



EVALUATION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE STUDIES

REICHMAN 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 was pleased to meet with the President, the Provost, the Dean of the Lauder School, the Heads of the study programs, senior academic faculty, adjuncts, students, and alumni, and is thankful for their time and effort to attend the meetings. All the participants were enthusiastic, and it is apparent that they take pride in the Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy and Strategy.

The Committee was impressed with a number of features of the School, including:

1. The leadership of the Dean, who has made great strides in curriculum reform, and in inspiring his faculty to be committed both to the Institution and its students;
2. The research excellence of the faculty, which was apparent both in the quality of publications, and in the interconnectedness of the faculty to public policy issues confronting Israel and the world;
3. The level of overall student and alumni satisfaction with their educational experiences in the School and the University;
4. The campus, which the Committee found to be an inviting and attractive environment in which to study and conduct research.

The Committee was, however, constrained in its efforts to probe the University and School for further information and details relating to the Self-Evaluation Report. This was a feature that stemmed in part from several obstacles during the visit, namely, the excessive number of participants in some meetings and the opaqueness of the Self-Evaluation Report itself, particularly with respect to aspects of self-reflection and self-criticism. The opening video and tours of the communication museum and psychology-neuroscience laboratory could have been replaced with a more targeted engagement with the Committee on potential gaps between aspiration and performance.

This report provides some key recommendations. Most importantly, the Committee recommends an extended period of intensive reflection on, and development of, the intellectual and theoretical foundations of the study programs within the Lauder School by faculty and administrative staff.

Section 3: Observations

3.1 The Institution and the Parent Unit

The Dean should be commended for his enthusiasm, direction, and clarity of vision for the Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy and Strategy. The Committee applauds the overall mission of Reichman University in its goal of making the Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy and Strategy a leading institution.

From the Committee's conversations with students and alumni it is clear that Reichman University and the Lauder School have made progress in their aspirations to cultivate and develop future leaders.

The Committee notes that Reichman University and the Lauder School are organized in a top-down managerial structure, which apparently functions well in the view of current faculty. However, **the Committee suggests that the university and School might want to consider ways in which faculty input, for example, on recruitment, may broaden and enrich the decision-making process.**

3.2 Internal Quality Assurance

The Committee understands the self-evaluation process as an opportunity for the University to delve deeply into both its strengths and areas that need additional thought and work. The meeting of University personnel and the Committee provides an opportunity to brainstorm about what they have been doing, what they need to be doing, and what they wish to be doing.

Both in the Self-Evaluation Report and in the meetings with the Committee, the University did an excellent job in listing its strengths and elaborating the reforms they have recently undertaken. The Committee felt, though, that the reflection about areas that could be improved, and areas of weakness were very limited. The key weakness noted in the "Internal Quality Assurance" section in the Self-Evaluation Report was the lack of an alumni database. In the Self-Evaluation Report and its executive summary, a number of weaknesses were listed, but more broadly, there seemed little attempt to scrutinize and reflect more deeply on the substance of the School and the intellectual foundation of the curriculum.

The Committee understands from its conversations with the leadership that the Lauder School sees itself as a hybrid model that bridges public policy, political science, and international relations. The Committee found it difficult, however, to discern how this hybrid model is underpinned by a cohesive intellectual and theoretical foundation. The Committee would expect to find such a foundation in an institution that prides itself on being a "leading institution of higher education in the field of political science" (p. 4, Self-Evaluation Report).

The Committee recommends an extended period of intensive reflection on the intellectual foundations of the study programs within the Lauder School by faculty and administrative staff.

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			

There was a mismatch in expectations between the Institution and the Committee. On the one hand, the Committee, on behalf of the CHE expected a self-reflective report and discussion during its visit. On the other hand, the Institution appeared to use this process in a promotional manner.

3.3 The Department/Study Program

The School's mission is to prepare its students to be leaders and contribute to society. The School offers two simultaneous BA programs, one in Hebrew and one in English for international students. Students in both the Hebrew program and in the international program are very satisfied with the programs and the accessibility to their teachers, in particular to the Dean. Most teachers teach in both programs. The program in Hebrew also includes courses taught in English, and students are required to take two such courses.

The School is in the process of implementing a curricular reform. First-year students take seven introductory courses and study core courses for their first three semesters. They then choose a specialization track from the following: Security Studies and Counter-Terrorism; Contemporary Middle East; Diplomacy and Global Affairs; Public Policy and Administration; and Data, Government and Democracy (the parallel international program currently offers three of these tracks). The other components of this reform are practical workshops, changing many courses from 2 hours to 4 hours, and introducing new internships, which are accompanied by final project assignments.

The curricular reform is promising, innovative, and thoughtful. However, the Committee is concerned that the reform might lead to fragmentation and loss of cohesiveness. When the Committee met with the 9 Programs Heads (including MA programs), the faculty members insisted that there was no problem of too much fragmentation, as they work across subject matters even if they have their own expertise. And yet, the underlying structure of the

program did not seem clear to all faculty. For example, the Committee was uncertain whether the Program Heads knew which introductory courses were given to all students. It is also difficult to understand from the Self-Evaluation Report and additional material whether there are courses, for example, in the introduction to comparative politics or in political science in general.

The study program consists of several courses, such as professional workshops on creativity and problem solving, often taught by practitioners. These are meant to empower the students and prepare them for leadership roles. In addition, the program has a number of courses on contemporary issues such as Gender and the #MeToo movement, which the students find relevant, attractive and inspiring. The School also updated its teaching methods and introduced new approaches such as project-based learning. The Committee applauds these methods and approaches.

The Committee is also impressed with the way in which the program empowers students and prepares them to become entrepreneurs, leaders, etc. However, in its discussions with the students, the Committee found that they were not clear about the discipline or disciplines they studied. The Committee does not subscribe to the view that there is a single way to teach politics, IR, government, or public policy. However, **the Committee suggests that the intellectual and theoretical foundations of the program should be strengthened and made clearer, precisely because the School offers a multidisciplinary approach.**

Students praised both the School and their study programs. One alumna said she had started to study abroad and found her studies boring. When she came to the Reichman University she found the program “mind-blowing.” Students and alumni seemed to be extremely enthusiastic about the content of the program and the overall experience.

The MA program was not given enough focus during the visit, so the Committee is unable to fully evaluate this program. In particular the Committee was disappointed that the meeting designated for MA students was predominantly populated by TAs, who were not studying in the program. Consequently, this lessened the Committee's ability to probe the quality of the MA program.

Moreover, the Committee notes two issues. First, on p. 36 of the Self-Evaluation Report, the scheduling of courses in the MA program falls on Thursdays and Fridays, which thereby may compromise the abilities of some religious groups to fully participate in the program. Second, according to the Self-Evaluation Report and the Committee's discussions with faculty members, there is an issue of too large class sizes in the MA program.

The Committee commends the informal tutorial that is given by the lecturers when “research cadets” take part in research in the institutes and then co-publish articles with their professors.

The Committee was told by the students that not enough academic guidance and supervision is given to those who wish to study abroad for postgraduate studies. At the same time, students did share their appreciation of how easy it is to find one's way to the lecturer's office and consult with him or her on any topic.

The School did not mention many weaknesses or challenges in its study program in the Self-Evaluation Report, although the above comments suggest that some challenges do indeed exist. Nonetheless, the Committee is impressed with the reforms implemented and with the sincere attempt to improve and update the program.

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 concurs with the Department's performance in "The Department/Study Program".

3.4 Teaching and Learning Outcomes

The Self-Evaluation Report discusses Reichman University's Teaching Innovation Unit (TIU), which provides university-wide support for training current and new faculty, and pedagogy. The TIU supports workshops (in-person and online), advanced technological tools, and personal guidance for faculty. Although the Committee did not visit the TIU, none of the information received contradicts the adequacy of the overall support for current and new faculty. The positive feedback from students about their educational experience is an indirect endorsement for what TIU does.

The Self-Evaluation Report identifies three methods for evaluating quality of teaching: teaching surveys; reviews by the Department chair (presumed here to be Program Heads and the Dean, as noted in the Self-Evaluation Report); and meeting with class representatives.

The primary method for evaluating teaching is teaching surveys. However, the Self-Evaluation Report notes that: "The main problem, and one intensified by the move to online surveys, is a low student response rate" (p. 27). During the Committee's on-site interviews, it did not receive any information about whether low student-response rates have improved. **Given the**

heavy reliance on teaching surveys, the Committee encourages faculty and the administration to continue to use available tools to improve response rates.

In the Committee’s interviews, Program Heads noted the value of reviews by administrators and meetings with class representatives, which augment student teaching evaluations. Program Heads reported that the Dean and Heads meet regularly with first-, second- and third-year BA students, and MA students. In these meetings, students are able to raise issues with the Dean and Program Head. The meetings lead to both commendations and criticisms of faculty teaching. In light of strong support for faculty teaching and commitments to students that the Committee heard in its conversations with current students and alumni, the two methods to augment teaching evaluations appear to be helpful for achieving that goal.

The Committee sampled a large number of the more than 80 syllabi accompanying the Self-Evaluation Report to assess the presence of Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) written by instructors for students in their courses. The sample syllabi were uneven in their presentation of ILOs, with some syllabi giving little attention formally to learning objectives, others with some attention to ILOs, and still others with detailed ILOs. The Self-Evaluation Report indicated that project-based learning is a future avenue for improving learning outcomes, but the Committee received no evidence or interview comments about this process. Having said that, in our interviews, students commented that the course objectives as set out by the instructors were clear and were achieved.

The Self-evaluation Report notes that: “Many of the challenges related to teaching and learning outcomes, [...] are addressed at the level of the University” (p. 31). The Committee was not made privy to the outcomes of these University-level actions to address challenges related to teaching and learning outcomes.

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 was not able to verify that ILOs are created for each class and are part of curricular assessment processes. The Committee's rating reflects its inability to document the application and use of ILOs.

3.5 Students

The School has sizeable enrolments in both the Hebrew and international programs. Admission to the program is decided at the university level, and it is based on a rather high threshold. When granted only on the basis of a matriculation certificate, the matriculation average needed is above 100; when admissions is based on the psychometric test only, the grade required is 650 and above, plus evidence of being entitled to a matriculation certificate. Special categories of admission take into account candidates' special qualifications and experience, such as service in the IDF, excellence in music or in sports.

The Committee notes that the relationships between the Israeli and international students were not clear. Some lecturers thought that there was a lot of cooperation and many meetings between the two groups. Others mentioned the age gap as an obstacle. According to the students, Hebrew/English language barriers seemed to be an issue amongst some of the students. In particular, (1) some remarked that language differences separated students into groups in social settings; and (2) there was a remark that Israeli students were given preferential treatment.

According to the Self-Evaluation Report the number of students enrolling has been declining. The Committee understands that the School believes that this is part of a national, perhaps even international trend, and yet the School is conscious of this trend and regards it as one of its main challenges.

The Committee notes that the dropout numbers are worrying. In the BA in Hebrew they reach 20% and 25%, and in the BA in English the rate is as high as 38%, although the Committee understands that the rate has improved in recent years.

According to the Self-Evaluation Report and the Committee's meeting with the President and the Dean, the University is satisfied with the number of Arab students enrolled in the program. From conversations during its visit, the Committee understands that Arab students comprise just 2.5% of the study body, although the Committee was unable to confirm this figure, as the requested data from the University were not provided. Conversations with faculty and students suggest that more can be done to increase intake of Arab students. Some of the lecturers we talked to believe that the high tuition fees are an obstacle. Others mentioned that language for Arab students was an issue and while their Hebrew reading was satisfactory, expressing themselves orally or in writing was more of a challenge to them. Nonetheless, the Committee learned that every Arab student who is accepted to the University can sign up for a program whereby they are assigned a mentor for their second year. Overall, **the Committee suggests improving access for Arab students by, for example, providing additional scholarships to these students.**

Financial aid is given to one-sixth of the students, and the overall University aid amounts to 30M Shekels. All Israeli students of Ethiopian origin are entitled to scholarships. The University claims that it has the highest number of Ethiopian students in any Israeli academic institution.

The Committee is impressed with the attachment that students and alumni feel towards the School. In particular, students enjoy the multiple topics they study, the internships, the special study trips in Israel and abroad, and the accessibility of the lecturers. Students are extremely enthusiastic about the content of the program and the overall experience in the University, including – and this was mentioned time and again – the personal connections with other students and the networking that studying at Reichman University offers. Students and alumni also remarked on the close ties with faculty both during and after their studies.

According to the Self-Evaluation Report, “a significant number of BA students in government have continued to study toward an advanced degree at our university” (Extras, file 34), and 35 students have completed or are in the process of PhD study, some of them in Israel and some in prestigious universities abroad. The alumni with whom the Committee met cited the importance of their education in securing important positions in the private and public sectors, as well as in non-profit organizations.

The Committee asked the students what their plans in life were, and many mentioned going to high-tech industries or studying abroad. The students also mentioned that they had acquired very good practical tools for these. However, some students thought that the School should encourage its students to go into politics or seek positions in civil society instead of gravitating towards high-tech positions.

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 Committee concurs with the Department’s performance in “Students”.

3.6 Academic Faculty and Human Resources

The Committee met with the University President and Provost, the Dean of the Lauder School, the Heads of the various BA and MA study programs, and several senior academic faculty. The Committee was particularly impressed with the vision, energy, focus, clarity and proactiveness of the Dean, and in the view of the Committee, the Dean is an excellent representative and leader of the School. The Dean articulated the key differences between the Lauder School and a typical political science department as being the focus of the former on: democratic principles, social responsibility, student-oriented ethos, interdisciplinarity, and an orientation towards practical instruction.

Faculty who also served as Heads of study programs were enthusiastic about the School and University, as were senior faculty. However, the large number of participants from the School who participated in these meetings made it difficult for the Committee to home in on, and clarify key aspects of concern, such as recruitment and promotion, professional development, the adequateness of pedagogical training, and so on. For instance, the Committee was told that younger faculty receive lower overall teaching loads than senior faculty, but we were unable to pursue this more fully. (The existence of personal contracts made it difficult for the Committee to discern and gauge disparities in workloads and other equity concerns.)

Notably, the Self-Evaluation Report notes that while pedagogical training is centralized within the University, any other professional development “is left to the faculty member’s own initiative” (p. 51). **The Committee agrees with the statement in the Report that the School could do more to provide professional development opportunities for its faculty.**

It was clear, however, that Program Heads and faculty were happy with the School and its leadership (one describing employment at the Lauder School as “an adventure”). Faculty respected and admired the current Dean, and all appeared to be fully on board with the curriculum reform initiated by the Dean. Overall, the collegiality among faculty in the School appeared to be strong, and the culture within the School is one of positive engagement among faculty in teaching and research.

The Committee noted that there seems to be no formal mentoring program in place for women junior faculty, although apparently informal arrangements exist to provide support. Faculty did not seem to be of the view that stronger measures were needed for more mentoring.

There did not seem to be a culture of involvement by the broader faculty in the recruitment process, either for recruiting the Dean or for new faculty recruitment. However, this top-down decision-making process for recruitment seemed to be accepted by faculty members. The Self-Evaluation Report describes, for example, that in a recent recruitment of a senior faculty member, “(s)everal candidates came to campus to deliver a talk and meet with faculty. The most suitable candidate received an offer, which he accepted. The entire process was rather short and efficient” (p. 44).

The Self-Evaluation Report noted that the Lauder School’s current 21 (apparently recently moving to 22) permanent faculty is insufficient for its teaching needs and so relies on a large number (150) of adjunct instructors. The Report notes that “(i)deally, the School would reduce its reliance on adjunct instructors by increasing the size of the permanent faculty” (p. 48), but

the Committee observes that it is difficult to envisage the level of recruitment that would be required to make a dent in the disparity between 21/22 permanent faculty and 150 adjuncts.

With respect to the promotions process, the Self-Evaluation Report notes that the “requirements and procedure for promotion are transparent”. In conversations with faculty, the feedback to the Committee was that faculty appeared to be content with the information and clarity of this promotion process.

The Lauder School endorses as part of its mission the focus, attention, and support for its students. It was clear that good interaction exists between faculty and students not only in the study program (discussed in section 3.3) but also in the area of research, as evidenced by the “student cadets” who, as the Committee understands, take part in research activities in the institutes and then subsequently publish materials that are co-authored with their professors.

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 concurs with the Department’s performance in “Academic Faculty and Human Resources”.

3.7 Diversity

The Committee recognizes and applauds the representation of women in senior positions at the University, including those of the Provost, CEO and Vice President, and various Deans. The Committee also notes that 9 out of 21 faculty members are women, with many of these at the level of professor. This gender diversity seems satisfactory..

From the Self-Evaluation Report, the University apparently has no formal minority policy for faculty. Regardless, it “does have a policy for nurturing minority students and ensuring that they enjoy equal opportunity” (p. 56). This includes having University-level programs for Arab students, those with disabilities, and those from disadvantaged backgrounds. However, the Report also recognizes that more can be done “to attract members of minorities to apply to study at the School, as well as for faculty positions at the School” (p. 58). **The Committee strongly supports this assessment and particularly recommends that more is done to attract Arab students, for instance, by way of scholarship (as noted above in section 3.5).** Moreover, while the Committee was told in conversations with faculty that two people were involved in recruiting and supporting both Arab and Ethiopian students, the Committee was unable to obtain clarity on whether the two staff members cited in these conversations were synonymous with the program which supports minority students more broadly.

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 suggests that minor improvements can be made in attracting Arab students, and thus assesses performance slightly lower.

3.8 Research

Both the quality and quantity of research of the faculty as a whole are at a high level. Some of the most senior faculty are internationally renowned scholars that have had a broad impact in their field. One professor, for example, has authored or co-authored 15 books, including ones with prestigious publishers, such as the university presses of Cambridge, Oxford, and Stanford.

Another faculty member is an example of someone recently promoted to the rank of associate professor. She has authored or co-authored 20 articles in refereed journals, including such influential journals as the *British Journal of Political Science* and the *Journal of Peace Research*.

Influential research has not been limited to the most senior faculty. Another recently appointed associate professor has, for instance, published numerous papers in refereed journals, some among the top in political science, and has authored and co-authored two books, one of which is award-winning. Practically all the faculty have been awarded multiple research grants. Many of these grant awards are from prestigious international funders of research. A number of faculty members are involved in collaborative research and publishing, some with international academics.

A good portion of the faculty’s research is in the field of international relations. This is reflected not only in their publications but in the curriculum as well.

There are four research institutes in the School. All seem to enable faculty members attached to them to fund, undertake, and publish their research. Research is both basic and applied. The research institutes are especially helpful in promoting applied research. This research is in line with the mission of the School and the University.

One of the highlights of the Committee’s campus visit was learning about the integration of students in faculty research, both at the BA and MA levels. The curriculum includes practical courses for students that “empower” them, teaching them how to write an article, how to present a paper, and more. The Committee members were told of an opportunity in which students are designated as “research cadets,” working together on a research paper with a faculty member. In the end, the student becomes a co-author on the paper. Some of these papers have been published in professional journals. These collaborations are most often through the four research institutes in the School.

Although teaching and service are taken into account in promotions, research appears to be the primary factor, both at the University level and promotion to full professor through the CHE process. For promotion, according to the Self-Evaluation report, a faculty member must have published at least two papers in A-ranked journals. Both books (especially in top academic publishers) and refereed articles in journals play key roles in promotion.

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 feels that the faculty as a whole has been exemplary in research and publishing.

3.9 Infrastructure

The Infrastructure of the University and the Lauder School is impressive. The buildings and grounds within the campus create an inviting place for students to come and linger.

Faculty offices are spacious. In one office that Committee members visited, the instructor said that he spends most of his working hours there, both for his writing as well as his meetings with students. Classrooms are attractive and well-suited to teaching. In sum, the School infrastructure is well suited to its needs.

The Committee was impressed with the library, at least with the short time that we spent there. The Committee was told that the library contains a large number of printed and digital volumes, especially for such a young university. The Committee was also informed that the library has the essential databases and research collections for faculty research and for students. Reference librarians are readily available for individual sessions with students. Additionally, the library provides workshops for students on how to best use the library for their research papers.

The Committee understands that the library does not, however, contain any academic texts in Arabic. Many classic and important contemporary works have been translated into Arabic. And so, **the Committee recommends that the library obtains such texts for the benefit of the Arabic language speakers.**

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 performance in "Infrastructure".

Section 4: Recommendations

Essential

The Committee recommends an extended period of intensive reflection on the intellectual and theoretical foundations of the study programs within the Lauder School by faculty and administrative staff.

Important

The Committee supports the Self-Evaluation Report's assessment that recruitment of more Arab students is required. The Committee recommends that more targeted scholarships be introduced to attract Arab students.

The committee recommends that the library obtain more Arabic texts for the benefit of the Arabic language speakers.

Desirable

The Committee echoes the statement in the Self-Evaluation Report which recommends that the School could do more to provide professional development opportunities for its faculty.

Signed by:

Prof. Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey
Committee Chair

Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey

Prof. Joel Migdal

Joel Migdal

Prof. James Perry

James L. Perry

Prof. Avner de Shalit

Avner de Shalit

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