

International Relations Bachelor Of Arts Proposal

2. Summary of UCUI Review of International Relations Proposal

Areas of UCUI guidelines satisfactorily addressed in body of proposal:

1. Rationale: program need, how program promotes the mission of the university, and program goals
2. Academic unit: staffing needs
3. Program plan: Admission requirements, recruiting, expected enrollment, academic advising
4. Needs and costs of program: Description of new resources needed, Library holdings, classroom/laboratory space and equipment needs
5. Implementation plan: time line

Areas of concern subsequently addressed by department after contact by UCUI reviewers (note: this information should be added to the proposal before it goes to the Senate):

- A. Faculty qualifications missing
Appendix B provided to address this issue
- B. Support of other departments missing
Appendix F provided to address this issue
- C. Source of students

Department follow-up clarified that students in proforma are new students and it is expected that significant number of existing OU students are also expected to transfer from other political science majors

- D. Course descriptions missing
Appendix A provided to address this issue

Areas not yet addressed that should be included before proposal goes to Senate:

- A. Number of credits does not appear to equal 124 (need to clarify in the proposal)
(Note: This appears to have been addressed in response to SRPC inquiry)
- B. How program supports goals of the unit and its impact on current programs
- C. Expected career options for graduates not clearly stated

Additional UCUI suggestions for possible enhancement of the program

- A. Add an optional study abroad element
- B. Partner with SBA to consider an option for SBA students
- D. UCUI reviewers felt that the assessment component could be strengthened

3. SENATE PLANNING REVIEW COMMITTEE

To: Senate Steering

From: Senate Planning and Review
Committee
Frances Jackson, Chair

Re: International Relations Degree
Program

The Senate Planning and Review Committee (SPRC) reviewed the proposal from the Department of Political Science to initiate a new degree program in International Relations (IR). SPRC strongly endorses this proposal and urges the Senate to approve this new degree program.

Strengths

The world of the 21st century will be a much smaller world than any that preceded it. This proposal will prepare individuals to work in international affairs, whether that is a governmental or business-related position. This program will assist students to develop a functional understanding of international relations that will focus on problem solving strategies. This distinguishes this degree from the degree in International Studies which, according to the proposal, focuses more on culture, cultural traditions and literature, with a focus on a single nation or region rather than a world-wide focus. This degree is consistent with Vision 2010 goals.

A further strength of this proposal is its multi-disciplinary foundation. This program includes the Department of History, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, Department of Philosophy, Center for International Programs and the Department of Economics from the School of Business Administration. This is an outstanding example of inter and intra departmental/school collaboration which supports the basic tenets of what this degree seeks to accomplish.

The goal of this program is to have 15 majors by the program's second year and a steady state of 30 majors by year five of program implementation. There are only two other programs similar to this in the State of Michigan, one at Grand Valley State University and the other at the University of Michigan. Appropriate letters of support from OU and faculty at other institutions as well as supporting data from current students taking political sciences courses was provided in the proposal, providing both validation and support to initiate this degree.

Concerns

There were minor concerns/questions about this proposal, all of which have been successfully addressed by John Klemanski from the Department of Political Science, the author of the

proposal. SPRC members believed that the internship should be planned earlier in the implementation phase than the five year goal stated in the proposal. Committee members also requested a credit summary because we could not determine from the proposal if the program as designed provided for the 124 credits necessary for a bachelor's degree. Professor Klemanski submitted a summary of the credits required for this program and has also agreed to work towards earlier implementation of the internship program.

In conclusion, SPRC recommends that the Senate approve the degree program in IR. This degree program is consistent with the university's mission and Vision 2010.

4. SENATE BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE

TO: Susan Awbrey, Chair, UCUI
FROM: Austin Murphy, Chair, Senate Budget Review Committee

DATE: 11/16/06

RE: Senate Budget Review Committee Comments on the Proposal for a New Program in International Relations

The budget for the proposed new program in International Relations seems to have a major problem in terms of using gross instead of incremental revenues. While there does seem to be extensive interest in the program among existing OU students, the existing OU students who actually do enter the program do not increase OU revenues if they would otherwise continue at OU and major in some other subject like political science. There is no indication on the survey of the OU students of an intent to leave OU if there is no International Relations program (about 1/3 merely indicated they would consider the program if it existed). There is also no indication that more students would initially attend or transfer to OU as a result of having the program. Without such information, the incremental revenue figures might logically assumed to be close to zero in the budget that uses incremental costs. In any event, the large positive cash flow is not justified and would likely instead be a non-trivial incremental drain on OU, possibly in excess of \$80,000 per year.

In addition, all revenues and costs should be adjusted for anticipated inflation. Objective estimates of long-term inflationary expectations can be computed from data reported daily in the Wall Street Journal. Such estimates have been fairly stable over the last few years at about 3% per year.

The proposal indicates that there will be a need for 6-7 additional classrooms annually starting in the second year. If OU does not have the necessary additional classroom space in a particular year, then the cost of renting space elsewhere would represent an incremental cost. Even if OU

currently has sufficient classroom capacity for the program, future enrollments and classes at OU may lead to a shortage for which a conditional cost should optimally be listed.

It would help if a complete report on the additional courses to be taught by the requested new faculty member and part-time faculty were specified. Also, given there is no budget for administrative costs associated with the new program, is it to be assumed that such tasks will be undertaken by existing administrators, or will the new faculty member take over these tasks, perhaps with a workload reduction? In addition, within the context of quality, the use of part-time instructors brings up the question of the effect on quality, not only in the program but also in other classes where full-time faculty teaching in the program are replaced with part-time faculty.

Some concern was raised over the small size of the supplies budget and the lack of an advertising/marketing budget/plan. While it was felt that the program might be marketed adequately by some flyers and brochures internally, it is unclear how the program might generate any incremental students for Oakland University for many years without external promotions.

The issue of bringing in outside speakers was also raised. Wouldn't international speakers be useful in the program, and shouldn't there therefore be some budgeting for honorariums as well as travel?

It was widely perceived that the program should permit study abroad as part of the curriculum, and it should really require it. Do any of the other programs in International Relations at other universities not have a study-abroad component? Many actually think that, to make the program high quality, there is a need to require study in a country where the language to be learned is utilized (allowing Canada, and possibly even Windsor, to qualify) a portion of the language requirement itself would optimally be studied in that foreign country. Such offerings and requirements might require a change in the budget, although the extra costs could potentially be passed on to the students enrolled in the study abroad program.

The proposal also indicates a hope for an additional scholarship for the proposed program. If this is a request for OU funding, then it should be so budgeted. If not, the source of funding for the hope (the department of political science?) should be explicitly listed. A possible need for such scholarships may in fact exist (especially if there is an optional or required component to study abroad which is currently not listed), and so the likelihood of such funding should be stated.

If the program is of especially high quality (and eventually brings OU renown, more students, greater donations, etc.), then perhaps the net incremental cash outflows might be well spent in comparison to other spending alternatives that OU may have. However, an additional alternative budget with study-abroad components would seem to be necessary in order to make such an evaluation.

If the cost of the program is determined by OU to be too high, then another alternative might be possible: a major in political science that permits concentration in most or all of the classes that

are listed for the program. Within this context, it might be possible to reduce other class offerings to offset additional class offerings made to facilitate the concentration.

5. RESPONSE TO SBRC'S COMMENTS.

December 8, 2006

MEMO

TO: Austin Murphy, Chair
Senate Budget Review Committee

FROM: John S. Klemanski, Chair
Dept of Political Science

RE: Response to SBRC's email
comments of 11/16/06

The faculty of the Department of Political Science has reviewed and debated the SBRC's comments sent in an email to Susan Awbrey, Chair of UCUI, dated November 16, 2006. We thank the committee for its careful review of the proposal.

We agree that the supplies and advertising costs were under-funded in the original proposal. We've added \$1,000 to the supplies budget and \$2,000 to the advertising budget in Year 1 (Supplies and Services line item now reads \$7,500). This was a helpful suggestion.

SBRC rejected our identification of new (incremental only) students through the survey of OCC students. We believe that the OCC survey results, plus the interest expressed from potential OU students who've made contact with our department, more than meet the projection of ten incremental students in Year 1 and 30 by Year 5. SBRC and the department differ on their interpretation of the value of the OCC survey in predicting the number of incremental students to this program. The department did ask if there was an alternative instrument SBRC would prefer but did not receive a satisfactory response. Our conservative estimate of the incremental students to OU are those indicated in the budget.

The SBRC's request for the proposal to include an inflation rate calculation (which it originally recommended at 3% per year, then suggested 2.56%) appears to be unnecessary. The College dean's office has told us that no such calculation has been included in new program proposals for the past 30 years. Moreover, since both revenue and cost inflation rates would be applied across the board, the relationship between costs and revenues would remain the same.

SBRC also suggested that space costs be included in the proposal. We understand that space is a current and future issue. However, growth is a strategic goal of OU and this new program

will contribute to that goal. Moreover, the College has instructed us to assume that space will be available for this new program. We see no need to include these costs in the proposal.

◆ The SBRC's request for a complete report on the additional courses to be taught by new faculty members is not possible because they are not yet hired and we do not know their specific areas of expertise, only the general areas. We do expect that the new full-time faculty member will teach a normal load of five courses per academic year.

◆ We anticipated the possibility of administrative costs (in the form of a course reduction for a program director), but since this was not expected until sometime after Year 5, it was not included in the proposal. These costs would occur only if the program's enrollment far surpassed our expectations and the selection of an IR program director was determined to be necessary. New program budgets are reviewed annually for this purpose.

◆ We do not anticipate that there will be any costs associated with bringing in guest speakers. In the past, our department has relied on individuals who do not charge a fee to speak to a university class. The department of political science has a gift fund that it can use should we decide to pay an honorarium to a guest.

◆ Our faculty deliberated at length the merits of a required Study Abroad program when we originally developed the program proposal and again discussed this in reaction to the comments from SBRC. At an estimated \$5,000 additional cost per student, a required Study Abroad component would either bust our budget or substantially discourage students who cannot afford Study Abroad from enrolling. The true cost for our students would also include foregone wages from jobs. The amount would be something closer to \$7,000-8500 if lost wages were figured in. We are developing contacts both in the U.S. and abroad for students who would elect an internship option as part of their IR program. However, this would be an option not a requirement.

◆ We are currently working on funding a scholarship that would be earmarked for IR majors. We have the funding right now to underwrite five years of an annual \$1,000 scholarship, but our hope is to identify donors who will agree to endow the scholarship. We are 100% sure that a \$1,000 scholarship for IR majors will be funded and 80% confident that an endowed scholarship will be created.

We thank the SBRC for its comments, for contributing to spirited discussions in our department about the programs and its needs. We have accepted its suggestion to adjust our Supplies and Services budget and have addressed the remaining concerns in the original proposal or in this response. We look forward to the SBRC's final report to UCUI and to the floor debate in the Senate, ideally at the January meeting.

6. Comparison Universities with IR programs -- Required Study Abroad Component

1. Stanford ❖ no
2. Wisconsin ❖ no
3. Carnegie-Mellon ❖ no
4. Drake ❖ no
5. Univ. of San Diego ❖ no
6. Hobart and William Smith ❖ no
7. UC ❖ Davis ❖ no (only in an IS-equivalent program, not IR)
8. Mr. Holyoke ❖ no
9. Cleveland State ❖ no
10. Kent State ❖ no
11. Delaware ❖ no
12. Wellesley ❖ no
13. William & Mary ❖ no
14. Tufts ❖ no
15. Connecticut College ❖ no
16. College of Wooster ❖ no
17. Boston U. ❖ no
18. Knox College ❖ no
19. NYU ❖ (yes, must be taken at specific exchange universities with which NYU has a long-established arrangement)
20. James Madison/ MSU ❖ no

Michigan Universities

1. U❖M ❖ no IR program
2. EMU ❖ no IR
3. WMU ❖ yes, IR; no required Study Abroad
4. CMU ❖ no IR
5. MSU ❖ yes, IR (James Madison); no required Study Abroad
6. Wayne State ❖ no IR

7. Ishiyama Evaluation

Evaluation of Oakland University International Relations Major Proposal

John Ishiyama, Ph.D.
 Professor of Political Science
 Director, Ronald E. McNair Program
 Truman State University
 Editor in Chief, *Journal of Political Science Education*

I have read the proposal for an International Relations Major at Oakland University and I must say that the proposal appears to be well articulated and well researched, complete with market survey results. The proposal calls for a 41-46 hour major with a multidisciplinary core and a language requirement, with the major housed in the Department of Political Science. The proposal envisions a program with up to fifty majors. Beyond the obvious benefits outlined in the proposal, I support this proposal because of the structure of its curriculum. The proposed curricular structure is well thought out and supported by most of the literature on the construction of the interdisciplinary international studies major.

The structure of the program is most intriguing. The major provides for a common introductory course in international (Issues in World Politics 114) a research methodology course, and senior seminar capstone course. This design is consistent with the literature, and in particular with the recommendations made by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) report on the Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the report produced by the American Political Science Association (APSA) Task Force on Political Science (Wahlke, 1991; see also Breuning, Parker and Ishiyama, 2001; Ishiyama and Hartlaub, 2003). These reports recommended a consciously structured major that entails sequential learning, promotes the development of the building blocks of knowledge that lead to more sophisticated understanding and ... leaps of the imagination and efforts at synthesis (AACU, 1991: 24). The development of thinking skills cannot be accomplished merely by cumulative exposure to more and more... subject matter (AACU, 1991: 24). Majors which emphasize breadth at the expense of depth result in shallow learning unless students also grasp the assumptions, arguments, approaches, and controversies that have shaped particular claims and findings (Wahlke, 1991: 49). In particular the literature recommends 1) a broad introductory overview of the discipline (such as an introduction to international studies course); 2) a research methods course; 3) a senior capstone course.

A common Freshman experience is necessary to introduce incoming majors to the basic concepts of the discipline. In addition, this course should introduce students to broader theories and concepts central to the discipline and should serve both as an accessible overview of the discipline and as a building block course. A second required course would be a course on research methodology. Given that international studies is an eclectic discipline, it is perhaps unwise to require a single common methodology course as is recommended for a discipline like political science. However, some kind of research methodology course that introduces students to the analytical skills required to conduct independent research (at least from the perspective of advocates of a structured major) should be required for majors. This could be in the form of either qualitative (such as historiography or literary criticism) or quantitative methodology (such as econometrics) that provide students with the skills to conduct independent inquiry in an international studies field. Some type of methodology course not only provides a student with specific skills relevant to research, it also fosters critical thinking skills that are cited as important in most consciously constructed sets of learning outcomes (Golich, 2000; Dombrowski, 2001; Scott, 2001).

Finally, a capstone course, such as a Senior Seminar or a Senior Experience should be included in the curriculum to provide a broad synthesis of what the student has learned during the course of the major. This capstone course provides a good opportunity to get a strong sense

of the context of different fields, and to appreciate their methodological strengths and weaknesses.

The proposed major has all of these recommended features. The major, if adopted, should be of great benefit to the institution. Thus I am very pleased to write this letter of support for this proposal to establish an international relations major at Oakland University

References

American Association of Colleges and Universities (1991) ♦ Political Science. ♦ *Reports from the Fields: Project on Liberal Learning, Study-in-Depth, and the Arts and Sciences Major, vol. 2*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.

Breuning, Marijke, Paul Parker and John Ishiyama (2001) ♦ The Last Laugh: Skill Building through a Liberal Arts Political Science Curriculum ♦ *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34:657-661.

Dombrowski, Peter (2001) ♦ Teaching the Political Consequences of Inequality: Theory and Practice ♦ *International Studies Perspectives* 2(4):351-355.

Golich, Vicki L. (2000) ♦ The ABCs of Case Teaching ♦ *International Studies Perspectives* 1(1):11-29.

Ishiyama, John and Marijke Breuning (2004) A Survey of International Studies Programs at Liberal Arts Colleges and Universities in the Midwest: Characteristics and Correlates ♦ *International Studies Perspectives* 5:134-146.

Ishiyama, John and Stephen Hartlaub (2003) "Sequential or Flexible? The Impact of Differently Structured Political Science Majors on the Development of Student Reasoning" *PS: Political Science and Politics*

Wahlke, John C. (1991) "Liberal Learning and the Political Science Major: A Report to the Profession." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 24(1): 48-60.

8. ADDENDUM To ♦ Proposal for a New Program in International Relations ♦ January 29, 2007

ADDENDUM

To

♦ Proposal for a New Program in International Relations ♦


January 29, 2007

The following changes have been made to the Proposal since it was approved by the College Faculty Assembly. Please note the following revisions or additions:

- ◆ Added \$3,000 to supplies and services budget (per SBRC recommendation)
- ◆ A program review by Prof. John Ishiyama, Truman State University, who conducts research on IR education and edits the Journal of Political Science Education, the major scholarly journal focused on teaching political science; he is an expert in IR education and IR degree programs
- ◆ Include PS 458 Public Affairs Internship (4 credits) as a capstone option
- ◆ A comparison of 20 other institutions offering IR programs that demonstrates that a required study abroad component to IR programs is not the standard practice of a wide variety of universities. We remain committed to encouraging study abroad and IR internships as an option for IR majors.
- ◆ A clarification to the original proforma that now indicates projections for both new students and the total number of expected majors. The new student projections are based on: phone inquiries we◆ve received from students at other institutions (EMU, MCC, Wayne State); discussions with current OU students who◆ve indicated a desire to obtain an IR degree (at OU or elsewhere), and our OCC student survey. At ◆steady state◆ in Year 5, we project a total of 60 students, half of which will be new.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
New Students	10	15	20	25	30
Total Students (inc. new students)	20	30	40	50	60

- We have created a separate IR student scholarship account, which currently totals \$3,000, including a recent \$1,000 contribution from the Department of Political Science◆s Advisory Board chair Martha Brown. We continue to seek more scholarship funding for this program, including trying to identify a contributor who will fund an endowed scholarship for IR majors.
- ◆ Per the Library Dean◆s recommendation, the IR faculty reconsidered the purchase of the Public Affairs Information Service (PAIS) abstract service. PAIS provides only abstract information (in some cases, a single sentence). Our faculty and students need access to full text materials. Abstracts, which also can be found on many journal publishers◆ websites (see Taylor and Francis; Elsevier), are available free

through these other sources  in some cases, publishers provide full-text articles for free. The PAIS cost (\$5,500) does not provide value for money, in our view.

updated 2/13/07