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A. Review committee activities and materials reviewed

For the graduate academic program review, the committee conducted 7 separate in-person interviews via Zoom with a total duration of 8.5 hours:

- Discussion of self-study and graduate program with Graduate Program Director Nadav Shelef and Department Administrator Faye Lux.
- 2 Graduate Student focus groups (4 meetings in total).
- 2 Meetings with department faculty and graduate students.

In addition to the self-study, the committee reviewed documents provided by Nadav Shelef upon request concerning program assessment, attached to this report.

The committee performed administrative tasks to schedule meetings with interview participants and held internal meetings via Zoom and over e-mail to plan for interviews and to digest materials and interviews.

B. Program evaluation

B.1: PhD program

Learning goals

The review committee found the stated learning outcomes to be sensible. The committee is not qualified to assess the extent to which these learning goals are appropriate for a Political Science program at the UW Madison rank. This would likely be the domain of an external review by other political scientists. The review committee is working off the assumption that the learning outcomes represent the expertise of the department. We are focusing the review on how requirements and assessment serve the learning outcomes, as formulated. On a related note, the committee did not find evidence that the department itself is seeking external validation, guidance, and inspiration in its formulation of program learning outcomes.

Learning requirements

Broadly, the committee found the program requirements to be well connected with the learning outcomes. One area of concern that was raised in student interviews was an insufficient depth of the methods sequence offerings and requirements.1 Specifically, that the statistics course is out of

1 This then concerns learning outcome 2 and requirement 2.
touch with front line research methods, and that there is a need for a re-evaluation of the composition of the sequence. In general, the committee wonders whether a requirement of 6 credits devoted to empirical methods courses out of a total of 51 credits in the program is sufficient to meet learning goal 2, given what appears to be an increasingly empirical field. This is speculation on the part of the committee and tools and methods may currently be included in other courses. However, if the department is relying on other courses to meet learning outcome 2, it may be worth an effort to measure whether all students elect courses that supplement the required methods courses in meeting outcome 2. This would be similar to the mapping exercise from course learning goals to program learning outcomes suggested in the undergraduate program review.

Student interviews had some students expressing a wish for a diversification of the program course offerings. This was partly motivated by a wish for greater faculty diversity. Some expressed a desire to see course offerings on parts of the World outside of the Western hemisphere.

A significant number of students expressed great satisfaction with their own learning outcomes. This was a recurring theme in interviews and should not be minimized as the review committee brings up points of potential improvement and concern in the following sections.

Assessment

The self-study does not contain an assessment plan, nor does the department seem to have one. Our interviews suggest that assessment is the domain of the Graduate Program Director and that it is sensitive to the idiosyncrasies of the particular director in charge. Actual assessment is performed by the Graduate Program Coordinator (presumably under the guidance of the Graduate Program Director), which is a position that appears to currently be in flux. Continuity in goals and assessments is subject to the hand-off from one director to another and not guided by a broader institutional structure. The Graduate Program Coordinator submits an assessment report to the Provost’s office as required annually but the review committee did not get a sense that this activity has a significant connection to the PhD program’s assessment.

Informally, the culture of the department seems to suggest that the assessment of the Ph.D. program involves rank of student placement, number of external dissertation awards, and finally quality of incoming students. We take this from the concluding evaluation on page 21 in the self-study, “Our graduate program continues to excel, attracting exceptional students who produce high quality dissertations and enjoy very good placement rates.” These are admirable performance measures that directly involve external evaluation of the program. As such, the review committee does not want to discourage these measures as an important part of program assessment. However, the connection to program learning outcomes is somewhat opaque. Furthermore, narrow reliance on these measures raises some concerns, among which are:

- Students who are not interested in placing “well” by the department’s standards are a drag on the performance measure. If such students are predictably associated with certain demographic characteristics, it could in subtle ways discourage the department to admit students with such characteristics to the PhD program. The department would also be less encouraged to invest in the education of such students. Student interviews suggested something of tension in relation to students seeking teaching focused jobs as opposed to research jobs possibly suffering from this kind of effect. That said, the students also said
that they had found advisers that were accommodating and sensitive to the student’s goals. It is not clear how the department measures the program’s performance in relation to such students, though.

- How does the department choose its success criteria in relation to these measures? The department does not know how its peers are performing along these measures. These are not simple data to come by. It is by no means impossible but requires an effort that the department does not seem to have engaged in systematically. The review committee asked for comparative data, which the Graduate Program Director provided (they are attached to this report), but direct comparison with peers is not available.

- How is performance sensitive to student stipend levels? How does one adjust success criteria accordingly? This happens to be one area where the department has managed to secure solid comparative data to peers. UW-Madison graduate student stipends are quite low relative to peers.

The program is not engaging in a systematic assessment exercise of its graduate program even with its implicitly stated assessment measures. This puts the program at risk of failing to detect performance problems and allow it to take corrective measures. The department has also missed an opportunity to explicitly state its success criteria and their relation to learning outcomes as part of not formulating an assessment plan.

**Department context**

The committee found evidence that the program plays a substantive role in both mission and purpose of the department and that its contexts are supporting it. Clearly, the research mission of the department and the learning goals of graduate program are supportive of each other. The department has a number of practices that support the program, such as,

- The department offers seminar workshops where external speakers are invited and graduate students also present in. These seminar workshops are by subfield.
- The Graduate Program Director offers a professional development course that serves to develop each student’s prospectus.
- Student interviews quite uniformly demonstrated substantial satisfaction with the student’s advisors.
- The program runs a first-year mentoring program, where senior graduate students are assigned to first-year students. The program received mixed reviews depending on the effort of the senior student involved. The department itself does not structure or communicate shared expectations related to the mentoring program.
- Diversity and inclusion initiatives summarized on p 6 in “Addendum to memo for internal review committee” provided by the Graduate Program Director, attached to submission of this report.

Student interviews also generated comments on contexts where additional support would be welcome:

- The interviews revealed significant misgivings related to program climate and inclusiveness. It is somewhat telling that these concerns were more pronounced among under-represented and minority students. Areas of particular concern:
• The department does not seem proactive in learning about the particular challenges facing under-represented and minority students. The department not being very diverse itself does not intrinsically anticipate these problems. Part of the work of the diversity committee could be to help the department institutionalize such a discovery process.

• There is among some students a perceived hostility in the department to concerns about improving inclusiveness and diversity.

• Advising is very decentralized and the program emphasizes that part of student learning is to be self-directed. However, under-represented and minority students may face disadvantage due to a greater barrier in connecting with advisors of different race, ethnicity, and/or gender. These students may also enter with less knowledge about “how things work.”

• Preliminary preparation is not institutionalized and varies significantly by subfield.

• There was an oft repeated wish for versions of “labs” where students of similar interest could interact with faculty on particular topics.

B.2: MA program

The MA program is an incidental degree that happens either along the way toward a PhD or provides some return to work done in the PhD program should the student exit before achieving a PhD. There is no evidence that the MA program has independent design considerations. The committee has decided to not consider this an independent program intended for review. Interviews did reveal that the department has for a considerable period of time considered the creation of a terminal MA degree program.

B.3: Doctoral minor

The program is run by the Graduate Program Director subject to graduate school rules in service of individual needs by students. The program is not described in the self-study. In an interview with the Graduate Program Director, the committee did not find any reasons for concern.

C. Program improvement recommendations

• The program must institutionalize its assessment plan as well as the actual implementation of it.

• In a point also made in the context of the undergraduate program, the review committee found that the program could benefit from institutionalizing a number of its contexts. This is quite pronounced in relation to diversity and inclusion where decentralized governance can impose inequities in access to help, guidance, as well as influence by minority students and faculty. The department is clearly making efforts in this direction as evidenced by, for example, a committee dedicated to these issues. However, interviews suggested that more can be done. Examples are,

  o A more structured peer mentoring program with greater accountability imposed and sensitivity to incoming students’ individual needs.

  o Create within the program assessment step mechanisms that solicit feedback on department climate from students while also ensuring confidentiality.
Create structure around the matching of students to advisors as well as the ongoing advisor/advisee relationships. The review committee did find that the program is imposing some possibly beneficial structure on the advisor/advisee relationship through an evaluation form the advisor must do on each advisee. It was a bit unclear how effective it is. This may be an area where concerns about “equal access” to and inclusiveness of advising could be addressed through an institutionalized set of requirements on the relationship.

- In the context of an effective learning and work environment, the review committee heard a number of voices expressing satisfaction and happiness with department climate as it relates to inclusiveness and diversity. However, it also heard enough anguished voices expressing the opposite opinion that it appears to warrant the no doubt uncomfortable department process of formally soliciting and recording voices on this, as well as formulate a plan of action for how to address them. It is likely a process where the department could benefit from outside help and resources in how to run such a process and mediate it. A third party could also help endow the process with credibility.

D. Future direction

While student interviews revealed a number of points of potential improvement, they also broadly showed a significant respect and appreciation for the quality of the program. The recommendations listed above would sustain and strengthen the program.

E. Required follow-up actions

- The program must formulate and implement an assessment plan.
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I. Overview

1. Departmental History, Aims, and Standing

The Department of Political Science is one of America’s oldest and most respected political science programs. The department was founded in 1904, the same historical moment in which the discipline of political science and the American Political Science Association emerged. From the beginning, the Department has been closely linked to the Wisconsin Idea, due in no small part to the work of Charles McCarthy, who lectured in Political Science from 1905 to 1917, and who emphasized public engagement, as shown by Crawford Young in his history of the department. (Young History 34-35). The department currently has 33 tenured and tenure-track faculty, 5 affiliated faculty, 11 full-time staff and approximately 75 graduate students active in the Ph.D. program.

The Department aims to be a premier political science program, recognized nationally and internationally for its excellence in research and teaching. Long ranked among the top programs in the discipline, the department has for the last ten years held steady at 15th in U.S. News and World Report rankings. The department retains its longstanding commitment to methodological pluralism and to strength in all subfields of the discipline.

As reflected in the graph below, on most measures of research productivity, Academic Analytics ranks the department in the top 10% of Political Science departments in the United States.

In the Department’s last 10-year review, then Dean Sandefur encouraged the Department to focus on publishing articles in top Political Science journals. In the last 10 years, according to Academic Analytics, department faculty have published 10 articles in the flagship American Political Science Review (tied for 13th among Political Science Departments). Over the same period, department faculty have published 39 articles in the top three discipline wide journals: American Political Science Review, Journal of Politics and American Journal of Political Science (18th among Political Science Departments). In keeping with the department’s openness to different approaches to research and publication, department faculty have over the last ten years published 74 books (tied for 17th among Political Science Departments). Of these books, 18 were published
with Cambridge University Press, the top press in the discipline (tied for 9th). We also note that our department ranks 7th in the country for the number of major APSA dissertation awards between 2000 and 2018.

The disciplinary visibility of department faculty is indicated by their having won a total of 56 major disciplinary awards over the last ten years and by their serving in lead editorial roles at the American Political Science Review, International Organization, Election Law Journal and Legislative Studies Quarterly. On campus, current department faculty have won 14 Vilas Associates Awards, 5 Romnes Awards, 4 Kellett Awards and 3 WARF Named Professorships. The department also includes one Hilldale Professor, 2 Vilas Distinguished Achievement Professors and one holder of a prestigious Letters & Science professorship.

In addition to its scholarly achievements, the department has a longstanding commitment to excellence in teaching and learning. Among current department faculty members, 10 have been recognized with campus wide teaching awards, and one has won a UW systemwide teaching award. Department faculty have also been active in the UW Teaching Academy and UW’s educational innovation effort, regularly contribute to honors and FIGs curriculum and have participated in the programming of Chadbourne Residential College and Bradley Learning Community. Two department faculty have recently completed the professional development program opportunity offered by Madison Teaching and Learning Excellence (MTLE). The Department also provides a wide array of high impact practices (see II.8) oriented toward our undergraduate majors. These include the Wisconsin in Washington internship program, the Political Science Debate Society, Mock Trial, the Political Science Student Association, and a variety of FIG and honors experiences.

Finally, Department faculty provide extensive service to the College and University. In addition to regularly serving on high level College and University Committees (e.g. Academic Planning Council, Divisional Committee, Graduate School Research Committee, UW 2020 committee, L and S Curriculum Committee), Department faculty have recently served in formal leadership roles in the following units: Center for Early Modern Studies; Center for European Studies; Center for Russia, East Europe and Central Asia; Center for the Study of Liberal Democracy; Chadbourne Residential College; Chicana@/Lantina@ Studies; Educational Innovation (Senior Fellow); Elections Research Center; Graduate School (Associate Dean); Institutional Review Board; Integrated Liberal Studies; International Studies; Morgridge Center for Public Service’ Teaching Academy Co-Chair; Tommy Thompson Center for Public Leadership; UW Teaching Academy

2. Departmental Academic Structure

The Department’s faculty is comprised of five different subfields: American politics, comparative politics, international relations, methodology, and political theory.

American Politics: The American Politics field covers all aspects of and approaches to American politics. Topics covered include but are not limited to political behavior, all institutions of government (Congress, the presidency, courts, and the bureaucracy), state and local government, parties and public policy, American political economy, interest groups, and social movements. Methodologies used by faculty in the field are wide-ranging including archival research, statistical analysis, and cultural analysis.

Comparative Politics: Scholars of Comparative Politics investigate similarities and differences in patterns of politics across the world. They engage in within-country, cross-national, and cross-regional research with a geographic focus outside the United States (although the US may be included as a case in cross-national comparative research). Comparativists use a variety of methods and often possess deep expertise in particular countries or regions. This knowledge is important for the purpose of systematic comparison, theory building, theory testing, and awareness of context specific variables and causal relationships masked by immersion in our own polities and societies. The field of Comparative Politics includes, among others, the study of political institutions, electoral behavior and procedures, public policy, political economy, political violence, social
movements and organizations, protest and revolution.

**International Relations:** International relations attempts to explain the interactions of states in the global interstate system, and it also attempts to explain the interactions of others whose behavior originates within one country and is targeted toward members of other countries. In short, the study of international relations is an attempt to explain behavior that occurs across the boundaries of states, the broader relationships of which such behavior is a part, and the institutions (private, state, nongovernmental, and intergovernmental) that oversee those interactions.

**Political Methodology:** The Political Methodology field includes training in qualitative and quantitative design, empirical theory, statistical methods and formal theory.

**Political Theory:** The political theory field spans a broad historical range that includes ancient, early modern, modern and post-modern political thought. Within each of these domains, the primary objects of inquiry are twofold: first, the study political theories; second, normative, analytic, and historical theorizing about politics. It also incorporates important themes such as citizenship and democracy, constitutionalism and legal theory, post-structuralism, and gender studies.

3. **Political Science Degree Programs**

The Department’s academic programs include graduate degrees (doctoral minor, M.A., and Ph.D.), an undergraduate certificate (Political Economy, Philosophy, and Politics), undergraduate degrees (B.A. and B.S.), honors in the major and a senior thesis option. At the graduate level, students can concentrate in American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Methodology, and Political Theory.

4. **Department Intellectual Life**

The Department of Political Science maintains a number of workshops and colloquia. Four of these (The American Politics Workshop, The Comparative Politics Colloquium, The International Relations Colloquium, and the Political Theory Workshop) are structured such that graduate students can enroll in them for credit and are coordinated by faculty and graduate students from their respective fields. These workshops feature regular meetings in which visiting scholars along with members of the Madison community present research; each periodically features professionalism-oriented talks as well. Beyond the four subfield workshops, the Department coordinates or participates in the following: the European Politics Workshop, the Experimental Politics Workshop, the Latin America Colloquium, the Models and Data Group, and the Political Economy Colloquium.

5. **Recommendations from Prior External Review and Department Response**

We conclude this introductory section by highlighting (beyond the recommendation to publish more articles in top Political Science Journals) the two specific curricular recommendations from the Dean’s summary letter signifying the conclusion of the Department’s last 10 year review:

“First, the lack of a statistics requirement for the major is a glaring omission in a department that strives for excellence in research. It strikes me that faculty opposition to introducing such a requirement is much less today than it might have been in the past. You and your colleagues need to attend to this issue. Second, the external committee saw the need to introduce to your curriculum upper-level of that emphasize writing and research. I understand the constraints that might impede movement in this direction in the near term.”

With respect to the first recommendation, our undergraduates are required to take at least one research methods course from the following list: PS 170, PS 270, PS 274, PS 348, PS 373, PS 551
With respect to the second recommendation, the department now offers a variety of writing intensive courses, including PS 272 (Introduction to Public Policy), PS 601 (our senior seminar topics course, which involves extensive research and writing) and PS 681, 682, 683, & 684 (our senior thesis courses). In addition, various undergraduate courses (including those offered for honors or as part of first year interest groups) are regularly taught as writing intensive.

6. Review Process Description

This review was produced by a committee that included John Zumbrunnen (Professor and Chair); Dan Kapust (Professor), Nadav Shelef (Professor, Associate Chair and Director of Graduate Studies), Amy Gangl (Senior Lecturer and Director of Undergraduate Engagment) and Rachel Margolies (Undergraduate Coordinator), in consultation with departmental faculty, staff and students. Data for the report was obtained from Academic Planning and Institutional Research and Academic Information Management in the College of Letters & Science. A draft of the final report was reviewed and approved by the department’s Executive Committee.

II. Political Science Undergraduate Program

1. Overview of Undergraduate Degree Programs

The Department of Political Science offers both a B.A. and B.S. in Political Science; it also serves as the administrative home and runs the undergraduate certificate in Political Economy, Philosophy, and Politics (PEPP). The PEPP certificate (see II.5) is jointly run with the departments of Economics and Philosophy. Daniel Kapust serves as Faculty Director of the Certificate; Eunsook Jung serves as Associate Director.

2. Undergraduate Learning Outcomes

The BA and BS degrees in Political Science center on the following learning outcomes:

1. Develop an understanding of and appreciation for the methods and approaches of diverse subfields in Political Science—American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Theory—and their relevance to important theoretical and pragmatic questions.
2. Analyze different forms and practices of governance both democratic and non-democratic.
3. Argue effectively and defend propositions with intellectual integrity, while considering a range of alternative points of view and evidence.
4. Analyze relations among individuals, civil society, political institutions, and states.
5. Analyze the motivations and consequences of political decision-making and activities.

The certificate in Political Economy, Philosophy, and Politics centers on the following learning outcomes:

1. Knowing key concepts and arguments from economics, philosophy, and political science.
2. Synthesizing arguments, concepts, and methods from philosophy, politics, and economics.
3. Applying arguments, concepts, and methods from philosophy, politics, and economics to contemporary policy debates.

3. Requirements for the Political Science BA/BS

1. Foundations courses: At least one course\(^2\) in three of these subfields: American Government, International Relations, Comparative Politics, Political Theory

\(^2\) See Appendix 1 for a list of undergraduate course offerings broken down by subfield.
2. Research Methods Course: At least one research methods course chosen from the following:
PS 170, PS 270, PS 274, PS 348, PS 373, PS 551
3. Upper Level Electives: At least 15 credits of upper level work in the major (courses
numbered 300 or above).
4. Students must have at least 30 credits within the Political Science Department
5. Students must maintain a 2.000 GPA in all Political Science courses and courses that count
toward the major, a 2.000 GPA on 15 upper-level credits in the major, taken in residence, and
15 credits in Political Science, taken on campus
6. Courses may only meet one Distribution area. A course may meet both a Distribution and
the Research Methods requirement, but will only be applied once toward the 30 credits
required in the major
7. No more than 6 total credits of Directed Study (PS 199, PS 698, PS 699) and Internship (PS
315, PS 303) may count in the major.

4. Honors in the Major

1. To declare Honors in the Major, students must have at least one POLI SCI course for
Honors, at least a 3.300 University GPA, and meet with the major advisor to discuss the
requirements.
2. To earn Honors in the Major, students must satisfy the requirements for the major
(above) and these additional requirements:
   a. Earn a 3.300 or higher University GPA
   b. Earn 3.500 GPA or higher in all POLI SCI courses
   c. Complete at least 20 credits in POLI SCI for Honors to include:
      PS 601: Proseminar: Topics in Political Science (3 credits)
      PS 685: Honors Research Internship in Political Science (1-3 credits)
   d. Complete one of these Thesis sequences (6-8 credits):
      i. PS 681 Senior Honors Thesis & PS 682 Senior Honors Thesis
      ii. PS 683 Senior Honors Thesis Seminar & PS 684 Senior Honors Thesis
      Seminar
3. A grade of B or higher is required to earn Honors credit.

5. Certificate in Political Economy, Philosophy, and Politics (PEPP)

1. Core Breadth: Four courses for 12 credits, one course from each of these areas: Economics,
   Philosophy, Political Theory, Political Institutions.3
2. Elective Depth: Take one (1) additional course (3 credits) from the areas above in either
   Economics or Philosophy.
3. Capstone Seminar: PS 461: Interdisciplinary Seminar in Political Economy, Philosophy, &
   Politics.
4. Residency and Quality of Work: 2.000 GPA in all courses eligible for the certificate and 9
   credits in residence
5. Students declare for PEPP certificate through this link: https://polisci.wisc.edu/pepp-
certificate/

3 Please see Appendix 2 for a list of PEPP courses by area.
6. Trends in Undergraduate Enrollment

This section documents trends in Political Science undergraduate enrollments. Table 1 provides the number of majors in each Fall term over the past 10 years; Tables 2 and 3 depict Political Science’s 10 year trends in time to degree, featuring AAUP peer comparisons; Table 4 provides exceptions to major requirement counts; Table 5 provides APIR “persistence in major” data. “Credit follows instructor” data are provided in Appendix 3. Faculty credit hours generated per FTE unit data are provided in Appendix 5.

We wish to highlight three trends. First, the total number of majors has increased after reaching a low point in 2016. Majors in 2019 surpassed the previous high point in 2011. Second, time-to-degree for our majors has consistently decreased since 2011-2012, and the department is on par with or lower than our AAU peers. Third, the number of exceptions granted has trended downward in recent years.

Table 1: Political Science Majors: 10 Year Trend, Fall #’s

For these data in chart form, see Appendix 4.

Table 2: Undergraduate Time to Degree, 10 Year Trend, With Peer Comparison

---

4 For these data in chart form, see Appendix 4.
Table 4: Undergraduate Time to Degree, 10 Year Trend, With Peer Comparisons

Average Time-to-Degree (elapsed calendar years): UW-Madison and AAU Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Year</th>
<th>Average Time-to-Degree</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UW-Madison</td>
<td>AAU Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Exceptions to Major Requirement Counts

Exceptions made to the Political Science Major Requirements

Table 6 APIR Persistence in Major Data

Ten Majors with the Highest Percentage of Intended Students Graduating in the Same Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Number Intended</th>
<th>Number Graduated</th>
<th>Graduated/Intended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Science</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Sciences and Disorders</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes majors that had 30 or more graduates who intended the major.
7. PEPP Enrollment and Credentials

Spring 2020 marks the 5th semester in which students have enrolled in the PEPP Certificate. Currently, 60 students have declared for the certificate, and 4 students have earned the credential prior to the 2019-2020 academic year. (4 applied for the credential for Fall 2019, and 6 for Spring 2020). In Spring 2019, 52 students were enrolled in the PEPP program, including 30 males, 22 females and 5 students identified as targeted minorities. PEPP students came from 20 different majors (including 24 Political Science majors and 17 Economics majors).

8. Political Science Participation in High Impact Practices

The Department of Political Science is deeply involved in a variety of High Impact Practices (HIPs), as is documented in the 3 tables below. We also wish to highlight two further elements of our HIP efforts.

Wisconsin in Washington. Building on its long experience with a summer internship program in Washington, D.C., the department has partnered with the International Division and International Academic Programs to create Wisconsin in Washington (WIW). WIW sends approximately students each semester to Washington D.C. and another 25 for an eight week summer term. At least ⅔ of participants each term are political science majors or double majors. Department play a lead role in advising and preparing students for the program, and the department administers its own scholarships for the program funded by generous department alumni.

Student Organizations. In 2018, the department facilitated the creation of the Political Science Student Association, now a registered student organization with nearly 100 members. With funding from the department, PSSA conducts nonpartisan programming open to the campus community. PSSA regularly partners with other campus organizations, including College Democrats, College Republicans and the Wisconsin Student Union on programming. In addition, the department in 2019 facilitated the creation of the Political Science Debate Society and continues to support a campus chapter of Pi Sigma Alpha, the national political science honor society.

With respect to quantitative data on Political Science HIPs, Table 7 documents Political Science graduates’ participation in high impact practices, along with comparison to all L & S graduates; Table 8 documents Political Science contributions to FIGs; Table 9 documents Political Science contributions to L & S Honors. We note that Honors participations growth in 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 represents concerted effort to have all sections of large enrollment courses as HIA.

Table 7: Political Science Graduates’ Participation in HIPs and Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>7126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Learning Community</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Interest Groups</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning Course</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent/Directed Study</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Experience</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Based Experience</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Course</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Course</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Experience</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one High Impact Experience</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Political Science Contributions to FIGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>FIG Seminars</th>
<th>FIG linked sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Political Science Contributions to Honors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>HIA sections</th>
<th>HON sections</th>
<th>HOP sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Diversity within the Political Science Undergraduate Program

As indicated in Table 10, the demographics of UW Political students—in terms of both Political Science majors and enrollments in the four subfield introductory courses—are broadly similar to the demographics of the general population of UW undergraduates. Students from targeted minority groups are underrepresented among Political Science students, as they are among UW students more generally. The Political Science student body differs from the UW student body in having a lower percentage of international students and a higher percentage of women students.

Table 10: Undergraduate Students, Fall 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minority Students</th>
<th>Targeted Minority</th>
<th>International Students</th>
<th>Female Students</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All UW degree seeking undergraduates</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol Sci Majors</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 104: Intro to American Politics</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 120: Politics Around the World</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 140: Intro to International Relations</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 160: Intro to Political Thought</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 11, 12 and 13 depict D-F drop-rate differentials for Targeted Minority vs. Non-Targeted Minority, Male vs. Female, and First Generation vs. Non First Generation students. Taking note of the higher D-F drop rates for targeted minority, first generation and women students, particularly in research methods courses (e.g., PS 348 and PS 274), the department’s undergraduate team has partnered with faculty to launch a peer tutoring program in PS 348 during spring 2020. We will analyze the results of this pilot and then work to expand the program to other courses in 2020-2021.

Table 11: D-F Drop Rate Differentials: Targeted Minority vs. Non-Targeted Minority (PS courses with highest differentials)

Table 12: D-F Drop Rate Differentials: Male vs. Female (PS courses with highest differentials)
10. Departmental Advising

The Department of Political Science is fortunate to have a team of four talented undergraduate program staff members: Cassie Chulick (Undergraduate Advisor); Joel Clark (Director of Professional Development); Amy Gangl (Director of Undergraduate Engagement), and Rachel Margolies (Undergraduate Coordinator). Chulick, Gangl, and Margolies engage in academic advising, while Clark engages in career-related advising. A fifth staff member, Eunsook Jung, left for a position in the college effective February 17, 2020. Our advising assignments and student-to-adviser ratios are thus in flux. In addition to their work as advisors, Clark and Gangl each offer courses. Gangl helps to oversee the department’s undergraduate organizations (Pi Sigma Alpha, Political Science Debate Society, the Political Science Student Association). She has launched and directs our Peer Mentor program, through which advanced undergraduates serve as additional advising resources for our majors, and she co-produces with three undergraduates our political science podcast, which serves as an important mode of communication with both current students and alumni.

11. Career Development in Political Science

In addition to offering its own career course and career advising, the department has increasingly partnered with SuccessWorks. This includes coordinating the department’s career course with SuccessWorks’ Taking Initiative Course and, in fall 2019, co-hosting the first ‘Political Science @ Work” event. In addition, Amy Gangl has created a new mentor matching program that pairs current students with recent department alumni for networking and career advice. This program has been developed in close collaboration with SuccessWorks and the Wisconsin Foundation and Alumni Association.

12. Political Science Undergraduate Degree Program Assessment

The Department’s assessment plan, created in 2016, is included in Appendix 5, along with the assessment report for 2018-2019. We note that due to turnover in both the Director of Undergraduate Programs and Department Administrator positions, the department did not carry out our assessment plan in 2016-2017 or 2017-2018. In 2019-2020, The Department applied for and received a grant from the Provost’s office to update and enter in AEFIS course learning outcomes for all courses numbered 699 and below.

Given the quite recent creation of the PEPP Certificate, we have not yet undertaken formal assessment. The Steering Committee actively oversees the PEPP curriculum, and has implemented a number of changes, including the addition of several courses to the course array, along with articulating the expectation that faculty strive to work with the Writing Center in teaching PS 461. The Director of the PEPP Certificate
maintains a Box folder in which copies of all research papers written for PS 461 are maintained to ensure that a sampling of anonymous student papers can be evaluated with the assessment rubric provided to L & S when the time comes for PEPP’s review.

III. Political Science Graduate program

1. Graduate Degrees and Learning Outcomes

The Political Science departments offers three graduate credentials: the MA, the PhD, and the Doctoral Minor.

The MA’s learning outcomes are:

1. Develop an appreciation of the diverse subfields of political science.
2. Learn to articulate questions of importance to the field that can be answered using the methods of political science.
3. Learn to select and utilize methods of political inquiry appropriate to particular research questions.
4. Learn to constructively critique existing work in political science.
5. Develop an understanding of political science from an historical context.
6. Recognize and apply principles of ethical and professional conduct in research, teaching, and service.

The PhD program’s learning outcomes are:

1. Master the state of existing research in two or more subfields of political science.
2. Acquire expert knowledge of methods of political inquiry.
3. Design, conduct, and complete original research of substantive value to the field of political science that makes and original contribution to knowledge.
4. Master the communication of complex concepts to a range of audiences.
5. Demonstrate and foster ethical and professional conduct in research, teaching, and service.

2. General Structure of the PhD Program. In addition to earning 51 total credits, Ph.D. students are required to:

1. Take PS 800: Political Science as a Discipline and Profession (1 credit; must be done in the first semester)
2. Take PS 817: Empirical Methods of Political Inquiry (3 credits) and an additional 3 credits of Graduate Level Statistical Methodology Coursework.
3. Meet with their advisor to discuss the faculty’s First Year Assessment of their progress in the program by the start of their third semester.
4. Take and pass two general prelims from the specified list (International Relations, American Politics, Comparative Politics, Political Theory, Political Methodology) in June following their fourth semester.
5. Present one or more possible dissertation ideas to a committee with a minimum of two faculty members no later than September 15th of the 5th semester.
6. Take PS 801: Research and Writing Seminar (3 credits)

5 For an overview of the structure, see Appendix 6. For a complete list of graduate courses, see Appendix 8.
7. Submit a conference level research paper for review by January 15 before start of 6th semester.
8. Complete the minor requirement. (9 credits)
9. Meet the minimum graduate credit requirement. (32 credits)
10. Fulfill any requirements specified by the student’s primary subfield, such as presenting at a workshop.
11. Maintain a minimum of B average in coursework.
12. Remove all Incompletes before defending the dissertation proposal.
13. Produce an approved dissertation proposal before the start of the seventh semester.
14. Write, defend and deposit a thesis of an acceptable standard that makes an original contribution to knowledge.

3. Graduate Advising, Graduate Guide, and Normal Progress

Graduate advising begins formally at the start of the school year in August for incoming students. The department offers a “math camp,” followed by a department orientation with the Associate Chair. Following that, the Associate Chair meets individually with each graduate student to discuss course plans as well as preferences for a faculty advisor. Based on that meeting, as well as consultations with the faculty, each first year student is assigned a faculty advisor who serves as the primary mentor for the student in his or her first three years in the program. Students may switch to a different primary advisor at any point, as their interests evolve. In addition to the faculty mentor, incoming students are also assigned peer mentors, who are more advanced students in the program. The graduate advising load is distributed relatively evenly, with faculty members serving as dissertation chairs of between 0 and 5 students, with a mean of 2.19 per faculty member.

For first year students, the department holds a “First Year Assessment” every May, in which the entire faculty meets to discuss first year students’ performance. The meeting results in individually tailored letters to each first year student detailing what has gone well and issues on which there could be improvement. Each student is then required to meet with their advisor to discuss the contents of the letter.

Beyond first-year mentoring, the department has a strong norm of hands-on faculty mentoring. In the last three years, we have formalized some aspects of this relationship by encouraging faculty to develop explicit “mentor-mentee” guidelines and requiring each student to meet with the chair of their dissertation committee every semester. Mentoring is also extensive as students enter the job market. In the spring, the department holds two sessions with students who anticipate going on the job market in the fall: one with the Associate Chair and one with professors who recently were on the job market themselves. The department also creates a placement website with sample cover letters, teaching statements, CVs, and so forth. Come August, the Associate Chair reviews each candidate’s materials and meets individually with her or him. The department then creates space for each candidate to present a practice job talk in one or more departmental colloquia, where the student receives extensive feedback. Finally, in recent years, the department has created a mock interview day, where our students engage in mock one-on-one interviews with the faculty to simulate their experience on actual interviews.

Finally, the department is increasingly promoting a “whole of committee” approach, as opposed to a “chair-centric” approach to dissertation writing and mentoring. Students are responsible for assembling their own dissertation committees and encouraged to start discussing the possibility with faculty early on in their graduate school career. Graduate students are required to have at least three faculty members on their prospectus defense committee, and 4 on the dissertation committee.

---

6 For an overview of normal progress, see Appendix 7.
The Department provides electronic copies of the Graduate Guide and with a Model of Normal Progress.

4. Funding and Support

The department has invested tremendous resources in our graduate program. We have in recent years, per an agreement with the college, reduced the size of our incoming graduate classes in order to increase TA and PA appointment levels to 50% (a standard to which others on campus have begun to move). This allowed for higher stipends, though it also decreased our number of available TAs and so our overall instructional capacity. The average annual guaranteed stipend amount for the cohort entering our program in fall 2010 was $14,434 for those receiving University Fellowships, and $11,552 for TAs or PAs. For the fall 2020 cohort, the average annual stipend guarantee for 5-years will be $24,800 for those with University Fellowships, and $23,300 for TAs or PAs. These represent an increase of 72% and 102%, respectively over the last 10 years. Our support for graduate student stipends is higher than what they are paid by the university and require substantial “top-offs” by the department. Under the new funding levels, the department will be spending about $191,000 of endowment income on student stipends and summer funding annually (once all students are on at the new levels).

These new funding levels have enabled us to narrow the gap between our stipends and those of our public university competitors, though we remain far behind departments in private universities with whom we compete for graduate student talent. On average, our students also teach more than their peers at other institutions, further reducing their productivity during graduate school, and therefore, their placement in the job market. These funding gaps are also a significant hurdle to recruiting admitted first-generation students and those from under-represented backgrounds.

In addition to this, the department is also devoting significant resources to the professional development of our graduate students in a number of ways. First, the department provides $300 annually to each student to enable the presentation of their work at a professional conference. Second, the department holds four weekly (American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Theory) and two monthly (Experimental politics, Models and Data) scholarly workshop series at which graduate students (as well as faculty and outside speakers) present their work, serve as discussants, and develop their professional networks. The department also supports the activities of the Women in Political Science group in an effort to address some of the gender imbalances in time to completion and degree rates, as well as the Graduate Student Professional Development workshop. Finally, we have grown significantly the funds available for students through the competitive summer initiative project. This project provides funds for students to pursue additional training or undertake research over the summer. Last year, the department awarded over $80,000 in summer initiative funding. All told, the department has allocated upwards of $250,000 annually of privately raised endowment income to the graduate program.

5. Admissions, Enrollment, and Diversity

Table 14 below shows total enrollment in Political Science Graduate Programs. As indicated in Table 15, percentages of students from minority and targeted minority groups are similar among Political Science graduate students and UW graduate students generally. Percentages of international students and female students are noticeably lower among Political Science graduate students than among UW graduate students more generally. Table 16 documents the % of minority applicants, admitted students, and enrolled students. Table 17 documents overall demographic data for the Political Science graduate program.

---

7 University Fellowships provide fellowships in years 1 and 4 of the program.
During the last two academic years, the department has made significant efforts to enhance diversity among its graduate students. The current and previous associate chairs have focused in particular on enhancing diversity in our applicant pool. Three efforts along these lines are noteworthy. First, starting in summer 2018, the department funded a faculty member for travel to and participate in the American Political Science Association’s Ralph Bunche Institute, a summer program designed to assist undergraduates from historically underrepresented groups as they explore options for graduate study in Political Science. Second, faculty and graduate students in the international relations subfield launched a diversity initiative that brought undergraduates from historically underrepresented groups from around the country to Madison in spring 2019 for a day of workshops, both substantive and focused on exploring graduate study. This effort is being expanded in 2020, to a department-wide visiting day funded by the department. Finally, the associate chair has initiated a regular practice of contacting students in recognized pipeline programs (McNair scholars, APSA’s Minority Student Recruitment Program) to encourage them to apply to our program. To reduce the cost of applying to our program, the department pays the application fee for these students.

Table 14: Enrollment in Political Science Graduate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14: Enrollment in Political Science Graduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Demographics of Graduate Students, Fall 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15: Demographics of Graduate Students, Fall 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All UW professional and graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: % Minority Student Applicants, Admitted, and Enrolled

Table 17: Overall Demographic Data for Political Science Graduate Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate program demographic data, AY 2010-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% female applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% female admits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% female enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% targeted minority applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% targeted minority admits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% targeted minority enrolled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Time to Degree, Completion Rate, Outcomes, and Placements

The median time to degree for students in our program for the 2013-2017 degree cohorts was 7.04 years. This is slightly higher than that of our AAU peer median time to degree, which was 6.47 years. Overall, our 10-year completion rate (for cohorts entering the program between the 2004-2005 and 2006-2007 academic years) is 73%. This is significantly higher than the AAU Peer 10-year completion rate for the same period, which was 55%. 
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Table 18: Median Time to Degree, 2010-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Targeted minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five years or less</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 years</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 years</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 years</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 years</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Completion Rates, 2018-2016 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion rates, 2008-2016 cohorts</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Targeted minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Plan</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still enrolled</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal MA</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete plan</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Doctoral Career Outcomes

For detailed demographic data on placement, see Appendix 9.
7. Department Graduate Diversity Efforts

As the data above shows, one area of needed improvement has been in our ability to recruit students from under-represented students to our graduate program. Historically, we have engaged in a number of practices to help ameliorate this problem. First, the department pays the full cost of attending our prospective student visit to students from under-represented backgrounds (all others get up to $400 in travel expenses reimbursed). Second, the department is usually allocated an Advanced Opportunity Fellowship in addition to our complement of University Fellowships that we can award to a student from an under-represented background. Unfortunately, our overall low level of compensation (even for those on fellowships, see below) makes us relatively uncompetitive for these highly sought-after students.

Over the last several years, the department has undertaken a number of initiatives intended to familiarize students from underrepresented background with our department and increase the proportion of students from underrepresented backgrounds in our applicant pool. Our guiding logic has been that having more qualified students in the pool will lead to more students from underrepresented backgrounds among the admitted students and, as a result, also increase our take-up rate. These initiatives include a number of outreach efforts, such as sending a faculty member to the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute, reaching out to McNair Scholars and participants in APSA’s MSRP program, participation in APSA’s diversity graduate school fair, and purposeful engagement with these students before they apply to graduate school.

A second initiative has been to launch a diversity visiting day in which we bring a cohort of first generation and under-represented students to our department. This visiting day is intended to increase the diversity of applicants to political science Ph.D. programs (including ours) by reaching out to students in under-represented groups who might not otherwise consider graduate school. Our intention is to reach out to students relatively earlier in their academic career (current juniors and perhaps seniors who have not yet applied to graduate school). During the visiting day, students participate in conversations with our faculty and graduate students about current political science research as well as about applying to graduate school, graduate school life, and post-graduate school career paths. We focus especially on how to navigate academia and the support networks available to first-generation graduate students and students from underrepresented backgrounds. The department covers all travel expenses for students to attend. This initiative began with a pilot program funded by the IR group in fall 2019. The department voted to expand the initiative to a department-wide one that will be held in April 2020.

It is too early to evaluate the overall impact of these initiatives on either the proportion of students from under-represented backgrounds in our applicant pool or on our take-up rate. However, initial indications are positive. The proportion of students from under-represented backgrounds among applicants for Fall 2020 was 11%, still low, but higher than at any time in the last decade. Perhaps because of our attention to recruitment among pilot programs aimed at high achieving students and preparing them for graduate school, the proportion of admitted students from underrepresented background this year was also especially high.

We are also turning our attention to building a climate in the graduate program where every student feels welcomed and supported. This includes a series of conversations between the associate chair and students from under-represented backgrounds intended to learn what we can do better to support them in our program, as well as revamping our Prospective Student Visit to provide explicit opportunities for students to engage with one another on these topics.
IV. Evaluation and Reflection

1. Faculty

The Department of Political Science continues to exhibit great strength, though we do face some important challenges. We have retained our place among the top 15 ranked programs, and, as noted above, our faculty remain highly productive and visible scholars. This is true despite the significant budgetary headwinds faced by the department in recent years. As indicated in Table 21, those headwinds, because they have meant sharply reduced hiring, have lead to decline in the number of faculty FTE in the department and an increasing concentration of faculty at the rank of full professor. The department has also weathered many retention cases, successfully keeping most all of our faculty (in since fall 2017, there have been 8 retention cases, all but one successful). This success, though, adds expenses to the department’s budget tally sheet, thus moving faculty hiring farther into the future.

Table 21: Political Science Faculty FTE by Rank and Gender, 2013-2018
2. Undergraduate Program

Political Science remains one of the **five most popular majors on campus**. A combination of **external pressures** (the financial crisis, the collapse of the law market) and **decreased instructional resources** (fewer faculty due to our not being authorized to hire and fewer teaching assistants following our reduction of the size of our graduate program in order to increase appointment levels and stipends) led to a decline in total enrollments and majors until 2017, when both began to trend upward. Declared majors are now near 1000 (up from 750 at their nadir). Particularly given enrollment expansion, we now face the challenge of providing sufficient enrollment access to meet demand. The department appreciates the College’s provision of new 101 funding in recent reallocation exercises and hopes to see **similar increases in future exercises**. We also appreciate the College’s encouragement of our overspending our budget for teaching assistants, allowing us to add sections to our most popular courses. We look forward to this additional spending being regularized through **permanent increases to our teaching assistant budget**. In the longer run, though, **hiring additional faculty** will be crucial to ensuring sufficient undergraduate access.

As indicated above, the department continues to make **significant contributions to high impact practices**, including FIGs and honors. Department faculty and staff have also embraced summer term expansion by developing high quality online courses. We can, though, do more. The majority of our honors offerings, for example, involve the addition of honors options (HIA) to existing courses. While valuable, these do not provide the full high impact experience of honors only sections or honors only courses. Our faculty are eager to offer more of the latter, but we face a trade-off between small honors sections and courses and the high demand from the general undergraduate population. This trade-off can be ameliorated through **more central support for high impact practices**.

We note as well that the department currently offers only one course that meets the general education **ethnic studies requirement**. We hope to expand our offerings in this area. As discussed in the Diversity and Climate section below, a top priority (with accompanying budgetary need) is to hire a scholar of race and ethnic politic who might develop relevant courses.

Finally, we note that the department’s undergraduate staff has in recent years done excellent work in **expanding opportunities for our students**. These include the creation in the last two years alone of our summer visiting international students program, our political science student association, our debate society, our student-led departmental podcast, and our peer mentor program. In 2019-2020, we have expanded a mentor matching program piloted in spring 2019, which matches current majors with recent department alumni. In spring 2020, noting achievement gaps for minority and women students in our research methods courses, we have launched a pilot peer tutoring program.

3. Graduate Program

Our **graduate program continues to excel**, attracting exceptional students who produce high quality dissertations and enjoy very good placement rates. In addition, we are making significant efforts and notable progress in diversifying our graduate student body. This performance is remarkable given available resources. As indicated above (and as is true for many departments at UW), **standard graduate stipends are well below those offered by our peers** (we compete with the best public and private research institutions). We are able to close this competitive gap significantly, though not entirely, through our development efforts and the amazing generosity of our friends and alumni; but our continued success will require greater support from campus.
4. **Diversity, Equity and Climate**

In each of the above areas, diversity, equity and climate are of central importance. As tables 22 and 23 indicate, our faculty and staff reflect the general lack of diversity at UW-Madison.

**Table 22: Demographics of Political Science Faculty Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All UW faculty</th>
<th>Minority Faculty</th>
<th>Female Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Science Faculty</th>
<th>Minority Faculty</th>
<th>Female Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 23: Demographics Among Political Science Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All UW Academic Staff</th>
<th>Minority Staff</th>
<th>Female Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Science Academic Staff</th>
<th>Minority Staff</th>
<th>Female Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All UW University Staff</th>
<th>Minority Staff</th>
<th>Female Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Science University Staff</th>
<th>Minority Staff</th>
<th>Female Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of diversity among department faculty was an central and often expressed concern in a department climate survey of faculty, staff and graduate students conducted through WISELI’s department chair climate workshop in fall 2017. A more diverse faculty will help attract, support and retain a more diverse student body at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Ultimately, **the department cannot diversify its faculty unless it can hire faculty**. Given the department’s budget situation, opportunities to hire will come in non-traditional ways.

The Target of Opportunity Program is important in this regard, and the department is making significant efforts to identify potential candidates. For example, the four subfield workshops—each of which brings 2-3 outside scholars to campus each month—have worked to diversify significantly the group of scholars invited to present their work. This had begun before the revitalization of the TOP program and workshop.
coordinators have redoubled these efforts. The department submitted TOP requests to hire in each of the last two academic years. In 2018-2019, our request was granted, but too late in our hiring cycle to be effective; our candidate was hired by the University of Chicago. Our TOP request in 2019-2020 was not granted. Meanwhile, following discussions at a department strategic planning retreat in May, 2019, a survey of faculty indicated that the top hiring priority for the department was in the field of race and ethnic politics, a field likely to produce a more diverse applicant pool than other fields. The chair is also at work on a development effort to secure private funding to support a TOP hire in the future.

The department has been able to add new faculty in the last two academic years, one through private funding and two through the cluster hire program. In all three searches, we have aimed to employ best practices for hiring for inclusive excellence. All search committee chairs participated in WISELI’s workshop on hiring for inclusive excellence, and all search committee members (and the department faculty more generally) worked to communicate through their professional networks and organizations that we welcomed a diverse applicant pool. In addition, one search committee experimented with a new application review process that involved an initial review of anonymized research statements from all candidates. In general, finalist pools for the three positions were more diverse than in the past, particularly with regard to candidate gender. In the end, these searches did add to department diversity, with the addition of one female faculty member and one international faculty member.

When, hopefully in the near future, we are able to enhance diversity through hiring, it will be essential that our department climate provides a welcoming and inclusive workplace for everyone. Our 2017 climate survey has proven helpful in this regard. In addition to highlighting concerns with lack of diversity, survey results indicated a need to improve transparency and representation in department governance. In response to this second issue, the chair initiated, and the department approved, changes to governance designed to enhance transparency and to provide opportunities for more diverse leadership. These changes included:

- The number of department standing committees was reduced, with an eye towards drawing more effectively on the diversity that exists among department faculty without overburdening faculty from underrepresented groups with multiple leadership roles.
- A chair’s advisory committee was created to consult with the chair on mid-level decisions, and committee membership was chosen with an eye towards diversity.
- The Equity and Diversity Committee was revitalized, with regular meetings and an ongoing agenda including rewriting the department’s professional workplace statement, working to create a diversity and inclusive excellence page on the department’s website, and addressing issues of equity, access and inclusivity both proactively and as they arise in the department.
- The chair stepped away from leadership roles (and, in most cases, membership) on department governance committees to allow for the development and exercise of more broad-based leadership.

These efforts to make department governance more inclusive and transparent were aimed at enhancing department climate and preparing the department better to recruit, support and retain a more diverse faculty. With our efforts to enhance the diversity of our graduate applicant pool and student body and our efforts to close achievement gaps in our undergraduate courses, we are making substantial progress. We know, however, that to enhance and support diversity in the student body, a more diverse faculty is a necessary condition.
5. Advancement, Development and Alumni Relations

Political Science has for many years been at the fore of development activities at the department level at UW. Working with a dedicated (and partially department funded) development director from the Wisconsin Foundation and Alumni Association, the department has created and maintained an active Board of Visitors, now with 35 members who offer strategic advice and input to the chair and fulfill a substantial yearly giving commitment. The department has been remarkably successful in attracting gifts and now has endowed funds totaling nearly $20 million at WFAA. This includes funding for 4 active professorships, with 5 more professorships pledged for the future. These professorships both support faculty research and relieve pressure from the department’s 101 salary budget. We note that these developments efforts do require the deployment of significant department resources, most notably the time and energy of the department chair, department development chair, department administrator, chair’s assistant, director of undergraduate engagement and director of professional development. We will not relent in these development activities. We do note the importance to development appeals, though, of continued strong commitment (including budgetary commitment) to the department on the part of the college and university.
V. Appendices

Appendix 1: Undergraduate Course Offerings, Broken Down by Subfield

1. International Relations

POLI SCI 140: Introduction to International Relations
POLI SCI 340: The European Union: Politics and Political Economy
POLI SCI 343: Theories of International Security
POLI SCI 345: Conflict Resolution
POLI SCI 346: China in World Politics
POLI SCI 347: Terrorism
POLI SCI 348: Analysis of International Relations
POLI SCI 350: International Political Economy
POLI SCI 351: Politics of the World Economy
POLI SCI 353: The Third World in the International System
POLI SCI 354: International Institutions and World Order
POLI SCI 356: Principles of International Law
POLI SCI 359: American Foreign Policy
POLI SCI/GEN&WS 429: Gender and Politics in Comparative Perspective
POLI SCI/ECON/ENVIR ST/URB R PL 449: Government and Natural Resources
POLI SCI 455: African International Relations
POLI SCI 652: The Politics of Development

2. American Government

POLI SCI 104: Introduction to American Politics and Government
POLI SCI 184: Introduction to American Politics
POLI SCI 205: Introduction to State Government
POLI SCI 206: Introduction to Political Psychology
POLI SCI/LEGAL ST 217: Law, Politics and Society
POLI SCI/CHICLA 231: Politics in Multi-Cultural Societies
POLI SCI/CHICLA 302: Mexican-American Politics
POLI SCI 303: Election Campaign Practicum
POLI SCI 304: The Political Economy of Race in the United States
POLI SCI 305: Elections and Voting Behavior
POLI SCI 308: Public Administration
POLI SCI 309: Civil Liberties in the United States
POLI SCI 311: United States Congress
POLI SCI 314: Criminal Law and Justice
POLI SCI 315: Legislative Internship
POLI SCI 402: Wisconsin in Washington Internship Course
POLI SCI 405: State Government and Public Policy
POLI SCI 408: The American Presidency
POLI SCI 409: American Parties and Politics
POLI SCI 410: Citizenship, Democracy, and Difference
POLI SCI 411: The American Constitution: Powers and Structures of Government
POLI SCI 412: The American Constitution: Rights and Civil Liberties
POLI SCI 414: The Supreme Court as a Political Institution
POLI SCI 415: The Separation of Powers and Federal Courts
POLI SCI 416: Community Power and Grass Roots Politics
POLI SCI 417: The American Judicial System
POLI SCI/PUB AFFR 419: Administrative Law
POLI SCI 490: Study Abroad Topics in Political Science: American Government
POLI SCI 510: Politics of Government Regulation
POLI SCI 511: Campaign Finance
POLI SCI 514: Interest Group Politics
POLI SCI 515: Public Opinion
POLI SCI 516: Political Communications
POLI SCI 602: Wisconsin in Washington Advanced Public Policy Course

3. Political Theory

POLI SCI 160: Introduction to Political Theory
POLI SCI 265: Development of Ancient and Medieval Western Political Thought
POLI SCI 266: The Development of Modern Western Political Thought
POLI SCI 360: History of American Political Thought
POLI SCI 361: Contemporary American Political Thought
POLI SCI 363: Literature and Politics
POLI SCI 460: Topics in Political Philosophy
POLI SCI 463: Deception and Politics
POLI SCI/GEN&WS 469: Women and Politics
POLI SCI/AFROAMER 519: African American Political Theory
POLI SCI 561: Radical Political Theory
POLI SCI 590: Study Abroad Topics in Political Science: Political Theory

4. Comparative Politics

POLI SCI 120: Politics Around the World
POLI SCI 182: Politics Around the World (Honors)
POLI SCI/CHICLA 231: Politics in Multi-Cultural Societies
POLI SCI/ASIAN/GEOG/HISTORY/SOC 244: Introduction to Southeast Asia: Vietnam to the Philippines
POLI SCI/GEOG/HISTORY/SLAVIC 253: Russia: An Interdisciplinary Survey
POLI SCI/GEOG/HISTORY/SLAVIC 254: Eastern Europe: An Interdisciplinary Survey
POLI SCI/ASIAN/E A STD/S HISTORY 255: Introduction to East Asian Civilizations
POLI SCI/AFROAMER/ANTHRO/C& E SOC/GEOG/HISTORY/LACIS/SOC/SPANISH 260: Latin America: An Introduction
POLI SCI/AFRICAN/AFROAMER/ANTHRO/GEOG/HIST/SOC 277: Africa: An Introductory Survey
POLI SCI 321: Latin-American Politics
POLI SCI 322: Politics of Southeast Asia
POLI SCI 324: Political Power in Contemporary China
POLI SCI/INTL ST 325: Social Movements and Revolutions in Latin America
POLI SCI/ASIAN 326: Politics of South Asia
POLI SCI/INTL ST 327: Indian Politics in Comparative Perspective
POLI SCI 329: African Politics
POLI SCI 330: Political Economy of Development
POLI SCI 332: German Politics
POLI SCI 334: Russian Politics
POLI SCI 421: The Challenge of Democratization
POLI SCI/CHICLA/HISTORY 422: Latino History and Politics
POLI SCI/INTL ST 423: Social Mobilization in Latin America
POLI SCI/INTL ST 431: Contentious Politics
POLI SCI 432: Comparative Legal Institutions
POLI SCI/RELIG ST 433: Religion and Politics
POLI SCI/INTL ST 434: The Politics of Human Rights
POLI SCI/INTL ST 436: Political Inequality: Measures, Causes, Effects and Remedies
POLI SCI 437: Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict
POLI SCI 438: Comparative Political Culture
POLI SCI/INTL ST 439: The Comparative Study of Genocide
POLI SCI 529: Arab-Israeli Conflict
POLI SCI 534: Socialism and Transitions to the Market
POLI SCI 537: Electoral Systems and Representation
POLI SCI 538: Politics and Policies in the European Union
POLI SCI 635: Comparative Politics of Sport
POLI SCI 690: Study Abroad Topics in Political Science: Comparative Politics
Total Credits 9-12

5. Research Methods in Political Science

POLI SCI 270: Understanding Political Numbers
POLI SCI 274: Political Choice and Strategy
POLI SCI 348: Analysis of International Relations
POLI SCI/JOURN/URB R PL 373: Introduction to Survey Research
POLI SCI 374: Introduction to Statistical Inference for Political Research

6. Thesis and Independent Study

POLI SCI 691: SENIOR THESIS
POLI SCI 692: SENIOR THESIS
POLI SCI 698: DIRECTED STUDY
POLI SCI 699: DIRECTED STUDY
# Appendix 2: PEPP Courses by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECON 330</td>
<td>Money and Banking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 435</td>
<td>The Financial System</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 464</td>
<td>International Trade</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 465</td>
<td>The American Economy to 1865</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON/HISTORY 466</td>
<td>The American Economy Since 1865</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHILOS/ECON 524</td>
<td>Philosophy and Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOS 541</td>
<td>Modern Ethical Theories</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOS 549</td>
<td>Great Moral Philosophers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOS 555</td>
<td>Political Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOS 559</td>
<td>Philosophy of Law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 266</td>
<td>The Development of Modern Western Political Thought</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 360</td>
<td>History of American Political Thought</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 361</td>
<td>Contemporary American Political Thought</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 363</td>
<td>Literature and Politics</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 411</td>
<td>The American Constitution : Powers and Structures of Government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 463</td>
<td>Deception and Politics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 274</td>
<td>Political Choice and Strategy</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 330</td>
<td>Political Economy of Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 340</td>
<td>The European Union: Politics and Political Economy</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 350</td>
<td>International Political Economy</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI SCI 356</td>
<td>Principles of International Law</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Credit Follow Instructor Reports

Table 1: Enrollment by Academic Year (Credits Follow Instructors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>16723.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>17008.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>17301.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>17835.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>18836.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>21735.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>23908.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>24583.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Enrollment in Fall Semester (Credits Follow Instructor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>8809.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>8587.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>9250.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>8610.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>9226.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>9675.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>11681.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>12962.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>12582.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Enrollment in Spring Semester (Credits Follow Instructor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>CFI_CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>8136.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>7757.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>8690.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>8608.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>9161.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>10053.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>10946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>12000.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Political Science Majors: 10 Year Trend, Fall #'s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5: Faculty Credit Hours Generated per FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty (all funds)</th>
<th>Undergrad FTE</th>
<th>Grad FTE</th>
<th>TA FTE</th>
<th>Instructional FTE</th>
<th>Faculty Payroll</th>
<th>% Credit Hours</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>% Instructional FTE</th>
<th>% Salary Paid</th>
<th>% Program FTE</th>
<th>% Instructional FTE</th>
<th>% Salary Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty (all funds)</th>
<th>Undergrad FTE</th>
<th>Grad FTE</th>
<th>TA FTE</th>
<th>Instructional FTE</th>
<th>Faculty Payroll</th>
<th>% Credit Hours</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>% Instructional FTE</th>
<th>% Salary Paid</th>
<th>% Program FTE</th>
<th>% Instructional FTE</th>
<th>% Salary Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>2,619,319</td>
<td>1,425,288</td>
<td>1,194,031</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Data represents faculty credit hours generated per FTE for each academic year (2009-2010 to 2018-2019). The columns include faculty (all funds), under- and graduate FTE, TA FTE, instructional FTE, faculty payroll, and percentage credit hours per faculty FTE. The last row shows the average values for each metric across the years.
Appendix 6: Student Learning Assessment Plan: Undergraduate Major in Political Science

**Identifying Information:**
School/College: College of Letters and Science
Undergraduate Degree/Major Program Name: Political Science
Faculty Director Contact/Title: David Canon, Chair
Contact Information: dtcanon@wisc.edu

**Phase I of Assessment Planning – Student Learning Outcomes**

**Background:**
During the 2014-2015 academic-year, the Department of Political Science convened a faculty committee to begin improving the assessment of undergraduate learning. The ad-hoc committee proposed 5 learning outcomes for undergraduate political science majors which were adopted by the Department. Integral to the effort to formulate student-learning outcomes were two undergraduate Political Science major focus group meetings facilitated by a current Ph.D. student in the Department along with the Director of Undergraduate Studies. Student views were considered during faculty discussions and decisions about learning outcomes.

**Student Learning Goals:**

1. Articulate an understanding of and appreciation for the methods and approaches of diverse subfields in Political Science-American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Theory-and their relevance to important theoretical and pragmatic questions.

2. Analyze different forms and practices of governance both democratic and non-democratic.

3. Argue effectively and defend propositions with intellectual integrity, while considering a range of alternative points of view and evidence.

4. Analyze relations among individuals, civil society, political institutions, and states.

5. Analyze the motivations and consequences of political decision-making and activities.

**Plan for Assessing Each Student Learning Goal:** Method and Timetable

1. Who is responsible for assessment?
Director of Undergraduate Studies (currently, Ricardo Galliano Court)

2. What is the plan for review of the assessment information?
Yearly review by the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC)

3. What is the plan for production of an annual summary report?
To be provided by the Director of Undergraduate Studies, in consultation with the UPC

4. How will recommendations be implemented?
On a rolling basis, as relevant, and upon consultation with the UPC.

**Phase II of Assessment Planning – Political Science Major Curriculum Mapping**
Undergraduate Degree Program Curriculum Mapping Worksheet:

Required courses for undergraduate political science majors each meet many learning outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 103 Intro. American Politics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 104 Intro. Int’l. Relations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 106 Intro. Comparative Politics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 209 Intro. Political Theory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 218 Intro. Political Numbers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Level Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 376 Analysis of Int’l. Relations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 411 Constitution Law I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 427 Legislative Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 506 Topics in Pol. Philosophy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 630 Topics in Comp. Politics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase III of Assessment Planning – Measuring Student Learning

In conformity with campus expectations and mandates by the Higher Learning Commission, the Department of Political Science will assess student learning with direct and indirect measures biennially. It is
advantageous to construct the assessment out of activities that have other uses or that are elements of other initiatives, that the assessment be more a clearing-house of departmental activities than a novel initiative stressing already limited resources.

Direct measures:

1. Each of the five subfields in Political Science (American Government, International Studies, Political Theory, Comparative Politics, and Research Methodology) will choose one upper level course in that field and collect 20 final papers or essays to be analyzed according to a rubric that focuses on the Student Learning Goals. (Appendix 4)

2. A selection of Senior and honors theses will also be analyzed according to a rubric that focuses on the Student Learning Goals. (Appendix 4)

Indirect measures:

1. Student Evaluations of Teaching have been shown to have a strong correlation with student learning. Evaluations can be reconsidered and reformulated to offer a clearer view into student learning. Revising this process would create a powerful feedback loop, particularly useful for improving the quality of graduate assistant teaching (projects of the DUS, the UPC, and the Associate Chair). Evaluations are more successfully used to assess students’ perceptions of their own learning rather than relying on them to judge pedagogy, which studies have shown to be ineffective. (Appendix 1)

2. Senior Exit Surveys that ask experienced students to reflect on their learning. (Appendix 2)

3. Alumni Surveys, 3, 5, or 10 years after graduation. This outreach is particularly valuable for preexisting development and networking/internships initiatives. (Appendix 3)

Appendix 1: Student Course Evaluations

The Department of Political Science will move from asking students about their perceptions of instructor performance on course evaluations to student perceptions of their own learning in courses.

Current Evaluations for Faculty:

1. Method appropriate for size of class?
2. What portion of classes did you attend?
3. Were lectures clearly presented and organized?
4. What proportion of lectures were relevant to course?
5. How useful were the assigned readings?
6. Were objectives clearly laid out and explained early?
7. How well did lectures and readings meet defined objectives?
8. How does this course compare in terms of difficulty?
9. How willing was your professor to consult with you individually?
10. Please rank the effectiveness of these contacts:
11. Do you feel the grading was fair?
12. Did this course make you think?
13. OVERALL PERFORMANCE

Current Evaluations for Teaching Assistants:

1. What proportion of the discussion sections led by the TA have you attended so far this semester?
2. How well does the TA answer questions and clarify concepts?
3. To what extent does the TA encourage or create opportunities for students to participate in discussion?
4. How many times this semester have you met with your TA during office hours or by appointment?
5. Did you believe that your TA was accessible or difficult to reach if you needed her/his help (whether or not you sought help)?
6. How helpful did you find your TA when meeting with her/him?
7. TAs try to give useful written feedback and comments on papers and particularly, exams. To what extent were the remarks helpful?
8. Preparing for tests
9. Discussion of important ideas not covered in the lecture
10. Clarification of lectures
11. Clarification of readings
12. If you had to rate your TA as a potential or future professor, what would you say?
13. OVERALL PERFORMANCE

The UW Teaching Academy has proposed evaluations for university-wide course evaluations in addition to specific departmental evaluations; these will serve as a useful model for reevaluating course evaluations going forward. The data collected from these evaluations will become public serving as a much needed alternative to grading distributions and Rate-My-Professor.

1. At the time you enrolled, did you take this course primarily to fulfill a requirement for your major? [yes/no]
2. In general, how much did this course enhance your knowledge of the world, such as knowledge of human cultures, society, or science? [Not at all, A little, Somewhat, Quite a bit, A great deal]
3. How much did this course help you develop intellectual skills, such as critical or creative thinking, quantitative reasoning, and problem solving? [Not at all, …]
4. How much did this course help you develop potential workplace skills, such as written and oral communication, computer literacy, and working in teams? [Not at all, …]
5. How much did this course increase your sense of social responsibility, for example by increasing your knowledge of cultures or providing you with opportunities for civic or community involvement?
6. How much did this course improve your ability to combine knowledge or skills from different fields of study? [Not at all, …]
7. How would you rate the overall educational value of this course, that is the extent to which the course improved your all-around education or prepared you for the future? [Very poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very good].
8. How would you rate the overall quality of this course, that is the extent to which it was structured and taught in order to maximize its educational value? [Very poor, …]

Appendix 2: Senior Exit Surveys

The Department of Political Science is planning to begin administering senior exit surveys that ask experienced students to reflect on their learning. Here are the potential questions for the survey:

1. What personal interests made a major in Political Science seem right for you?
2. Were there any specific opportunities offered to you that made your decision to major in Political Science clear?
3. What were your expectations of a Political Science major. Were there aspects that exceeded your expectations? Were there aspects that did not?
4. What were the most meaningful elements of your Political Science major, in the classroom and outside of the classroom?
5. Did you have any frustrations while a Political Science major?
6. What was your particular field of interest? How confident are you in the issues, methodology, and practice in your area of interest?
7. Are you planning or have you applied to graduate or professional school?
   a. What discipline have you selected for your post-graduate studies?
b. To which universities have you applied?
c. Have you been accepted into a graduate program and if so at what university?
d. Do you feel that your academic experience has given you the skills and knowledge necessary to pursue your chosen field?
   i. If you answered yes, what aspect of the Political Science undergraduate program helped you prepare for graduate studies.
   ii. If you answered no, please tell us why you think the political science undergraduate program failed to prepare you for graduate studies.
8. Are you applying for a professional position?
9. For what jobs are you applying?
   a. Have you been hired? If so, may we ask, what is your position title and who is your employer? May we ask your beginning salary?
   b. Do you feel that your academic training has given you the knowledge and skills necessary to pursue a professional position?
      i. If so, can you tell us some specifics of the political science undergraduate program that helped you gain the skills necessary to pursue professional employment.
      ii. If no, please tell us why you think the political science undergraduate program failed to provide you the skills necessary to pursue professional employment.
10. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the Political Science major?

Appendix 3: Alumni Surveys

The Department of Political Science is planning to begin administering alumni surveys that ask alumni to reflect on their learning 3, 5, or 10 years after graduation. This outreach is also valuable for both development and networking/internships initiatives. Here are the potential questions for the survey:

1. Name (The mail survey application should be able to insert the name and other information, e.g. date of graduation, etc.)
2. Education
   a. Did you complete another major besides Political Science?
   b. Did you complete a certificate while an undergraduate?
   c. When did you graduate?
3. Your Political Science major
   a. What personal interests made a major in Political Science seem right for you?
   b. Were there any specific opportunities offered to you that made your decision to major in Political Science clear?
   c. What were your expectations of a Political Science major. Were there aspects that exceeded your expectations? Were there aspects that did not?
   d. What were the most meaningful elements of your Political Science major, in the classroom and outside of the classroom?
   e. Did you have any frustrations while a Political Science major?
   f. What was your particular field of interest? How confident are you in the issues, methodology, and practice in your area of interest?
      i. What should a young student considering Political Science know?
      ii. What would you say to someone who was worried about the job prospects of Political Science majors?
   g. Do you still look at the world as a political scientist does?
4. Employment
   a. Where do you work?
   b. What is your job title?
      i. How long have you had this position?
      ii. What are your key duties?
c. Did your position require additional credentials beyond your undergraduate degree?

d. What is a typical day like?

e. Does your job involve travel?

f. What do you like most about your job?

g. What do you like least?

h. Did majoring in Political Science prepared you for this occupation? Did Political Science co-curricular activities prepare you?

i. What particular Political Science knowledge or skills have you brought to your job?

j. Do you feel that your academic training has given you the knowledge and skills necessary to pursue your career?

i. If so, can you tell us some specifics of the political science undergraduate program that helped you gain the knowledge and skills necessary to pursue your career.

ii. If no, please tell us why you think the political science undergraduate program failed to provide you the skills necessary to pursue your career.

5. Anything else you would like us to know?

Appendix 4: Rubric

1. **Research Question and Thesis Statement**: Does the student develop a clear and focused research question related to an important area or subfield of political science? Is the question(s) addressed thoroughly in the thesis or are there remaining gaps or inconsistencies in the thesis? Is the thesis statement well-developed? 10 points.

2. **Methodology**: Does the student employ an appropriate methodology to answer the research question? Does the student fully explain the rationale for using the specific method? 10 points.

3. **Command of Literature**: Does the student place the research question within the context of relevant political science literature? Does the literature review provide a fair picture of the state of knowledge on the topic and closely related topics? 20 points.

4. **Use of Sources & Citation**: Does the student use a variety of appropriate sources or too few? Specifically, does the student rely mainly on peer-reviewed sources? Does the student completely and responsibly cite references and use the proper citation style required by the department? 10 points.

5. **Analysis**: Is the analytical framework clear and appropriate? Does the work avoid mere description and instead offer analysis for the political topic under study? Does the student provide adequate evidence from secondary research sources for each line of reasoning? Does the student employ tools of original analysis (such as data analysis or analysis of primary sources) when appropriate (such as those students pursuing Honors)? 20 points.

6. **Organization**: Is the writing well-organized and focused? Is there an introduction that clearly states the research question and lays out a clear outline of the larger scope? Is the writing clearly organized in sections with headings? Is there a logical flow between the sections? Does the conclusion offer a lucid summation of the argument? 20 points.

7. **Writing Style**: Is the writing style clear, concise, and focused? Is the writing grammatically correct and largely error-free? 10 points.
### Appendix 7: Graduate Program at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall and Spring terms</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Outcomes for the year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Enroll in 3-4 courses per semester: PS 800, PS 812, PS 813, PS 817 Field seminar or equivalent Other methods and substantive Attend field workshops Professionalization: • Meet with speakers • Attend brown bags • Attend research working groups</td>
<td>Meet with advisor Predissertation research Start exam prep</td>
<td>Aim for at least one working paper Develop and discuss dissertation ideas</td>
<td>Training in methods Training in two fields Progress on dissertation ideas Start research portfolio Professionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Enroll in 3-4 courses per semester Present at a field workshop Attend field workshops Professionalization: • Meet with speakers • Attend brown bags • Attend research working groups</td>
<td>Exams in June Retake in August Fieldwork and dissertation development</td>
<td>Complete additional research papers Begin dissertation prospectus discussion with faculty</td>
<td>Qualification in two fields Training in methods and language (as appropriate) Concrete steps to dissertation committee and topic Develop research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Complete remaining course requirements Dissertation prospectus meeting by Sept 15 Dissertation prospectus course Complete courses for Minor Attend field workshops Professionalization: • Meet with speakers • Attend brown bags • Attend research working groups</td>
<td>Fieldwork and dissertation research Develop paper(s) for journal submission</td>
<td>Complete research paper by January 15 (start of 6th) Defend prospectus by end of spring semester</td>
<td>Dissertation prospectus developed and defended At least one conference level paper and ideally more in a research portfolio Courses completed Minor completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4th | Enroll in PS 990 Research and Thesis Professionalization:  
    • Meet with speakers  
    • Attend brown bags  
    • Attend research working groups  
    • Attend placement meeting | Dissertation Research papers | Dissertation Research papers | Research for dissertation  
    Paper development  
    Aim for conference presentation  
    Start thinking about job market |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5th + 6th | Enroll in PS 990 Research and Thesis Professionalization:  
    • Meet with speakers  
    • Attend brown bags  
    • Attend research working groups | Dissertation Research paper | Complete Dissertation Submit papers to journals  
    Conference presentation | Prepare for and compete on job market  
    PhD in hand! |
Appendix 7: Graduate Student Schedule of Normal Progress

Ph.D. in Political Science: Ideal Schedule

| FIRST YEAR: Methods Training; Develop Knowledge in Two Fields; Deepen Research Interests; Professionalization |
|---|---|---|
| **Fall Term** | **Spring Term** | **Summer** |
| Courses: PS 800, PS 812, PS 817 (if offered) | Courses: PS 813 | Pre-dissertation research |
| Courses: Field Seminar or equivalent | Courses: Mix of substantive and methods | Additional methods training |
| Professionalization: Attend workshops, meet speakers, read journals and books | Professionalization: Workshop/Speakers, Journals/books | Work on papers |
| Meet with advisors and faculty | Meet with advisors and faculty | Read journals and books |

| SECOND YEAR: Prepare for Exams; Develop Dissertation Topics and Research Papers; Methods Training; Professionalization |
|---|---|---|
| **Fall Term** | **Spring Term** | **Summer** |
| Methods and substantive courses | Methods and substantive courses | Sit for qualifying exams |
| Language training (if applicable) | Language training (if applicable) | Pre-dissertation research |
| Continue with Workshop/Speaker/reading | Continue with Workshop/Speakers/reading | Develop dissertation ideas |
| Start preparing for exams | Identify draft prospectus committee | Develop research paper |
| Continue to meet with faculty and discuss dissertation topics | Continue to meet with faculty | Read journals and books |

| THIRD YEAR: Develop and Defend Dissertation Proposal; Develop Research Portfolio; Professionalization |
|---|---|---|
| **Fall Term** | **Spring Term** | **Summer** |
| Meet with at least two faculty to discuss dissertation ideas (by 9/15) | Finish courses | Dissertation Research |
| PS 801 (Proposal Writing Class) | Defend prospectus | Work on papers for publication |
| Methods / Substantive/ Language courses | Continue professionalization | |
| As before: workshops, speakers, reading, and meet with faculty regularly | Attend placement meeting | |
| Submit research paper by January 15 | Discuss with faculty plans to present paper at conference and attend conference | |

| FOURTH YEAR: Dissertation and research; develop plan to present at conferences |
|---|---|---|
| **Fall Term** | **Spring Term** | **Summer** |
| Dissertation Research | Dissertation Research and publications | Dissertation Research |
| Develop publications | Placement Meeting | Conference prep |
| Attend Scholarly Conference and workshops | Attend Scholarly Conference and workshops | Develop papers |

| FIFTH YEAR: Dissertation and research; prepare for job market |
|---|---|---|
| **Fall Term** | **Spring Term** | **Summer** |
| Dissertation Research and Publications | Dissertation Research and Publications | Dissertation Research and Pubs |
| Conferences and workshops | Conferences and workshops | Conferences |
| Placement meeting | | |

| FIFTH or SIXTH YEAR: Finish dissertation, get job, graduate |
Appendix 8: Graduate Courses

POLI SCI 700 — INTRODUCTION TO INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

POLI SCI 701 — AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

POLI SCI 702 — INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

POLI SCI 703 — INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND LAW

POLI SCI 704 — INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

POLI SCI/HISTORY/PUB AFFR 724 — THE POLITICS OF PERSUASION: SOFT POWER IN EUROPE AND THE U.S.

POLI SCI 799 — DIRECTED STUDY

POLI SCI 800 — POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A DISCIPLINE AND PROFESSION

POLI SCI 801 — RESEARCH AND WRITING SEMINAR

POLI SCI/FRENCH/GERMAN/HISTORY/SOC 804 — INTERDISCIPLINARY WESTERN EUROPEAN AREA STUDIES SEMINAR

POLI SCI 811 — INTRODUCTION TO STATISTICAL COMPUTING IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

POLI SCI 812 — INTRODUCTION TO STATISTICAL METHODS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

POLI SCI 813 — MULTIVARIABLE STATISTICAL INFERENCE FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH

POLI SCI 814 — SOCIAL IDENTITIES: DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT

POLI SCI 817 — EMPIRICAL METHODS OF POLITICAL INQUIRY

POLI SCI 818 — MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATION

POLI SCI 821 — MASS POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

POLI SCI 823 — POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

POLI SCI 825 — RACE AND POLITICS IN THE UNITED STATES

POLI SCI 826 — THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

POLI SCI 827 — INTEREST GROUPS IN AMERICAN POLITICS

POLI SCI 828 — THE CONTEMPORARY PRESIDENCY: ISSUES AND APPROACHES

POLI SCI/JOURN 829 — POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

POLI SCI 831 — CONCEPTS IN POLITICAL THEORY

POLI SCI 833 — TOPICS IN ANCIENT POLITICAL THOUGHT

POLI SCI/CLASSICS 834 — ROMAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

POLI SCI/A A E 835 — GAME THEORY AND POLITICAL ANALYSIS

POLI SCI 836 — FORMAL MODELS OF DOMESTIC POLITICS

POLI SCI 837 — FORMAL MODELS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

POLI SCI 839 — METHODS OF POLITICAL THEORY
POLI SCI 840 — COMPARATIVE POLITICAL ECONOMY
POLI SCI 843 — THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF DEVELOPMENT
POLI SCI 844 — DEMOCRATIC IMPERFECTIONS
POLI SCI 853 — COMPARATIVE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS
POLI SCI 854 — NATIONALISM AND ETHNIC CONFLICT
POLI SCI 855 — POLITICS AND CULTURE IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE
POLI SCI 856 — FIELD SEMINAR IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS
POLI SCI 857 — INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORIES
POLI SCI 862 — STATE AND SOCIETY IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE
POLI SCI 863 — THE JUDICIAL PROCESS
POLI SCI 864 — INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY
POLI SCI 865 — THE SUPREME COURT AND THE CONSTITUTION IN AMERICAN POLITICS
POLI SCI/ENVIIR ST/PUB AFFR 866 — GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE
POLI SCI/PUB AFFR 871 — PUBLIC PROGRAM EVALUATION
POLI SCI 873 — AMERICAN POLITICAL PARTIES
POLI SCI/PUB AFFR/URB R PL 874 — POLICY-MAKING PROCESS
POLI SCI/PUB AFFR 875 — PUBLIC PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION
POLI SCI/PUB AFFR/URB R PL 878 — PUBLIC MANAGEMENT
POLI SCI 881 — AMERICAN POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT
POLI SCI/PUB AFFR 885 — ADVANCED PUBLIC MANAGEMENT: CRAFT, CONSTRAINTS AND ACCOUNTABILITY
POLI SCI/PUB AFFR/URB R PL 890 — FEDERAL BUDGET AND TAX POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
POLI SCI 900 — TOPICS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE
POLI SCI 904 — SEMINAR-AMERICAN POLITICS
POLI SCI 917 — TIME SERIES ANALYSIS
POLI SCI 919 — SEMINAR-ADVANCED METHODOLOGY
POLI SCI 931 — SEMINAR-POLITICAL THEORY
POLI SCI/GEN&WS 933 — FEMINIST POLITICAL THEORY
POLI SCI 940 — DOMESTIC POLITICS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
POLI SCI 945 — SEMINAR-NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
POLI SCI 948 — SEMINAR: TOPICS IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS
POLI SCI 949 — SEMINAR-POST COMMUNIST POLITICS
POLI SCI 959 — SEMINAR-INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
POLI SCI 960 — SEMINAR-INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
POLI SCI 962 — SEMINAR: LATIN-AMERICAN POLITICS
POLI SCI/URB R PL 969 — SEMINAR-TRENDS AND ISSUES IN PUBLIC PLANNING
POLI SCI/A A E/ANTHRO/C&E SOC/GEOG/HISTORY/LACIS/PORTUG/SOC/SPANISH 982 — INTERDEPARTMENTAL SEMINAR IN THE LATIN-AMERICAN AREA
POLI SCI/AFRICAN/ANTHRO/ECON/GEOG/HISTORY 983 — INTERDEPARTMENTAL SEMINAR-AFRICAN STUDIES
POLI SCI 986 — POLITICAL THEORY WORKSHOP
POLI SCI 987 — COMPARATIVE POLITICS COLLOQUIUM
POLI SCI 988 — INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS WORKSHOP
POLI SCI 989 — AMERICAN POLITICS WORKSHOP
POLI SCI 990 — RESEARCH AND THESIS
POLI SCI 999 — INDEPENDENT WORK
## Appendix 9: Graduate Placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Market*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Market First Time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or Two-Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6**</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unplaced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Tenure Track**</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% One or Two Year</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Postdoc</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-Academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Admin.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unplaced</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For recent years the term “on market” refers specifically to students who used the department’s placement service.

**Includes those who have tenure-track positions following postdocs.
Sorry about that -- the email sent itself when I did a "cntl-v" to paste Nadav's comments. Anyway, here they are:

"On balance, I didn’t find any major errors, though I would have interpreted some things differently:

- On the desire for more required statistical methods training: 1) Political science is a very diverse field so it doesn’t make sense to require everyone to take many more methods courses; 2) there is a huge variety of methods out there, as well as a tradeoff between methods courses, substantive ones, and time to degree.
- While under-represented, and especially first generation students, may enter with less knowledge about “how things work”, one way we have attempted to address these issues is in PS800 which serves as a place to discuss “how things work” so that everybody is brought up to speed regardless of their background.
- We just implemented the mandatory advisor/advisee meetings a couple of years ago, so it’s a little hard to assess its effectiveness yet, though I think doing so would be a good thing."

Also, on the undergrad report I wanted to note their unusual concern with the "exceptions" to the major that were noted in one figure in our self-study. They spent a huge amount of time on this in our meeting and it really isn’t that big an issue (given that it is related to the PEPP certificate program). Also, I think the overall tone of the reports doesn’t really capture how seriously we take teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level in our department and overall, what a great job our professors do in the classroom. The overriding focus of the reports was on measuring learning outcomes, which is of course, very difficult to do in a broad field like political science.

Let me know if you have any questions or if you need anything else from me.

sincerely,

David

David Canon
Professor and Chair
Leon Epstein Faculty Fellow
Department of Political Science
110 North Hall
1050 Bascom Mall
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706
(608) 263-2283
Dear Elaine,

Nadav Shelef (Associate Chair), Amy Gangl (Undergrad Program Director), Rachel Margolies (Undergrad Program Adviser), and I reviewed the Review Committee Reports. We didn’t have any corrections, but Nadav provided this feedback:

David Canon  
Professor and Chair  
Leon Epstein Faculty Fellow  
Department of Political Science  
110 North Hall  
1050 Bascom Mall  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison, WI 53706  
(608) 263-2283  
polisci.wisc.edu  
Facebook.com/uwpolisci  
twitter.com/uwpolisci

Hello, David!

The committee conducting the review of academic programs in Political Science have submitted their reports of the Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. I’ve attached them for your review and to give you an opportunity to correct any factual errors. (They also shared a number of materials they gathered in the course of the review, to which I assume you are privy because the department provided them.)

Do you think there’s any chance you could provide a departmental response by November 13? If that were possible, the L&S APC discussion could be held on the 18th, and we could keep this work moving along.

I hope this finds you well,
Elaine

Elaine M. Klein, Ph.D.
Associate Dean for Academic Planning, College of Letters & Science
Director, University General Education

email: elaine.klein@wisc.edu / google voice: (608) 620-5222

Pronouns: she/her
March 3, 2021

TO: Scott Straus, Professor and Chair
FROM: Eric M. Wilcots, Dean
RE: Review of Political Science Academic Programs, including:
   • BA/BS Major
   • MA-Political Science
   • Ph.D., Political Science

CC: Jenna Alsteen, Assistant Dean, Grad School
    Greg Downey, Associate Dean for Social Science, L&S
    Elaine M. Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
    Jocelyn Milner, Vice Provost and Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Parmesh Ramanathan, Associate Dean, Graduate School

Attachments: 2020 Review of Academic Programs in Political Science (Review Committee Report, Undergraduate and Graduate Programs, department response to reports)

On December 15, 2020, the L&S Academic Planning Council discussed the materials submitted for the review of academic programs in Political Science, as enumerated above. Associate Dean Greg Downey led the council’s discussion, and as expected, we learned that like many L&S programs, the programs in Political Science appear to be performing well and students are satisfied.

One topic, common to the challenges many departments face, also warrants serious consideration. As noted by the review committee, efforts to further diversify the student body and faculty continue to require your attention, and we assume the department will not only continue that conversation, but also take action to address the reported disparity in perceptions about the department’s climate, and heed the review committee’s advice about regularly and systematically soliciting feedback on climate issues from graduate students, staff, and faculty, as well as seeking broad campus expertise and assistance on diversity, equity, and inclusion issues to help you analyze and act on this feedback. Council members (and L&S Administration) understand that this is hard work, and that it takes time and attention: we trust that the Department of Political Science can and will continue to make headway.

The council agreed, on the whole, with the review committee’s conclusion that the department is functioning well and managing its programs appropriately, with one caveat concerning the work to assess student learning. The Academic Planning Council agreed with the review committee’s recommendations encouraging the department to review its assessment plans and practice, and
to ensure not only that this work aligns with the learning goals of Political Science’s programs, but that assessment plans are implemented. To that end, the APC expects that the department will seek out the expertise of the Provost’s Office of Student Learning Assessment to immediately implement undergraduate and graduate program assessment plans, to bring these aspects of academic program administration into alignment with campus policy and practice.

I am happy to report that the L&S APC unanimously approved a motion to consider the L&S portion of this review complete. The next phase of review will involve discussion by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee, which may offer advice from its perspective.

We wish you, your colleagues, and students continued success.