



---

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW**

15-16 CAPR 17  
Thursday, April 21, 2016

**TO:** The Academic Senate

**FROM:** The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR)

**SUBJECT:** 15-16 CAPR 17: 2014-15 Five-Year Program Review for Political Science

**PURPOSE:** For Action by the Senate

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Review of Political Science; CAPR recommends the program continue without modification. The date of the next Five-Year Program Review is to be determined.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Chair of the Department of Political Science, Kim Geron, presented the Political Science program's five-year review at the March 3, 2016 CAPR meeting. The previous five-year review was completed in 2008-09. Dating back to the University's founding, Political Science is a long-standing program at CSUEB. The program has 227 FTES, 193 majors, 19 minors, and averages 47 graduates per year. The program offers three options: Traditional, Pre-Law, and Public Affairs & Administration. CSUEB is the only Northern California CSU to offer a pre-law option.

Faculty headcount declined from 11 in 2008 to 6 in 2013; FTEF declined from 7 in Fall 2008 to 6.02 in Fall 2012. While the number of majors grew modestly from 184 in 2008 to 193 in Fall 2013, the program has been forced to reduce the number of courses offered by 20% from Fall 2008 to Fall 2013. The program reports that students are now finding it difficult to get the courses they need to graduate, particularly in the Public Affairs Option.

Despite these challenges, the Political Science program has sought to maintain its commitment to an integrated curriculum that focuses on critical thinking, writing, and research. In the face of serious staffing and budgetary challenges, the program has done its best to continue to offer a full course curriculum, and has continued to make standards and assessment integral to its operations.

The Political Science faculty, though small, is active in research, publication, and service. Their students are actively engaged in the classroom, on campus, and in the community. The program has an internship program that places students in governmental offices, with elected officials, and with community organizations. The also administers several scholarships for CSUEB students to pursue internships in Washington and Sacramento. Through maintaining its long tradition of student activism in student government, student clubs, community organizations, and

political campaigns, the Department supports the University's goal of promoting civic engagement and community service.

### **OVERVIEW OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO CAPR:**

The following documents were submitted to CAPR:

- A self-study
- A five-year plan
- External reviewer's report by Dr. David M. Speak, Cal Poly Pomona
- Response to the external reviewer's report

### **CAPR ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM'S FIVE-YEAR REVIEW:**

#### **Program Improvements since the Last Review**

##### 1. Faculty

The program reports that they settled professors Ortuoste and Bergman into a "long and productive relationship" with the Department and University. (Ortuoste had received tenure since the previous review and at the time of this review Bergman was up for tenure, which she since received.) The program secured a new faculty member after a search in 2014/15 and was authorized to search for an additional faculty member in 2015-16.

##### 2. Online and Hybrid Course Offerings

The proportion of hybrid/online course offerings increased from less than 2% in 2009-10 to more than 20% in 2011-12. These courses enhance flexibility for all students and especially majors.

#### **Areas of Continuing Concern**

In our careful consideration of their self-study, we find that the program is gathering more assessment data than is required: not only is the program assessing the work of all of its majors at the maturity level (POSC 4910), it is also their assessing student work at the intermediate level (POSC 3030). In addition, the program conducts an exit survey on all their majors. While the program is putting a lot of time and effort into collecting data, there is no evidence that this data has led faculty to have meaningful programmatic discussions about what is working and not working in their program nor has it led to the implementation of curricular or programmatic improvements. In short, there is no evidence in the five-year review of the program "closing the loop" on assessment. This seemed peculiar to us until we read the outside reviewer report, which provided us with this insight: "The one significant obstacle to a genuinely reflexive examination of the Department's work is the apparent lack of ongoing collegial conversation about the future."

### **CAPR RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTINUATION OF THE PROGRAM:**

We concur with the program's own goals for the next five years:

- To take advantage of semester conversion to create more cohesion in course offerings in order to more attractively package their major options;

- To consider department projects will be most that will be useful to their students' education, their future employment opportunities, as well as their understanding of politics, law, public policy, and international affairs. Some possibilities include: an "Applied Politics" focus, a "Big Data" track, or an investment in a survey center to teach students how to conduct and analyze survey data. Another possibility is to enhance course offerings and focus on the politics and policy implications of science and technology.

CAPR recommends that following in the strongest possible terms:

- Rethink assessment efforts so that more effort is put into meaningful discussions about how to "close the loop." CAPR will be keeping a close eye on the program's future annual reports, looking for evidence of "closing the loop" discussions and activities. Consider collecting less assessment data as a way to ease the work burden. Note that programs are only required to assess student work at maturity (i.e. at the Senior level) and only *direct* assessment is required. The program would be in compliance if they assessed *a sample* of student work produced in POSC 4910 and eliminated exit surveys and assessment of POSC 3030. The program would, however, have to provide evidence of having collectively analyzed their assessment data and they will need to describe the implementation of specific programmatic changes that result from such analysis.

CAPR recommends the continuation of the program without modification.

**DATE OF THE PROGRAM'S NEXT FIVE-YEAR REVIEW:**

AY to be determined

**Department of Political Science**  
**5-year Review**  
**Prepared 2014**

**I. Summary**

Political Science is a long standing program at CSUEB dating back to the University's founding. While the program was significantly larger during earlier years, internal demand remains strong with 227 FTES, 193 majors, 19 minors, and 47 graduates per year (these data place the department in the top 3rd or 4th quartile among University departments). Furthermore, the Department has a strong pre-law program to prepare students to enter law school, and this is a frequently cited reason students give for coming to CSUEB as we are the only Northern California CSU that offers a pre-law major. In its current configuration, the department has three options in the major and a minor. The options include: Traditional, Pre-Law, Public Affairs & Administration; the graduation unit requirements for each major requirements are 56 units for the Traditional major, 64 units for the Pre-Law major, and 61 units for the Public Administration option. The most popular and largest option is the Traditional major.

Since 2010, we have added hybrid and online courses to enhance flexibility in course times and offerings for all students and especially majors. The proportion of hybrid/online course offerings increased from less than 2% in 2009-10 to more than 20% in 2011-12. In addition to political science majors, we serve the wider University, as 68.5% of all courses we offer satisfy upper division (UD) or lower division (LD) general education (GE) requirements. We have two LD service courses: 1201 and 1202 which meet U.S. History Code Requirements for all CSU students. In addition, there are 32 UD courses that can be used for GE Areas (C4/D4); POSC 3410-Law and Society is the most popular course for non-majors, and we regularly fill three sections every quarter. We also participate in GE Clusters and offer various other LD and UD courses to meet U.S. History/Government Requirement for all students. Internal demand is not fully realized due to limited course offerings for LD and UD GE/Code courses which could increase our FTES.

There are a number of reasons for our limited course offerings, for one, faculty headcount declined from 11 in 2008 to 6 in 2013; FTEF declined from 7 in Fall 2008 to 6.02 in Fall 2012. The economic crisis precipitated a budget crisis in the state and forced the university to reduce enrollments and reduce our resources. While the number of majors grew modestly from 184 in 2008 to 193 in Fall 2013, the department has reduced the number of courses offered by 20% from Fall 2008 to Fall 2013 and students are finding it difficult to get the courses they need to graduate, particularly in the Public Affairs Option, where there are very limited course offerings. Also, the average section size went from 36.3 in 2009 to 31.7 in Fall 2013. The situation has gotten worse with two retirements in Fall 2013. Our lecturer pool was devastated in 2010 by budget cuts, and we were reduced to only one 3 YR Lecturer. In the past year, we added a 1 year lecturer.

We know that external demand for students with Political Science degrees remains strong to work for elected officials, government agencies, and nonprofits. Many students are hired to work in law-related jobs, others attend law school, and graduate school mainly in Master of Public Administration programs, or MA/PhD in Political Science. There is also demand for our students to work in the public sector in Human Resources and as analysts and government employees, as well as in the private sector in management and analyst positions.

In the five years since the last review the Department has sought to maintain its commitment to an integrated curriculum that focuses on critical thinking, writing, and research. As this report will show, the Department has attempted to consistently offer its full course curriculum in the face of serious staffing and budgetary challenges, and has continued to make standards and assessment integral to its operations.

The Political Science faculty is active in research and publication (see resumes). Our students are engaged in both the learning and doing of politics. Our students routinely are involved in student governance. Both the faculty and students are involved in community affairs. The Department is proud of its active clubs. The Political Science Club/Phi Sigma Alpha chapter helps to bring interest in politics to the community and produces an annual awards and graduation ceremony. The club won a prestigious award for new chapter growth from the national Phi Sigma Alpha organization this year. Our Model U.N. teams present the intricacy of international relations to the University community.

For many years, the department has had a good internship program that places students in governmental offices, with elected officials, and with community organizations. The Department also administers several scholarships for CSUEB students to pursue internships in Washington and Sacramento. In addition, there is a long tradition of student activism in student government, student clubs, community organizations, and political campaigns. Finally, the Department has long supported the University's goal of promoting civic engagement and community service; three members of the faculty recently added a service learning component to some courses. These activities bring cohesion and community to the Department, its students, and the wider University environment.

## **II. Mission Statement, Goals, Departmental Learning Outcomes, and Institutional Learning Outcomes**

### **a. Mission Statement**

The mission of the B.A. degree program in Political Science is to promote knowledge and understanding of politics and society through instruction and scholarship in the areas of American government, comparative government, political theory, international relations, public administration and public law. The Department seeks to develop in its students the skills of reading, research, analysis, writing, speaking, and political participation, and to promote the values of citizenship. The Department serves students, scholars and citizens through teaching, research and community service.

### **b. Goals**

1. To meet the needs of our growing number of majors through attention to advising (including improved materials) and careful scheduling of courses;
2. To offer strong academic programs in the 5 subfields of the major: American Politics and Policy, Public Law, Comparative Politics, International Relations and Political Theory;
3. To maintain high standards of teaching, with support for innovation and constant improvement;
4. To make significant contributions to the field of political science;
5. To promote the values of citizenship through our instructional offerings, student activities and sponsorship of campus events;
6. To attract new majors by developing new curricula and promotional materials and by doing outreach to community colleges.

### **c. Departmental Learning Outcomes & Course Alignment:**

SLO 1 "develop and articulate an understanding of democratic theory and practice and gain practical experience in politics, public policy, and civic engagement." All lower and upper division POSC courses.

SLO 1a “understanding democratic theory and practice.”

All upper-division American Government, Public Policy, Law, Comparative, and IR).

SLO 1b “involvement in practical experience/civic engagement.” Students do Political Internships where they are engaged in politics at local, state, national and global level.

SLO 2 “demonstrates through oral and written competency, an understanding of the theories, concepts, empirical content, and research agendas of the fields of political science with advanced understanding in the selected option and the use of critical thinking.” All lower and upper division POSC courses.

SLO2a: “understanding theories and concepts in political science.”

SLO2b: “understanding quantitative and qualitative empirical content.”

SLO 2c: “understanding research agendas.”

SLO 3 “demonstrate an understanding of political institutions, processes, and culture in the U.S. and around the world including the economic, ideological, ethnic, and cultural groups and movements that engage the political process.” All POSC courses.

SLO 3a “understand the relationship between ethnic, racial, religious, and socioeconomic diversity and national political cultures.” All upper-division POSC courses.

SLO 3b “understand the relationship between political culture and political institutions and processes.” All American Government, Law, Public Policy, Comparative and some International Relations courses.

SLO 3c: “understand the institutions and processes of government.” All POSC courses.

SLO 3d: “understand the debate over the concept of sustainability as it applies to different public policy areas, including the economy and the environment.”

SLO 4 “articulate career goals, demonstrate knowledge of how to achieve those goals, and produce evidence of working to achieve the goals.”

SLO 5 “demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge through collaborative learning and Teamwork.” Selected POSC courses, especially POSC 3550, POSC 3030, POSC 4910 and the internship/cooperative education courses. Service learning is included in selective courses. The Department sponsors two student clubs, students involved with ASI, and volunteering in political campaigns.

#### **d. Institutional Learning Outcomes & Departmental Alignment:**

The Department Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) support and align with the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the University in the following way:

**ILO:** Graduates of CSUEB will be able to think critically and creatively and apply analytical and quantitative reasoning to address complex challenges and everyday problems.

**SLO: #2**

**ILO:** Graduates of CSUEB will be able to communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others.

**SLO #2 and 3**

**ILO:** Graduates of CSUEB will be able to apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competencies to promote equity and social justice in our communities.

**SLO: #3a and 3b**

**ILO:** Graduates of CSUEB will be able to work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities.

**SLO: #5**

**ILO:** Graduates of CSUEB will be able to act responsibly and sustainably at local, national, and global levels.

**SLO: #1a, 1b and 3d**

**ILO:** Graduates of CSUEB will demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study.

**SLO: #1 and 1a**

**III. Curriculum Development, Advising and Retention, Internships, and Career Orientation**

**a. Curriculum Development**

Our program has not changed its curriculum except to reduce courses no longer offered or to modify some courses to be taught in hybrid and/or online. Plans for curricular change are on hold as discussed below. The Department has increased its online and hybrid offerings, however, with the heavy emphasis on high quality writing, we have limited our online courses so faculty can work closely with students to improve their writing and critical thinking skills. We will continue to use various options of educational delivery where appropriate and to address student concerns to have courses offered that meet their hectic schedules. With the full retirement of one colleague in Fall 2013, and another colleague starting the Faculty Early Retirement Program, we went from 6 permanent faculty in Fall 2012 to only 4 fulltime faculty. The Dept. Chair also has not taught courses for four years, due to other service requirements, which means we have 3 permanent faculty for almost 200 Majors. The Department received approval for one additional position for Fall 2015 in American Government which will address a major need to teach courses in American Government institutions and ideally in Practical/Applied politics as well. The need for at least one additional position in the department to provide the necessary advising and course coverage is vital for the POSC program's continued success.

Though the Department identified two areas for curricular growth in 2008, American/California Politics with an emphasis in "Applied Politics" and Comparative Politics/International Relations with an emphasis in Asia, we are unable to move forward with a plan for a Practical/Applied Politics. Faculty resources had to be shifted to existing Options in the face of budget/section cuts. There is still strong student support for Practical/Applied Politics options (9/18 in focus group POSC 4910-01, Spring 2013). Another plan, to work with Extended Education to develop a joint POSC/Para-Legal degree and certificate has also stalled due to the loss of faculty resources. Student support for this program is high (18/18 students in Focus Group POSC 4910-01, Spring 2013).

For the past several years, the Department has had a full-time faculty member trained primarily in comparative politics, one of the major sub-fields in the discipline, and specializing in Asia. Strong student interest in international relations, the growing importance of Asia in international affairs, and the increasing number of Asian students on campus make this an important subfield for the department. Due to faculty staffing issues, Dr. Maria Ortuoste has not been able to enhance our course offerings in the field nor develop any study tours to different Asian locations, so this remains an unaddressed future objective.

### **1. Minority Politics**

Minority politics are of growing importance in the American electorate and in the discipline of Political Science. In addition, minorities are a growing portion of the CSUEB student population. The Department now no tenure-track scholars working in the area of minority politics; Dr. Michelson left CSUEB in 2011 and Dr. Geron has not taught courses in the department for four years due to his role as CFA Vice President and Department Chair. Historically, the Department has offered one course, Ethnic and Minority Politics, which is cross-listed with Ethnic Studies. In 2007-2008, the Department created two new minority politics courses: African-American and Asian-American; these courses have only recently been offered and they have been taught by lecturers. Dr. Bergman is available to teach these courses, having recently published *Latino America* (2014), however, that would alter her teaching load in other areas that might potentially harm the departments other course offerings. The Department needs to further discuss the place of minority politics courses in the major.

### **2. Lower Division**

Over the years, the Department had deemphasized lower division courses; the overwhelming majority of POSC majors enter as junior transfers. The Department dropped a lower division comparative politics course and a lower division public policy course. However, the Department has participated in the lower division Cluster program since its inception (we offered previously three sections of POSC 1000 Introduction to Politics and one section of POSC 1500 Conflict in World Politics). In 2013-14, the Department offered 2 sections of POSC 1171 Environmental Politics, and 1 section of POSC 1500 (now a stand-alone lower division GE course). The department's lower division offerings should grow as the university's lower division enrollments expand and we convert to Semesters by 2018.

### **3. Other Curricular Issues**

A majority of graduating seniors say in exit interviews that they are satisfied with the POSC curriculum and feel that the program met their expectations. Most also say that there is the right balance between required courses and "free choice" in their course selection.

Students (in the 4910 focus groups and exit surveys) have made a number of suggestions relative to the current POSC offerings. The exit survey revealed frustration over the number (few) of POSC offerings, over the (in)frequency of offerings, and over course scheduling. Most upper-division electives are offered on a once a year or even once/two-year basis. Students would also like to see a better spread of courses among the days of the week. The department needs to address the question of whether to broaden or deepen the curriculum. However budget realities make additional courses unlikely at this time. Online classes for now are the only way for offering course work to students studying in all the time frames. The Department has taught a number of classes online and hybrid since 2010 to meet this need, especially as relates to nighttime students.

One curricular suggestion did elicit significant support. In focus groups, graduating seniors have expressed an interest in seeing the Department develop a blended program involving the political science major and para-legal studies. Anecdotal evidence indicates that a number of political science majors seek para-legal certificates after graduation. However the constant pressure on the Department to limit the number of sections offered means this sort of expansion of the program is not possible. Working with Extended Education is the only possibility to service this perceived demand, however, even this collaboration requires resources that have been unavailable for the department to pursue this option.

**b. Retention, Growth, and Advising**

The Department's retention strategy is built around identifying and assisting majors experiencing academic difficulties. All department faculty members identify students with serious skills problems and guide them to the appropriate university support services. The University has an Early Alert system through which a faculty member can communicate with students experiencing difficulties in a class. Major advisors are able to check student records to search for early alert warnings, but are not automatically informed. A process by which the home department is notified is desirable. Political science advisors are expected to be aware of the range of university support services so that they can advise students accordingly. The Department has prepared a brochure listing all such services, which is distributed to all advisors.

In terms of growing the number of majors in the department, the Department has had an up and down history with major enrollment from 2009 to 2014, as can be seen in the table on the next page. Comparing 2014 to 2009 shows that we have lost a net 18 majors over time, a 9.5% decrease. Comparatively speaking, these up and down enrollments during the 2009 – 2014 period are reflected across all CLASS departments and programs; nor is our overall 9.5% decrease unique among departments in the College, if anything, political science is on the low end of major declines. Enrollment fluctuations and losses among departments in CLASS may be indicative of college-level issues.

**College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences**

**California State University, East Bay**

Fall term headcount of majors by Department

Fall 2009 to Fall 2014

Undergraduate and graduate

Produced October 11, 2014

Rafael Hernandez, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Administration

Dept.	Plan	Fall term						Change from '09 to '14	
		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Count	%
AGES	ANTH	75	59	75	76	78	72	-3	-4.0%
	GEOG	77	76	83	105	92	83	6	7.8%
ART	ART	412	357	340	402	430	428	16	3.9%
	MM	33	31	29	28	23	21	-12	-36.4%
COMM	COMM	437	374	393	420	439	456	19	4.3%
CRJA	CRJA	463	419	496	575	631	704	241	52.1%
CSD	CSD	203	177	169	176	217	240	37	18.2%
ENGL	ENGL	295	242	258	246	269	258	-37	-12.5%
ES	ES	48	34	28	34	46	41	-7	-14.6%
HDEV	HDEV	482	390	418	462	431	424	-58	-12.0%
HIST	HIST	201	174	163	164	161	160	-41	-20.4%
LBST	LBST	468	396	367	376	381	364	-104	-22.2%
MLL	MLL	37	30	33	32	27	34	-3	-8.1%
MUS	MUS	167	134	150	156	134	127	-40	-24.0%
PHIL	PHIL	48	41	29	29	31	42	-6	-12.5%
POSC	POSC	190	164	183	204	193	172	-18	-9.5%
	INTS	77	71	64	62	56	50	-27	-35.1%
PUAD	MPA	198	138	145	160	169	197	-1	-0.5%
	HCA	91	85	120	174	156	165	74	81.3%
SOC	SOC	404	329	343	417	484	546	142	35.1%
SW	SW	235	187	156	172	146	144	-91	-38.7%
THEA	THEA	67	63	60	62	62	62	-5	-7.5%
CLASS Total*		4708	3971	4102	4532	4656	4790	82	1.7%

	Fall term						Change from '09 to '13	
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Count	%
University wide	14,749	12,889	13,158	13,851	14,525		-224	-1.5%

Data sources

Fall 2009 to Fall 2013	APR Standard Data, College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences
Fall 2014 (CLASS only)	<p>Pioneer Data Warehouse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; CSUEB Student Administration</li> <li>&gt; Enrollment Reports</li> <li>&gt; Summary of Academic Plans By College By Dept (4001B)</li> </ul> <p>Headcount of all students in undergraduate and graduate Academic Plans for undergraduate and graduate degrees (including 2nd degree seekers and double majors) with an Enrollment Status of "active enrolled" and all options checked for Expected Graduation Term and Degree Check Out Status</p> <p>Data checked 10/09/2014 @ 11 AM</p>

The University once had an active outreach program to Bay Area Community Colleges, which provided our department with assistance to get to majors fairs and meetings with counseling services and departments for all our feeder Community Colleges. It may only be a coincidence, but our decline corresponds to the end of those programs. In addition, not least due to the decline in the number of available faculty, departmental efforts have slowed. Dr. Norman Bowen was liaison to the Community College District for a number of years. With departmental administrative help, we sent out department brochures to Community College Political Science departments and to individual Community College colleagues. Dr. Bowen also had an email listserv of Community College colleagues and sent out information on our campus events. We organized events at Community Colleges and invited them to our events (MUN simulations). Several department faculty were invited to Community Colleges to talk about our major. Dr. Bowen stopped doing these outreach efforts when he was no longer granted release time for International Studies and when we lost administrative support in the office. Doing an outreach program and other things are time and resource consuming. The university would need to commit resources for the department to once again engage in these types of activities.

With respect to advising, the last 5-year review indicated that half graduating seniors expressed satisfaction with their advisor, and a quarter were highly satisfied. Still, some students found it difficult to schedule a meeting with their advisor. In the wake of the last 5-year review, we outlined a new process that was designed to insure that every major has and consults an advisor. The implementation of this process has been sporadic and is not yet fully realized though some steps have been taken. The Department did incorporate the last outside reviewer's suggestion to standardize advising forms across the different options (08-09 CAPR 44). In addition, an advising brochure was developed that was to be emailed to all new majors, and, periodically, to all majors as a reminder. While the major listserv is used as a regular Departmental communication tool by the Department chair and the administrative coordinator to update all majors on a range of Departmental issues, its use for advising remains unfulfilled. When majors come into the office, call, or email, they are told that they can select an advisor if they have a preference, if they do not a preference an initial advisor is designated based on major option (Traditional, Pre-law, Public Administration), and students can change advisors at any time.

In spite of our recognized challenges with advising, the department still does well; 15/31 seniors said that they were "satisfied" with their major advisor and 16/31 students were neutral or dissatisfied. Nevertheless, the department and the University recognize the need and opportunity for improvements. Advising has become a new university focus after CSUEB President Morishita made student success and retention a number one priority. It has been also suggested that we supplement the current system with sign-ups for advising in classes, asking students if they have an advisor and taking the names, options, and interests of those that do not. However, as many political sciences classes are comprised with enrollments of equal numbers of non-majors, this is potentially an inefficient and distracting activity. Another possibility is to assign students based on alphabet, instead of assigning an advisor based on major option (e.g. A-D = Baggins, E-H = Bergman, etc.). In this way one step is eliminated and students know immediately with whom to make contact. We also do not have at least one faculty advisor available for early evening advising on a weekly basis. Online advising is perhaps the only remedy to the range of times students demand service.

### **c. Internship program**

Directed by Dr. Kim Geron, the internship program attracts about 25 students per year. Interns register for a separate course, POSC 3113 Political Internship, and may take it for 2 or 4 units. Students work 80-100 hours in a supervised environment, generally in politics, a legal environment, or in the public policy arena. Professor's Geron and Bergman supervise these students, evaluates their academic assignments.

A new University requirements requires a site visit and approval for risk assessment, but there is currently no course compensation for faculty to do this work. Such a situation is clearly inequitable and deserves attention by the Department and the college.

#### **d. Career Orientation**

In response to previous focus group demands the department develop better career advising, the new department SLOs include career advising. Most recently, 14/31 graduating seniors were satisfied with “the assistance I received from POSC faculty in the area of career counseling or preparation for graduate school,” while 17/31 were either neutral or dissatisfied. [Exit Survey 2013, question 32.] Open-end comments from the survey make it clear that some very good advising occurs. Still, students want better assistance with career planning. Instructors in 4910 find that many students do not begin to think about graduate school or career options until their senior year. The department is discussing plans to strengthen career advising. Though changes in the job market may necessitate a broader vision for how the department should best approach career advising. Such a vision is addressed in more detail in section seven below.

By way of one example, appropriate career advising may not only be a question of appropriate educational preparation but a reflection of extant realities in particular fields. Recently, 47 law schools began retroactively reducing tuition and returning money to students from the last two years of classes rather than face class action suits. The situation in the job market is that students are just not getting jobs in the legal profession. Three of the 175 ABA accredited law schools have failed, and more are expected to follow. The Law School Admissions Testing service (LSAT) notes that test registration is at a forty-year low. Furthermore, the Law School Data Assembly Service (LSDAS), the system maintained by the Law School Admission Council (LSAC) which puts together the data derived from a candidate's transcripts and LSAT, is demanding law advisors push law school aggressively. In addition, almost every law school is dropping admissions requirements. Our Students with a 2.5 GPA are getting in to law school, while students with higher GPAs are going into STEM fields. Finally, this tide is unlikely to change anytime soon, as the Roberts Court in its ruling is continually reducing the right to file suit.

There is, however, very strong student support in focus groups conducted by the department for a coordinated pre-law option/para-legal certificate. In an attempt to address this possibility Dr. Elizabeth Bergman initiated a conversation with Extended Ed a few years ago. Being short on resources, the department has been in a holding pattern trying to deliver a minimum schedule.

### **IV. Assessment**

#### **a. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

Summary of Assessment: Program Student Learning Outcomes

Students graduating with a B.A. in Political Science from CSU East Bay will be able to:

1. Develop and articulate an understanding of democratic theory and practice and gain practical experience in politics, public policy, and civic engagement;
2. Demonstrate thorough oral and written competency, an understanding of the theories, concepts, and empirical content, and research agenda of the fields of political science with advanced understanding in the selected option;
3. Demonstrate an understanding of political culture in the U.S. and around the world including the economic, ideological, ethnic and cultural groups and movements that engage the political process.
4. Articulate career goals, demonstrate knowledge of how to achieve those goals, and produce evidence of working to achieve the goals; and
5. Demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge through collaborative learning and teamwork

**b. Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed**

**POSC Assessment Grid POSC 3030 for F12/W13/Spr13**

Scale: POOR                      FAIR                      GOOD                      EXCELLENT

(PSL02a) Course SLO1: Ability, with minimum prompting, to develop a strong thesis statement.

Indicator: research plan and annotated bibliography.

Rubric:	Unable	With much help	4910with some help	Independently
	11	22	36	23

(PSL02b) Course SLO2: Ability, with minimum guidance and suggestion of materials to develop a strong bibliography using appropriate academic, governmental, and other sources. Indicator: research plan and annotated bibliography.

Rubric:	Unable	With much Help	With some help	Independently
	11	22	36	23

(PSL01a, 2a) Course SLO3: Ability, independently, to write a well structured research paper with a sustained argument in error-free college-level English. Indicator: research plan and annotated bibliography.

Rubric: weak structure/argument	some structure	mostly sustained	strong all areas
11	22	36	23

(PSL02a) Course SLO4: Ability to understand and critique the concepts and theories of political science Indicator: group presentations.

Rubric: none	partial	mostly	understand and critique
11	22	36	23

(PSL02a) Course SLO5: Ability orally to communicate course material and academic research in persuasive professional English. Indicator: group presentation.

Rubric: limited or poor	some	mostly	strong
11	22	36	23

(PSL02b) Course SLO6: Ability to read, understand, and critique non-quantitative academic POSC articles. Indicator: research plan and annotated bibliography.

Rubric: weak	partial	grasps basics	strong and critique
11	22	36	23

(PSL06) Course SLO7: Ability to apply knowledge through collaborative learning and teamwork. Indicator: Group projects and presentations.

Rubric: weak	some	good insight/ assistance	excellent insight/ assistance
11	22	36	23

**c. POSC 4910 (Senior Seminar) Aggregate data from 3 sections in 2014**

Scale:	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
(PSL02a) Course SLO1: Ability, with minimum prompting to develop a strong thesis statement. Indicator: research paper.				
Rubric:	Unable	with much help	with some help	Independently
	8	30	17	6
(PSL02b) Course SLO2: Ability with minimum guidance and suggestion of materials to develop a strong bibliography using appropriate academic, governmental, and other sources. Indicator: paper preparation and bibliography				
Rubric:	weak prep even with help	Inconsistently	Generally independent	Strong
	11	19	18	13
PSL01a, 2a Course SLO3: Ability, independently, to write a well structured research paper with a sustained argument inn error-free college level English Indicator: research paper				
Rubric:	weak Structure Argument	some structure argument	mostly sustained	Strong all areas
	13	23	14	11
(PSL02a) Course SLO4: Ability to understand and critique the concepts and theories of political science Indicator: seminar discussions and roundtables				
Rubric:	none	partial	mostly	understand and critique
	5	27	16	13
(PSL02a) Course SL05: Ability orally to communicate course material and academic research in persuasive professional English Indicator: formal presentation				
Rubric:	limited or poor	some	mostly	strong
	8	22	20	11
(PSL02b) Course SL06: Ability to read, understand and critique non-quantitative academic POSC articles Indicator: seminar presentation				
Rubric:	weak	partial	grasps basics	strong and with a critique
	6	25	21	9
(PSL05 Course SLO 7: Ability to apply knowledge through collaborative learning and teamwork Indicator: seminar groups/roundtables/peer assessment				
Rubric:	weak	some	good insight	excellent insight
	9	23	14	9

#### **d. Summary of Assessment Process**

POSC SLOs are introduced in POSC 3030, the upper-division gateway survey of the major. These SLOs are developed in all upper-division POSC courses, which are expected to practice all SLOs that are appropriate to the individual subject matter. All upper-division course syllabi now contain SLOs aligned with the program SLOs. In particular, all upper-division courses are expected to introduce and practice research, analytic, writing, and oral skills in the POSC sub-fields, identify students struggling academically and seek appropriate assistance for them and notify the department. SLO measurement occurs in POSC 3030 and the capstone Political Science Seminar (POSC 4910). Students are expected to achieve mastery of the SLOs in the seminar, which involves an extensive research plan, a 20-page research paper, a formal oral presentation, and participation in a seminar reading and analysis exercise.

All POSC majors are assessed, however, the results are aggregated. Assessment results are shared with the department faculty. Expectations of individual faculty in support of assessment are renewed regularly. The instructors in POSC 3030 and POSC 4910 work closely together. Both courses have been adapted extensively over the past few years to focus on the SLOs. POSC 3030 introduces and practices the various components that go into the seminar project. The seminar instructors use a highly detailed process approach to the research project whereby weekly preliminary assignments provide incremental development of the final paper and multiple indicators of the SLOs. The rubric for 4910 reflects this developmental approach and indicates how close students come to mastery of the SLOs.

#### **e. Summary of Results**

A comparison of the results in POSC 3030 and POSC 4910 show that students rate higher in 3030. 3030 introduces the components of an academic research project. Students are expected to practice the skills and write shorter papers in the upper-division courses and then demonstrate mastery in the longer seminar paper and formal presentation. The department also administers an anonymous exit survey to all graduating seniors. Students find the seminar to be a more challenging course, as it is designed to be. 13/15 graduating seniors found the seminar to be challenging. 8/18 found the seminar to be too challenging, including 4 of the 8 that said that the seminar was challenging in a good way (“a good intellectual challenge,” “rewarding,” “a great learning experience”). One student commented the need for more ‘prior extensive prep and more emphasis on scholarly research.’ [Exit survey Sp 2013]

In general, students find that the seminar “works well as a capstone experience.” 19/31 strongly agreed or agree while 11/31 disagree or strongly disagreed. 20/31 agreed that they were well prepared for the seminar project, while 9/31 disagreed. 16/31 students agreed whereas 12/31 disagreed that “the format and structure of the seminar was conducive to the preparation of a quality research paper.” One student commented, in response to this question, that there should be “much better preparation for research and writing. “I felt very unprepared for the Senior Seminar. Most professors do not push this and it is very important to success in the field.” In the follow-up 4910 focus group in Winter 2014 several students felt there were excessive seminar readings in addition to the research project. In Spring 2014, 9/23 students fell three or more weeks behind in the assignments. Five cited illness or injury. Four cited their work schedule (including several working full time and taking a full load). Many noted the high number of units they were taking. No student in the class was aware of the amount of work outside of class that is expected of students according to the university catalogue. The department plans to address the issue of course work load and the level of assignments in POSC courses.

As in past years, the overwhelming majority of POSC majors are satisfied with the major. 19/30 agreed that the major “fulfilled their expectations,” while 5/31 disagreed and six were neutral. [Exit Survey]

## **V. Faculty**

Two faculty separated during the period of review, Michael Good and Melissa Michelson, and Norman Bowen is in the second year of FERP. No new faculty joined the department in the review period. We are currently engaged in a TT search to hire a junior faculty member in September 2015. We hope to hire an American Political Institutions member with a specialization in social media and digital governance.

Dr. Ortuoste received tenure this year (2014) and Dr. Bergman is undergoing tenure review (2014-15).

## **VI. Resources**

As in our previous 5-year review, the Political Science Department remains a low cost high productivity unit. As in 2008, the same statement applies: "we recognize in University finances we are one of the programs that pay for other programs by providing large classes and demanding few special resources. That said, the Department was starved to near failure in recent years through lack of resources, primarily hiring."

We remain unable to fulfill our promise and potential due to a lack of faculty resources. We need an additional 2 hires in the next five years. Our immediate need is for a position that focuses on public policy in one or more areas such as the environment and sustainability, or science and technology. We anticipate we will need an additional position in International relations/Comparative politics. The IR/CP position is needed as our FERP colleague, Prof. Bowen, retires as this would only leave the department with one colleague, Dr. Ortuoste, to teach our catalogue of two major subfields. These two positions would enable us to return to 2008-level strength and also meet future goals and grow the major.

## **VII. Five Year Plan**

We note that we have achieved the objectives from the last 5-year plan, as summarized in 08-09 CAPR 44; 1) continued to teach many students on limited resources, 2) avoided moving back a to cafeteria approach to course offerings, 3) settled 2008 new hires (Ortuoste and Bergman) into long and productive relationship with the Department and University, 4) offered online and hybrid courses, 5) secured a new faculty hire (in process 2014/15), and 6) continue to improve advising. For the next 5-year plan and for the future, our objectives are to maintain and improve the above listed goals. Going forward, into the next 5-year plan, we seek to create a broader vision for future in order to better serve the needs of students and the University as a whole.

First, the department needs more cohesion in course offerings in order to more attractively package our major options; initial efforts to revise and redefine outdated courses was begun by Bergman in Fall 2011. With the plans for the University to transition in less than four years to Semester, the department will undertake a thorough review of its curriculum, and our 3 options, to enhance cohesion in our program offerings.

Second, as part our efforts to revise our courses as part of the conversion to Semesters, we will determine what department projects will be most useful to our students' education, their future employment opportunities, as well as their understanding of politics, law, and public policy, and international affairs. Some possibilities include: an "Applied Politics" focus, or a "Big Data" track, or an investment in a survey center to teach students how to conduct and analyze survey data and provide a service to the campus community. Another possibility is to enhance our course offerings and focus on the politics and policy implications of science and technology. This may be accomplished through an affinity hire with our colleagues in STEM fields. This will help demonstrate to students that the major provides them with expertise and preparation desirable to employers.

Third, the department will continue to explore partnering with other departments that are not part of existing schools in the college – e.g. Public Administration or Sociology (numerous public universities have joined political science and sociology departments),<sup>1</sup> Criminal Justice, and/or AGES to develop synergies and enhance our limited resources together. We will also strive on a limited basis to partner with a few local political science programs at community colleges to build better relationships with our colleagues and students.

Students (and their parents) want to find careers that use the knowledge and skills they gained at CSUEB whether in the field of politics, law, government, non-profit organizations, or in other fields. For many, the connection between a political science degree and a job is obscure. We have to change that perception and that reality. While our department prides itself on its focus on enhancing students writing and verbal skills to provide them with a strong foundation in any job, we want to do a better job of using the subject knowledge students are learning in political science to also obtain a job in a related field. Due in part to limited resources, the department is unable to make the connection between graduating with a major in political science and obtaining a job (see Section III.d. above). Our brochures have a recitation of the kinds of jobs one can get with a BA in Political Science, but this list is (a) not comprehensive and (b) intangible to some of our students. We need to rebrand ourselves as a department offering a major that provides education and skills that make our students competitive in today's job market.

We can do two things in the next five years to accomplish such a repurposing of our mission and role;

1) Create an Internship Director (CSU Long Beach has one) to focus on garnering and placing students in internships -- our goal should be of 50% of all majors students experiencing an internship during their CSUEB tenure. According to Forbes, internships may be the easiest way to jobs, fully 69% of companies offered full-time jobs to their interns.<sup>2</sup> Finding internships and doing the site visits required for risk management requires faculty commitment and time, time that current faculty do not have.

2) Create a database of actual jobs (not open jobs) with contact names; this will also facilitate the acquisition of internships. According to the US Census, there are more than 500,000 elected posts of all kinds in the United States.<sup>3</sup> In California alone there are more than 25,000 elected posts – Dr. Bergman is in process of compiling a database of these elective offices and local-level agencies for her book on the Special Districts in the state. (Additionally, the number of operational and management jobs in local government in the state and the nation far exceeds the number of elective posts.)

In addition to elective posts for which any US citizen over the age of 18 can run, and managerial positions, there are thousands of advertising jobs available in campaigns, social media, and traditional media. In the last presidential election alone more than \$4 billion dollars was spent on advertising. In fact, job opportunities for advertising managers are projected to grow by 13% between now and 2020, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. One of the main reasons for this growth is the fact that the internet has created a new market for advertising.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nearly 50% believe that college/university presidents should eliminate sociology.

<http://freakonomics.com/2012/07/12/the-verdict-is-in-sociology-and-political-science-deserve-the-hatchet/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jacquelynsmith/2012/12/06/internships-may-be-the-easiest-way-to-a-job-in-2013/>

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.census.gov/prod/2/gov/gc/gc92\\_1\\_2.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/2/gov/gc/gc92_1_2.pdf)

Finally, in the area of “Big Data,” according to a [report published last year by McKinsey & Co.](#), by 2018 the U.S. could face a shortage of 140,000 to 190,000 people with "deep analytical talent" and of 1.5 million people capable of analyzing data in ways that enable business decisions. The departments POSC 3030 course is a data analysis course, as are a number of other courses (e.g. 3130, 3300, 3330, 3800), and we should market them as such in a rebranding of the department.

This is an ambitious plan for a small department. Without additional resources we will be unable to fully achieve this 5-year plan. We are truly at a crossroads between the past and the future, between the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the 21<sup>st</sup>. We wish to be a forward thinking and responsive department, one that is relevant to the needs of the University’s students today and tomorrow. It is our intention to do all the things in our power to meet that important goal, and it is our hope that the University will assist us in reaching it.

**STATISTICAL DATA**

APR Summary Data 2009-2013

**Political Science**

Fall Quarter

<b>Headcount Enrollment</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Undergraduate	190	164	183	204	193
Postbaccalaureate	4	2	3	0	0
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number of Majors	194	166	186	204	193
<b>Degrees Awarded</b>	<b>08-09</b>	<b>09-10</b>	<b>10-11</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>
Undergraduate	48	50	37	50	51
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number of Majors	48	50	37	50	51
<b>Student Faculty Ratios</b>					
Tenured/Track	27.23	29.68	25.53	26.49	25.64
Lecturer	35.85	40.28	33.17	36.77	36.33
SFR By Level (All Faculty)	29.73	31.61	27.9	28.31	29.85
Lower Division	38.39	49.89	39.54	37.4	41.95
Upper Division	26.88	26.94	24.64	27.31	27.75
<b>Section Size</b>					
Number of Sections Offered	21	20	20	19	20
SCU taught	2768	2776	2428	2556	2428
Average Section Size	36.3	38.3	33.4	35.1	31.7
Average Section Size for LD	44.2	55.8	47	42	42
Average Section Size for UD	33.5	33.3	29.5	34.3	29.8
LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	2	2	1	1	0
UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	13	14	12	14	12
LD Section taught by Lecturer	3	2	3	1	3
<b>POSC Student Demographics Fall 2013</b>					
	Male	Female	Total		
Black	9	18	27		
Asian	17	10	27		
Pacific Islander	2	0	2		
Hispanic/Latino	28	38	66		
White	29	14	43		
Multiply Ethnicity	6	10	16		
Race/Ethnicity unknown	4	4	8		
Nonresident Alien	1	3	4		
American Indian = 0					

## Curriculum Map for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, CSU East Bay

**Degree:** B.A. in Political Science **Dept:** POLS

**Levels:** I=Introduced; P=Practiced; M=Mastered (terms adopted from WASC recommendations)

**Indicators:** A=Assignments; E=Essays; R=Research Project/Papers; T=Objective Tests;

**Symbols:** X=Exams of Mixed Types (tests, short answers, essays); O=Other Types of Work  
V=Variable (may vary from different sections or instructors)

e.g., T50=The indicator is an Objective Test, which constitutes 50% of the course evaluation

**Instructions:**

- 1) Enter a course ONLY if that course is part of the requirement of the relevant major (either core, option requirement, or elective). Enter the course according to the course number, from smallest to the largest numbers).
- 2) For each course, for the course line (see example 01), use the pull down list (click the cell, and the downward arrow will show) to indicate at what level the material is addressed for each SLO. For the Indicators line, enter the symbols, such as T50, O35, etc., to indicate the type of work and the % of its weight of the course evaluation (Round to every 5%, e.g., 15, 20, 25, etc.)
- 3) If the SLO maps to any ILO, enter the same values under that ILO for the same course (see example 01). Map ALL relevant ILOs when appropriate.

**Reveal SLO/ILO text:** Mouse over each SLO or ILO, the full text of that SLO/ILO will show on the screen.

Serial #	Course Prefix	Course #	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	SLO5	ILO1	ILO2	ILO3	ILO4	ILO5	ILO6	Note
01	POLS	1171	I	I	I			I	I	I		I	I	
	Indicators		X 100	X 100	X 100			X 100	X 100	X 100		X 100	X 100	
02	POLS	1201	I	I	I		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	Indicators		R 30	A 32	A 32		A 32	A 32	A 32	A 32	A 32	R 30	R 30	
03	POLS	1202	I	I	I			I	I	I		I	I	
	Indicators		T 100	T 100	T 100			T 100	T 100	T 100		T 100	T 100	
04	POLS	1500	I	I	I		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	Indicators		X 66	X 66	X 66		A 15	X 66	X 66	X 66	A 15	X 66	X 66	
05	POLS	3030	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
	Indicators		AER	AER	AT	O 0	O 0	AER	AER	AT	O 0	AER	AER	
06	POLS	3111	P	P	P	P		P	P	P		P	P	
	Indicators		X 60	R 30	X 60	O 0		R 30	R 30	X 60		X 60	X 60	
07	POLS	3115	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
	Indicators		X 60	X 60	X 60	O 0	A 40	X 60	X 60	X 60	A 40	X 60	X 60	
08	POLS	3130	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
	Indicators		X 60	X 60	X 60	O 0	A 40	X 60	X 60	X 60	A 40	X 60	X 60	
09	POLS	3150	P	P	P	P		P	P	P		P	P	
	Indicators		A 25	X 50	X 50	O 0		X 50	X 50	X 50		A 25	A 25	
10	POLS	3201	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
	Indicators		X 50	R 30	X 50		A 20	R 30	R 30	X 50	A 20	X 50	X 50	
11	POLS	3204	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
	Indicators		X 45	R 24	X 45		O 10	R 25	R 25	X 45	O 10	X 45	X 45	
12	POLS	3230	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
	Indicators		X 25	E 20	X 20		A 25	E 20	E 20	X 20	A 25	X 25	X 25	
13	POLS	3280	P	P	P			P	P	P		P	P	
	Indicators		X 16	R 33	A 33			R 33	R 33	A 33		X 16	X 16	
14	POLS	3290	P	P	P			P	P	P		P	P	
	Indicators		X 33	R 50	X 33			R 50	R 50	X 33		X 33	X 33	
15	POLS	3300	P	P	P	P		P	P	P		P	P	
	Indicators		X 75	X 75	X 75	O 0		X 75	X 75	X 75		X 75	X 75	
16	POLS	3310	P	P	P	P		P	P	P		P	P	
	Indicators		ATX 90	ATX 90	ATX 90	O 0		ATX 90	ATX 90	ATX 90		ATX 90	ATX 90	
17	POLS	3330	P	P		P	P	P	P		P	P	P	
	Indicators		A 40	R 40		O 0	A 20	R 40	R 40		A 20	A 40	A 40	

18	POLS 3340 Indicators	P E 50	P R 25	P E 50	P O 0	P R/O 35		P R 25	P R 25	P E 50	P R/P 35	P E 50	P E 50	
19	POLS 3410 Indicators	P T 30	P R 40		P O 0	P O 5		P R 40	P R 40		P O 5	P T 30	P T 30	
20	POLS 3417 Indicators		P R 30	P X 60					P R 30	P R 60				
21	POLS 3419 Indicators	P E 80	P E 80	P T 10	P O 0			P E 80	P E 80	P T 10		P E 80	P E 80	
22	POLS 3441 Indicators	P X 66	P X/O 10	P X 60	P O 0			P X/O 10	P X/O 100			P X 66	P X 66	
23	POLS 3442 Indicators	P E 66	P EO 100	P E 66	P O 0			P EO 100	P EO 100	P E 66		P E 66	P E 66	
24	POLS 3460 Indicators	P X 50	P X 25	P X 75		P A 25		P X 25	P X 25	P X 75	P A 25	P X 50	P X 50	
25	POLS 3470 Indicators		P X 40	P X 40		P A 40		P X 40	P X 40	P X 40	P A 40			
26	POLS 3500 Indicators	P X 50	P R 30	P X 50	P O 0	P A 20		P R 30	P R 30	P X 50	P A 20	P X 50	P X 50	
27	POLS 3505 Indicators	P X 40	P O 25	P X 40	P O 0	P O 50		P O 25	P O 25	P X 40		P X 40	P X 40	
28	POLS 3510 Indicators		P O 25	P X 40	P O 0			P O 25	P O 25	P X 40				
29	POLS 3520 Indicators	P A 18	P E 24	P E 24	P O 0	P A 18		P E 24	P E 24	P E 24	P A 18	P A 18	P A 18	
30	POLS 3521 Indicators	P X 50	P R 30	P X 50	P O 0	P A 20		P R 30	P R 30	P X 50	P A 20	P X 50	P X 50	
31	POLS 3550 Indicators	P R 25	P R 25	P R 25	P O 0	P R 25		P R 25	P R 25	P R 25	P R 25	P R 25	P R 25	
32	POLS 3703 Indicators	P E/O 90	P E/O 90	P E/O 90		P E 10		P E/O 90	P E/O 90	P E/O 90	P E 10	P E/O 90	P E/O 90	
33	POLS 3704 Indicators	P E/O 80	P E/O 80	P E/O 80		P O 20		P E/O 80	P E/O 80	P E/O 80	P O 20	P E/O 80	P E/O 80	
34	POLS 3711 Indicators	P E/O 80	P E/O 80	P E/O 80		P O 20		P E/O 80	P E/O 80	P E/O 80	P O 20	P E/O 80	P E/O 80	
35	POLS 3713 Indicators	P A 33	P E 33	P A 33		P A 33		P E 33	P E 33	P A 33	P A 33	P A 33	P A 33	
36	POLS 3717 Indicators		P E 33	P A 33		P A 33		P E 33	P E 33	P A 33	P A 33			
37	POLS 3800 Indicators		P A 30	P R 50		P R 50		P A 30	P A 30	P R 50	P R 50			
38	POLS 4171 Indicators	P A 33	P R 33	P A 33		P A 33		P R 33	P R 33	P A 33	P A 33	P A 33	P A 33	
39	POLS 4910 Indicators	M E 50	M A 20	M E 50	M O 0	M A 20		M A 20	M A 20	M E 50	M A 20	M E 50	M E 50	

### C. OUTSIDE REVIEWER RUBRIC (suggested)

The report of the Outside Reviewer should address any areas where improvement might be implemented as noted above, particularly for items with ratings of 3 or lower or where discussion is necessary. Ideas for improvement are welcomed, as are areas worthy of praise. Please be sure to support your ratings and review. Cite specific examples or data.

		<b>The Self-study:</b>	<b>Definitions or rephrasing</b>	<b>Scoring plan</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Page number</b>
<b>1. Self-study of the Program</b>	Compare the previous five-year review with the current state of the program. Is the program generally moving in a direction consistent with the field?	As an expert in the field, has the program chosen directions that are generally consistent with choices at other institutions of higher learning?.	4 = clearly related to direction of field 3 = related with some differences 2 = related, but lacking clarity of vision 1 = not related to movement in the field	4	2,3	
	Study the requests for new faculty for the program. Are the requests consistent with the current direction of the field?	Are the proposed new hires relevant to standard needs or changes in the field?	4 = very consistent with direction of field 3 = consistent with direction of field 2 = consistent with direction of field, but over or under ambitious for program 1 = not consistent with direction of field	4	8	
	Study the Outcomes Assessment portion of the self-study. Are the outcomes and their assessment mechanisms reasonable for the field and the programs?	These statements describe essential educational content covered in order to achieve the program mission/goals. They identify in content-centered terms (e.g., concepts, theories, paradigms, etc.) the knowledge and skills the program aims to convey.	4 = outcomes related to goals; thought out 3 = outcomes described with some clarity 2 = outcomes described, but generally lacking vision or appropriateness 1 = outcomes not clear or inappropriate	4	4	
	Study the student/program statistics provided. Do these numbers reflect national trends in the field? Are SFRs appropriate to the field?	Would other programs have class sizes or student faculty ratios (SFR) of similar size? Is the field growing or shrinking in the areas that this program is trying to move?	4 = shows better than expected statistics and trends for programs like this one 3 = shows appropriate statistics and trends for programs like this one 2 = shows somewhat similar numbers to like programs 1 = shows numbers inappropriate to the field	3	6	
	Compare the program requirements for CSUEB and similar programs in the CSU and UC. Are the program's requirements reasonable for its position in the field?	These are lists, tables, or other schema showing requirements within programs as they relate to overall student learning objectives (e.g., showing hierarchical programmatic connections and/or explaining how courses fit together within degree programs and other course sequences such as options, minors, credentials, or concentrations, etc.).	4 = requirements well aligned with other programs 3 = requirements appropriate 2 = requirements somewhat aligned 1 = requirements not aligned with similar programs	3	3	

	Are the achievements of the faculty consistent with similar programs?	These are professional activities, publications, grants awards, fellowships, or other recognition. Compared to similar programs:	4 = achievements are outstanding 3 = achievements are aligned 2 = achievements are somewhat aligned 1 = achievements are lower than expected	3	5
	Are the achievements of the students consistent with similar programs?	These are educational activities, publications, grants awards, fellowships, or other recognition. Compared to similar programs:	4 = achievements are outstanding 3 = achievements are aligned 2 = achievements are somewhat aligned 1 = achievements are lower than expected	3	6
<b>2. Program Plan</b>	<b>The Academic Plan</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Scoring plan</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Page number</b>
	Study the planned curricular changes.	Are the proposed curricular changes reasonable for the field and appropriate for the program? Is there a need for the proposed changes? Considering the three areas: description of curricular changes, appropriateness of these changes, and linkage to program objectives.	4 = curricular changes clearly described, appear appropriate, and linked to program objectives 3 = curricular changes fall short in one 2 = curricular changes fall short in two 1 = proposed changes are not appropriate	3	8
	Consider the national and regional trends for student growth in the field.	Do you expect the number of majors to increase in the next five years?	4 = number of students should increase dramatically in this field 3 = number of students should increase slightly 2 = number of students should remain flat 1 = number of students will decrease	4	7-8
	Consider the national and regional trends for employment in the field.	Do you expect jobs to increase and students in this program to be prepared for changes in the job market requirements?	4 = number of jobs should increase in this field and students should be prepared 3 = number of students should increase slightly 2 = number of students should remain flat 1 = number of students will decrease	4	
	Consider the resources required for implementing proposed changes.	Are the resources realistic and adequate to the intended purpose?	4 = realistic and adequate 3 = realistic and probably adequate 2 = realistic but more resources are necessary 1 = unrealistic	2	5

	Overall evaluation of the plan.	Considering the plan overall, how would you rate its quality, potential for benefiting the program, and likelihood of completion if resources are allocated to this plan?	4 = very likely to be successful 3 = likely to be successful 2 = could succeed at a later time 1 = unlikely to be successful	2	6
<b>3. Curriculum</b>	<b>Curriculum and program</b>	<b>Overall considerations</b>	<b>Scoring plan</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Page number</b>
	In your judgment are the program requirements adequate to meet the goals of the program?	Be sure to consider where students graduating from the program are expected to go next, workplace, etc.	4 = such description is explicitly offered 3 = such description is at least implied 2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this 1 = no such description offered	4	2
	In your opinion, is adequate breadth present in the program?	Do students get exposure to a broad enough field of study, including interdisciplinary coursework?	4 = breadth of program is admirable 3 = breadth of program is adequate 2 = breadth needs some improvement 1 = breadth is inadequate	4	2
	In your opinion, is adequate depth present in the program?	Do students get exposure to a deep enough field of study, including interdisciplinary coursework?	4 = depth of program is admirable 3 = depth of program is adequate 2 = depth needs some improvement 1 = depth is inadequate	3	2
<b>4. Resources</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Additional considerations</b>	<b>Scoring plan</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Page number</b>
	In your judgment is the number of tenure-track faculty adequate to meet the goals of the program if no new positions are added?	Be sure to consider options available for adjunct faculty.	4 = current number of faculty is adequate 3 = nearly adequate considering adjunct faculty 2 = number of faculty inadequate by one 1 = inadequate by two or more	1	1-10
	In your opinion is the number of tenure-track faculty consistent with similar programs or meets the expected numbers for programs of this size?	Please consider the use of adjunct faculty at similar institutions.	4 = number of faculty meets expectations 3 = nearly meets expectations considering adjunct faculty 2 = number of faculty inadequate by one 1 = inadequate by two or more	1	

	In your judgment are the facilities (space, equipment, technology), adequate to meet the goals of the program if no new resources are added?	Be sure to consider options that are available to the program in terms of raising outside funding.	4 = the current facilities are adequate 3 = the current facilities are nearly adequate 2 = the facilities need improvement 1 = the facilities are inadequate	4	3
	In your judgment are the facilities (space, equipment, technology), consistent with similar programs or programs of this size?	Please consider the use of outside funding raising at similar institutions.	4 = breadth of program is admirable 3 = breadth of program is adequate 2 = breadth needs some improvement 1 = breadth is inadequate	<=?	
<b>5. Site Visit</b>	On your site visit to campus consider the library holdings and services for the discipline.	Be sure to consider options that are available to the program in terms of obtaining outside library resources. Are these adequate to the degree program offered?	4 = library holdings/services are adequate 3 = holdings/services nearly adequate 2 = journals are inadequate 1 = library holdings (texts) are inadequate	n/o	
	While on campus you will meet with and discuss the program with students currently in the program.	Consider the nature of the comments of the students. Consider their educational goals. Do students seem satisfied with the program?	4 = students seem highly satisfied 3 = students seem adequately satisfied 2 = students seem somewhat satisfied 1 = students seem inadequately satisfied	4	6
	You will meet with and discuss the program with lecturers/adjunct faculty from the program.	Consider the breadth, flexibility, and scope these faculty add to the program.	4 = adjunct faculty enhance program 3 = adjunct faculty are adequate, involved 2 = adjunct faculty adequate, not involved 1 = adjunct faculty are inadequate	n/o	
	While on campus you may meet with and discuss the program with alumni from the program.	Consider the enthusiasm and interest of the alumni and adjunct faculty. Consider their ability to enhance the program offerings both in terms of curriculum and financial contributions.	4 = alumni participate actively 3 = alumni participate somewhat 2 = alumni participation is low 1 = alumni participation is not appropriate	n/o	
	While on campus you may meet with and discuss the program with staff from the program	Do the staff member(s) seem adequate in terms of support for the program? Are they enthusiastic and dedicated to the program?	4 = staff enhance program 3 = staff enhance program, but stretched 2 = staff are barely adequate 1 = staff are inadequate	4	5
<i>Synthesis: Overall quality of plan</i>					

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Additional considerations</b>	<b>Scoring plan</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>5. Synthesis</b>	In your opinion does the program adequately utilize information from its academic program review process and its assessment processes?	The program should present a well-developed and coherent assessment plan that includes continuous and well-integrated linkage among review, assessment, planning, and implementation activities.	4 = definitely 3 = probably 2 = possibly, but uncertain 1 = definitely not	<b>3</b>
	Are there natural areas that the program could move toward or areas of natural cooperation in the University?	In your opinion are there opportunities for expansion or contraction of the program?	Please respond to this item in your report.	
<b>6 Total</b>	<b><u>Sum of scores out of possible 100</u></b>			<b>67/84</b>
	<b>Average of scores</b>			<b>3.1</b>

**The report of the Outside Reviewer should address any areas where improvement might be implemented as noted above, particularly for items with ratings of 3 or lower or where discussion is necessary. Ideas for improvement are welcomed, as are areas worthy of praise. Please be sure to support your ratings and review. Cite specific examples or data.**



***The Department of Political Science  
The California State University, East Bay  
Report of the External Reviewer  
Winter 2015***

*Professor David M. Speak  
Professor of Political Science and Chair, Academic Senate  
The California State Polytechnic University, Pomona*

An academic department is a living, organic being, carrying with it the DNA of its provenance and responding to the vicissitudes of its environment. Like other organic beings, the department has natural defensive responses. When challenged by depletion of its membership (the core resource) due to resignation, retirement or death in a time of plenty, the department can usually continue to thrive while addressing the loss. The model is self-regenerating. However, when these regularly occurring challenges coincide with extremely harsh environmental circumstances, the department can be severely compromised through no fault of its own. Despite an engineered resilience, the natural patterns of the life of a department are vulnerable to vagaries of chance.

The confluence of an increasing reluctance on the part of state legislatures to fund higher public education and the Great Recession has created conditions painfully familiar to every one associated with a university community in the second decade of the current century. The consequences of that confluence are immediately apparent in the current condition of the Department of Political Science at the California State University, East Bay. This situation is particularly troubling because it's hard to imagine any successful middle-sized public university without a vigorous department uniquely dedicated to the extension and dissemination of civic education (Aristotle called it "the queen of sciences"). As I will explain below, the serious nature of this situation is even more trenchant when, as here, a compelling case can be made for the *unique centrality of civic education to the CSUEB mission*.

The good news is that the Department of Political Science has, even with its current challenges, very considerable strengths, sufficient to provide a foundation for a strengthened unit capable of providing campus leadership in terms of curriculum, community engagement and regional significance. This department can be, and I think *will be*, one of the centers of excellence in an increasingly prominent institutional anchor of the East Bay. But to accomplish this the Department needs a critical core of tenure track faculty members.

I visited CSUEB on the twelfth and thirteenth of February, 2015. I spoke with Dean Rountree and Associate Dean Chester, department faculty members, (Professors Baggins, Bergman and Geron and Professor Emeritus Bowen) and the department administrative support person, Ms. Sandy Coulter. I was also able to meet with students both in a small group and by intruding upon a class meeting with the kind invitation of Professor Baggins. Coincidentally but not inapposite to this review I met with a group of faculty leaders surrounding calendar conversion, allowing me to triangulate informally some observations about Political Science. I have studied both the Department's current Five Year self-study report and the last Five Year Review, including the Report of the last external reviewer, Professor Andranovich of CSULA. My review should be understood with the usual caveat accompanying any snapshot in time of a complex institution.

### ***Curriculum***

The Department offers a BA in Political Science with three options in a single major and a Political Science minor. Notably, graduate work in the subfield of Public Affairs and Public Administration is offered in a separate department. The course offerings and program expectations are pretty standard for undergraduate political science programs, though both are heavily skewed to the upper division.

*An Upper Division Bias* This distribution of course offerings reflects in part the composition of the campus student body, but also embodies some programmatic choices at the departmental level. With five or six distinct subfields in the discipline, the absence of an introductory course in each particular subfield, combined with the absence of sequenced upper division courses, yields a trade-off: each upper division course is put in the position of having to provide some introduction to the subfield (vernacular and organizing concepts) at the beginning of each term. This may often at least marginally water down the depth of treatment of the advanced material. The upside is that this makes the upper division courses accessible to non-majors, an important leavening agent in political science courses. This is a debate that my own department has confronted and incompletely resolved in favor of a comprehensive array of lower division courses (on one hand) that are *not* required prerequisites to the upper division courses (on the other). That means in our case only a slightly reduced onus on the upper division course to provide basic intro material. Given the dearth of faculty resources in the CSUEB department I wouldn't recommend adding lower division courses (or any courses) at this time. But the tradeoff itself adds weight to the need for additional faculty resources.

*CSUEB Political Science External Review*

*Three Major Options* Offering three distinct options with such a small faculty is a more substantial concern. The Department needs to ask whether the options are truly distinct and if so, whether they are supported by apposite faculty expertise. The current program as structured allows, almost unavoidably, for a high degree of flexibility in terms of the particular courses chosen to complete the option. Each option is bookended by the two common intro courses and the single common capstone. That the students all flow into a common senior seminar reinforces the question about distinctness. The options exist as badges more than anything else. Admittedly the badges seem to have merit: when I spoke with students in a small group there was a representative of each of the options: a Kenyan national who spoke approvingly of the breadth of her “traditional” option; a non-local Californian who indicated that she would not have ended up at CSUEB except for the “Pre-Law” option unique, according to her research, among the Northern CSUs; and a Vet who has already applied to do graduate work in Public Administration. Each spoke positively about the choice of coursework appropriate to their separate circumstances. General Motors used the same badging strategy, for a long time successfully selling the same automotive innards to a lot of folks who had loyalty to Oldsmobile or Buick or Pontiac. Hard times brought the demise of two of those three brands: the same concern for efficiency might productively fuel a similar reexamination of the Political Science options, whether or not the same conclusion is reached.

*Curricular Innovation* The Self-Study identifies an interest in Minority Politics, but acknowledges the scarcity of resources available to operationalize this goal. Subsuming that emphasis in the larger more encompassing thrust toward civic engagement (discussed below) does provide some hope of addressing this significant curricular opportunity. Professor Andranovich, in the last external review, noted the appropriateness of this emphasis “given the rich political history in the East Bay and its current transformation.” More on this later.

*Facility Resources* I did not make a systematic review of the Facility Resources available to the Department of Political Science but one issue came up during my visit. The students suggested that it would be nice to be able to use the Department conference room as a student gathering place when it is not in use otherwise. Having seen the room and the use to which it is currently being put, I think this suggestion impracticable. However I think it would be a significant advantage to the cohesiveness of the major cohort to have some more appropriate space made available for their use. Perhaps as sister departments vacate the building bound for new quarters, a space might be found for a student/faculty lounge-- a departmental Junior Common Room, if you will.

### ***Student Community***

*Student Clubs* The desire for a gathering space for political science majors points up a related potential issue. The students I spoke with believed that membership in the Political Science club required a 3.0GPA. This may be because of the conjoining of the Club with the Pi Sigma Alpha Chapter—a national honors society with GPA minimal qualifications. Whether the Club actually requires that GPA or not, the shared perception seemed to operationalize that exclusivity in any event. If there is no student club accommodating all Political Science majors, that’s a missed opportunity. A major-centered student club is a great recruitment tool and an instrument of effective informal education as well. The last five year review discusses a Political Science Club active in “four of the last five years,” a Pre-Law Club and the Model United Nations. This year’s review mentions the Model UN and the PoliSci/PSA Club but not a Pre-Law Club. In general I’m guessing that more could be done to create a sense of community among the students in the department.

*Advising* Both the last five year review and this five year review talk about general satisfaction with advising of the political science students. My understanding is that there’s no mandatory advisement and that for many (those not in academic difficulty and thus flagged by the Early Warning system), this means *minimal* actual advisement. This is understandable given the lack of tenure track faculty able to provide this important educational function, but it is a missed opportunity to enrich the experience of undergraduates and encourage appropriate transition to their next life opportunities. Since the academic advisor may represent the only term-to-term faculty contact continuity, it can serve a very important role even for students who are doing well academically. It is also one of the ways to cement ties to the Department that yield development opportunities later, when the current students are successful alums. Development officers will tell you that donors often enthuse about the impact of specific faculty members outside the classroom.

### ***Programmatic Assessment***

I believe the department has the procedures in place to be properly reflective about its programmatic progress. The Senior Seminar and Exit Interviews provide a terrific opportunity to test the congruence between the Student Learning Outcomes of the Program and the University with the curricular and other arrangements meant to bring those to fruition. The non-instructional parts of the Department's mission are both more difficult to assess systematically but also more accessible to qualitative judgments. The one significant obstacle to a genuinely reflexive examination of the Department's work is the apparent lack of ongoing collegial conversation about the future. The Five

Year review admits that curricular development is ‘on hold’ due to the lack of faculty resources. The current situation is not conducive to rigorous collegial debate about the way forward.

**The Great Strengths of the Political Science Department:**

*Human Resources of the Department* The **current active faculty members** are a source of great optimism in projecting the long-term health of the Department. The colleagues with whom I had a chance to speak, to a person, are highly accomplished professionals with an unquestionable commitment to the success of their students and the larger mission of the Department, College and University. One of the things I'm most sensitive to (and about) when I interact with colleagues up and down the CSU is the wistful feeling that we'd be better if we were more like the UC system. I disagree. The CSU has its own distinct mission--a noble one. We are *not* UC-Lite. This feeling of second-class status is frustrating enough when encountered outside the CSU, where folks might not be expected to understand the subtle but important differences in the missions of the two university systems. When our own CSU colleagues fall victim to this misunderstanding it can be positively corrosive to our work together. The tenure stream faculty members of the Political Science Department do get it. Their passion is for their students—their *actual* students, not an idealized or unrealistic image of the undergraduate scholar. The theme of connecting the students and the program to the real world is universally shared, although it is expressed in different ways, attached to different projects. My concern is that the status quo (a small number of core faculty members overlain with some interpersonal tensions) has practically speaking frozen the Department in place. A conversation about the way forward would certainly best be encouraged by bringing in new faculty colleagues, but might also be engendered by conversations with sister departments about the formation of a School within the College, conversations with Continuing Ed about a paralegal certificate program (a revenue source), or conversations with feeder community college departments breathing rigorous substance into 1440 arrangements. Apparently prior forms of direct outreach to feeder Community Colleges were discontinued for lack of resources. The catch here is that the current faculty all have full dance cards: it is hard to recommend that any one of them should take up one of these challenges.

The long serving and totally dedicated Department administrative support person, Ms Coulter, is nearing retirement. This represents an unavoidable loss for the Department notwithstanding the adequacy of the anticipated shared support arrangement. A shared arrangement offers both benefit (greater incidental interaction with colleagues in other departments) it also threatens to further diminish the sense of the Department as a coherent ‘family’ unit.

*Students Affiliated with the Department* A very healthy number of students have chosen to be **political science majors**. The Self-Study suggests that a recent dip in numbers corresponds to the decline College-wise, but I'm not sure the numbers bear this out. It's too soon to worry about a trend, but the absolute number of majors is a significant resource. If the students I spoke with are at all representative of the cohort of political science majors, the Department is attracting able, interesting and public-oriented students. With the decrease in Law School applicants nation-wide, all Political Science Departments have to be vigilant about declining numbers, but at least so far this doesn't seem to be an issue for the CSUEB Political Science Department. The current number of majors would seem objectively to be too large to be adequately advised by the tenure stream faculty. Both the direct queries about advising I made of students during my visit and the exit interview results suggest that students feel adequately served in this regard, but I am skeptical. Especially given the large number of first-generation college students at CSUEB, faculty advisement provides an opportunity to do much more than registration form-filling. Such advisement often needs to be enforced with a registration hold. This is expensive in faculty terms, but is liable to yield significant returns on graduation rates and – more distantly—on development efforts among alumni.

The students with whom I spoke (the small gathering admittedly self-selecting, but the classroom visit not vulnerable to this caveat) feel very good about the curriculum and the commitment of the Department faculty members to student success. The number of Political Science minors (I saw a five year average indicating just under twenty) is modest and a growth opportunity if adequate faculty resources are forthcoming.

*The Department's Image on Campus* The ordinary incidental conversations that I had while visiting the campus (including a meeting with a group of faculty leaders interested in calendar conversion) indicate that the Department has a strong reputation across the university. This is liable to be a reflection of the reputation of the individual faculty members involved as much as a programmatic judgment, but in either case, no counter-indications or concerns surfaced in my casual conversations with other folks on campus.

### ***The Future of the Program and the Department***

So the Political Science Department has strong, active faculty members, healthy numbers of engaged students and a good reputation. These are the building blocks of success. It is clear that the

Department *has been* successful. The questions for a five-year review are: *will --and how will --the Department continue to be* successful?

The single most significant challenge in the Department's ability to assure its future is its current inability to have an engaged, engaging internal dialogue. That inability has multiple, disparate roots which are, I believe, well understood by the participants. Some of the difficulty springs from very different approaches to the matters at hand, e.g., the appropriateness of educational modalities. Some of the difficulty arises from personality friction of the sort that's always possible and not infrequently present in an academic department. *But the most significant source of the department's inability to talk about its future is the disabling reduction of the faculty through resignation, death, leave and absorption in competing institutional tasks.* A loss of critical mass has befallen the Department, and the remaining crew must feel more like survivors than conquerors. The Political Science Department's five-year plan suggests the appointment of an Internship Coordinator and the development of a database of local employment/internship opportunities. These initiatives are spot on, but entirely unrealistic given the current faculty.

*It is an incredibly poignant assertion in the last five year review that the recent hire of two new tenure-stream colleagues marked the first time in years that the faculty ranks had not been reduced from one review to the next. The hope was expressed that a corner had been turned. Now, five years later, that hope appears to have been largely chimerical. Ironically, this is the most promising feature of the problem.*

It's hard to know how to count the current faculty strength but in all practicality it is minimal. I find it hard to understand how this skeletal crew has managed to keep the ship afloat and achieve the positive results it has. At the time of the external review site visit, a search for a new tenure-stream colleague was at a late stage and appeared to be headed to successful conclusion. There was talk of an "affinity" hire as a reasonable chance at another slot. Depending on the circumstances of the faculty member on leave, another colleague is possible, either in the return of the absent person or a replacement. This would represent a practical doubling of the faculty strength. But even that is just a start, and certainly not enough to allow the Department to meet its potential.

***Helping to Define the Campus Mission*** This Department has the potential not just to be a center of excellence at Cal State East Bay, but a defining carrier of the campus's unique image. What more than anything else defines the San Francisco Bay? It is a gateway to the Golden State, and thus a Gateway

to America. As the US turns increasingly to the Pacific to define its place in the world, the San Francisco Bay becomes Uncle Sam's Front Door. Lady Liberty faces East-- the Old Country, but the Golden Gate faces the rising economic and social powerhouses of the twenty-first century. California State University East Bay, with its diverse student body (an Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution) and its emphasis on community college transfers, has a natural affinity with the issue of class mobility more direct than the very urban San Francisco State and the comfortable complacency of San Jose State which is increasingly identified with Silicon Valley. CSUEB, the Gateway campus of the northern part of the state, can be the standard-bearer of the CSU's unique emphasis on upward mobility. The campus is currently engaged in an active conversation about instructional modes to increase access. This conversation is entirely consistent with this theme of class mobility, a theme that poses the accessibility question in stark terms: CSUEB must be a bridge across the Digital Divide if it is to be successful in the larger task of allowing the great majority a shot at a higher standard of living.

Political Science, Aristotle's Queen of Sciences, is the natural core of a campus identified in this fashion. This is already visible in the aspirations of the Political Science Department. The Department has long advocated a focus on public involvement and civic engagement, reflected in its course offerings and its emphasis on internship and service learning. There is a promising suggestion about linking with the College of the Extended University on paralegal training parallel to the Pre-Law option. It's no accident that one faculty member was heavily involved in International Studies and another is heavily involved in the CFA and the CSU East Bay Student Services Operation for Success (SSOS). The Public Administration option is a direct expression of this, as is the Pre-Law option (say what you will about lawyers, their profession is the one most prominently associated with elected office). The suggested focus on Minority Politics is one facet of the same motivation. The United States, as Professor Baggins eloquently explains, is not a polity defined by narrow attachment to religious or ethnic or cultural homogeneity. Our eclecticism necessitates that we define ourselves by our civic culture – a civil religion of liberty and self-reliance.

Individually, faculty members in Political Science talk of pieces of this larger possibility but have yet to embrace the whole. Get enough new blood around the table—a table where the senior members of the Department are enthused and engaged—and the possibilities are substantial. This conversation cannot be forestalled indefinitely: the retirement of the two senior members of the department is, if not exactly around the corner, at least within the visible distance. The Faculty Early

Retirement Program is predicated on a model of gradually stepping away from the active life of the department. If the Department has not firmly grasped a concrete vision of its future and taken the first steps toward that vision by the time of these retirements, a huge gap in the Department's narrative thread opens up, and the task becomes a foundational one rather than the more reliable evolutionary task now posed. There was some talk of an additional school within the College: perhaps that might form the locus for a defining conversation of the sort imagined here if the other Department partners share the gateway vision and *as long as the institutional arrangement does not compromise the integrity and independence of the component Departments.*

As a long-time CSU faculty member and current campus Senate Chair, I'm aware of the resource constraints of the present circumstances. I also know of the predilection of external reviewers to suggest more resources for the unit under review, and thus the skepticism that might be expected in the face of such a call. Nonetheless I believe that this Department really needs and can make good use of additional faculty resources. An affinity search tied to the minority politics emphasis would be a start, but even beyond that an additional faculty line is justified, especially if the colleague on leave does not return. Without an infusion of new blood, the status quo (which seems a mid-air stall) is liable to continue, and Department will be on a glide path to a diminished future. On the other hand, the prospects for a vibrant department that contributes centrally to a campus defined by its gateway mission are substantial given the department's history, its substantive expertise, its well-thought-out but disjointed ambitions and the hearty core of committed individuals ready to launch the next phase.

***About the "OUTSIDE REVIEWER RUBRIC"*** I filled out this rubric to the extent that I thought manageable, but I have to say I didn't find it particularly helpful in this particular instance. Some rows were "not observed" –but fortunately in areas that your institutional research team can do a much more comprehensive job than I can. I understand the motivation for the outside reviewer rubric, and since it was used in pretty much this same form for the last five year review, I guess you get some longitudinal data (though of questionable inter-instance reliability). The effort to provide comparative data across programs (in the College? in the University?) has forced an artificial consistency on issues that will have quite different significance from one specific program to the next. The calculation of a single number average score seems a blunt instrument to get at what must be a summative judgment anyway. In the end, the usefulness of a review should be in the formative

*CSUEB Political Science External Review*

*assessments rather than the summative ones. So don't put much faith in my scribbling upon that rubric. My apologies.*

It's been a pleasure, and a distinct honor to conduct this external review. I have spoken candidly about the challenging circumstances of the Department of Political Science at the time of the review in hopes of assisting the University to capitalize on an opportunity that risks being lost. In closing I want to reiterate that the difficult circumstances of the Political Science Department exist *despite* the presence of a cadre of able, committed faculty members. The spark has not been lost, but the flame must be reignited and tended. The result of that care will be ample reward for the investment.

May 8, 2015

#### Department of Political Science Response to Outside Evaluator's Report on 5 Year Program Review

Dr. David Speak is to be commended for his insightful outside review of the Department of Political Science as part of the 5 Year Program Review process at CSU East Bay. His evaluation consisted of reviewing the previous 5 Year Program review documents, the current 5 Year Program Review documents, he also spoke with department colleagues, current students, and staff member, Dean Rountree and Association Dean Chester, and miscellaneous faculty colleagues on the campus during his two day visit in February 2015.

We acknowledge his observations and recommendations for a comprehensive view of the department's next five years; he recognizes this is tied closely to having adequate resources to carry out any department plans. With the skeleton crew the department has limped along for the past several years with limitations to embark upon new initiatives such as re-examination of student advising system, cross-campus collaborations.

The Department has developed in recent years an assessment plan tied to SLOS, we have maintained most of the core courses, however this has been hampered by reduction in SCU enrollment targets that have limited some course offerings and slowed time to graduation or required significant course substitutions for students.

Looking to the future, we have one successful tenure track position search completed this year and this person will start this Fall Quarter 2015 which will provide an additional colleague to teach core courses, advise students and help grow the major. We have just heard we were approved for our proposed tenure track "Affinity" hire focused on civic engagement and race and ethnic politics. This position would start in Fall 2016. Also, as a part of the conversion to semester process, the department will be reviewing our curriculum and how it is offered. We will consider the observations of the outside evaluator in our deliberations.

One cautionary note, even with the addition of 2 positions in the next two years, we are likely to have two faculty enter the FERP program in the next five years and we currently have a faculty member in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of his FERP. The completion of his FERP and the start of 2 more FERPs will mean the core TT faculty will be 3-4 members, two of whom will be junior faculty. This limited number of faculty will severely limit our ability to grow our major in new and substantive ways, and hamper our ability to grow the department's visible footprint in the region as political science departments typically do. However, we will continue to focus on creating quality academic experience for our students.