

Report of the External Review Committee for the Department of Political Science, University of Kansas

January 2018

Lee Ann Banaszak (Pennsylvania State University), Keith Gaddie (University of Oklahoma), Amanda Murdie (University of Georgia), and Eric Handley (Internal Liaison, Department of Sociology, University of Kansas)

I. Introduction and Overview

The external review committee was charged with assessing the current conditions and growth potential of the Department of Political Science at the University of Kansas. In particular, we were asked for insights into how the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Kansas can further support and enhance the department during a period of difficult budgetary restrictions. We conducted interviews at the University of Kansas on December 11 and 12, 2017. The first meeting was with Associate Dean Jim Mielke and Dean Carl Lejuez. We then met with faculty subfield groups, individual faculty, and both undergraduate and graduate students. The campus visit concluded with a final meeting with Dean Carl Lejuez. The committee's evaluation is based on these in-person meetings, and information provided us from the 2017 department's self-study and the 2010 report of the previous external review team.

Based on these observations, we conclude that the Department of Political Science at the University of Kansas has achieved notable success in the areas of research, teaching, and service during a time of tremendous budget constraints and diminishing human resources. The faculty are engaged, the department leadership is well-respected, and the students are remarkably happy with their experiences in the department. We think that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences can help in furthering the success of the department. Many of our suggestions can be implemented without budgetary costs. Below, we first outline the current status of the faculty, graduate program, recourses, departmental culture, and leadership. We then provide a summary of what we see as the primary challenges and opportunities of the department and our recommendations on how to address these challenges and how the department can continue to prosper.

II. Current Status

a. Faculty

The Department of Political Science currently consists of 14 tenure line faculty fairly evenly distributed across ranks and subfields with four Assistant Professors, five Associate Professors, and four Full Professors. Three lecturers were also listed on the website, although we did not receive any materials about them or meet with them and so they are not included in this assessment. In terms of numbers, the total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty lines is down considerably, even compared to 2017, when the department self-study was performed. There are several reasons for the decline in numbers – several high-profile faculty have retired;

some faculty left the university; and at least one faculty member has moved their line to the School of Public Affairs and Administration.

There is a balanced distribution across the traditional subfields (with the exception of political theory) with four faculty in International Relations, five in Comparative Politics, and five in American Politics. Only one tenured faculty member identified political theory as a main field. In many departments, American Politics is significantly larger than other fields, and so it is not surprising that most of the losses in recent years have been in the area of American Politics. Beyond these traditional political science subfields, there are also several other areas of strength. First, there are 3-4 faculty who claim expertise in methodology and six faculty whose research focuses on gender or sexuality. It should be particularly noted that the concentration in gender and sexuality is unusual and could be exploited as a notable additional area of strength. It is rare for political science departments to have more than 1-2 people working in this area. There is also an emerging dominance of behavioral political science across subfields that could be similarly exploited. How this is cultivated or muted will be critical to the future direction of the department.

All of the tenure line faculty are research active, with a steady stream of publications and grant applications. This is a significant plus. It is not unusual in departments to have at least one or two research inactive faculty, particularly at the Associate ranks (this is decidedly not the case at KU). Faculty publications consist largely of a mix of books or monographs, peer-reviewed publications, and book chapters. About half of the current faculty have also published in blogs (like the *Washington Post's* Monkey Cage) or have written articles for newspapers. All of the faculty reported that both books and articles are acceptable paths to tenure and promotion decisions, and the faculty produce both types of publications. Books appeared in a range of venues from top university presses (University of Chicago; Oxford University Press; University of Michigan) to other less visible university presses (University of Texas and University of Kentucky) and non-university presses (Routledge). The vast majority of articles appeared in journals with very specific followings (e.g. *Human Rights Review*, *Remedial and Social Education*, *Journal of Homosexuality*) with a minority proportion in good general journals (*Social Science Quarterly*, *Political Research Quarterly*, *British Journal of Political Studies*) or top subfield journals (*International Studies Quarterly*, *Political Analysis*, *Electoral Studies*, *Politics & Gender*).

The department self-study noted that the department is below the national mean in citations and that, in attempts to gain visibility, they had over the previous period attempted to increase their publications in the top journals, increased their web presence (via ResearchGate) and engaged in greater interactions with news media in an attempt to raise their profile. Despite this, the department citation count is significantly below the median and even the most productive faculty have not had any recent publications in the top three journals in political science and only rarely in the top subfield journals. We agree with the previous external review team that noted that “a regular routine of trying to get articles into *The American Political Science Review*...and other top-ranked journals, and books published at major university presses, would add to the scholarly reputation of the Department.” We encourage the department to identify 10-12 top journals that are likely to increase visibility (including top subfield journals in all of the concentrations above). One way to encourage publications in such journals is to recognize that this may require

larger, more ambitious projects and that, because the acceptance rate on such journals is low, it may also take additional time in shopping the piece around. Giving publication in high quality journals extra acknowledgement in tenure and promotion and in annual reviews is important. Moreover, publications in top-tier journals should be rewarded over multiple years since -- like books -- such publications require multi-year investments.

Importantly, a large majority of the faculty are grant active, defined as actively seeking external grant funding, and the department has a good success rate on external grant applications. Moreover, the faculty have been creative in seeking funding beyond the traditional focus on the National Science Foundation; recent grants include funding from the Department of Education, Department of Defense, and National Institutes of Health. Faculty noted though that the support for grant-writing is good in terms of intellectual support and support for writing budgets and proposal preparation, but that the quality of grant proposals could be increased if there was more support. In our experience, the support needed for quality grant writing is budget neutral if one weighs the increase in external funds. Most of all, faculty noted that course releases for grant writing, tuition waivers for graduate students, and increases in seed funding to do pilot studies would likely increase the success rate of grants (and hence overall funding).

Objective indicators and discussions with students indicate that the faculty are actively engaged in teaching and mentoring students at both the graduate and undergraduate level, and that there is widespread satisfaction among students with the education they receive. In our meeting with undergraduate students, the students praised the faculty's accessibility, the internship programs within the department, and their sense that the program prepares them well for future careers. The objective data provided by the department self-study also suggests that the faculty and program does well in satisfying student demands. The only improvement suggested by the undergraduates would be to expand the offerings in methods, perhaps teaching a course that allowed students to utilize statistics programs more or courses with specific applications to political science. This might also allow advanced graduate students to gain the opportunity to teaching methods, something that would also help move graduate student placement beyond small regional colleges and private sector jobs.

It is also clear from the interviews with faculty and graduate students that faculty are active in developing the graduate curriculum and engaged in training graduate students. The graduate students we talked with generally praised the mentoring and teaching of the political science faculty, and the faculty had thoughtfully designed a curriculum designed to place students at teaching schools. With the exception of newly arrived assistant professors, most faculty serve as major advisor for at least 1-2 Ph.D. students and serve on even more committees. Both faculty and graduate students discussed myriad ways that graduate students are professionalized in terms of the discipline. It is also clear from faculty CVs that at least some faculty are working with students on research. We discuss faculty participation in the graduate program in more detail below.

The faculty are highly involved in service to the university, providing considerable leadership to centers and interdisciplinary units within the college in addition to the leadership within the department. Indeed, six of the fourteen faculty within the department have directed interdisciplinary centers or served in department administrative offices within the last five years.

Each of these requires considerable investment and, while it contributes to the department's engagement within the public and development of important interdisciplinary communities within the college and university, it substitutes for the disciplinary activity that can increase visibility to the department. Only a small minority of faculty were serving in important posts in the major disciplinary associations (such as President or Executive Council of an APSA section, or Program Chair at a major conference). Relatively few faculty served on editorial boards of major journals, and only one faculty member was Editor or Associate Editor of a journal. Disciplinary service helps to create the sorts of intellectual networks that enhance academic networks and therefore increase visibility. We would encourage the faculty to increase their activity within the discipline's associations and encourage the college and department to increase support for serving as journal editors, particularly for journals central to the discipline of political science.

b. Graduate Program

The graduate program has a healthy esprit. Students are confident in the mentoring and guidance they receive from the faculty. There is some support for professional development, including resources for academic conference travel. The graduate students enjoy office space and also have access to a computing facility which also provides a social hub. There are some potential research resource needs which can be addressed with one-time college money.

The department self-study reports between 4 and 8 doctorates granted in any given year, and a total of 35 doctorates completed between 2010-2015. Progress toward degree is impressive. The average years to completion stands at just under five (4.7), and the average time to completion has fallen by a year since the previous program review (5.7). And, if one considers only doctoral enrollment, the time to completion is just under four years.

We wish to compliment and note the movement by the department to a three-paper dissertation model. This approach, which is common in economics and many of the physical sciences, is increasingly used in political science. This model allows the development of pre-examination research projects into potentially-publishable articles, held together by a common research focus.

The department attributes this success to their new advising and mentoring model, an active and aggressive program of study plan, and 'timely recognition of the job market and job market requirements.' We believe this is a generally sound analysis, though there is a potential downside to the emphasis on too-rapid movement of graduate students to the job market.

As of 2015, there were 33 fulltime doctoral students, which is a slight downturn from the average for the previous three years. Of currently enrolled doctoral students, 18 are carried on departmental teaching assistantships and another two are funded on a grant. The unit is seeking additional funding opportunities to support doctoral students. Additional support for the pursuit of quality external funding opportunities should allow the unit to achieve this goal independent of ongoing institutional support.

Placement: Since 2012, there have been a total of 31 doctoral student who secured placement. Most of these have been academic appointments, with 17 in the tenure stream and another three

being fulltime but not tenure-earning. Of the academic placements, one has been at a Ph. D.-granting department (the hire of a completing doctoral student into KU's Department of Political Science through a competitive search.) Most of the academic placements have been at public teaching colleges and private liberal arts colleges.

Doctoral students related early movement into the job market. Students report applying for jobs either while in comprehensive examinations or immediately following comprehensive, with the encouragement of the faculty. This is a novel strategy, and one the reviewers have not previously encountered. The rationale, of socializing students to the process of portfolio and application assembly, has some logic. However, we are not convinced that this is a sound practice given the nature of the higher education job market. We think it more likely to reduce opportunities for placement by leading to perceptions that KU is sending students onto the market far in advance of sufficient preparation and socialization to being prospective faculty.

Student Development: Graduate student teaching opportunities are primarily in support of the general introductory American Government course, or in teaching undergraduate research methods. This is typical of doctoral programs in political science at many public comprehensive universities.

Mentoring has led to publication opportunities for graduate students. Part of the success in building strong faculty-graduate student relationships is the Thompson Scholars. This program provides summer funds for students to collaborate with faculty on research. The resulting stream of conference papers and articles raises the profile of the students and also increases their professional socialization. Expansion of this program should be encouraged. The Cigler award and Johnson Award should further enhance these opportunities.

The journals where collaborative graduate student research has placed are of good reputation. *Law & Policy*, *Social Science Quarterly*, *Religion, State & Society*, and *Political Science Quarterly* represent quality outlets with good visibility and intellectual impact. Of course, we encourage the faculty to aim for the very highest quality outlets for both themselves and their students. And, the graduate students need to be encouraged to send their own work out for review. The establishment of an independent intellectual identity and the ability to work alone heightens the prospects for landing a quality interview, and therefore will help with student placement.

The student supervision load is uneven. In the past four years, 18 faculty have shared 230 committee slot opportunities, which would average 13 per faculty member. Much of the work in mentoring graduate students and engaging in committee service is falling on the shoulders of a few faculty. This is to be expected in a department in transition, where many senior faculty members have retired and where there is also a large cohort of junior faculty. Three (Britton, Haider-Markel, Joslyn) have served on 34, 28, and 30 committees respectively, with another three faculty serving on 17 committees each (143 of 230 opportunities). Eight faculty have served on less than 10 committees. And, some of the other broad-serving faculty recently retired (Sharp and Loomis). This often occurs in departments, and graduate students then gravitate to faculty who teach their seminars, or who are publishing, or who take an interest in mentoring. We suspect this is the case here, and encourage a further broadening of opportunities for all the

faculty to engage with the doctoral students in seminar and through committee service.

There is frequent evaluation and feedback given to graduate students, especially to those who teach. The commitment to early mentoring and frequent contact has a positive impact on the graduate students. And, the evaluation and renewal system is professional, and based on holistic performance indicators. The faculty and graduate students indicate a realistic evaluation of their current circumstance. The program develops students from a regional pool of candidates and applicants, and markets them to liberal arts colleges and teaching colleges. But, at the same time, the program ranks at #65 in the U.S. News rankings out of 120+ Ph. D.-granting schools, and has highly-visible faculty with an historic record for publication excellence. Given the quality of the faculty, the systematic training, and the product, we encourage our colleagues to have greater ambitions for their graduate program.

c. Resources

The department reports adequate research and teaching support, offices and teaching space. There are sufficient graduate students to support the teaching and research mission, though the department indicates a desire to grow through their own efforts.

The primary resource concern is in the area of staffing. The department staffing has been cut from three persons to one, and the unit now shares a graduate program advisor with two other units in the building. Efforts to centralize administrative functions up to the college and university are perceived as now devolving back onto the academic unit. We recognize that this is a university-wide circumstance for KU, but bring it to the attention of the dean because it is a source of concern in the unit, and has an impact on department culture and graduate training.

We are impressed at the efforts by the current chair in the area of fundraising and resource development, and how those assets are put to work on behalf of the faculty and students. We strongly suggest that the University and central development explore opportunities for the creation of at least one endowed professorship in the department, in order to help elevate further the research mission of the unit. The University might also consider an investment in a visiting distinguished chair, in order to bring in other scholars from around the country on sabbatical leave, in order to interact with and spread the word of the good work taking place at KU and expose the graduate students and junior faculty to other distinguished scholars.

d. Department Culture

In many ways, department collegiality and morale is strikingly improved from where it was when the last external review was undertaken in 2010. At that time, the International Relations subfield faculty, many of whom have left the department in the time since, were wanting to split from the department. Our interviews with faculty at this time indicated that the culture has changed and collegiality in the department is rather good.

Multiple interviews with various stakeholders did indicate that improvements could still take place concerning collegiality and morale. Despite the improvement in morale since the 2010 review, in many regards, the department is still in a “post war” environment. Actions taken to

limit disagreements in the past may be lingering, limiting morale today. For example, many faculty members indicated that much work is done outside of the office and that some faculty members are frequently absent from departmental brown bags and lectures. In general, faculty members responded that there were limited moments for face-to-face engagement. Graduate students also indicated that this was an issue with faculty. The department has also experienced a reduction in staff, as mentioned above. When faculty and staff numbers in the office are low, this can create a reinforcing cycle of limited faculty engagement and low morale. Although we feel these issues are relatively minor at the moment, we fear that a continued lack of face-to-face interactions among faculty members could contribute to diminished collegiately and lower morale in the future.

Further, we think departmental culture is negatively affected by somewhat ambiguous tenure standards and some uncertainty among junior faculty as to what their colleagues are looking for in an acceptable tenure file. In our one-on-one interviews with faculty, we asked each faculty member what the tenure expectations were. We received a wide range of answers, everything from around one article a year in any peer-reviewed journal to 12 to 15 articles, with multiple articles in top field or subfield journals (i.e. *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *International Studies Quarterly*, and *Legislative Studies Quarterly*). Faculty gave a variety of answers about whether the “book route” is advisable across subfields and whether a book should “count” for a certain number of articles. Although we recognize that some flexibility is necessary in the tenure process, the degree of ambiguity currently in the Department about what constitutes a tenurable record is likely harming collegiality and morale across ranks.

Ambiguity in the annual review standards are also an impediment to improved department collegiately and morale. Multiple faculty members reported that there is not an agreed upon standard for research output. Some indicated that no focus is placed on the quality of research outlets, limiting the overall research profile of the department. Interviews indicated some dissatisfaction and disagreement with whether the quality of research outlet is a consideration in faculty reviews; one faculty member even indicated that the only reason to publish in top outlets is “so you can leave, so you can apply for other jobs.” Without more facilitated discussions on research output and outlet quality, we feel that disagreements in this area will continue to harm department morale.

We would like to note, however, that there is culture of grant-writing in the department that has grown since the 2010 review. As mentioned above, multiple faculty members indicated that the department and the college provide incentives for grant-writing and that staff support in the grant-writing process is excellent. Although further support is advised, including course releases for the preparation of major grants, we see an excellent department grant-writing culture across subfields and across ranks.

Perhaps the lack of agreement on tenure requirements and research outlets has also contributed to an additional problem we see is affecting department culture: unnecessary lingering at the tenured associate level. Due in part to previous successes in research, many associates have been tapped for leadership in Title VI centers and in colleges and centers that relate to the Department. These service responsibilities can be tremendous, and these time commitments appear to have

contributed to some unnecessary delays in the process to promotion to full. Feelings that some faculty with heavy service loads are being “lapped” by more junior faculty in the promotion process could harm department morale, as a few of our individual interviews indicated.

Ongoing interactions with the University of Kansas’s School of Public Affairs and Administration have also harmed department collegiality and culture. In both the subfield meetings and in the one-on-one meetings, we were struck by the level of animosity directed at the school. According to our interviews, the school has repeatedly “poached” productive faculty members from the department. There is also a feeling that the school is more lavishly supported than the department. Faculty members indicated that the history of poaching from the school has influenced hiring decisions in the department, perhaps leading to quality candidates being overlooked for fear that they would likely be poached by the school. These dynamics are not healthy for the department or the University as a whole.

Within the various subfields, our interviews highlighted much collegiality and collaboration. It appears that faculty frequently coauthor together and with multiple graduate students. We were also struck by the coherent visions that the Comparative Politics and International Relations subfields provided. Perhaps due to previous issues with the School of Public Affairs and Administration, however, we did not see a coherent vision from the American Politics subfield. Instead, there appears to be much disagreement with how to proceed in such a limited budget environment, especially with the threat of the School of Public Affairs and Administration taking productive American Politics or Policy faculty. Some of this disagreement could have appeared heightened in our interviews due to recent disagreements about hiring in the subfield. However, we think facilitated discussions and strategic planning are especially necessary within the American Politics subfield and about the American Politics subfield with the whole faculty. Without continued conversations about the vision of the subfield, these disagreements could contribute to diminished collegiality and lower morale.

A further issue of department culture deserves attention. During our visit, we had faculty members frequently refer to the non-tenure track faculty members in the department. However, we did not have any scheduled time with these faculty members. Integrating non-tenure track faculty members into the department is essential. As these faculty members teach many of the undergraduate introductory courses, the need to integrate them into the department goes beyond their own morale and feelings of inclusion. It is essential that these faculty members be integrated into the department to ensure healthy discussions about teaching pedagogy and content, as well as just contribute to the overall department culture.

e. Leadership and Strategic Planning

Our interviews showed much support for the departmental and college leadership. Multiple interviewees reported that the dean and current department chair are easy to access, willing to listen, and supportive of faculty. Interviewees were also extremely supportive of the director of graduate studies and the direction of the graduate program. In general, the faculty and students seem content with the current leadership’s direction for the department.

The major issue of concern in the area of leadership is who will take over as chair once the current department chair steps down. There does not appear to be a consensus candidate and we left our interviews with a sense of dread about the transition to a new chair. College support in this area will definitely be necessary.

Further complicating any leadership transition process, the University has had to severely diminish political science-specific staff support. This lack of staff support may be especially harmful when there is a transition to a new chair or director of graduate studies. In addition, a new director of graduate studies may benefit from a more political science-specific graduate advisor. At the very least, it would be useful that this advisor have a background in the social sciences.

Within the various subfields, there appears to be clear leadership and input across ranks. The International Relations faculty did discuss the need for a more senior International Relations faculty member. Given the high proportion of junior faculty in this subfield, we think a strategic senior hire in this subfield could help provide subfield leadership and help push forward the strategic plan of the existing International Relations faculty.

An additional area of concern in this area is the process of faculty retention. Interviewees indicated that there appears to be an idiosyncratic process by which the leadership responds with preemptive or retention offers. More dialogue with the faculty as to retention process is advised. Finally, the department has lost many faculty lines in the last decade. Interviewees indicated that more dialogue between centralized leadership and the department is necessary for a collective understanding of how the department fits within the college's strategic plan.

III. Summary of Primary Challenges and Recommendations for Strategic Growth

The current Department of Political Science is dramatically improved from the department discussed in the 2010 program review. The department should be commended for its progress and existing accomplishments. As the department moves forward, we see a number of potential challenges and opportunities for further growth. To reiterate the challenges we outlined above, we highlight what we see as the five primary challenges the department will face moving forward. We then provide our recommendations for how to address these challenges and facilitate continued departmental progress.

Challenge #1: Moving past a post-conflict environment

This is a good department. But it seems like there is a 'legacy' of the previous culture, which built social capital out of adversity and defined identity out of conflict. This is no longer the case, but there is nothing taking its place. A lack of engagement at brown bags/guest lectures and limited in-office time are symptoms that the department is still suffering from this past environment.

We note two potential issues of concern as the faculty continue to move past these previous difficulties: (a) a lack of a coherent subfield vision for American Politics and (b) uncertainty about future department leadership. As to the issue of subfield vision, the American Politics field

has the least coherent subfield vision, even though they are tightly and coherently defined as a group of quality behavioralist political scientists. There are competing tensions at work between the teaching mission, which would require hiring multiple institutional specialists to bring ‘balance’ to the field, versus the emerging research dominance on the behavioral side of the subfield.

As to the issue of future faculty leadership, many associates have been delayed in their path to promotion due to demanding leadership positions at interdisciplinary centers. There does not appear to be a clear sense of who could be the next department leader and this uncertainty, coupled with institutional memory of past conflict, could be a future challenge.

Recommendations for addressing this challenge:

1. A one-two day retreat, away from campus, might help the unit discuss some of the concerns raised during our visit and help develop a more positive social capital. This could focus on identifying the future course of the unit, building and endorsing a strategic planning system, and creating a safe space to clear the cobwebs of the past.
2. We believe the American Politics field needs to rise above the current debate about future hiring. This is not necessarily an ‘either/or’ situation. It is possible to identify a quality political scientist in American politics who can teach and write in both institutions and behavior. One might also invest in someone who is not a conventional institutionalist, but who instead works in an area such as American political development and yet still builds on the behavioralist strengths of the department. We note that hiring to cover areas could leave the American field without a core area of excellence that attracts graduate students and builds visibility.

However, in order to resolve this dilemma, it will be incumbent on some faculty to lay aside cynical and defeatist mindsets that sometimes carry over from the past. A constructive conversation about the future of the subfield will be necessary for the group – and ultimately the department – to truly progress. We believe the department and subfield leadership has a vision, and can provide this direction.

3. If further discussions cannot identify a future department leader, the college should consider the option of an external department chair.
4. We encourage the faculty to include limited-term and non-tenure-track faculty in their activities and planning whenever possible.

Challenge #2: Reduce uncertainty and delays with promotion

There seems to be no clearly articulated standards for tenure or promotion. In particular, the assistant professors are not receiving a clear and consistent message on the promotion. Further, there are several quality faculty who are primed for promotion to full professor but lack of clear standards make this difficult. The department, however, seems to be stuck with a legacy of ‘the

long wait' for full professor and there are faculty members that appear to have been delayed as a result of leadership in interdisciplinary centers.

Recommendations for addressing this challenge:

1. We encourage the department to articulate a shared vision of the requirements for tenure and promotion.
2. We also encourage full professors to mentor their junior colleagues in these standards. Encouraging a culture of fast promotion to full ensures not only professional progression, but also raises, higher institutional profile, and a broader pool of potential institutional leaders.
3. For assistant professors, we recommend the broadening of trainings for first year professors and more centralized mentorship during the whole pre-tenure period.
4. The college should try to avoid placing associate professors in leadership roles in interdisciplinary centers before a clear pathway to promotion to full is established.

Challenge #3: Increase the research profile of the department

Faculty should be commended for their grant applications and research activities. Moving forward, however, publication visibility can be improved. As a whole, the department is underperforming in terms of top-tier publications and citation counts. Increasing the research profile of the department will help with graduate student recruitment and placement.

Recommendations for addressing this challenge:

1. We encourage the faculty to collectively identify both top subfield and top discipline outlets. Articulating and discussing what these outlets are, especially in interdisciplinary work, can be especially helpful for junior faculty.
2. We encourage the evaluation system to give more, and variable credit for higher-quality publication. It is important to place a premium on highly-competitive outlets (the 'blue chips') and build a reward system in annual review and tenure review for these publications.
3. We recommend rewarding faculty who aim "high and miss." The department can give annual evaluation credit for R&Rs at agreed-to top quality journals. Grant applications are already similarly rewarded, regardless of success.
4. We recommend instituting a long-term (3+ years) moving average for annual review with much greater emphasis (and salary increases) given to those publishing in top outlets. This ensures that quality publications, or clusters of publication success, are rewarded down-stream. This is a common practice in academic departments, with the moving

average reducing distress over ‘famine’ years and allowing faculty to invest in high profile publications and research projects that might not have immediate payoffs.

5. We encourage all faculty to have active websites and Google Scholar pages. Creating these pages ensures that faculty scholarship will be made visible through the most common search engine in the academy. Journal publishers regularly report that well over half of their downloads come from hits via Google and Google Scholar. This also ensures that the department has ready access to a quality source of metrics on faculty visibility. Also, the department should pursue KU support to ensure that open access for faculty publications can be paid for whenever possible. This will assure more downloads and more citations.
6. The annual review system should reward association leadership. KU is about to emerge with a vibrant and established faculty. This faculty can assure more visibility by taking active roles in ISA, the APSA, the MPSA, and SPSA, for example.
7. We recommend faculty pursue editorial leadership positions, including seeking to make KU an editorial home of a journal. There are several faculty who are more than qualified to serve as editors of quality subfield journals, or even a general interest journal such as *Political Research Quarterly*, which will soon come up for availability. Editorial homes enhance departmental identity and expose graduate students to an important part of the profession.
8. We encourage the faculty to aim for graduate student placement at more research oriented schools. Although we recognize that the department has established a niche in placing graduate students in teaching-intensive positions, we think this has dampened the research profile of the department. Many students have publications with faculty members upon graduation; as the outlets of these publications improve, these students could be competitive at research-intensive universities. Lengthening the time in residence for some research-intensive students would also help in improving the quality of doctoral placements.
9. We encourage the college to continue to invest in ways that increase the probability of grant success and risky, but high payoff research, such as course releases for grant writing, and increases in seed funding to do pilot studies.

Challenge #4: Improved relationship with the School of Public Affairs and Administration

Morale has been harmed by the “poaching” of faculty from the department to the School of Public Affairs and Administration. For the subfield most closely connected to the school, American Politics, this has harmed their strategic planning and increased cynical and defeatist mindsets with the subfield. Also, a general feeling of inequality in resource allocation has limited potential synergies between the units.

Recommendations for addressing this challenge:

1. We encourage college leadership to meet with both units to discuss past issues and ways forward. We also encourage the college to provide a solution to the poaching issue perhaps by endorsing only the movement of partial lines, or by providing counteroffers of with the same resources for staying within the Political Science department.
2. We suggest the college considers the possibility of joint hires across the units, particularly with the goal of building both programs simultaneously.
3. We suggest that the department and school create a joint lecture series that would bring in speakers of interest to both units.
4. We encourage the allocation of interdisciplinary seed grant funds to projects across the units.

Challenge #5: Continue to fulfill mission with budget constraints

The University has had tremendous budget constraints and is trying to continue to fulfill its mission with diminished resources for many years. Unfortunately, for the department, these constraints have led to a reduction in staff support. Some tasks have been centralized and then have reverted back to overloaded staff members. Further, graduate advising has become shared within the building where the department is housed.

1. We realize that funds are constrained. However, the continued examination of how tasks have been (re)allocated is necessary to optimize faculty and staff time.
2. If possible, additional student workers or an additional staff member would help in the administration of the department. This will be very important when there is a transition to new department leadership. Alternatively, having some staff who rotate across departments or who can fill in for staff who must take leave may help provide continuity and a more positive department community.
3. We recommend that the department be staffed so that it can remain open with a staff member present during normal business hours. Department morale is linked to an open office, and this is also important to building a political science community from faculty, graduate students and undergraduate students.
4. Graduate advising may be more optimally arranged around academic disciplines (i.e. social sciences, humanities, etc.) instead of its current geographically-based arrangement. Having graduate staff spend time in the departments they work for (at least a couple of days a month) will increase their ability to help in a multi-department environment.

In summary, we think this is a solid department that is moving in a positive direction. The department has weathered serious storms and yet has a vibrant faculty that are doing well in all parts of the University's mission. We believe there is potential to do even better, and hope this review leads to even greater future success.