



EVALUATION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE STUDIES

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY

COMMITTEE FOR THE EVALUATION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS STUDIES IN ISRAEL

December 2022

Section 1: Background and Procedures

- 1.1** In the academic year 2022, the Council for Higher Education [CHE] put in place arrangements for the evaluation of study programs in the field of Political Science and International Relations in Israel.
- 1.2** The Higher Education Institutions [HEIs] participating in the evaluation process were:
- 1.3** To undertake the evaluation, the Vice Chair of the CHE appointed a Committee consisting of¹:
- **Prof. Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey** – *Chair*. Head of Department (2019-2022), and Fellow of the British Academy Department of Government, LSE, UK.
 - **Prof. Dr. Tanja A. Börzel** – Professor of political science and chair for European Integration at the Otto Suhr Institute for Political Science, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany.
 - **Prof. Joel Migdal** – Robert F. Philip Professor of International Studies, University of Washington, USA.
 - **Prof. James Perry** – Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, USA.
 - **Prof. Avner de Shalit** – Political philosopher and Max Kampelman Chair of Democracy and Human Rights, Hebrew University, Israel.
- Pe'er Baris-Barnea and Anat Haina served as the Coordinators of the Committee on behalf of the CHE.
- 1.4** The evaluation process was conducted in accordance with the CHE's Guidelines for Self-Evaluation (January 2022). Within this framework the evaluation committee was required to:
- examine the self-evaluation reports submitted by the institutions that provide study programs in Political Science and International Relations;
 - conduct on-site visits at those institutions participating in the evaluation process;
 - submit to the CHE an individual report on each of the academic units and study programs participating in the evaluation;
 - set out the committee's findings and recommendations for each study program;
 - submit to the CHE a general report regarding the evaluated field of study within the Israeli system of higher education including recommendations for standards in the evaluated field of study;
- 1.5** The evaluation committee examined only the evidence provided by each participating institution — considering this alongside the distinctive mission set out by each institution in terms of its own aims and objectives. This material was further elaborated and explained in discussions with senior management, lecturers,

¹ The committee's letter of appointment is attached as **Appendix 1**.

students, and alumni during the course of each one-day visit to each of the institutions.

- 1.6 In undertaking this work, the committee considered matters of quality assurance and quality enhancement — applying its collective knowledge of developments and good practices in the delivery of higher education in Political Science (mainly from European countries and the USA) to the evaluation of such provision in Israel.

Section 2: Executive Summary

The Committee applauds the Political Science Department for its ambition to “become an internationally leading department,” and sees its recommendations in this report as supporting that ambition.

The Committee met with the University President, Rector and Vice Rector, the Dean of the Social Sciences, the Department Head, as well as faculty and students. The Committee is impressed with the ambition and energy of the leadership, as well as the earnest dedication of the faculty and students to both the University and the Department of Political Science.

This report details by subject areas the observations by the Committee about the Department of Political Science at HUJI. Overall, the Committee was satisfied with the Department, particularly its emphasis on research excellence. The recommendations made by the Committee seek to improve strengths of the Department and elevate its overall standing in Israeli higher education and internationally. A number of the recommendations are targeted not at the Department, but at the level of the University, including its recruitment process, and its promotion criteria.

At the level of the Department, the Committee identifies the need for a strategic vision to underpin the rationalization of the study program. On the issue of the rapid decline in student enrollment in the academic year of 2022, there is an urgent need for an evidence-based plan of action.

Section 3: Observations

3.1 The Institution and the Parent Unit

The Self-Evaluation Report noted difficulties by the Department to acquire data from the University, particularly on research grants. The Department also remarked that it was not provided with administrative support to manage the self-evaluation process. The University appears to be in the early stages of better equipping departments with information on research grants.

The Self-Evaluation Report also remarked on the “pathetically disastrous embracement of the SAP system” (p.4).

Overall, there is room for improvement in the University better supporting the Political Science Department; however, it is the understanding of the Committee that the University recognizes some of these issues, and is seeking remedies.

3.2 Internal Quality Assurance

The Committee was impressed and gratified with the Department's honesty in the Self-Evaluation Report and its frank assessment of both its strengths and weaknesses. The same level of honesty and frankness was also shared by all faculty and students we interviewed. This ability to conduct a thorough and rigorous self-assessment has made the job of the Committee easier, by identifying areas of priority.

Indeed, the Self-Evaluation Report identifies a number of areas where the Department would seek to make improvements. This Committee does not touch on all of those, but rather highlights areas that the Committee judges to be of greatest benefit to the Department. The Committee urges the Department to continue to make progress in other areas of its Self-Evaluation Report, however, which are not discussed in this Committee Report.

The Committee also recognizes that, from challenges listed in the Self-Evaluation Report, the Department's administrative resources were severely stretched in undertaking the self-evaluation process itself. Ideally, additional administrative support would be given to departments undertaking evaluation, targeted at the preparation of the report itself.

With respect to previous CHE evaluations, the Committee notes that the 2011 CHE Committee recommended merging the two departments of Political Science and International Relations into one department. While the present Committee has not yet evaluated the International Relations Department (this will be done in May 2023, and will generate a separate CHE report), this Committee does not discern any imperative for a merging of the two departments. Consequently, the present Committee agrees with the earlier recommendation of the 2007 CHE Committee to retain the two separate departments.

Perhaps the most important feature of the international evaluation committee reports from 2007, 2011 and the present report, is that all three committees were concerned with the recruitment process at Hebrew University. This report describes the concerns of the present committee in Section 3.6. Here, it is useful to quote the 2011 report in detail:

"...no change has been made with regard to offering departments more control over the hiring process. Departments still do not have dedicated slots to fill over multiple years, they still have to bring their chosen candidates to an appointment committee at the faculty level which then compares candidates across all social science departments. As a result, as the 2007 Committee report pointed out (p. 22), 'there is a premium placed on finding "safe" candidates who can prevail in inter-departmental competition who are sure to accept if they receive an offer'. ...Once again, we can only repeat the observations of the 2007 Committee report with regard to this untenable situation. Four years later, the negative consequences of this recruitment practice have become obvious."

It should be emphasized that now three committees are all recommending the same change by the Hebrew University leadership. Given that this recommendation from the 2007 and

2011 reports has been discarded, **this Committee recommends that CHE discusses the process of recruitment directly with the Hebrew University leadership, and especially the reasons for retaining its current recruitment process.**

The Department evaluated its overall performance in Internal Quality Assurance:

(1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs significant improvements, 3=needs minor improvements, 4=satisfactory, 5=highly satisfactory)

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the Department's overall performance in Internal Quality Assurance:

	1	2	3	4	5
			X		

The reason for the lower score by the Committee is that we would like to have the Hebrew University leadership discuss its recruitment process with CHE and explain why it seeks to retain its current process.

3.3 The Department/Study Program

The Department of Political Science at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem offers degrees at the BA, MA and PhD levels. The Department has a global reputation for its research and has strengths in several subfields of political science, including comparative politics, political behavior, political theory, and political psychology.

Enrollments have fluctuated in recent years. The most recent year (2022-2023) has seen a significant decline in enrollments. The Committee’s conversations with administrative leaders, faculty, students at all levels, and alumni were unable to identify definitive reasons or causes for the decline. **The decline in student numbers should be addressed by significant data gathering to provide an evidence-based foundation for action.** Once the causes are better understood, direct actions should be taken.

The Committee applauds the efforts of the Head of the Department to take immediate actions with the first-year course offerings to improve enrollment. The Committee views this immediate action as a necessary first step to improve the attractiveness of political science at the Hebrew University to prospective students.

There is no overarching strategy to guide the rationalization of the curriculum. **The Committee strongly recommends that the Department as a whole invests effort in thoughtful reflection**

to identify strategic directions for where it sees itself in five years. Given the broad range of curricular activities in which the Department is engaged, the Committee believes attempts to rationalize the curriculum should be directed by a strategic vision for the Department's identity.

The Committee supports the Dean of Social Sciences' concept for creating a centralized unit that provides methodology training for graduate students from all social science departments. Such a unit would enable the Political Science Department, and other departments in the social sciences, to realize their needs for cutting-edge methodology training in both qualitative and quantitative methodology for graduate students. At the same time, the Committee also supports the initiatives of the Head of the Political Science Department to provide PhD students with funding to pursue individual, highly-specialized, targeted methodology courses online.

Based on our interviews with faculty and students, the Committee believes there is a compelling need to enhance the Department's faculty by hiring a political methodologist. A new hire in political methodology would help fulfill a need for better methodological training for BA students. In addition, the recruitment of a political methodologist would give the Department someone to provide more subject-matter expertise for internal and collaborative curriculum development. This recommendation is formalized in the section on Academic Faculty and Human Resources (3.6).

The Committee thus sees the solution for the methodology needs expressed by the Department in the Self-Evaluation Report, and by faculty and students in our interviews, in these three levels:

- Recruitment of a political methodologist;
- Creation of centralized provision of methodology training by the Faculty of Social Sciences; and
- Funding for individual PhD students to pursue specialized methodology training.

The internationalization of the study program – HUJI students studying abroad and international students coming to HUJI – is a complex problem for which the Committee has no ready solutions. The Committee recognizes that the Department is targeting two goals: (1) its international position as a world-leading institution; and (2) adherence to the University's overarching goal to preserve and research "Jewish, cultural, spiritual, and intellectual traditions" (Self-Evaluation Report, p. 9). These two goals require the presence of both English and Hebrew in the curriculum, and the difficulty is to get the balance between the two.

The Department evaluated its overall performance in Study Program:

(1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs significant improvements, 3=needs minor improvements, 4=satisfactory, 5=highly satisfactory)

	1	2	3	4	5
			X		

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the Department's overall performance in Study Program:

	1	2	3	4	5
		X			

The Committee agrees with the Department that some degree of improvement in the study program is needed. Given our uncertainty about the causes for recent declines in enrollment and the need for development of clear strategic direction, the Committee rates the Department's overall performance with respect to the Study Program as "needing significant improvement."

3.4 Teaching and Learning Outcomes

The Committee understands that student surveys are the primary mechanism for teaching evaluation. There were a number of problems identified with the use of these surveys: (1) the use of inappropriate and offensive comments by students toward their instructors; (2) the perception by some faculty that student survey results are being used without due attention to course type (e.g., required vs. elective courses, course difficulty). The latter is perceived by many faculty interviewed to be a factor with respect to promotions, although this may be a problem of miscommunication between faculty and the administration.

The Committee believes the University, faculty, and Department should consider a variety of steps to improve student surveys for evaluation of teaching, both to address the two issues above and other issues raised in our interviews (e.g., low response rates). These steps might include having the Teaching and Learning Center benchmark its use of student evaluations against world-leading institutions; providing an instruction-sheet for students with guidance about constructive versus inappropriate and offensive feedback; and giving students time during class to complete online teaching surveys.

In addition, the Committee recommends the University, Faculty and Department consider creating awards for effective teaching, including departmental awards, faculty-wide awards, and awards by the student union. These awards would be independent of student surveys. Such awards would then constitute additional evidence for teaching excellence in promotion cases.

The Committee applauds the Department's detailed articulation of intended learning outcomes (ILOs) for undergraduate and graduate programs (pp. 35-36 of the Self-Evaluation Report). The Committee's interviews of faculty indicated their satisfaction with the ILOs and their involvement in the development and review of ILOs.

The Department evaluated its overall performance in Teaching and Learning Outcomes:

(1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs significant improvements, 3=needs minor improvements, 4=satisfactory, 5=highly satisfactory)

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the Department's overall performance in Teaching and Learning Outcomes:

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Committee concurs with the Department's rating of its overall performance in "Teaching and Learning Outcomes".

3.5 Students

The Department expresses satisfaction with most aspects of student admissions and the quality of its students. At several points in the Self-Evaluation Report, the Department refers to the system as optimal, especially in light of resources invested in the system. The Committee found no evidence to the contrary. We therefore concur with the Department's assessment of student admissions, advancement and completion.

The area where the Department expresses need for improvement is in "demand," which involves "spreading the word concerning special programs..." (Self-Evaluation Report, p. 41). The Committee concurs with the Department's assessment of the need to better "spread the word." With respect to improving demand, the Committee interviewed two alumni, both of whom provided impressive endorsements for the Political Science Department. The Committee believes alumni can be persuasive voices for marketing the Department's programs and, more broadly, the value of pursuing political science studies.

In our conversations with the President, Rector, and Vice Rector, we discussed alumni relations. They noted that HUJI in the past was not well-organized with respect to information about its alumni. The Committee understands that the University has now developed an alumni database, which may facilitate the Department's need to enlist alumni for improving demand.

The Department evaluated its overall performance in Students:

(1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs significant improvements, 3=needs minor improvements, 4=satisfactory, 5=highly satisfactory)

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the Department's overall performance in Students:

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Department's rating of its performance for Students in the Self-evaluation Report was "1," unsatisfactory. The Committee understands that this represents an unintended error (the Department's rating of its performance for Alumni tracking was "unsatisfactory" but inadvertently entered for Students). The Committee rates the Department's performance for Students as satisfactory.

3.6 Academic Faculty and Human Resources

The Committee applauds the Political Science Department for its ambition to "become an internationally leading department" and sees its recommendations as supporting that ambition. The Committee notes that the Department ensures that all non-tenured faculty receive mentorship from a senior faculty member, and, based on our conversations with faculty, this seems to be working well.

The Committee observes three key areas for improvement in the area of Academic Faculty and Human Resources: (1) recruitment; (2) promotions criteria; and (3) data on workloads in the Department to ensure greater equity among faculty with respect to service and teaching.

On recruitment, the Committee understands that when a faculty member leaves the Department, the line for that member is withdrawn by the University. Moreover, the Committee also understands that recruitment rounds are structured so that departments compete with one another on an annual basis for new positions.

The Committee sees these two structural features of recruitment as problematic, as it creates a strong incentive by the departments to "game" the process, which can undermine the outcome for both the Political Science Department and the University. Specifically, departments appear to be incentivized to identify candidates for recruitment who will (1) remain in post as long as possible (to avoid a department losing a line); and (2) have a competitive edge over other departments. While this may be efficient for the University, it

constrains the Political Science Department's ability to balance (a) finding excellent candidates which optimize the probability of actually "winning" a line vis-a-vis other departments, with (b) filling needs in the Political Science Department with respect to teaching and research. For example, the Department needs both a specialist in Israeli politics, and a political methodologist. But in order to play the game, neither of these areas would necessarily produce a candidate who will have the "impact" expected by the University leadership. **The Committee recommends that the University examine these structural features of recruitment and seek ways to lessen the incentivization of gaming so as better to achieve its collective goal of research excellence across all departments.**

Moreover, with respect to recruitment, **the Committee recommends that the Political Science Department link recruitment directly with the recommendation in the Study Program to develop an overarching strategy for the next five years.** Such a strategy would provide clarity on where the Department positions itself in the global field of political science and how it prioritizes areas of recruitment to better achieve its objective of becoming a world-leading center for political science.

The Committee agrees with the Department's Self-Evaluation that it would benefit from recruitment in both Israeli Politics and Political Methodology. A recruitment in Israeli Politics would strengthen and utilize the Department's location in Jerusalem, by better bridging academic research with Israeli politics, policy making, and policy implementation. A new recruitment in Political Methodology would be of particular use in better preparing undergraduate students to acquire fundamental competency, which then readies them for graduate studies and professional careers. **The Committee recommends the appointment of two new positions in the Department, one in Israeli Politics and one in Political Methodology.**

With respect to the process for promotion, while the overall process appears to work well, the criteria are not transparent. **The Committee recommends that the University works with the Department to make more transparent the criteria for promotion across research, teaching and service/citizenship.** In this, the Committee agrees with the Department's Self-Evaluation Report, which urges the University to "publish a general statement on the relevance of criteria other than publications for promotion (teaching, 'citizenship', etc)" (p. 53). From the Self-Evaluation Report and the interviews with faculty, the Committee understands that the criteria and process for promotion is conveyed to new faculty verbally in informal conversations, and in annual meetings of non-tenured faculty with the Dean. Yet, from conversations with faculty, it was evident that faculty found the criteria for promotion opaque and confusing. Faculty are unclear on the requirements with respect to: books versus articles; substance of research versus its "impact" as judged by journal impact factors and citations; whether and how book chapters count for promotions; and so on. Informal conversations seem to be the primary source of information and these invariably are subject to problems of (mis)communication. The Committee thus recommends that the University provides all faculty more clarity and transparency for all levels of promotions. **In particular, the Committee recommends that service/citizenship is recognized and rewarded in promotions cases, which in turn would also help to address the problem identified both by current and previous heads of department, whereby certain faculty members did not provide sufficient service/citizenship.**

Also with respect to promotions, the Committee’s previous recommendation for the creation of Awards for Excellent Teaching in the Teaching and Learning section of this Report could then feed into promotions by constituting further evidence of teaching excellence for promotions cases. (Notably, these awards would be independent of student surveys.)

The Committee noted from the Head of the Department that some faculty refused to serve as requested for service positions, and among the faculty, some expressed unfair (and unequal) teaching loads. **The Committee thus recommends that the Department conducts a data gathering exercise on the teaching undertaken by all faculty (hours, type of course, number of students), as well as supervision, and all aspects of service by faculty.** This could take the form of a spreadsheet, which will be available to all faculty and updated regularly. Other means could also be used for the same goal of transparency, if some other way could be adapted to better suit the culture of the Department. In any case, the result should be greater transparency and equity to all faculty with regard to workloads. In part, such transparency in workloads would lessen the problem of “the few faculty members who repeatedly fail to fulfill their basic duties” (p 55).

The Department evaluated its overall performance in Academic Faculty and Human Resources:

(1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs significant improvements, 3=needs minor improvements, 4=satisfactory, 5=highly satisfactory)

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the Department's overall performance in Academic Faculty and Human Resources:

	1	2	3	4	5
			X		

The Committee assesses that the University is in need of improving both its promotions and recruitment procedures. These are the primary reasons for the assessment by the Committee.

3.7 Diversity

The Department endorses the vision of HUJI that defines diversity as a condition for academic excellence. The Committee acknowledges the progress the Department has made with regard to gender equality.

Regarding diversity for minorities, the Committee commends the University on recognizing “the general secondary education issued by Jordan to, among others, Palestinian residents of East Jerusalem” (p. 65). The Committee also understands from the President of the University that it has introduced a one-year preparation for “Arab students from East-Jerusalem” (see also Annex 3.5-I of the Self-Evaluation Report).

Overall, the Committee encourages the Department to continue with its efforts to increase gender equality and diversity in the student body and faculty. A more proactive approach in recruiting a more diverse faculty could involve talent scouting and headhunting.

The Department evaluated its overall performance in Diversity:

(1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs significant improvements, 3=needs minor improvements, 4=satisfactory, 5=highly satisfactory)

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the Department's overall performance in Diversity:

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Committee concurs with the Department’s rating of its overall performance in “Diversity”.

3.8 Research

The Department is a leading Political Science department in Israel and internationally. Faculty members conduct cutting-edge research and publish in top-ranked journals and presses. Many have been awarded multiple research grants from national as well as international funding institutions, including the Israeli Science Foundation and the European Research Council. With more than 140 articles, around 20 books, and close to 70 chapters in edited volumes and handbooks, the overall research output of the Department in the past five years is remarkable.

The Committee is impressed by the breadth and depth of the Department’s research. It is also pleased to see that high quality research is not limited to the senior faculty. Dr. Roni Porat, who has been a non-tenured Senior Lecturer in the Department since 2020, for instance, is a prolific scholar who has consistently published in high-impact journals on cutting-edge topics, such as the role of emotions in politics. Her h-score compares well to that of senior faculty.

At the same time, the Committee notes some variation in the research productivity among the faculty, which is also mentioned in the Self-Evaluation Report (p. 75). The Committee suggests considering further assisting and incentivizing faculty in conducting and publishing high-quality research, e.g. by providing additional research funds. This would also encourage more student involvement in the Department’s research. Nonetheless, students were enthusiastic about how much they learned by working as research assistants.

Overall the Committee is satisfied with the level of research output by the Political Science Department. However, the Committee is also sensitive to the views of some faculty that insufficient attention is given to research which does not generate high journal impact, or a large number of citations. The Committee understands that the Dean has published research in the area of “impact,” and would encourage the University to take into consideration a broader operationalization of impact. For instance, Gideon Rahat, full professor and current Head of the Department, has published internationally on party and personalized politics, including several books with university presses. But he also has several publications in Hebrew with the Israel Institute for Democracy, which is important to meet HUJI’s goal of the “expansion of the boundaries of knowledge for the benefit of all humanity” (p. 9).

Finally, hiring a specialist on Israeli politics and a political methodologist would further strengthen the research excellence of the Department (see above, section 3.6).

The Department evaluated its overall performance in Research:

(1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs significant improvements, 3=needs minor improvements, 4=satisfactory, 5=highly satisfactory)

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the Department's overall performance in Research:

	1	2	3	4	5
				X	

The Committee concurs with the Department’s rating of its overall performance in “Research”.

3.9 Infrastructure

Overall, the infrastructure available to the Department is satisfactory. However, there are significant space constraints. The Committee welcomes the construction of a new floor in the

Social Sciences wing, which will provide more space for seminars and graduate students. The Committee encourages HUJI to continue the upgrading of the technical infrastructure. All working spaces, including those of PhD students, should have access to WiFi. From our conversations with PhD students, WiFi is not always available and students have had to provide their own wired connection.

The Committee commends the University on adding signs in Arabic.

The library appears up-to-date. Neither students nor faculty raised any concerns with regard to the availability of databases, journals and books. Assistance to the teaching and learning process is provided. The Committee is particularly impressed with the collection of Arabic texts.

The Department evaluated its overall performance in Infrastructure:

(1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs significant improvements, 3=needs minor improvements, 4=satisfactory, 5=highly satisfactory)

	1	2	3	4	5
			X		

The Evaluation Committee evaluated the Department's overall performance in Infrastructure:

	1	2	3	4	5
			X		

The Committee concurs with the Department's rating of its overall performance in "Infrastructure".

Section 4: Recommendations

Essential

The Committee recommends that the Department as a whole invests effort in thoughtful reflection to identify strategic directions for where it sees itself in five years, and link this to its recruitment goals and study program.

The Committee recommends that the University gathers data on student enrollment in Political Science to provide an evidence-based foundation for action.

The Committee recommends that CHE discusses the process of recruitment directly with the Hebrew University leadership, including ways to lessen the incentivization of gaming in the recruitment process.

Important

The Committee recommends the appointment of two new positions in the Department, one in Israeli Politics and one in Political Methodology.

The Committee recommends that the University works with the Department to make more transparent the criteria for promotion across research, teaching and service/citizenship, and elevates the significance given to service/citizenship.

Desirable

The Committee recommends that the Department should conduct a data gathering exercise on all aspects of teaching and service undertaken by faculty.

The Committee recommends that the University, Faculty, and Department consider creating awards for effective teaching, including departmental awards, faculty-wide awards, and awards by the student union.

Signed by:

Prof. Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey
Committee Chair

Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey

Prof. Dr. Tanja A. Börzel

Tanja A. Börzel

Prof. James Perry

James L. Perry

Appendix I: Letter of Appointment



July 2022

Prof. Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey
Department of Government
London School of Economics
UK

Dear Professor,

The Israeli Council for Higher Education (CHE) strives to ensure the continuing excellence and quality of Israeli higher education through a systematic evaluation process. By engaging upon this mission, the CHE seeks: to enhance and ensure the quality of academic studies, to provide the public with information regarding the quality of study programs in institutions of higher education throughout Israel, and to ensure the continued integration of the Israeli system of higher education in the international academic arena.

As part of this important endeavor we reach out to world renowned academicians to help us meet the challenges that confront the Israeli higher education by accepting our invitation to participate in our international evaluation committees. This process establishes a structure for an ongoing consultative process around the globe on common academic dilemmas and prospects.

I therefore deeply appreciate your willingness to join us in this crucial enterprise.

It is with great pleasure that I hereby appoint you to serve as the chair of the Council for Higher Education's Committee for the Evaluation of **Political Science and International Relations** departments. In addition to yourself, the composition of the Committee will be as follows: Prof. Tanja A. Börzel, Prof. Joel Migdal, Prof. James Perry, Prof. Avner de Shalit, Prof. Cameron Thies.

Ms. Pe'er Baris-Barnea will be the coordinator of the Committee.

I wish you much success in your role as a member of this most important committee.

Sincerely,

Prof. Edit Tshuva,
Vice Chair,
The Council for Higher Education (CHE)

Enclosures: Appendix to the Appointment Letter of Evaluation Committees

cc: Dr. Varda Ben-Shaul, Deputy Director-General for QA, CHE
Dr. Liran Gordon, Senior Advisor for Evaluation and Quality Enhancement
Ms. Pe'er Baris-Barnea, Committee Coordinator