

Security Policy Studies MA Program

Assessment of Learning Outcome – Cognitive Skills

June 2013

Below is a discussion and analysis of the SPS MA Program's indirect measure to assess student learning outcomes in terms of cognitive skills development. This is complimentary to our 2013 direct measure to assess student learning outcomes conducted through a survey administered to our current students and alumni about their cognitive skills development.

Context

In the "Assessment Plan for the Master's Degree in Security Policy Studies" the SPS Program Committee identified as a key learning outcome the development of our students' cognitive skills. This development of cognitive skills was to be obtained by students participating in a variety of SPS courses. Acquisition of those skills would be demonstrated through the successful completion of the SPS capstone project in the student's final semester of their degree.

The learning outcomes of these cognitive skills were identified in the Assessment Plan as:

- a) Critical analysis skills.
- b) Engagement with the scholarly literatures in the Security Policy Studies field.
- c) Ability to assess the main debates in the Security Policy Studies literature through the evaluation and integration of theoretical and empirical materials.
- d) Ability to formulate and test concepts and hypotheses.
- e) Ability to develop, formulate and sustain a cogent argument based on engagement with the literature. A demonstrated ability to preemptively include second-level arguments into written and oral work.

In our Assessment Plan we noted the standard means of assessment of cognitive skills development as being:

- Through participation in weekly seminars, presentation of papers, policy memorandums, and participation in debates.
- Through independent student study, to analyze readings and complete assessed essays.
- Enhanced by feedback from professors and constructive criticism from peers.

Our Assessment Plan established a standard Assessment Process Control for cognitive skills development through:

- Student learning outcomes assessed by individual professors.
- Assessment process control achieved through monitoring of student evaluation of courses.
- Peer assessment of adjunct faculty, including review of syllabuses.
- (Potentially through SPS Committee evaluation of course syllabuses, examination results, and student transcripts.)

The SPS Program's 2010 Assessment of Learning Outcomes focused on the capstone courses and assessed them in terms of; the development of subject knowledge and learning, key skills:

analysis, cognitive skills, communication, and professional skills. The 2010 Assessment of Learning Outcomes recommended that “The SPS Director will administer a survey to graduating students asking them to evaluate how well the program enhanced their abilities in each learning goal above, what aspects of the program were most helpful, and what suggestions they have for improvement.”

Methodology

The survey was distributed to students who were about to graduate from the SPS Program and our list of alumni who had graduated from the program in the previous three years. The survey was disseminated to the students twice; once before and once after the exam period. A total of 46 responses were received, with a majority coming from alumni of the SPS Program. The survey was designed by Program Director Paul Williams and Program Assistant Samia Ausaf.

The survey covers a number of issues and was designed to allow students to reflect on the various ways in which the SPS Program has assisted the students in developing their cognitive skills. The survey is divided into three main sections: respondent’s status; experiences of classes (three-credit and independent study); and experiences with faculty. The survey questions were as follows:

What is your current academic status?

- Alumnus/Alumna
- Graduating Student (in last semester of graduate school)

Current Status

1. What is your current job status?

- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Intern
- Unemployed, not looking for work
- Unemployed, looking for work

2. Is your current position related to your academic field of study?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

3. Did you get your current position after you joined the SPS Program?

- Yes
- No

4. How adequately has the SPS Program catered to developing the analytical skills required for the position you aspire to?

- Extremely
- Very
- Moderately

- Slightly
- Not at all

Classes

5. Did your 3-credit courses adequately balance a theoretical and a practical approach to security studies?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

6. Did your 3-credit courses introduce you to key debates in Security Policy Studies literature?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

7. Did your 3-credit courses allow you to develop greater analytical skills? If so, how? If so, which were most helpful? Were any not helpful?

- Textbox

8. Did you carry out a 3-credit independent study?

- Yes
- No

9. If yes, did your independent study allow you to develop greater analytical skills? If so, how? If not, why not?

- Text box

10. Did the SPS Program better equip you to discuss or write about security-related topics in a formal setting?

- Extremely
- Very
- Moderately
- Slightly
- Not at all

Faculty

11. Did faculty offer advice relevant/helpful to your academic work?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat relevant/helpful

12. Do you have any specific comments on faculty assistance in your cognitive skills development?

- Textbox

13. What could the SPS Program do to improve the way it tries to enhance cognitive skills development?

- Textbox

Rubrics

The following rubrics are used to assess the success of the SPS program and the school more broadly in enhancing the professional skills development of our student body:

1. *A Strong Performance*

- would be indicated if the majority of responses to questions four and ten were either “Extremely” or “Very.”
- would be indicated if the majority of the responses to questions five, six and eleven were “yes.”
- would be indicated if the qualitative responses to question seven and nine were judged to be positive.

2. *A Fair Performance*

- would be indicated if the majority of responses to questions four and ten were “Moderately.”
- would be indicated if the majority of the responses to questions five, six and eleven were “somewhat.”
- would be indicated if the qualitative responses to question seven and nine were judged to be ambivalent.

3. *A Poor Performance*

- would be indicated if the majority of responses to question four and ten were either “Slightly.”
- would be indicated if the majority of the responses to questions five, six and eleven were “no.”
- would be indicated if the qualitative responses to question seven and nine were judged to be poor.

Survey Responses

Question Four

How adequately has the SPS Program catered to developing the analytical skills required for the position you aspire to?

- Extremely
- Very
- Moderately
- Slightly
- Not at all

Extremely	6
-----------	---

Very	21
Moderately	15
Slightly	4
Not at All	0

Question Ten

Did the SPS Program better equip you to discuss or write about security-related topics in a formal setting?

- Extremely
- Very
- Moderately
- Slightly
- Not at all

Extremely	9
Very	18
Moderately	8
Slightly	2
Not at all	1

Of the 92 individual responses, 54 (59%) were either “Extremely” or “Very,” 23 (25%) were “Moderately,” and 7 (8%) were “Slightly or Not at all.” The SPS Program therefore had a strong performance on this metric when judged against the rubrics.

Question Five

Did your 3-credit courses adequately balance a theoretical and a practical approach to security studies?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

Yes	34
No	1
Somewhat	11

Question Six

Did your 3-credit courses introduce you to key debates in Security Policy Studies literature?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

Yes	34
No	1
Somewhat	11

Question Eleven

Did faculty offer advice relevant/helpful to your academic work?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat relevant/helpful

Yes	33
No	0
Somewhat	13

Of the 138 individual responses, 101 (73%) were “Yes,” 35 (25%) were “Somewhat,” and 2 (1%) were “No.” The SPS Program therefore had a strong performance on this metric when judged against the rubrics.

Question Seven

Qualitative Responses were as follows:

1. Yes - the Foreign Service Officer course (or a course with a title to that effect)..
2. Defense Policy and Program Analysis I and Covert Action and National Security were the two best courses I took at graduate school that prepared me for my current job (intelligence analyst, 4 years experience in field, 8 years professional experience). These two courses stressed balancing multiple projects simultaneously and short papers that required determining a 'bottom line up front' or BLUF and then articulating thoughts in 500 words or less. Unfortunately, most classes gave scholarly articles and then asked students to agree or disagree. These two classes gave students raw data and then made us come up with our own analysis and then bounce it off one another.
3. Defense Policy Analysis with Bruce Powers was excellent. Really strong approach to analysis focusing on assumptions and also conveying analysis using concise writing.
4. Of all courses I took the core requirements were the least useful. Would have preferred the option of choosing 2 out of 3 and saving 3rd core class for one of my areas of specialization. Courses on Space Policy and Law were most directly applicable to my line of work.
5. n/a
6. Yes, writing a paper is generally an act of analysis. Some professors were much more deliberate about fostering analytical skills, versus acquiring knowledge on which to practice analysis. Courses that stood out were International Security Politics (Prof Spear), Asian Security (Prof Mochizuki), Defense Policy and Program Analysis (Prof's first name was Zach, DOD official, blanking on last name...), History of Strategy, and Strategic Planning for 21st Century.
7. I vastly improved my ability to deliver concise and critical analyses
8. Yes, primarily through written assignments and seminar-style discussions in class.
9. Most helpful- Political Violence and Terrorism, Skills courses, Poverty & Bottom-up Development. Least helpful- Global Food Security
10. The most helpful skill they taught me was brevity: being able to develop an argument in a limited space.

11. Defense Policy and Program Analysis was particularly useful in developing analytical skills. This was accomplished through lots of practice, by critiquing analyses or writing analyses on a weekly basis.
12. Defense Policy and Program Analysis (particularly Part I) was one of the best courses in terms of developing analytical skills.
13. It was a mix. Some were a waste of time, some provided ideas for how to think about security-related analytical problems.
14. My analytical skills were most improved through the tools that I gained and/or strengthened during my time at GW. I learned several new methodologies for conducting research and performing analysis that built upon what I learned as an undergrad.
15. It gave the opportunity to explore my arguments on practical issues.
16. Defense Policy and Program Analysis with Prof. Powers was most helpful in this regard. The amount of challenges to our analytical skills and critical thinking was perfect and I wish that some of the other classes had a similar approach. I think Prof. Powers mastered that! the corner stone class International Security Policy was on the opposite end, as it was more getting through the different subjects, touching on a lot of topics without analyzing them in depth.
17. Too far ago to recall
18. Most helpful - Terrorism and Conflict in the North Caucasus, International Security Politics, History of Strategy and Policy, Counterintelligence, Covert Action, Fundamentals of Intelligence, Responses to Terrorism. Not helpful - SPS Capstone, Transnational Security Issues
19. Defense Policy Analysis was extremely helpful to the extent that informational analysis and summary was required.
20. Yes, however most analytical skills taught were overly erudite and academic. There was too little of day-to-day analysis such as financial modeling, country risk analysis, market analysis, etc.
21. The courses prepared me to analyze at a level for public policy, not necessarily at a scholarly level.
22. The most helpful courses in developing analytical skills were research method courses (ie: quantitative analysis, gender research methods etc.) I think this is a section of the curriculum ESIA could look to further develop since employers (at least in my field) seem to be looking for these. Suggestions would be further courses on M&E, performing assessments etc. Beyond that, the courses that most pushed me to develop further analytic skills were honestly those taught by the best
23. My development-focused courses helped in this regard, but security-specific courses were very broad. (to be fair, several were survey courses)
24. Not really. There wasn't enough rigour in the marking of papers
25. They developed a capacity for policy argumentation.
26. Many courses were helpful in learning to write condensed analytical pieces that are more like what I've been expected to write in internships and jobs.
27. Political-Military Relations, Defense Policy Analysis and International Economics were the most helpful. These courses focused on breaking down and critiquing arguments. These exercises led to more thoughtful analysis and
28. All courses were great. Recommend foreign language be required. I felt that skills-based courses were also helpful.

29. For the most part, they did, if only because my fellow students brought in helpful perspectives from their personal experiences. Some professors were very good (e.g. Caitlin Talmadge) but others could have done better in grading (e.g. Capstone professors).
30. yes, defense program analysis was helpful, as was science of nuclear materials
31. the most helpful courses were those that structured debates between positions into the discussions, such as assigning students to research and present opposite sides of the debate
32. Skills classes were particularly helpful.
33. The discussions in class were most useful to raising and assessing ideas.
34. Yes. Primarily through writing papers and getting feedback. Reconstruction and Stabilization, Defense Policy and Program Analysis, and International Peacekeeping were standouts with regards to developing analytical skills.
35. By introducing me to theory and then requiring the execution of that theory, my courses helped develop my analytical skills (or at least, my perception of my own analytical skills).
36. Final papers, policy memos, briefings
37. Capstone with Professor John Sano - good analytics. Formal Briefing with Prof. John Mirsham
38. Don't recall the title, but one that required us to do analysis and yet stay on a page. Very helpful for government work.
39. It was a mixed bag. While many courses were helpful in outlining the skills necessary for the discipline, I felt as if I was not able to apply those skills as much as I would have liked to. I also had high hopes for the capstone, and had envisioned working with real-world organizations to produce a deliverable. Unfortunately, the capstone experience was comparable to other seminar courses.
40. Not helpful-Capstone, Helpful-Non-State Actors & Political Psychology of terrorism
41. It helped me to be very precise in explaining the situation and be focused on the expectations. Second, it helped me in academic writing in international relations.
42. My courses helped me develop qualitative analytic skills. I learned how to identify and treat case studies through my coursework, in particular.
43. Most were helpful with analytic skill building.
44. Meh...a couple were helpful, couple were not.

These responses indicated a number of strengths within the SPS Program, with students regularly commenting on the different ways in which the program enhanced their critical analytical and cognitive skills. At the same time, areas for improvement were also regularly identified, particularly by alumnae who work within the government sector and engage with issues of security policy. Overall, the SPS Program had a strong to fair performance on this metric when judged against the rubrics.

Question Nine

Qualitative Responses were as follows:

1. I have been a 4 year student in the program but was not aware these were allowed. I have only been taking 1-2 classes a semester the last couple of years though due to work commitments.

2. Did not complete study in part due to non-existent communication support from professor.
3. Yes, primarily through in-depth research (books, periodicals, studies, interviews, et al.) and mentoring/guidance by the advisor.
4. Energy security analysis. Could have used more data analysis within that, but honestly didn't know where to start and did not get sufficient guidance.
5. I didn't but I wish I would have. This should be encouraged.
6. Just wanted to graduate

These responses indicated a number of weaknesses within the SPS Program with regard to its independent study option. The two problems identified by respondents are the need for better communication about the independent study option and the need to ensure better faculty guidance for those students taking an independent study class. Overall, the SPS Program had a fair to poor performance on this metric when judged against the rubrics.

Conclusion

In conclusion, using this indirect measure of assessment demonstrates that the SPS MA Program and the Elliott School more broadly has a strong record in enhancing the cognitive skills of the SPS student body when measured against the rubrics. Nevertheless, the assessment also highlights some areas of weakness where there is room for improvement, such as the Independent Study and ensuring more rigorous feedback on assessed work from the faculty.

Security Policy Studies MA Program Direct Measure of Assessment of Learning Outcome – Cognitive Skills

June 2013

Below is a discussion and analysis of the SPS MA Program direct measure to assess student learning outcomes in terms of cognitive skills development. This is complimentary to the Program's 2013 indirect measure to assess student learning outcomes conducted through a survey administered to our current students and alumni about their cognitive skills development.

Context

In the "Assessment Plan for the Master's Degree in Security Policy Studies" the SPS Program Committee identified as a key learning outcome the development of our students' cognitive skills. This development of cognitive skills was to be obtained by students participating in a variety of SPS courses. Acquisition of those skills would be demonstrated through the successful completion of the SPS capstone project in the student's final semester of their degree.

The learning outcomes of these cognitive skills were identified in the Assessment Plan as:

- f) Critical analysis skills.
- g) Engagement with the scholarly literatures in the Security Policy Studies field.
- h) Ability to assess the main debates in the Security Policy Studies literature through the evaluation and integration of theoretical and empirical materials.

- i) Ability to formulate and test concepts and hypotheses.
- j) Ability to develop, formulate and sustain a cogent argument based on engagement with the literature. A demonstrated ability to preemptively include second-level arguments into written and oral work.

In our Assessment Plan we noted the standard means of assessment of cognitive skills development as being:

- Through participation in weekly seminars, presentation of papers, policy memorandums, and participation in debates.
- Through independent student study, to analyze readings and complete assessed essays.
- Enhanced by feedback from professors and constructive criticism from peers.

Our Assessment Plan established a standard Assessment Process Control for cognitive skills development through:

- Student learning outcomes assessed by individual professors.
- Assessment process control achieved through monitoring of student evaluation of courses.
- Peer assessment of adjunct faculty, including review of syllabuses.
- (Potentially through SPS Committee evaluation of course syllabuses, examination results, and student transcripts.)

The SPS Program's 2010 Assessment of Learning Outcomes focused on the capstone courses and assessed them in terms of; the development of subject knowledge and learning, key skills: analysis, cognitive skills, communication, and professional skills. The 2010 Assessment of Learning Outcomes recommended that "The SPS Director will administer a survey to graduating students asking them to evaluate how well the program enhanced their abilities in each learning goal above, what aspects of the program were most helpful, and what suggestions they have for improvement."

To compliment this indirect assessment of learning outcomes we have now completed a direct assessment of learning outcomes concerning the cognitive skills of our MA Security Policy Studies students.

Methodology

For this direct measure a short survey was compiled and administered to the outside experts who observed the two SPS capstone classes run during the Spring 2013 semester. These outside experts were recruited by the capstone leaders (Professor Amer Latif and Professor Doga Eralp) due to their expertise in the issues being analyzed in the two capstone classes. The external observers were experts in the relevant field. SPS Program Director, Paul Williams, also observed the capstone presentations but did not participate in the survey.

For the capstone dealing with international responses to the war in Syria (Capstone One, Spring 2013), the external observers were:

1. Dr. Sinan Ciddi
2. Ms. Riva Kantowitz

3. Mr. John Smith

For the capstone dealing with a transnational terror attack on India (Capstone Two, Spring 2013), the observers were:

1. Ms. Polly Nayak
2. Mr. Brian Hedrick
3. Mr. Scott Schless

The survey was designed by Program Director Paul Williams and Program Assistant Samia Ausaf. It was designed to complement the survey of SPS students used as an indirect measure of learning outcomes and to be used in association with rubrics designed to enable assessment of student achievement in terms of professional skills. The full survey results are provided in this document's Appendix.

Survey

Presentation skills

1. On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students present their capstone project overall?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

2. Were presentation PowerPoint slides well organized?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

3. Were the oral presentation components well organized?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

4. If you saw students present more than once, did their overall presentation skills improve?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

Critical Analysis skills

5. On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students formulate and test concepts and hypotheses?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

6. On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students make a persuasive argument?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

7. On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students utilize their analytical skills?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

8. Could SPS students have applied greater analytical rigor to presentations? If so, how?

- Text box

Use of Security Policy Literature

9. On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did SPS students integrate Security Policy Studies (scholarly) literature into their presentations?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

10. On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), did SPS students demonstrate an ability to evaluate main debates in Security Policy Studies literature?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Professional skills

11. On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students display professionalism during their presentations?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

12. Could the capstone presentations have been better presented? If so, how?

- Text box

Rubrics

The following rubrics are used to assess the success of the SPS MA Program and the Elliott School more broadly in enhancing the cognitive skills development of our student body:

4. *A Strong Performance*

- would be indicated by numerical replies to questions one, five, six, seven, nine, ten and eleven that clustered around numbers 5 and 6.
- would be indicated if the majority of responses to questions two, three and four were “yes.”

5. *A Fair Performance*

- would be indicated by numerical replies to questions one, five, six, seven, nine, ten and eleven that clustered around numbers 4 and 3.
- would be indicated if the majority of responses to questions two, three and four were “somewhat.”

6. *A Poor Performance*

- would be indicated by numerical replies to questions one, five, six, seven, nine, ten and eleven that clustered around numbers 2 and 1.
- would be indicated if the majority of responses to questions two, three and four were “no.”

Survey Responses and Analysis

Question One

On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students present their capstone overall?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Possible Grade	Rating by Respondent
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	2
5	3
6	1

Question Five

On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students formulate and test concepts and hypotheses?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Possible Grade	Rating by Respondent
1	0
2	0
3	1
4	2
5	3
6	0

Question Six

On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students make a persuasive argument?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Possible Grade	Rating by Respondent
1	0
2	0
3	1
4	1
5	3
6	1

Question Seven

On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students utilize their analytical skills?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Possible Grade	Rating by Respondent
1	0
2	0
3	1
4	1
5	2
6	2

Question Nine

On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did SPS students integrate Security Policy Studies (scholarly) literature into their presentations?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Possible Grade	Rating by Respondent
1	0
2	1
3	1
4	0
5	4
6	0

Question Ten

On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), did SPS students demonstrate an ability to evaluate main debates in Security Policy Studies literature?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Possible Grade	Rating by Respondent
1	0
2	1
3	1
4	0
5	4
6	0

Question Eleven

On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students display professionalism during their presentations?

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Possible Grade	Rating by Respondent
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	2
5	2
6	2

Of the 42 individual responses to these questions, 27 (64%) scored a Strong rating (5-6); 13 (31%) scored a Fair rating (3-4); and 2 (5%) scored a Poor rating (1-2). Therefore, overall, the SPS program has displayed a Strong performance on this metric when judged against the rubrics.

Question Two

Were presentation PowerPoint's well organized?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

Possible Response	Response by Respondent
Yes	6
No	0
Somewhat	0

Question Three

Were the oral presentation components well organized?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

Possible Response	Response by Respondent
Yes	6
No	0
Somewhat	0

Question Four

If you saw students present more than once, did their overall presentation skills improve?

- Yes
- No
- Somewhat

Possible Response	Response by Respondent
Yes	2
No	1
Somewhat	1

As the majority of these responses (14 out of 16, or 88%) were "Yes" the SPS Program displayed a strong performance on this metric when judged against the rubrics.

Question Eight

Could SPS students have applied greater analytical rigor to presentations? If so, how?

Respondent Two: "Yes, it did not appear that the SPS students had done much reading of the academic literature nor did they appear to have studied some of the past wars and crises in South Asia."

Respondent Six: “The students could have added a bit more analytical rigor to the presentations. Some of the options which were presented were not well thought-out or counter-intuitive. However, we need to keep in mind that many of the students were exposed to South Asia security studies for the first time in this course which probably contributed to lack of analytical thought or creativity.”

These two responses to this question are coded as being constructively critical but not overly negative.

Question Twelve

Could the Capstone presentations been better presented? If so, how?

Respondent One: “All of the groups did well. Group II (1st presentation) had a very detailed presentation. They obviously put a lot of effort into their analysis. For a senior audience, they could streamline the presentation and get to the bottom line earlier. Group III did a better job at getting to the point sooner. They also had very pragmatic solutions. They could be better prepared for questions that take them off the track of the main presentation. Group I also had a very succinct presentation. I was particularly impressed that they had researched the legal basis in international agreements for their solutions. All of the groups did well and were able to stand their ground and defend their solutions under intense pressure. I would take any one of them as an Intern in my organization.”

Respondent Two: “Several of the presentations were very biased towards one country and discounted the fact that the United States as a global power has bilateral relations with both parties involved in the crisis. The presenters gave a good deal of background information and could have provided more policy options.”

Respondent Three: “Presentations were on-time and well-administered.”

Respondent Six: “The students did a nice job in their Capstone presentations. They were well-prepared, dressed professionally, and most continued to maintain their composure when pressed on some of their more controversial options.”

Answers to this question are coded as being positive.

Overall, this indicates a strong to fair performance by the students of the SPS Program on this metric compared to the rubric.

Appendix: Raw survey results

Questions One to Six

	On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students present their capstone overall?	Were presentation powerpoint slides well organized?	Were the oral presentation components well organized?	If you saw students present more than once, did their overall presentation skills improve?	On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students formulate and test concepts and hypotheses?	On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students make a persuasive argument?
1	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	5	6
2	4	Yes	Yes		3	3
3	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	5
4	6	Yes	Yes	No	5	5
5	5	Yes	Yes		5	5
6	4	Yes	Yes	Somewhat	4	4

Questions Seven to Twelve

	On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students utilize their analytical skills?	Could SPS students have applied greater analytical rigor to presentations? If so, how?	On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did SPS students integrate Security Policy Studies (scholarly) literature into their presentations?	On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), did SPS students demonstrate an ability to evaluate main debates in Security Policy Studies literature?	On a scale of 1 to 6 (6 being the highest), how well did the SPS students display professionalism during their presentations?	Could the Capstone presentations been better presented? If so, how?
1	5		5	5	6	All of the groups did well. 2Group II (1st p3resentation) had a v4ery detailed presentation. They obviously put

						<p>a lot of effort into their analysis. For a senior audience, they could streamline the presentation and get to the bottom line earlier.</p> <p>Group III Did a better job at getting to the point sooner. They also had very pragmatic solutions. They could be better prepared for questions that take them off the track of the main presentation.</p> <p>Group I also had a very succinct presentation. I was particularly impressed that they had researched the legal basis in international agreements for their solutions.</p> <p>All of the groups did well and were able to stand their ground and defend their solutions under intense pressure. I would take any one of them as an</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						Intern in my organization.
2		Yes, it did not appear that the SPS students had done much reading of the academic literature nor did they appear to have studied some of the past wars and crises in South Asia.				Several of the presentations were very biased towards one country and discounted the fact that the United States as a global power has bilateral relations with both parties involved in the crisis. The presenters gave a good deal of background information and could have provided more policy options.
	3		2	3	4	
3	5		5	5	4	
4	6		5	5	5	
5	6		5	5	6	
6		The students could have added a bit more analytical rigor to the presentations. Some of the options which were presented were not well thought-out or counter-intuitive. However, we need to keep in mind that many of the students were exposed to South Asia security studies for the first time in this course which probably contributed to				The students did a nice job in their Capstone presentations. They were well-prepared, dressed professionally, and most continued to maintain their composure when pressed on some of their more controversial options.
	4		3	2	5	

		lack of analytical thought or creativity.				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--