SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
1 8 5 6

Memorandum

To: Faculty Senate
Seton Hall University

From: Karen E. Boroff, Ph.D.
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President

Re: Approval of the Report of the Program Review Committee regarding the School of Diplomacy
(2019–FS–13)

Date: October 4, 2019

The School of Diplomacy and International Relations can take great pride in the prominence of the faculty and their connections to the United Nations. There are some impressive stories that appear on the website regarding the accomplishments of their students. This is all praiseworthy. There are a few items from the Program Review Committee's Report that I think are worth mentioning. I found myself agreeing with them. As an example, I concur that data on the centers and the faculty director responsibilities as well as how the excellence of the centers is assessed would be very helpful. These research centers do need to be self-sustaining and have a significant scholarly profile.

As documented by the Stewardship Taskforce Committee, both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Stillman School of Business, which have the largest enrollments, operate with the lowest ratio of administration and staff per students enrolled. While I do realize that a smaller faculty body can put demands on everyone for service, there are staffing measures that the School of Diplomacy and International Relations could adopt to relieve some of this pressure. According to the faculty loads prepared last fall, there are Diplomacy faculty whose total enrollment in all sections assigned to them was under 15 students, and most of the full-time faculty had total students under 60. Due to its center of excellence status, there are internally funded releases for faculty. There are junior faculty who have requested professional development leaves to advance their scholarship. These have been granted by the administration. These releases, while very important to scholarly development, may also be contributing to the sense of feeling overwhelmed by service needs, but these are the same expectations for all faculty. It is difficult to read that there has not been support from the administration for faculty. In terms of other issues raised in the internal and external reviews, it should be acknowledged that the University is moving toward a more decentralized process for budgeting. Responsibility centered management is a work in progress and the units that are revenue generating must be functioning efficiently for there to be an opportunity to capture revenue.

One issue that was discussed by the reviewers and the dean was the need for space – for meetings, for studying, for other types of engagements. There are also complaints about the quality of the rooms, that they are not big enough for more than a few students to meet with a professor at the same time, that the facilities do not measure up when a world leader comes to visit the campus. Any discussion of space has to

be first undergirded with a strategic plan for growth and the School is urged to develop one. Also, while we do not have dedicated IT resources in McQuaid, the TLTC can provide opportunities to hold classes in a very high- tech environment.

I found Dr. Nolan's remarks about linking up some of the learning objectives to various learning goals helpful. I am sure that her Middle States Accreditation experience informs her attention to assessment and the need to demonstrate that we made adjustments when we find deficiencies. Identifying the places in the syllabus where certain objectives are covered helps the student to see value of certain assignments. The analysis of the scores on the project paper in terms of writing a research question and knowing how to examine it was interesting to read.

One of the lessons from the review for me is the students' comments on broadening course offerings. There is nothing that should stop us from using relevant courses offered elsewhere in the University to satisfy an elective requirement. I was also interested to read that students want more research opportunities. I continue to encourage the faculty to reach a balance between teaching and research. Many of the sections of the entry level DIPL1711 course are being taught by adjunct faculty. The faculty need to reflect on this, especially given relentless concerns of freshmen students. The enrollment in them is generally 25 – 30 students. Many of the full-time faculty are teaching specialized graduate courses with smaller enrollments. To read that new faculty lines are needed to address the growth of the program is difficult to entertain in terms of overarching needs of the University. It would be beneficial to see some sustained growth and attempts to collaborate across various schools on offerings. It is my hope that there will be a new strategic plan, developed in concert with the University's strategic vision, to move the school forward and continue the pursuit of APSIA. Much more has to be done in evaluating the school's graduate portfolio.

I want to congratulate the School of Diplomacy and International Relations on its Twentieth Anniversary and on its aspiration to make "everyone learns and everyone leads." I accept this program review report and thank everyone who assisted in the review and preparation of the documents.