

**Report of the Dean of Academics to the Academic Council on the  
2020 IWP Curriculum Review (Year 2)  
17 June 2020**

I have received the reports of the faculty members that reviewed all five master's degree and all 17 graduate certificate programs. (NB: the Doctor of Statecraft and National Security degree was not reviewed this year, as it is still a new program and because it was substantially revised in the fall of 2018. It will be considered in subsequent curriculum reviews.) Below, please find my general findings and recommendations for strengthening the IWP curriculum. In almost all cases, my recommendations track with those of multiple IWP faculty members, operating independently. The reviewers also offered a number of constructive criticisms and suggestions for specific classes. In the interest of brevity, I will refrain from documenting them in this report and will instead reach out directly to individual faculty members to discuss these recommendations.

This report will first explain the methodology used to conduct this year's review, then outline the key school-wide findings of the review. It will then provide my prioritized list of academic topics of which IWP should seek to enhance its coverage by adding new courses. Finally, it will briefly discuss in more detail each of the degree and certificate programs.

*Methodology*

In the spring of 2019, based on feedback we received from Middle States, the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) recommended a change to the way IWP conducts curriculum reviews. In previous years, the Dean of Academics and the Academic Director were the primary authors of the curriculum review report, which was then provided to the committee for review and comment. The 2019 CRC instead recommended that the CR process be a three-year cycle that was more "bottom-up" than "top-down" and that permitted greater faculty involvement. The new process, which the Academic Council approved last year, is organized as follows: in Year 1 of the cycle, the CRC reviews IWP's mission, Institutional Objectives, Institutional Learning Objectives, and Program Learning Objectives; in Year 2 of the cycle (this year), faculty members review the specific academic programs and courses to determine whether the programs adequately meet the specified learning outcomes and whether there is unnecessary duplication of material; during Year 3, individual faculty members are charged with reviewing their individual syllabi based on the findings and recommendations of the Year 2 CR report.

The full-time faculty members conducted the 2020 curriculum review between March and May 2020, with each faculty member reviewing a selection of programs and answering the following questions:

- a) Do the required courses have substantial overlap in the topics covered or the course readings used?

- b) Are there significant scholarly gaps in the course readings? Is the material out-of-date, or is there new scholarship that needs coverage?
- c) Are there major topics in the field which the degree/ certificate does not adequately cover?
- d) Are the courses required for the degree, certificate, or specialization the right ones or should other courses take their place or be added?

The only exception to this process was the review of the three political philosophy courses (Ideas and Values in International Politics; American Founding Principles and Foreign Policy; and Western Moral Tradition and World Politics). Because of the specialized nature of these classes, they were reviewed separately from the rest of the curriculum.

It should be noted that, because some courses are required for several different degrees, several faculty members reviewed the same courses. In all such cases, their findings were largely consistent with one another, thus strengthening the overall case for some adjustments to the curriculum.

### *Summary of IWP-Wide Findings*

In general, the faculty felt that our overall curriculum was sound and broadly consistent with the school's mission and learning outcomes. They felt that students who studied and successfully completed our program would be well-prepared for a successful career in international affairs and national security. At the same time, they did note a number of gaps and areas in need of improvement.

#### Revise Political Philosophy Classes

Perhaps the most significant proposed change is in the required political philosophy courses. Currently, all students in any of the 52 credit M.A. programs must take 8 credits (2 courses) in political philosophy while Executive M.A. and Professional M.A. students take 2 and 4 credits, respectively. In his review of the three political philosophy classes, Dr. Wood found relatively little overlap between the courses, but does suggest a way of improving our coverage of the topic while reducing the total number of credits (most) students will take in political philosophy. Based on his findings and recommendations, I am proposing the following:

- Change the three political philosophy courses to 15 week, 1.5 hour classes, becoming 2-credit classes;
- Require all standard M.A. students to take all three of these classes, rather than simply two of them; and
- Take the two "leftover" credits and create a required capstone course that all standard M.A. students will have to take at some point in the final year of their studies at IWP.

Executive M.A. students, who currently take the two credit Political and Moral Philosophy class, would simply take the new, two credit version of Western Moral Tradition and World

Politics. Professional M.A. students would simply take any combination of four credits worth of these classes.

I seek Academic Council approval to make the following changes to the curriculum, beginning in the Fall 2020 semester:

- Change IWP 608 and IWP 615 into 15 week, two-credit classes, per Dr. Wood's request;
- Require all standard Master's students to take the revised 606, 608 and 615 courses;
- Require all Executive M.A. students to take the revised 615 course (they currently take a two credits version of it);
- Require all Professional M.A. students to take any four credits of political philosophy (same as they do now);
- Required all DSNS students without an IWP degree to take both 6060 and 6080; and
- Work with members of the faculty to design a capstone course, to be taught for the first time in Spring 2021. (NB: It is standard IWP policy to "grandfather" students' graduation requirements based on their date of matriculation. Therefore, only students enrolling this fall will be required to take the capstone course before graduating. Current students will simply have this as an option.)

### Update Course Readings

One of the most common observations across all reviewers was the need to update required readings in our courses. While students absolutely must be familiar with certain classic works in their fields, they also need to have better awareness of current scholarship. Too many of the readings are significantly dated while too much high-quality, more recent scholarship is being ignored. In addition, many of the more current readings are newspaper articles, blog posts, and other material that often lack scholarly rigor. While it is true that newer does not necessarily mean better, it is also true that greater access to archives, government documents, and other materials permit a more accurate understanding of historical events. In short, we need to strike a better balance between classic works and genuine contemporary scholarship.

To address this issue, I intend to send a note to all faculty asking them to look for ways to add new scholarship to their courses and pointing out that finding such scholarship is a great task for interns, should they agree to take one on. It's also possible, if I take on some interns this fall, to ask them to do some research for a number of the professors.

### Rebalance Course Coverage

Just as some of our readings are dated, many reviewers made a similar observation regarding the time periods covered in some of our courses. Several noted that a number of our courses are "Cold War heavy," with a large percentage (and in some cases an overwhelming majority) of the class covering Cold War events or using primarily Cold War examples. It should be noted that students have, for years, made similar observations. While much can and should be

learned from U.S. experiences in the Cold War, it has been 30 years since the Wall came down. We need to ensure that our courses address post-Cold War and contemporary developments, as well.

To address this issue, I will also encourage faculty to adjust and update their courses. In addition, I will prioritize adding courses with a more contemporary focus.

#### Better Incorporation of USG Information

Some reviewers noted that many of our courses do not assign official U.S. government documents or really focus on U.S. government definitions or doctrine. (It should, however, be noted that this assessment is based solely on information gleaned from the syllabi. It is very possible that this information is sufficiently covered in class lectures.) Given that many of our graduates go into government jobs, providing this knowledge to them at IWP will ultimately make them more effective and enhance their professional growth.

As with the other observations above, I will encourage faculty to assign such material and to be certain to address (where appropriate) U.S. government definitions and doctrine.

#### Enhance Coverage of Foreign Government Perspectives and Organizations

Given that part of IWP's mission is to teach our students to see the world as it really is, ensuring that they understand how other governments and cultures think is crucial. Yet there are indications that this topic is given relatively little systemic coverage in our courses (again, based solely on the syllabi, but reinforced by student survey data). Similarly, while many courses offer at least some explanation of the structure and functioning of the U.S. government, there is little to suggest that many of our courses do the same for our allies, partners, or (most importantly) adversaries. Once again, this type of knowledge is not only important in and of itself, but is valuable for the long-term professional success of our graduates.

Once again, I think the best way to address this possible shortfall is to encourage faculty to incorporate, as appropriate, this material into their courses. It should also be noted that, if the political philosophy requirements are changed as outlined above, ALL students will take Ideas and Values, meaning they all will get at least some exposure to the ideologies of foreign governments.

#### Reexamine Electives

Several reviewers noted that some of the courses that count towards various degrees or specializations have little to do with the program focus. For example, IWP 659 (Enemy Threat Doctrine of Global Jihadism) counts towards the Intelligence specialization within the SNSA degree, even though it has very little to do with intelligence.

To address this problem, I will review all electives for every degree and certificate program and present a proposed list of changes to the Academic Council for approval.

*Academic Development Priorities*

There is no shortage of areas where, given unlimited resources, IWP could gainfully expand its course offerings. Yet neither our financial resources nor our enrollment permits such actions. Instead, we need to be strategic, focusing our efforts on the highest payoff, most needed investments. With this idea in mind, I am offering my prioritized list of the general areas that will require the greatest emphasis in the development of new courses and faculty for the next several years. Most of these areas have been identified by more than one of the faculty reviewers.

1. **Cyber Intelligence:** This topic has been repeatedly mentioned as an area of significant weakness in our course offerings. We currently have a total of six credits in cyber-related matters (Cyber Terrorism; Cyber Strategy Development; and Cyber Statecraft, all two credits). Yet we lack a four-credit foundational course in cyber, though one is currently in development. If we wish to create a specialization in cyber intelligence for the SIS degree, we will need at least six more credits worth of classes.
2. **Military/Defense Policy:** The only course we offer that directly addresses defense policy is IWP 679 Defense Strategy, Planning and Budgeting. IWP 616 U.S. National Security Strategy and Emerging Threats touches on defense matters, but more in the context of external threats than internal workings, while IWP 628 Military Strategy is more theoretical than practical. The other defense courses are highly specialized on topics such as nuclear deterrence, irregular warfare, and military intelligence. Additional courses on such topics as military (or military/diplomatic) history or civil-military relations should be considered.
3. **Regional Studies:** The Asian program would benefit from a course on regional history or at least one on the history of U.S. policy in the region. (IWP 671 does offer a solid history of U.S.-China relations, but does not cover the U.S. relationship with the rest of the region.) The European program needs serious attention, as three-fourths of the courses are taught by the same professor (Dr. Chodakiewicz). Courses on contemporary European politics or European institutions would be valuable additions. The Middle East program needs a course on Israel/Israeli security in addition to a course on U.S. policy in the region.
4. **Diplomacy:** Apart from IWP 636 The Art of Diplomacy and IWP 682 International Organizations and Multilateral Diplomacy, we have very few courses that cover diplomacy. A course on diplomatic history would be helpful, as would potentially reviving IWP 614 Diplomacy Toward Comparative Regimes.

While there is always the possibility that we add courses not suggested above, this list captures, in my view, the areas most in need of attention. I request the Academic Council endorse this list.

### *Individual Degree and Certificate Programs*

In the sections below, I will attempt to summarize the general findings of the faculty review of our academic programs. I also will not repeat findings discussed in the school-wide assessment provided above. In general, the faculty expressed satisfaction with the basic structure

of the programs but offered suggestions for changes to improve them. At this time, I am not asking for Academic Council approval for any of the changes suggested below. There are several and addressing all of them at the same time could get unwieldy. After the Academic Council reviews and makes decisions on the Institute-wide changes discussed above, I will reengage with the Council to consider these and other proposed changes to each individual degree.

#### M.A. in Statecraft and National Security Affairs

In terms of the overall degree requirements, the reviewer found no major areas of unnecessary overlap or redundancy. One weakness that was identified, however, was that there was no required course on military policy or strategy. He suggested we consider requiring Military Strategy for the degree. The reviewer also pointed out that cyber issues need better coverage, whether we are talking about cyber intelligence, cyber attack/defense, or cyber influence. He suggested that we consider having some requirement that students take a cyber class. My own view is that, while I absolutely think we owe it to the students to address cyber issues, we need to be careful about adding additional requirements to our degrees. Additionally, given the broad array of specializations in this degree, it is not clear what a course that adequately covered the entire array of cyber issues would look like. In my view, a better approach would be to attempt to incorporate cyber issues into the individual courses. For example, IWP 628 could have a seminar on theories of cyber conflict while the individual statecraft classes focus specifically on how cyber influences the tool in question.

The reviewer also made the following suggestions regarding enhancements to the individual specializations:

- Homeland Security: If we intend to keep this specialization, we absolutely must find a new faculty member to teach IWP 664 Foundations in Homeland Security.
- Intelligence: Eliminate IWP 637 Public Diplomacy and Strategic Influence as an optional required course and require students to choose either the Propaganda or Political Warfare class.
- National Security and Defense Studies: Reconsider the area studies requirement and require the Military Strategy class.
- Public Diplomacy and Strategic Influence: There is significant, perhaps too much, overlap between this and the Intelligence specialization.

#### M.A. in Statecraft and International Affairs

Apart from the questionable applicability of some of the electives in the individual specializations discussed above, there were no major changes recommended to the degree program.

#### M.A. in Strategic Intelligence Studies

Approximately one year ago, Dr. Thomas and several members of the intelligence faculty completed an analysis similar to the one done for the curriculum review this year. As a result of that analysis, in November 2019, the Academic Council approved making IWP 681 Intelligence and the Law a required course for the degree and making IWP 631 Foreign Propaganda,

Perceptions and Policy an optional required class, along with IWP 656 Intelligence Collection and IWP 668 The Role and Importance of Human Intelligence. This change goes into effect in the fall of 2020.

Dr. Thomas and the faculty also made revisions to several intelligence courses in order to reduce unnecessary duplication. In light of those changes, I determined that there was no need to conduct further analysis of the SIS degree this year.

#### M.A. in Strategic and International Studies (Professional)

The reviewer noted no excessive duplication of topics or readings. He did suggest a few modifications to the degree requirements. First, he recommends that IWP 616 U.S. National Security Strategy and Emerging Threats replace IWP 659 Enemy Threat Doctrine of Global Jihadism as a required class. Given that jihadism is no longer the only, nor even the greatest, threat to the United States, a broader course that surveys all the major threats makes more sense for this degree. I endorse this change.

Second, he recommends that the two credit IWP 674 National Security Policy Directed Study take the place of the four credit IWP 601 National Security Policy Process. Doing so would free up two credits that students could use to take an additional two credits in their chosen field. I have no objection to this change but believe the Academic Council needs to study this potential change more closely before making a determination.

Third, he recommends permitting students to take both IWP 663 Cyber Statecraft and IWP 665 Corporate Statecraft as a fulfillment of one of their two required statecraft courses. I do not support this change but seek the thoughts of the other members of the Council.

#### Executive M.A. in National Security Affairs

The review found no significant gaps or excessive overlaps in the curriculum but did offer a number of recommendations. First, the reviewer raised the question of whether or not students should be required to take a course on China, given the current global situation. Right now, students in this program can choose to take either IWP 603 Russian Politics and Foreign Policy, IWP 630 Chinese Grand Strategy: Foreign and Military Policy, IWP 659 Enemy Threat Doctrine of Global Jihadism, or IWP 680 Modern China. In my view, the program needs to remain flexible enough to meet the students' needs. As important as China is, not all our potential students' professional responsibilities involve China. Since most students seeking an Executive M.A. are already accomplished professionals, it makes more sense to me to permit more customization of the degree, rather than less. For that reason, I do not support this proposed change.

Second, the reviewer suggests that, if we do not require a China class, we include a class on cyber issues or on military strategy to be options in addition to the choice of IWP 603/630/659/680 discussed above. I'm more supportive of this idea, given my preference for a more flexible executive degree.

Third, the current degree requires students take either Public Diplomacy and Strategic Influence or Political Warfare: Past, Present and Future. The reviewer recommends removing the public diplomacy course and instead permitting the Foreign Propaganda, Perceptions, and Policy to count towards that requirement. I support this change.

### *Conclusion*

In summary, the general finding of the 2020 Curriculum Review was that our academic programs are strong but do have some areas that need to be improved. I would like to take this opportunity to thank each member of the full-time faculty who contributed to this significant undertaking. I look forward to discussing this report with you at our earliest convenience.