliefs as it relates to critical thinking, civic engagement, and diversity outcomes:*

EXPECTED RESPONSE: Our assessment data show that we could also improve in our attempts to guide students through self-knowledge and integration (i.e., thinking about how their own identities coincide with what they are learning). These skills require reflection and analysis of the self and application of opinion to the subject matters at hand. The faculty will need to consider the pedagogical implications for teaching these skills.

In short, our assessment-related accomplishments include writing new PLOs and assessing them, developing new pedagogical approaches in individual, upper-level courses, discussing curriculum change, and utilizing new and existing resources for student research.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[Direct Assessment Tables.docx](#)

[Rubrics for Political Science Program Learning Outcomes.docx](#)

[PLO Indicator Results Table.docx](#)

## WASC 5 CORE COMPETENCIES

**18. How does the program ensure that graduates meet the WASC FIVE CORE COMPETENCIES? Present your findings of measurements you have done of the core competencies.**

### **Quantitative Reasoning (2018-2019)**

The Seaver College analysis of quantitative skills is not yet completed. Our program anticipates being part of the quantitative skills assessment of Seaver College.

### **Critical Thinking (2017-2018)**

Our results related to critical thinking and writing skills have been reviewed elsewhere in this report, but it is important to recall that we see critical thinking as an area of improvement while we see sufficient student outcomes in writing skills (see “PLO Indicator Results Table”). As noted in other sections, we intend to advance critical thinking skills by focusing on outcomes in political theory courses as well as class discussions, debates, and simulations. We also have noted in other sections of this report that we have increased attention to writing pedagogy/assignments since our assessment of writing skills.

### **Information Literacy (2016-2017)**

We were not a part of the Seaver College analysis of information literacy skills.

### **Oral Communication (2015-2016)**

We have not assessed for oral presentations skills, because we have yet to determine which upper-level classes would best represent the acquisition of oral presentation skills. However, our honors students present their research and we have been very pleased with the development of their oral presentation skills (See “Oral Communication – Core Competency Analysis”).

### **Written Communication (2014-2015)**

Our results related to critical thinking and writing skills have been reviewed elsewhere in this report, but it is important to recall that we see critical thinking as an area of improvement while we see sufficient student outcomes in writing skills (see “PLO Indicator Results Table”). As noted in other sections, we intend to advance critical thinking skills by focusing on outcomes in political theory courses as well as class discussions, debates, and simulations. We also have noted in other sections of this report that we have increased attention to writing pedagogy/assignments since our assessment of writing skills.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[Oral communication CORE COMPETENCY ANALYSIS.docx](#)

## General Education

**Please report on how your program supports the GE curriculum (include data reports on assessment.)**

See section 14, "Assessment Data."

## SUSTAINABILITY: RESOURCES

### Sustainability

**19. With the rapid changes in the higher education environment, the University needs to demonstrate how financial viability and planning of their long-term stability are ensured.**

**In order to demonstrate this each program should address**

- a. questions about the level of student demand for the program and**
- b. the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately so they are sufficient to maintain program quality.**
- c. What is happening within the profession, local community, or society that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future? (If appropriate include market research.)**

#### **A. Student Demand**

Since 2013, the number of majors has been relatively stable despite the slightly inauspicious national market for political science. Even though fewer students nationally seem interested in political science because of fewer prospects in the legal profession, Pepperdine has continued to attract quality students who then typically go on to study at more prestigious or the most sought-after law schools in the country (e.g., Stanford, Duke, Penn, Yale). During the spring semester of each year, our enrollment of majors has been 163 (2013), 147 (2014), 131 (2015), 145 (2016), 144 (2017), 150 (2018), and 146 (2019).

#### **B. Resource Allocation**

Most of the expenses of the department are concentrated in faculty salaries for tenure-line positions. Secondly, we also fund travel and related costs for professors' and students' research. Finally, we need to pay for administrative assistance and overhead on our main building.

#### **C. Need for this Program**

As long as human beings remain fallen and have conflicting interests, American society will need the services of lawyers. Under the current educational system, almost all practicing attorneys complete three years of law school after earning their bachelor's degree. One of the most

common undergraduate majors among law students is political science. We thus anticipate continued strong demand by students wishing to enter the legal profession and, secondarily, prepare for careers in international security, diplomacy, journalism, business, political activism, and academia. According to the most recent data by the APSA (change between '16-'17 and '17-'18 school years), about one-half of all political science departments in the US experienced growth in the number of majors, roughly one quarter reported no significant change, and only one fourth noted a substantial decline.

## **20. FACILITIES**

**Please describe the adequacy of**

- a. Classroom space**
- b. Laboratories**
- c. Office space**
- d. Programming venues**
- e. Student study spaces**

### **A. Classroom Space**

The Department regularly uses 11 different classrooms ranging in size from a 9-person seminar room to a lecture hall seating over 200. We are generally about to accommodate the demand for seating in these facilities.

### **B. Laboratories**

The Political Science Department shares a 20-unit statistics laboratory with the Psychology and Sociology Departments, an arrangement that has generally proven satisfactory. If we added more data-intensive courses or taught the Public Opinion and Voting every year instead of semi-annually, we might need to find an additional computer lab on campus.

### **C. Office Space**

Each regular professor has his or her relatively large, permanent office. The two adjuncts usually share a smaller work area for part-time instructors.

### **D. Programming Venues**

The Department holds formal guest-lectures in one of four large public-performance venues spread across the Seaver College campus. When we hosted a national conference in 2016 (American Association for Chinese Studies), we also scheduled several events on the campus of Pepperdine's School of Public Policy.

### **E. Student Study Space**

Undergraduate majors typically study in our large, newly renovated, high-tech library or in one of two adjoining student centers. The main Social and Natural Sciences complex likewise contains several smaller areas suitable for conversation or reading.

## **FACULTY AND STAFF**

**21. What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty/staff in the program in relation to the program purpose and goals? How do faculty/staff members' backgrounds, expertise, research, and other professional work contribute to the quality of the program?**

Evidence in this category should include (this could be collected through faculty CVs) :

- a. Proportion of faculty with terminal degrees
- b. List of faculty/staff specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program curriculum)
- c. Record of scholarship for each faculty member, professional presentations for staff members
- d. Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment
- e. External funding awarded to faculty/staff

### **A. Proportion of Faculty with Terminal Degrees**

All tenured or tenure-track faculty in Political Science have completed a Ph.D. in the subject. One of the part-time instructors has earned a J.D. instead, and the second adjunct is a Ph.D. student at the University of Southern California.

### **B. Specialties**

Our full-time faculty cover the following teaching and research specializations:

- Blakely: political theory (teaching); philosophy of social science (research)
- Caldwell: traditional international relations, US foreign policy (teaching); history of military conflict, security studies (research)
- Fetzer: US and comparative ethnic politics, quantitative methods (teaching); comparative migration politics, comparative religion and politics (research)
- Newman: US behavioral and institutional politics, media politics (teaching); US public opinion and voting, US racial politics (research)
- Orbals: European and Latin American politics, gender politics (teaching); women and politics in Spain, gender and terrorism (research)
- Soper: US institutional politics, US public law, comparative religion and politics (teaching); US and comparative religion-state relations (research)
- Williams: contemporary international relations, human rights and international law (teaching); security studies, human rights (research)

Within our curriculum, most substantive areas are staffed adequately with the possible exception of Civil Rights, African-American Politics, African and Middle-Eastern Politics, Political Economy, and Rational Choice/Game Theory. An affiliated regular professor in International Studies does teach North African and Middle-Eastern Politics, however, and a second full-time INTS colleague covers International Political Economy.

### **C. Record of Scholarship**

Publications by our regular faculty amount to the following (**please also see attached vitae**):

- Blakely: 1 single-authored book, 1 co-authored book, 8 single-authored articles, 1 co-authored book chapter, and 7 single-authored book reviews for a total of 18 publications

- Caldwell: 4 single-authored books, 1 co-authored book, 3 single-edited books, 2 co-edited books, 37 single-authored articles, 5 co-authored articles, 6 single-authored book chapters, 3 co-authored book chapters, and 14 single-authored book reviews for a total of 75 publications
- Fetzer: 4 single-authored books, 3 co-authored books, 12 single-authored articles, 14 co-authored articles, 3 single-authored book chapters, 12 co-authored book chapters, and 10 single-authored book reviews for a total of 58 publications
- Newman: 1 co-authored book, 5 single-authored articles, 17 co-authored articles, 1 co-authored book chapter, and 1 single-authored book review for a total of 25 publications
- Orbals: 2 co-authored books, 4 single-authored articles, 10 co-authored articles, 4 single-authored book chapters, 1 co-authored book chapters, and 2 single-authored book reviews for a total of 23 publications
- Soper: 1 single-authored book, 7 co-authored books, 3 single-authored articles, 11 co-authored articles, 5 single-authored book chapters, 11 co-authored book chapters, and 17 single-authored book reviews for a total of 55 publications
- Williams: 1 co-authored book, 2 co-edited books, 3 single-authored articles, 1 co-authored article, and 1 co-authored book chapter for a total of 8 publications

All of our professors regularly present drafts of their research manuscripts at US and international conferences such as those of the American Political Science Association, Western Political Science Association, Midwest Political Science Association, International Studies Association, British Columbia Political Studies Association, American Association for Chinese Studies, European Conference on Politics and Gender, and International Conference of Europeanists.

#### **D. Development Opportunities**

Departmental faculty have participated in numerous development activities such as presenting at APSA's Teaching and Learning Conference, attending special diversity-oriented SEED seminars, learning from workshops offered by Pepperdine's Center for Teaching Excellence, and listening to presentations on less well-known countries such as Timor-Leste at special meetings of the Association for Asian Studies.

#### **E. External Funding Awards**

Since 2013, regular professors have been awarded external grants from the Taiwan Fellowship (about \$10,000) and the University of Ottawa (\$800).

## **22. FACULTY/STAFF**

**Are there sufficient numbers of faculty/staff to maintain program quality? Do program faculty/staff have the support they need to do their work?**

- a. Distribution of faculty across ranks (or staff years at institution)**
- b. Diversity of faculty/staff**
- c. Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty)**
- d. Student-faculty ratio**
- e. Faculty workload**
- f. Faculty review and evaluation processes**
- g. Mentoring processes**
- h. Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds)**
- i. Sufficient time for research, program development**

### **A. Distribution of Ranks**

Assistant Professor: 1; Associate Professor: 0; Full Professor: 4; Distinguished Professor: 2. We also have two adjuncts this semester teaching one introductory American politics class each. The first adjunct is a regular Pepperdine staff member and a second is a graduate student at USC.

### **B. Diversity**

Of the seven regular faculty members, six are men, and an equal number are white. One professor is a woman, and a second colleague identifies as Latinx and is a native speaker of Spanish. Both adjuncts are white men. A biracial African-/Asian-American woman taught racial politics in a tenure line for us for 3 years, but she left for a research-I institution in her hometown.

### **C. Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty**

7 regular, full-time faculty members (6 of whom are tenured) versus 2 part-time adjunct instructors

### **D. Student-Faculty Ratio**

We currently have 146 majors and 7 full-time faculty, for a ratio of about 21 majors/faculty member.

### **E. Workload**

All Assistant Professors and Distinguished Professors at Seaver College teach a 3-2 load each academic year unless they are serving at one of Pepperdine's overseas campuses. Full Professors theoretically cover 3 classes every semester unless they are engaged in a specific research project (in which case the schedule drops to 3-2) or working as Divisional Dean (1-1). The adjuncts are teaching 1 course each this term.

### **F. Review and Evaluation Processes**

The normal tenure-track and promotion schedule includes a 3-year review as an Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to Associate after year 6, promotion to Full 6 years later, and the possibility to make Distinguished Professor 9 years afterwards. Once one has served at Full for about a decade, one normally is evaluated for a significant salary increase every 5 years. Within each rank except for Distinguished, one is eligible for smaller "step increases" every 2 (Assistant or Associate) or 3 years (Full). Increases in rank depend on evaluations by other Social Science faculty, the Divisional Dean, a faculty promotion committee, the Dean of Seaver College, the Provost, and members of the Board of Regents. Step increases require submission of a short self-evaluation to the Divisional Dean. Promotion to Distinguished also involves requesting letters from up to 9 external peer reviewers.

### **G. Mentoring Processes**

Older faculty in the Department informally coach junior colleagues on Pepperdine procedures and how to advance through the ranks and maximize their teaching and research effectiveness. This process has been so successful that we have not turned down an application for tenure in Political Science in over two decades. A few junior colleagues did leave tenure lines for personal reasons, however.

## H. Professional Development

The Social Science Division pays for thousands of dollars' worth of professional travel for conferences and field work each year, and the College further supports external grant writing and offers a range of grant programs and endowed chairs and professorships for interested faculty.

## I. Research and Program Development

Given the high publication rate of all regular faculty, some time is obviously devoted to research in addition to teaching and administration. The Dean and Provost have supported our investigations by granting reduced course loads automatically to untenured and Distinguished Professors and, on request, to Associate and Full Professors with an active research agenda. Seaver College and the Social Science Division likewise fund additional training in foreign languages, quantitative methods, and regional studies.

### Evidence

*Please attach evidence.*

[Caldwell CV.doc](#)

[Williams CV.doc](#)

[Blakely CV.doc](#)

[Fetzer CV.doc](#)

[Ortbals CV.docx](#)

[Newman CV.docx](#)

[Soper CV.doc](#)

## FINANCIAL RESOURCES

### Financial Resources

#### 23. Financial Resources:

**Please describe your operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period.**

On the whole, the Political Science program at Pepperdine has enjoyed a period of stable and adequate funding since the last program review. After a period of significant budget cuts in the wake of the 2008-2009 recession, the Social Science Division has recovered and even grown its budget slightly as a consequence of the University's decision to gradually increase enrollment at Seaver College.

Because Seaver College does not have a departmental structure like most colleges and universities in the United States, the budget for the Political Science program is not separable from the budget of the Social Science Division, of which Political Science is a part. What follows, therefore, are general comments about faculty salaries, support for faculty travel and other professional development needs, research support for both faculty and students, and scholarships.

The salary structure for faculty in the Political Science program follows the general guidelines that are fully described in the Seaver College Faculty Handbook (Chapter VI). In short, Seaver uses a fixed salary structure; although stipends may be awarded for specific duties, the base salary of all

people at the same rank (e.g., Assistant Professor II or Associate Professor III) is standardized. (A system of market-based stipends has also been established, but faculty in Political Science have not qualified for such stipends in the judgment of the Faculty Benefits and Stipends Committee.)

The Social Science Division funds each faculty member's professional travel. Until 2018-2019, a policy was in place that allowed for travel to two conferences per year, one national and one local, without attaching a specific amount of funding for each faculty member. (This policy allowed the divisional dean to be flexible in a situation where funding needs varied from faculty member to faculty member within the Division.) Beginning in 2018-2019, however, the divisional dean initiated a policy that allocates \$3000 to each full-time tenure-track faculty member. Additional travel funding is available as the need arises both from the Division and from the dean of Seaver College.

Out of the travel budget, the Social Science Division also sponsors travel for a limited number of students attending professional meetings, with preference given to those who are presenting research. In general, conference travel for students is limited to \$300 per student, but the Division often provides more, sometimes working with the dean of Seaver College to find funding to supplement the Division's funds.

Internal support for research—for both faculty and students—is available through a number of programs, most of which are sponsored by the Office of the Provost:

- The Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative supports up to three faculty-student research collaborations per division each semester. The faculty member receives \$500 per student to support the research project; students may receive \$1,000 if eligible for financial aid.
- The Summer Undergraduate Research Program provides participating faculty a \$1,000 stipend for each student supervised in a summer research project. Participating students are provided a scholarship to cover the cost of four units of credit.
- The Dean's Research Grant provides awards up to \$1,500 for faculty research projects. Applications are assessed by a faculty committee.
- Faculty members may apply for Seaver Research Council Grants, typically ranging from \$1,000 to \$4,500.
- Endowed chairs, professorships, and fellowships also provide funding for research purposes. Faculty members who have reached the rank of professor are eligible to apply for an endowed chair, which provides a \$6,000 annual stipend for research, travel, and professional support. Only one endowed chair is allocated to each division, but there are also two at-large chairs within Seaver College. Endowed professorships are available to faculty members at the associate professor and professor levels. These positions have a research, travel, and professional support stipend of \$4,000 per year attached to them. There is one endowed professorship allocated to each division and another five at-large endowed professorships. Finally, endowed fellowships, which carry a \$3,000 annual stipend for research, travel, and professional support, are available to faculty members who have not yet earned tenure.
- The University provides funding for one faculty member per year from Seaver College to travel to the United Kingdom to spend a week conducting research at Harris Manchester College in the University of Oxford.

For expenses beyond these funding options, faculty members are encouraged to apply for external grant support.

The vast majority of scholarships available to students in Seaver College are distributed through the Office of Financial Assistance. However, each academic division has a small budget line for scholarships to be distributed as the division wishes. In the Social Science Division, the divisional scholarship budget has gradually increased from \$19,101 in FY 2015 to \$22,078 in FY 2019.

## **EXTERNAL REVIEW**

**In summary please explain how, through the findings in the annual assessments, the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the educational experience that is supported through benchmarking. (Has the program been reviewed by external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, or compared with other similar institutions, or national standards?**

### **I. GUIDELINES FOR ORGANIZING THE EXTERNAL REVIEW**

The external review typically occurs after a program or department completes its self-study report, but the selection and invitation of external reviewers can occur during the self-study process to ensure the availability of the best reviewers. However, programs with concurrent accreditation (e.g., AACSB, APA, ABA) can use the visiting team for that discipline-specific accreditation as the external review. The report from the site visitors should be included in the final report. For an illustration of potential areas for the reviewers to consider, see Attachment below.

### **II. CHOOSING REVIEWERS**

The size and composition of the review team can vary, depending on the size of the program under review. Usually, the team involves one or two people. At the time a department or program is notified that it will be conducting a program review, appropriate individuals should submit a list of names of possible reviewers. These reviewers should be external to the school/University. External reviewers should be distinguished scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field and be familiar with campuses that are similar to Pepperdine University and the program undergoing review. It is also helpful for external reviewers to have had experience with program administration and with program assessment. At least one of the reviewers should be experienced with student learning outcomes assessment in order to review and analyze the program's assessment processes and results. The Dean of each School will have the final approval of the external reviewer.

### **III. MATERIALS FOR THE EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM**

At least 30 days prior to the scheduled department visit, the information from the program self-study and appropriate additional materials are sent to each member of the external review team. An identical information package should be provided to appropriate members of the administrators overseeing the program. The reviewers should compile a report that includes observations, strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations based on evidence. The attached External Review Report expectations outlines the guidelines for the external reviewers' site visit and report. Reviewers and Divisional Deans should also sign a consultant agreement. External Reviewers should also be given a schedule for their visit and a confirmation letter, and programs will submit a budget proposal for the site visit to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

#### IV. CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION

- Curriculum
- Faculty
- Resources
- Viability

#### V. EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM VISIT AND REPORT

The review team visit typically lasts for two days, during which time the review committee members meet with department faculty, academic advisors, students, and select administrators. The review team typically takes part in an exit interview just prior to concluding its departmental visit.

The team is expected to submit its written evaluation to the campus program review committee no later than 4 weeks after the visit. The written evaluation should include a review of strengths and challenges, resource allocation, and program viability as well as suggestions for policy and resources. Upon submission of the report, off-campus reviewers receive a previously agreed upon stipend and travel expense reimbursement (to be determined by the department under review).

As soon as the program receives the report from the external review team, it is distributed to the appropriate individuals. The department is typically asked to review the report (within a brief time period) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. To maximize the effectiveness of program review, the findings and resulting decisions should be shared with all of the stakeholder groups. Such sharing of findings generates buy-in to the program's and/or institution's goals. To facilitate and track the implementation of improvement plans, each year the relevant faculty members should review the progress of programs reviewed in previous years. If the department/program was not successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, they may follow up with their appropriate administrative unit regarding resource allocation or other barriers involved in preventing successful implementation.

#### External Reviewer Report Expectations

Please find the link below for the "External Review Summary Sheet".  
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Z835R7F>

#### External Reviewer Report Expectations

*Please attach the completed form.*

[Pepperdine External Review Report 2019.pdf](#)

## QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

#### QIP Form

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6ufJTQgPx32M3JiNTM3bV9KNVk/view?usp=sharing>