

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

March 4, 1974

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:05 PM. Senators not in attendance were:

Michael Barney	William S. Gaither	Jonathan E. Taylor
Ralph V. Exline	Russell Remage	Edward A. Trabant
Theodore M. Feely, Jr.	Edward H. Rosenberry	

The agenda, as distributed, was adopted by general consent.

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 4, 1974, were approved by general consent. The minutes of the special meeting of February 11, 1974, on the proposed Winter Session were changed on page six, seventh paragraph to read: "The motion to postpone was made by Prof. Acunha and seconded by Prof. Catts." The corrected minutes were approved by general consent.

Prof. Barbara Settles, Chairman, Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges, spoke briefly on the matter that the University adopt a policy providing evidence of prior warning in cases of grievance.

Provost Campbell indicated that the University does have a policy providing evidence of prior warning; it was instituted last year (1973). Each year the department chairmen meet with each faculty member for an evaluation and both parties have to sign the evaluation; the faculty member doesn't necessarily have to agree with what is stated, only that it was reviewed with him. A copy of the faculty evaluation is sent to the dean of the appropriate college and to the Provost where a copy is filed in the Academic Planning Office. In response to a question, the Provost noted that the review and signing of the evaluation by the faculty member was not a requirement at the time of the specific case in question.

After a lengthy discussion the following resolution, submitted by the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges, passed 37-2, with four abstentions including Professors Ernest J. Moyne and W. Bruce Finnie:

"Be it Resolved, that the University adopt a policy in which the University provides evidence of prior warning in cases of grievance involving that issue."

Prof. F. Loren Smith opened the discussion on the faculty role in implementation and evaluation of the 1974-75 Winter Session by offering the following chronological review of the events, as he knew them:

"A five-week winter term was first proposed as one of four possible changes from the present calendar at the September meeting of the General Council, a body charged to advise President Trabant concerning, among other things, the University calendar. The discussion of the proposed changes noted that they all had substantial implications for

the management of the academic programs of the University, and President Trabant postponed further discussion of the proposals pending an opportunity for their study by the Committee on Educational Innovation and Planning. The proposals were submitted to that Committee immediately, with the request that an evaluation of their feasibility be undertaken forthwith. That the CEIP was studying the proposed calendar changes was noted in the call for the October Senate meeting, and at that meeting I called special attention to that item, and suggested that the CEIP be given all possible assistance in evaluating the educational program effects of the proposed changes. I am informed by Prof. Fletcher, the Chairman of the CEIP, that the response to that suggestion was underwhelming. The Committee discovered substantial difficulties in preparing for any of the suggested changes, and brought to the Senate in November its recommendation that no change be made in the calendar for 1974-75, and that the Committee continue to study the matter. The Senate adopted this recommendation and instructed the Committee to solicit information from each department as to the expected impact of academic calendar changes on its program, and to report their findings both to the Senate and to President Trabant at the earliest opportunity.

"In early December the CEIP distributed to all deans, directors, and department chairmen a questionnaire asking evaluation of the Winter Session proposal under six headings, a summary opinion on any change from the present calendar, and an open question about other possible calendars. An approximate fifty percent return of that questionnaire was complete in mid-January, and the CEIP report was distributed to the faculty with the call for the February 4, 1974, Senate meeting. The report was received at that meeting; a motion was made to recommend that no calendar change be made for 1974-75, but action on the motion was postponed for want of CEIP representation and more information concerning the results of the questionnaire and the evaluation of the current Winterim.

"President Trabant invited the officers of the Senate to meet with him on Friday, February 8 to discuss the Winter Term proposal. At that meeting one member of the Executive Committee expressed strong negative views concerning the workability of the plan in his academic unit; one expressed mildly positive attitudes toward it, mentioning its possible virtues as perceived by the members of his department; and I expressed continued concern that whatever decision was made be made with faculty approval. Many questions about the details of the proposal were asked and answered by President Trabant. The Executive Committee met immediately with Provost Campbell to ask him to be prepared to answer those and other questions about the Winter term's characteristics at the special Senate meeting called for February 11. At that meeting the Senate heard Provost Campbell's detailed specification of the proposed Winter term, asked and received answers to several additional questions, and voted, 28 to 17, that no change be made in the present academic calendar for the year 1974-75.

"On Tuesday, February 12, I met with President Trabant to inform him of the Senate's action. He indicated his great concern with the Senate recommendation, and assured me that it would weigh heavily with him in making his final decision. After a further half-hour discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative decisions, I left the meeting persuaded that President Trabant was not yet decided, and would indeed include the Senate recommendation in his deliberations in reaching his decision.

"Late that same afternoon President Trabant called me to say that after devoting much careful thought to the matter, and after having discussed it further with Provost Campbell, he had very reluctantly decided that the benefits of moving to the Winter Term on an experimental basis outweighed the possible disadvantages, and that he was going to implement the plan for 1974-75. He thanked the Senate for its efforts and advice, cited his perceptions of the best interests of the University as moving him to the decision, and reiterated his determination that the Senate would be responsible to evaluate the success or failure of the experiment.

"On February 13, President Trabant issued the memorandum announcing the adoption of the Winter Term calendar. The Executive Committee of the Senate met on February 19, directed me to call the attention of the Committee on Committees to the need to establish the evaluation procedures, and decided to provide the Senate an opportunity to instruct that Committee of its wishes or special concerns by including this item on today's agenda."

Prof. E. E. Schweizer raised several questions, being: On the assumption that the Committee on Committees will nominate a committee to evaluate the Winter Session for 1974-75, and that they will bring a motion to this Senate on an evaluation no later than the March meeting of 1975, what if this Committee's evaluation is negative? Will it make any difference? Do we have any assurance that it will have an effect on the President's decision?

Prof. Smith reiterated that President Trabant had requested the Faculty Senate to be responsible for evaluating the success or failure of the experiment.

Prof. Schweizer personally viewed the Winter Session as another Summer Session and asked if the same director would oversee the Winter Session. Provost Campbell indicated that he would.

Dr. Gibson felt it more probable that the data needed for the committee's evaluation would be available at the April 1975 meeting rather than at the March meeting.

Prof. Schweizer questioned whether the President could hold off making the calendar until the April 1975 meeting. Provost Campbell felt he could but could not give a definite answer.

Provost Campbell felt that since Winterim and the Winter Session would be going simultaneously, that the Senate might want a group to oversee both by having subcommittees.

Prof. G. Bonner asked if the Senate was aware of the date the President has for setting the calendar. Dr. Gibson stated that next year's calendar hadn't been produced yet.

Prof. Wolters felt that since the Senate is too big to develop guidelines that the evaluating committee could develop them and then report back to the Senate.

Prof. Kingsbury asked if the Senate could withhold degree credit until an evaluation could be made since this program is experimental and its quality unknown. Prof. Smith replied that it could.

Prof. D. E. Ingersoll, Chairman, Committee on Committees, felt it was his intent to confront the Senate with statements from the Committee on Committees as to what could be seen as a mechanism to generate more information and instructions.

Ms. Chris Powell, President, U.D.C.C., expressed disappointment that many of the students' questions had not been answered. The U.D.C.C. has compiled an instrument of eleven questions on opinions and feelings, curriculum area, date of anticipated degree completion, and summer employment, which they would like to distribute through classes and asked the faculty's help in doing so. The Senate agreed by mutual consent.

Prof. C. D. Marler, Chairman, Committee on Rules, reported on a resolution to revise the Bylaws in order to provide for appeal procedures concerning the apportionment of Senate seats or assignments to voting units. The following addition to the Senate Bylaws (Section J-1) passed unanimously:

Appeals concerning the apportionment of Senate seats or the assignment of faculty to voting units for representation shall be directed to the Committee on Committees.

Prof. Pikulski, Chairman, Committee on Undergraduate Studies, reported on the change requested on the total number of credits required for the Bachelor's Degree in Electrical Engineering. When the Faculty Senate approved a resolution no longer requiring History 203 of all University students, the Department of Electrical Engineering eliminated H-203 from its curriculum. It later changed a Science elective in the second term of the freshman year from 3-4 credits to 4 credits. This in turn changed the total credit hours needed for graduation. The following resolution passed unanimously:

RESOLVED, the total number of credits required for the Bachelor's Degree in Electrical Engineering be changed from 126-127 to 126.

Prof. Pikulski reported on the proposed establishment of a Bachelor's degree in Administrative Information Support Systems. The degree would prepare students for positions in management training. A question was raised as to finding a simplified title for the program. Since the meeting the program has been renamed "Office Systems Administration," upon the recommendation of the College of Business and Economics and with the concurrence of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies that the change in name is only editorial.

The following resolution passed unanimously:

RESOLVED, Senate grants approval for the proposed Bachelor's Degree in Administrative Information Support Systems.

Prof. Pikulski reported on the proposed curricula changes in the Bachelor of Science Degree in Physical Education. The following resolution passed unanimously:

RESOLVED, Senate grants approval for the proposed curricular changes in the Bachelor of Science Degree in Physical Education.

Prof. J. Mather, Chairman, Committee on Graduate Studies, reported on the proposal to change the requirements for the MA Degree in Urban Affairs from 30 to 36 credit hours. The proposal to change the requirements passed unanimously.

Professors Mather and Schweizer reported on the proposed Ph.D. Program in Political Science. The proposal was first considered by the Graduate Studies Committee on November, 1972, and was just recently approved by both committees. The proposal passed unanimously. (Proposal attached.)

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.



Charles D. Marler, Secretary

Attachment - Ph.D. Program in Political Science

PROPOSAL FOR A DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREE

IN

POLITICAL SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

December, 1973

INTRODUCTION

No longer are conditions appropriate for creating new Ph.D. programs comprising traditional areas of political science.¹ Existing graduate programs appear adequate to meet traditional professional and educational needs for the foreseeable future. This does not mean that we take exception to the 1970 recommendation of the political science panel of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee that fifteen more political science departments should be developed to the top quality level over the next ten years.² Nor are we unaware that undergraduate enrollments in political science are continuing to increase³ and that a greater number of high-quality political science Ph.D.s will be required by higher educational institutions in the future.⁴ Rather, it is our contention that any new political science Ph.D. programs must be distinctive beyond the capacity and reach of traditional programs. A new Ph.D. program should fulfill existing and demonstrable needs of the profession in relationship to society and it should be congruent with the mission and resources of the university environment in which it is established. We propose such a new doctoral program.

¹"Many more Ph.D.'s, Fewer Faculty Openings Lead to 'Buyer's Market' in Academe," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. IV, No. 14, January 12, 1970, pp. 1, 6.

²Ian E. McNett, "Problems of Quantity and Quality Beset Political Science, A Study Finds," The Chronicle of Higher Education; Vol. IV, No. 20, February 24, 1970, p. 8.

³Nationally, there was a tripling in the number of undergraduate Political Science students between 1957 and 1968, and similar increases were projected by 1977. Ibid., p. 1.

⁴Richard L. Merritt and Gloria J. Pyszka, The Student Political Scientists Handbook, Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1969, p. 169.

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The institutions of higher education in the United States suffer from the dynamics of mutual isolation which accompany educational specialization. This isolation is manifest in the nature of most graduate programs in political science. Existing programs are generally distinguished by their almost exclusive focus on providing the student with skills necessary for the conduct of political research and participation in graduate education. They prepare individuals to work in educational institutions much like those from which they earned their degree. There is no need to establish new Ph.D. programs in political science designed to prepare individuals for careers in graduate teaching and research.

There are important demands, however, for professional political scientists which are not being met by existing programs. In undergraduate colleges, there is a growing demand for individuals who match professional disciplinary skill with an understanding of educational development and innovation.⁵ And there is increasing recognition of the need for political science graduate programs to prepare people for and to contribute to the public service.⁶

⁵Larry A. Van Dyne, "Big Effort Urged to Train Staff for Nation's Community Colleges", The Chronicle of Higher Education Vol. VII, No. 4, October 16, 1972, p. 1. A recent report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development estimates that in the two-year colleges alone there will be a need for some 9,370 new staff members each year during the next decade. The report emphasized the "virtual non-existence" of programs preparing people for such jobs. Ibid., p. 4.

⁶Richard L. Chapman and Frederic N. Cleaveland, Meeting the Needs of Tomorrow's Public Service (National Academy of Public Administration, Wash., D.C., Jan., 1973), p. 23.

Our concept of "public service" is exemplified by this statement of purpose in the bulletin of the John F. Kennedy School of Government: "Public service...extends beyond the formal government into the great variety of quasi-public service, research and teaching institutions throughout American society."⁷

In this broad sense, our graduate program--with the Ph.D. included--will seek students who put acquired skills to work in helping to research, influence and shape public policy, and in managing public programs.

Most of those now employed in undergraduate and public service institutions have been trained for something else. Existing graduate programs in political science, as in other disciplines, have not been oriented toward fulfilling the needs of these institutions. Students are not prepared with the skills nor the incentives to pursue careers at these institutions. Indeed, consistent with a general image of public education, undergraduate institutions often tend to be viewed as either a wasteland or an unhappy primitive society to which university scholars have a "responsibility, not unlike the missionaries, of bringing the benefits of a superior culture."⁸ As a result, the problems of qualified academic personnel are greatest at those institutions of higher learning facing perhaps the most acute and challenging problems. The need exists for new Ph.D. programs to fulfill the requirements of a wider range of educational institutions; to attempt to dispel the isolation of educational institutions.

The existing dilemma is not difficult to understand. A recent report sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and the Association

⁷ John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government, 1971-1972, Official Register of Harvard University, Vol. LXVIII, August 19, 1971, No. 14, p. 19.

⁸ Political Education in the Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science, The Report of The American Political Science Association's Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, p. 3.

of American Colleges suggests that:

Because graduate schools are fewer and higher than other institutions, the passage from graduate school to teaching position is almost always down. Attitudes developed in the graduate school help to lower the status of teaching for the degree candidates, chiefly by disregard for teaching during the period of formal study and by an avoidance of certain kinds of teaching when the certified degree recipient takes a full-time position.

Existing doctoral programs, then, are of marginal value in preparing individuals to seek careers in undergraduate institutions different from those in which they received their graduate degrees. Efforts to better fulfill existing needs have generally been limited to the development of Doctor of Arts programs at a few institutions often as an adjunct to an existing Ph.D. Such programs have been best characterized by their general dismissal of the thesis requirement for the Ph.D. rather than by intensive and innovative preparation for college teaching. As the AAUP-AAS report indicates, such efforts have not as yet developed into "imaginative graduate programs for prospective teachers."⁹ Moreover, it may be argued that the establishment of the D.A. as a simplified doctorate may represent a step backward rather than forward in ending the isolation of research and teaching values.

A program which attempts to fulfill the needs of public service institutions should not conceive of itself as de-emphasizing the research skills of its graduates. The program submitted by this department is built upon the premise that research and teaching skills are interdependent rather than mutually

⁹Kenneth E. Eble, et. al., Career Development of the Effective College Teachers, A.A.U.P.:Wash.,D.C., 1971, p. 16.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 33.

exclusive, whether the student pursues an academic, government, or other public service career. The importance of research skills and substantive command of a discipline is well recognized as a cornerstone of graduate education; indeed the Ph.D. degree is accepted as certification of research capability within the academic marketplace.¹¹ Our program underscores that meaning. We recognize the increasing mobility in the professional life of the political scientist, between research, education, and public service management.

Our program provides opportunities to develop skills in the creation of political science knowledge as well as the imparting of such knowledge. We believe that it is no more reasonable to expect the development of teaching skills without such opportunities than to expect the development of research competence without the opportunity to engage in research. The report of the American Political Science Association Committee on Graduate Education in Political Science indicates the inadequacy of present programs in providing sufficient opportunity and resources for the development of both sets of skills:

Nowhere is the disjunction between departmental purposes and structures, and between what students want and what departments are providing more clearly illustrated than in the subject of teaching. . .

For his part, the typical graduate student member of the Association indicates that he intends to devote more than half of his career to teaching, yet he is more dissatisfied with the overall training he is receiving in teaching skills than with any other aspect of his education.¹²

¹¹Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace, Doubleday & Co., Inc., Garden City, N.Y.:1958, pp. 68-79.

¹²Douglas Bennett, et al., Obstacles to Graduate Education in Political Science, Preliminary Report of the Committee for an Exploratory Study of Graduate Education in Political Science, prepared for delivery at the sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September, 1969, multilithed, p. 18.

We perceive, then, a demand not only in the academic marketplace, but also among those pursuing graduate study in political science for a greater emphasis on at least the opportunity to engage in undergraduate teaching or related activity as part of the regular curriculum for doctoral study.

The development of a doctoral program with the dual purpose of providing opportunities for both research and teaching development can contribute to the political science profession and to society not only by the efforts of its graduates but also by the development and diffusion of political science knowledge. Our Department's commitment to this program embodies a unique commitment to needed research and experimentation.

THE SUBSTANTIVE FOCUS: PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS

The substantive focus of the political science doctoral curriculum will be on the application of political science to the study of public policy. Our substantive focus represents continuity with our general concern with political education. From our perspective, the purpose of public policy analysis is to contribute to political education by identifying, clarifying and evaluating compelling contemporary problems of political decision-making.

Our program is postulated on the premise that the political scientist should at least in part direct his work toward the solution of contemporary social problems and that "the amelioration of the ills of our society should be a guiding force in the work of social researchers."¹³

Within the discipline there is recognition of the need to further develop the area of public policy analysis. Traditionally, the analysis of public

¹³Howard E. Freeman and Clarence C. Sherwood, Social Research and Social Policy, Prentice Hall, New York, 1970. See also Joel J. Schwartz, "The Social Research - Social Policy Nexus," Public Administration Review, Vol. XXXI, No. 6, Nov./Dec. 1971, pp. 678-686.

policy has been process-oriented. Primary concern has been given to the formulation and execution of governmental policy. Alternatively, public policy analysis has been viewed as involving the evaluation of the costs and benefits of government policy compared to perceived alternatives. Historically, this view appears to have developed out of a conception of "the policy sciences;" a conception of the social scientist as helping to fulfill the "intelligence needs of society."¹⁴

From our perspective, public policy analysis has as its central concern the evaluation of the performance of political systems. The initial vantage point for such evaluation is an examination of political outputs and their consequences. A concern with system performance directs attention to an entire range of questions relating to political choice, political change and political power which have constituted part of the infrastructure of political science. However, the point of departure for consideration of such questions differs from the process-oriented political science of the past few decades. Public policy analysis has a more substantive focus - a concern with the content and consequences of public policy.

As Kenneth Dolbeare has pointed out, process-oriented studies ask "why policies have their present form," but generally they do not ask "what difference it makes to people or problems that such policies were enacted."¹⁵

¹⁴See Harold Lasswell, "The Policy Orientation," Harold Lasswell and Daniel Lerner, eds., The Policy Sciences, Stanford Univ. Press: Stanford, Cal., 1948, pp. 3-15.

¹⁵Kenneth M. Dolbeare, "Public Policy Analysis and the Coming Struggle for the Soul of the Postbehavioral Revolution," in Philip Green and Sanford Levinson, eds., Power and Community: Dissenting Essays in Political Science, Random House, Inc., New York, 1970, pp. 85-111, at p. 90.

A concern for critically conscious and empirically informed public policy analysis has gained increasing support from political scientists. There appears to be recognition that without a real concern for evaluation of the content and consequences of political decisions knowledge of the political process will be severely hampered and examination of political performance incomplete at best. Moreover, public policy analysis should be viewed as a necessary adjunct of process-oriented analysis. Public policy incorporates any decisions or ongoing conditions of society which impact significantly upon the lives of large numbers of people. Adoption of such a functional definition insures that public policy analysis will be concerned not only with incremental political change but also with overall changes in political systems. As Kenneth Dolbeare has observed, "if we do our work promptly and well, it may be that the field of policy analysis can be developed into a model of the critical use of politically sophisticated intelligence."¹⁶

From the foregoing, it is apparent that the Department's perception of public policy analysis is not a narrow or constraining one. Rather, it represents an over-arching concern for the evaluation of the performance of political systems, foreign and domestic. Neither is it to be regarded as a substitute for the five fields of study in which current graduate program is arranged (i.e., American Government, Comparative Government, International Politics, Political Theory, Public Administration). For example, Ph.D. candidates would be encouraged to research public policy issues within the contexts of these constituent fields.

16

Ibid., p. 86.

THE TEACHING OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, PUBLIC POLICY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

The development of a doctoral program in political science with a dual focus on political science teaching and public policy analysis is uniquely suited to the mission and resources of the University of Delaware and its Department of Political Science.

The creation of a doctoral program at an intermediate sized state university should be predicated upon the expectation that such a program serves a special need and is consistent with the goals and mission of that institution. The proposed doctoral program is well suited to a state university whose interest is in the congruence of excellence in undergraduate and graduate education, and which perceives its distinct mission of carrying on programs of value to the community and the society in which it exists. This doctoral program offers the possibility of establishing a distinctive competence and reputation for the Department and the University. The Report of the Community Design Commission of the University of Delaware has emphasized the goals of integrating graduate and undergraduate education, ending the isolation of education and research, and of widening the University's outward gaze in serving the needs of a broader community. Moreover, the Report specifies that:

Expansion of graduate programs be justified on the basis of support and enrichment of undergraduate education, of clear regional need, or of unique and unusual opportunities to create programs of distinction...¹⁷

The standardized Ph.D. program, primarily designed to permit college and university faculties to reproduce themselves, needs to be rigorously examined. High priority should be given to exploring different, new, intellectually rigorous forms of the doctorate that

¹⁷The Decade Ahead: The Report of the Community Design Planning Commission, University of Delaware: Newark, Del., 1971, Vol. 1, p. 10.

can meet the expanded societal needs that this generation of students will be called upon to solve.¹⁸

Our dual emphasis upon political science teaching and public policy analysis is congruent with the mission identified by the Community Design. Moreover, the Commission has proposed that the creation of a doctoral program in political science is "a matter of priority" and that the creation of such a program should not hamper the Department's efforts at the undergraduate level.¹⁹ Indeed, the proposed Ph.D. given its goals, and given the value placed on the development of teaching and educational skills in political science, would reinforce the Department's commitments at the undergraduate level. The program is specifically designed to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction.

The substantive focus of the program enables significant cooperation with the graduate programs in Urban Affairs and Sociology. Over the past two years, the Department of Political Science has worked with the Division of Urban Affairs and the Department of Sociology in working out coordinated programs of study at the graduate level. The programs of these units thus serve as an important resource for our own graduate program and, similarly, our program may help to reinforce the efforts in Urban Affairs and Sociology. As a result of meetings throughout the 1971-72 academic year, the Political Science, Urban Affairs, and Sociology programs submitted to the Provost a Proposal to Establish A Collaborative Program in the Social Sciences. The proposal emphasized the compatibility of goals among the three units and the potential for graduate programs to be mutually reinforcing. We believe that this proposal for a Ph.D. program in Political Science is consistent with the values of collaboration, excellence and economy in graduate

18
Ibid.

19
Ibid., Vol. II, Part I, p. 815.

education at the University of Delaware. The establishment of a Ph.D. program in Political Science will enable our Department to fully contribute to collaborative efforts which will:

1. Enhance and strengthen the quality of graduate programs in all three units by enabling the pooling and sharing of faculty and resources.
2. Economize on program costs through interrelated curricula.
3. Provide opportunities for interdisciplinary research and teaching.
4. Provide economies of scale in the sharing of laboratory and data resources.
5. Improve the potential for outside funding of research by large scale interdisciplinary cooperation.
6. Afford greater flexibility in budgeting and planning.²⁰

The Political Science Ph.D. will be highly interdependent with other graduate programs but it will maintain distinctive focus. The integration of a substantive concern with public policy analysis and a program in teaching makes the proposal uniquely suited to the skills and resources of our Political Science Department. It will enable the placement of our Ph.D.'s in academic as well as other public service institutions and will enhance their mobility among such institutions as their careers as political scientists develop.

RESOURCES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The Political Science Department of the University of Delaware has a long record of achievement as a strong base on which to build a quality Ph.D. program. Though Delaware is one of only a few states that does not yet offer a Ph.D. in political science, the political science program at the University

²⁰Proposal to Establish a Collaborative Program in the Social Sciences (1972).

of Delaware has now matured to that stage at which it can confidently offer the highest academic degree. This level of maturation has been reached through a conscious decision by University of Delaware leaders to develop its Political Science Department into one of high quality.

Since August, 1969, thanks to University support, nine full-time and three part-time faculty were added to the seven full-time and one part-time member then comprising the Department's faculty. During the same period, moreover, undergraduate political science majors have increased from less than 200 in 1969 to 492 in 1972. This means that the Department now has more majors than all but one department in the College of Arts and Science and more than all but a few professional schools (e.g., elementary education and business administration). Meanwhile, total student enrollment in political science courses increased from 1060 in the fall of 1969 to 2018 in the fall of 1972.

The Department has long been known as one which is committed to, and has achieved excellence in, undergraduate education. During the two years, 1969-1971, the Department's undergraduate curriculum was completely overhauled and restructured and a new highly-rated student advisement program was introduced. New policy-oriented courses were introduced on poverty, science, environment, dissent, minorities, urban politics, etc., plus an election-year course on practical politics that has received national recognition as "the Delaware Plan" -- the University's rational alternative to the so-called "Princeton Plan." The Political Science House -- the University's first living-learning program -- was recognized as a model for other University departments, and an undergraduate honors program was initiated. The Department has provided leadership in developing computer-related courses permitting individualized instruction for

undergraduates, and in developing an interdepartmental Latin American Studies program, and an interdisciplinary science and technology program. In addition, efforts have been made to develop introductory political science courses which build upon high school social science curricula.

By March of 1970, data from a University study revealed that political science majors achieved the highest average scores in the University on the total Graduate Record Exam as well as on its social science area test.²¹ More than one of every four political science majors (76 of approximately 300) -- the highest percentage in the University -- earned the distinction of making the Dean's list for the Fall semester of 1970-71, by achieving at least an overall 3.25 grade point average. At the same time, the grading by political science faculty did not exceed University averages.

Considering its record of achievement, it is not surprising that the Community Design Planning Commission of the University highly evaluated the Political Science Department and called on other departments to "emulate" its example. In its 1971 report, The Decade Ahead (Vol. II, Part I, page 185), the Commission stated:

The Commission commends the Department for its concern for undergraduate teaching....Its interest in and implementation of...introductory courses, honors sections, intern experiences, living-learning programs and the like make it one of the most innovative departments in the University. Other departments would do well to emulate this example.²²

21

Carol Pemberton, The Relationship between Grades and Two External Measures of Academic Achievement, University Impact Study, University of Delaware, March, 1970, p. 14.

22

The Decade Ahead, op. cit., Vol. II, Part I, p. 815.

Even the above endorsement cannot truly convey the spirit that prevails among all department members that undergraduate education not be relegated to the status of an adjunct to a professional graduate program. It is no doubt true that all persons engaged in higher education would rank quality undergraduate education as an important value to be achieved. What makes our Political Science Department unique in this respect is its demonstrated determination not to have its undergraduate program diminished by other academic pursuits. Evidence abounds to support such an assertion. Professors in the Department have consistently received high ratings in the Course Evaluation Surveys sponsored by the Student Government Association. The Department has backed up its verbal commitments to excellence in teaching by rewarding members of its faculty through promotion and salary increases for their performance as undergraduate instructors. Of the small number of Excellence in Teaching Awards given by the University each year, members of the Department have been recognized twice during the past three years.

In sum, the Political Science Department possesses unique qualifications to pursue the type of graduate program herein proposed. Far from denigrating our commitment to undergraduate education, it will enhance it.

In addition to our commitments at the undergraduate level, the Department of Political Science has demonstrated an ongoing commitment to graduate education:

In the University's College of Arts and Science, eleven -- or over half -- of the Departments offer Ph.D. degrees. But only two departments in the College (English and History) exceeded the eleven M.A. degrees awarded political science graduate students on May 30, 1971. Indeed more graduate degrees were earned by political science students than in all but three departments in the

College including those offering the Ph.D. degree. The number of political science graduate students has nearly doubled in the past five years, from 25 in 1967 to 45 in 1972.

Moreover, over the past four years the department has offered over 50 different graduate level courses (600 or above) and has engaged in a general revision of the graduate curriculum. The number of graduate (800) level seminars offered annually is now equal to some departments offering a Ph.D. as well as an M.A. degree.

Since 1970, the research productivity of the Department has been impressive by any standard. In that period the political science faculty delivered 10 papers in national professional meetings, published 30 articles and 5 books, and has 18 articles and 4 books in press. Faculty are now working on 11 book manuscripts. The general research capability of the faculty is well documented by the vitae in the Appendix.

The Political Science Department currently numbers twenty-one of whom four are joint appointees with the Division of Urban Affairs and one with the College of Marine Studies. The twenty-one faculty are distributed by rank as follows: 5 professors, 4 associate professors, 12 assistant professors, all having Ph.D.s.

Since 1969, the Department's faculty strengthened and completely restructured its M.A. program and greatly increased M.A. degree and admissions standards. Meanwhile, the faculty prepared several drafts of a Ph.D. program in Political Science. In April, 1971, in its final report, the Community Design Commission commented, as follows, concerning the Department's Ph.D. goal:

The creation of a doctoral program is a matter of priority. Such a program should be selective in its emphasis and the Commission applauds the desire of the Department to focus on public policy analysis.

In a memorandum, dated February 23, 1971, from the Provost to the President, Dean of the College of Arts and Science, and the Associate Provost, entitled "Diary Note on Conference," the University's leadership decided to support a Ph.D. in Political Science. The memo stated: "It is our intent to go for the doctorate for Political Science," and that "The outside evaluation for the doctorate should be held...."

Meanwhile, the Department's Ph.D. proposal was approved by the College of Arts and Science Faculty Senate, and the Graduate Council of the College of Graduate Studies authorized external evaluation of the proposal.

In April, 1973, the Department was visited by three highly regarded political scientists, comprising the team of external evaluators of the Department's Ph.D. proposal, including a professor and former department chairman from the University of Minnesota, a professor and director of the political science graduate program from Princeton University, and an associate professor from Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In commenting on the Department's faculty, the evaluation team reported:

We were impressed by the high quality of the... Department. It is young and dynamic, and it has strong and attractive commitments both to teaching and scholarship. It has clear professional involvement....The department also appears to enjoy good morale.... Its.. members come from good graduate departments and have had good scholarly training. It is a department of excellent professional goals and values. It is, in short, a department of high promise and excellent prospects.

The Department's promise, it was noted, has been most fully realized in "carrying out its teaching mission," as evidenced by: (1) "the highest praise for its teaching and general concern for students," by both the Department's undergraduate and graduate students; (2) the Department's reputation among other departments; and (3) the growth of its undergraduate

major program.

And all of this appears to have been accomplished without sacrificing scholarly rigor and standards. In short, we can understand why the Community (Design) Commission... urged other departments...to "emulate" its example.

The evaluation team observed, further, that: the Department had upgraded its M.A. program "with obvious effectiveness;" its M.A. graduates "enjoy success in good doctoral programs;" there is "obvious quality" among their M.A. theses; morale among its graduate students is "high;" the Department has good M.A. admission criteria which are applied "with sense and sophistication;" the M.A. program appears innovative; and that the Department has "embarked on an imaginative program of recruiting good students, and the program has apparently paid off."

In short, it seems clear to us that the M.A. program is in good shape and clearly in considerably better shape than it was until fairly recently. Moreover, the department accomplished all of this without slighting or short-changing its flourishing undergraduate program.

The foregoing information and evaluation, concerning the achievements of the Department, demonstrate that the leadership of the University of Delaware can, and should, with great confidence embark on a program of support of Political Science similar to the support it has generated in the past for sciences, engineering, marine studies, and sociology.

Whatever the reasons, the lack of such a commitment by the University has led the Political Science Department to be insecure in its approach to planning for the future. As the Department's external evaluation team, observed:

Rightly or wrongly, the department, we believe, (has) felt itself in something of a contest for the uncertain favor of the University administration. More generally we found the department unsure of its future and opportunities despite its clear success in building itself into one of the strongest-- if not the strongest--social science departments in the University.

In urging the University to make such a "commitment" to Political Science, the evaluation team added:

It is a young, strong and ambitious department, and in every way it seems to us a good bet for a commitment on the part of the university. It has already shown its capacity for graduate education in the very obvious improvements it has worked in its present M.A. program.

The external evaluation team recommended the addition of two senior faculty. "Such additions will add to the teaching resources of the department," said the team, and "they will also help in the development of the doctorate and provide good role models for more junior members of the department."

We do not intend to suggest, of course, that several appointments will take care of the department's staffing problems for the foreseeable future. Even at present it is short-handed.... Clearly the addition of other assistant professors will be necessary in order to develop the depth for a Ph.D. program and to handle the many responsibilities of the department.

In conclusion, the external evaluation team stated:

Finally, we would like to close with what is perhaps more a hope than a recommendation. We hope, and recommend, that in planning for a doctoral program that the department and the University protect its very attractive undergraduate and M.A. programs. We feel it would be most unfortunate if resources, or attention, were diverted from them in order to start the doctoral program. Their success makes an important contribution to the University and its students, and probably also to the morale and sense of worth and confidence of the department itself. This hope constitutes one more reason for urging the University to make commitments to the department so that it may develop the doctoral program without having to compromise its commitments to the undergraduate and M.A. programs.

The Department of Political Science proposes, as suggested by the evaluation team, that the University make a commitment to the development of political science at the University of Delaware that would build on the Department's strong undergraduate and M.A. programs.

THE PROGRAM OF STUDY

The Department's proposed program is designed to provide each doctoral student with a combination of research and teaching skills. For the development of sound research capabilities in political science, the program will provide: (1) a balanced foundation in traditional areas of political science, (2) a rigorous background in research methodology, and (3) an intensive course of study in the application of political science to the study of public policy.

Concurrent with progress in the political science curriculum, each student will participate in a program of teaching development and innovation in political science. This part of the program will include: (1) a seminar on teaching political science; (2) a progressive program of teaching experiences under the guidance of faculty; and (3) for students with teaching as a career objective, an internship in which the student would work in a teaching, administrative or consulting capacity dealing with a problem of teaching political science.

It is to be emphasized that this Ph.D. program anticipates a modest number of student enrollees, beginning with the admission of four or five first-year students and projecting a maximum of approximately twelve students in all stages of the program at any one time. Keeping the program thus limited, will permit the faculty to tailor it to the interests of individual students, particularly after the first year, to individualize teaching experience, and more appropriately and readily to place graduates in significant positions.

The following pages present an overview of a student's progress through the program.

A. First Year of Study

Students will be expected to develop a basis of competency in the foundations of political science. Each doctoral student will be expected to complete 24 hours of credit in the fields of American Government, Comparative Government, Public Administration, International Politics and Political Theory. Core Seminars in each of these areas are presently offered by the Department. These seminars are reinforced by additional 600 and 800 level courses in each area. The students' objectives at this point in the program should be to develop broad knowledge of the discipline and avoid specialization. During the first year in the program each doctoral student will participate in the core seminar on the scope and methods of political analysis (PSC 800). This seminar explores the substantive scope, and evaluates the available methodologies of contemporary political science. Wherever possible, doctoral students during their first year should be supported by fellowships.

B. Preliminary Examination

A preliminary examination or other screening procedure is to be given at approximately the end of the second semester of residence. Successful completion of the Master of Arts comprehensive examinations is normally adequate to satisfy this requirement. Alternative written and oral examinations may be given when in the judgment of the faculty advisor they are necessary. A judgment will be made by the faculty concerning the student's continuation in the program.

C. Teaching Internship

Doctoral students with teaching as a career objective will participate in a teaching internship coordinated with the Department's curriculum. Normally this internship will occur during the summer, following the student's first or second academic year, but in every case timing will depend upon the faculty's

evaluation of the student's progress and maturity. During the internship students will work under the close guidance of Department faculty. Weekly seminars between interns and faculty will provide assessment of progress in teaching development. These seminars will concentrate on substantive materials related to the course being taught, but may also at times involve librarians, professors from the College of Education, instructional technologists and other specialists who can contribute their expertise to specific problems/situations that may develop in the intern's course. Students will evaluate their internship experience at its close. (It should be noted here that the internship may involve team-teaching, development of new courses, etc., as well as the traditional experience of a person teaching an already existing course.) Teaching interns will be remunerated for courses taught at a normal rate. Faculty supervisors for the internship should receive remuneration equivalent to that received for directing a summer special problem project.

D. The Second Year of Study

Students will specialize in two fields of public policy analysis chosen from public opinion and public policy, urban policy, policy administration, foreign and international policy. In addition, students may individualize their programs of study in conjunction with their advisory committees. All students will participate in two core seminars: a seminar in foundations of public policy analysis and a seminar in the teaching of political science. The seminar in foundations of public policy analysis will focus on providing the student with

theoretical and methodological skills of policy analysis. The seminar in the teaching of political science will focus upon the utilization of education resources in teaching political science.²³ All doctoral students during the second year should be employed as teaching assistants working closely with a member of the faculty in teaching political science.

E. Comprehensive Examinations

At the end of the second year of study, students should take comprehensive examinations. By passing these examinations, students will gain formal admission into doctoral candidacy. The examinations will be written and oral. Such examinations will focus on a student's fields of policy specialization.

F. The Third Year of Study

During the first semester of the third year, students with teaching as a career objective should participate in an internship intended to provide experience closely related to the student's field of interest. Such an internship might involve a project of educational innovation at the University of Delaware

23

The seminar in the teaching of political science will have a threefold focus: the development of Political Science as a discipline, and the status of teaching therein; functional approaches to the teaching process in Political Science; utilization of available University resources by the teaching political scientist. The objective of the seminar will be to cause Ph.D. candidates to think of good teaching (as well as good research) to be a highly valued professional goal.

The first focus will emphasize items such as reading in the history of political science, discussion of presidential addresses to the American Political Science Association, and evaluations of articles in Teaching Political Science (the discipline's journal devoted to teaching). The second focus will feature seminars led by departmental faculty actively using techniques such as simulation, survey research projects, political internships, etc., in their own teaching activities. The third focus will utilize University experts such as counselors, instructional technologists, librarians, education professors, and data managers as discussion leaders on how the political scientist might use their particular skills and services in his teaching activities.

or another educational institution, with the student in a teaching or administrative position. Alternatively, the internship might be served at a research center, governmental organization, or other institution actively involved in an aspect of a process related to the student's career interests.

Each student should submit a project evaluation for the review of the faculty. Preliminary contacts have been made with such institutions in developing this part of the proposal.

Subsequent to this internship experience, each student must prepare a Ph.D. dissertation. The dissertation will demonstrate the capacity of the student to carry on independent research. At the time of admission to candidacy for the Doctor of Philosophy degree, the student's major advisor should propose a committee of three or more persons to advise the student during the preparation of the dissertation and to conduct a final oral examination.