

# General Education Assessment Plan

## 5-Year Report

Items in section A should be addressed for every course the department offers in the objective under review; courses may be treated individually or combined into one report if appropriate. Items B and C need be addressed only once for the objective under review.

**Objective: 6**

**Department: Global Studies and Languages (GLBL)**

**Representative to Objective Review Committee: King Yik**

**Course(s): IS 2203 Introduction to International Organizations (S 2017 to S 2018)  
GLBL 2203 Introduction to International Organizations (F 2018 to S 2019)  
GLBL 2203 International Organizations Today (F 2019)**

A. For each general education learning outcome that the course aims to achieve:

1. Describe the specific assessment instrument(s) used to address the learning outcome.
  - a. Include full question text or assignment instructions, which may be included as an appendix.
  - b. Include a description of the timing of the assessment and the groups that were assessed.
  - c. Describe the criteria used to evaluate each assessment instrument, and how this evaluation was performed.
  - d. Describe the application of this or comparable assessment to any students earning credit for the class via early college program or test credit.

**This class is about International Organizations. The course number is 2203. The prefix was International Studies (IS) up to and including Spring 2018. From Fall 2018 onward, the prefix is Global Studies and Languages (GLBL). The title of the course was Introduction to International Organizations up to and including Spring 2019. It was shortened to International Organizations Today starting Fall 2019 after approval from the Undergraduate Curriculum Council.**

**The assessment plan for this class was approved on 9/27/2016 after the beginning of fall 2016 term. Data were collected for all sections and all modes from spring 2017 onward. Thus, the evaluation period is from Spring 2017 to Fall 2019.**

Two sections of the class are typically offered each term. During the evaluation period, twelve sections were offered. There is always one in-seat section on the Pocatello campus. An in-seat section was offered once in Idaho Falls. An E1 section was offered once for a student in the early college program. Other sections are online. Some of the online sections were late 8-week classes. All sections were taught by the same instructor who is also the representative to the Objective Review Committee.

|                             |
|-----------------------------|
| S 17                        |
| F 17 01 and E1              |
| F 17 02 Idaho Falls         |
| S 18 01                     |
| S 18 02 online, late 8-week |
| F 18 01                     |
| F 18 03 online, late 8-week |
| S 19 01                     |
| S 19 02 online              |
| F 19 01                     |
| F 19 03 online, late 8-week |

As stated in the approved assessment plan, the class has three learning objectives. The assessment instruments used for each learning objective is described below.

**Learning objective 1:** Student will demonstrate mastery of the historical context and organization structure of IGOs (International Government Organizations).

**Assessment instruments:** Exercises, tests, and exams were used to assess students' mastery of the facts regarding the history and organization structure of IGOs. Tests, exams, and extended assignments were used to assess students' ability to draw implications from the facts regarding the history and organization structure of IGOs. One such extended assignment was the change in the voting power within the International Monetary Fund over time.

**Alignment of assignments with the five Objective 6 competencies:**

| Objective 6 competency  | Relevant details in assignment  |
|---|---|
| Demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of a particular Social Science discipline. | A major topic in International Studies is the role of international organizations. This exercise is about an important international organization, the International Monetary Fund (IMF). |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Develop an understanding of self and the world by examining the dynamic interaction of individuals, groups, and societies as they shape and are shaped by history, culture, institutions, and ideas. | <b>history:</b> history of IMF<br><b>culture:</b> US, China, India<br><b>institution:</b> IMF<br><b>dynamic interaction of groups:</b> How the interaction among the US, China, India within the IMF evolved over time                            |
| Utilize Social Science approaches, such as research methods, inquiry, or problem-solving, to examine the variety of perspectives about human experiences.  | <b>Social Science approach:</b> Use the principal-agent framework often used in social sciences to explain why the IMF member countries (the principals) are dissatisfied with the IMF executive board (the agent) and therefore demanded reform. |
| Evaluate how reasoning, history, or culture informs and guides individual, civic, or global decisions.   | <b>reasoning:</b> by using the principal-agent framework and other models<br><b>history:</b> history of the IMF<br><b>culture:</b> US, China, India<br><b>global decision:</b> IMF reform   |
| Understand and appreciate similarities and differences among and between individuals, cultures, or societies across space and time.  | <b>Similarities and differences among and between cultures, or societies:</b> US, China, India<br><b>Across space:</b> countries in different parts of the world are members of the IMF<br><b>Across time:</b> power shift in the IMF over time.  |

**Learning objective 2: Students will be able to analyze current international conflicts and determine whether any IGOs might have a role, how they could resolve the conflict or promote cooperation, and identify whether there is any externality problem.**

**Assessment instruments:** Written assignments on current international events were used to assess whether students understand the role and limitations of international organizations in resolving international conflicts and promoting international cooperation. Written assignments on current events were used to assess whether students understand the interrelationship between an IGO and its member states. One such assignment was a position paper on United Nations and geopolitics among US, China and Japan.

**Alignment of assignments with the five Objective 6 competencies:**

| Objective 6 competency   | Relevant details in assignment   |
|--|--|
| Demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of a particular Social Science discipline.  | A major topic in International Studies is the role of international organizations. This exercise is about an important international organization, the United Nations.   |
| Develop an understanding of self and the world by examining the dynamic interaction of individuals, groups, and societies as they shape and are shaped by history, culture, institutions, and ideas. | <p><b>history:</b> how the history, especially World War II shaped the UN and how it impacted on the role of Japan in the UN</p> <p><b>culture:</b> cultural difference among US, China, and Japan</p> <p><b>institution:</b> UN</p> <p><b>dynamic interaction of groups:</b> How the economic development of Japan and China over time impacts on their respective relationship with the US and their role in the UN</p>                      |
| Evaluate how reasoning, history, or culture informs and guides individual, civic, or global decisions.   | <p><b>history:</b> how history of China and Japan and World War II history shape the roles in the UN</p> <p><b>culture:</b> How cultural differences among US, China, and Japan shape their interactions in the UN</p> <p><b>global decision:</b> power shift in the UN</p>  |
| Understand and appreciate similarities and differences among and between individuals, cultures, or societies across space and time.  | <p><b>Similarities and differences among and between cultures, or societies:</b> similarities and differences between Chinese and Japanese culture</p> <p><b>Across space:</b> geopolitics of US, China, and Japan in different parts of the world</p> <p><b>Across time:</b> change in economic power of Japan over time and change in both economic and political power of China over time; how these changes impact power within the UN</p> |

**Learning objective 3: Students will demonstrate understanding of simple game theory model, principal-agent problem, externality problem, and basic cost-benefit analysis and apply these tools to analyze IGO behavior.**

**Assessment instruments: Exercises, tests, and exams will be used to assess students' mastery of how to use the above analytical tools in the context of international organizations. One such analytical tool exercise is a cost-benefit analysis of an import tax and how it related to the World Trade Organization.**

**Alignment of assignments with the five Objective 6 competencies:**

| Objective 6 competency   | Relevant details in assignment   |
|--|--|
| Demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of a particular Social Science discipline.  | A major topic in International Studies is the role of international organizations. This exercise is about an important international organization, the World Trade Organization (WTO).   |
| Develop an understanding of self and the world by examining the dynamic interaction of individuals, groups, and societies as they shape and are shaped by history, culture, institutions, and ideas. | <b>history:</b> history of WTO<br><b>institution:</b> WTO<br><b>ideas:</b> free trade/protection<br><b>dynamic interaction of groups:</b> This assignment will analyze quantitatively how a trade policy can have different effects on different groups within a country |
| Utilize Social Science approaches, such as research methods, inquiry, or problem-solving, to examine the variety of perspectives about human experiences.  | <b>Social Science approach:</b> Use the cost-benefit analysis method often used in social sciences to evaluate how a trade policy can have different effects on the welfare (human experience) of different groups.  |
| Evaluate how reasoning, history, or culture informs and guides individual, civic, or global decisions.   | <b>reasoning:</b> by using cost-benefit analysis and other models<br><b>global decision:</b> international trade negotiation   |

**The syllabus, all the assignments, and final grades for all sections were collected and retained.**

**Each fall the instructor evaluated the assessment instruments using the rubric in the approved assessment plan. The results are included in the next section.**

**During the evaluation period, there was one early college student in IS 2203 Section E1 in Fall 2017. The student was assessed in exactly the same way as students in IS 2203 Section 01 in the same term.**

2. Describe the findings regarding the learning outcome, and overall conclusion as to the effectiveness of the class in achieving the learning outcome in question.

**The following table shows the percentage of students who satisfy an Objective 6 competency. A student is considered to have demonstrated the required competency if his or her score is 70% or above, as stated in the approved plan.**

| Term and Section            | Objective 6 Competency |        |        |        |        |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                             | 1                      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      |
| S 17                        | 83.02                  | 83.02  | 81.13  | 83.02  | 77.36  |
| F 17 01 and E1              | 84.85                  | 84.85  | 78.79  | 84.85  | 81.82  |
| F 17 02 Idaho Falls         | 76.92                  | 76.92  | 61.54  | 76.92  | 76.92  |
| S 18 01                     | 93.33                  | 93.33  | 93.33  | 93.33  | 100.00 |
| S 18 02 online, late 8-week | 60.00                  | 60.00  | 80.00  | 60.00  | 80.00  |
| F 18 01                     | 76.47                  | 76.47  | 82.35  | 76.47  | 82.35  |
| F 18 03 online, late 8-week | 100.00                 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 66.67  |
| S 19 01                     | 62.50                  | 62.50  | 75.00  | 62.50  | 75.00  |
| S 19 02 online              | 93.33                  | 93.33  | 100.00 | 93.33  | 93.33  |
| F 19 01                     | 72.73                  | 72.73  | 81.82  | 72.73  | 72.73  |
| F 19 03 online, late 8-week | 80.00                  | 80.00  | 90.00  | 80.00  | 100.00 |
| Average                     | 80.29                  | 80.29  | 84.00  | 80.29  | 82.38  |

**The average across of sections is above 70% for each of the five Objective 6 competencies. This indicates the course was effective in achieving the goals of Objective 6.**

**Regarding individual sections, in 7 out of the 11 sections students satisfied all five competencies. In 2 out of 11 sections students missed one required competency. The remaining 2 sections will be discussed in the next section.**

The following table shows the grade distributions.

| Term and Section            | A     | A-    | B+    | B     | B-    | C+    | C     | C-   | D+   | D     | D-   | F    | X     |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|------|------|-------|
| S 17                        | 32.69 | 13.46 | 15.38 | 17.31 | 11.54 | 7.69  | 1.92  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  |
| F 17 01 and E1              | 38.24 | 14.71 | 11.76 | 8.82  | 5.88  | 2.94  | 5.88  | 8.82 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.94  |
| F 17 02 Idaho Falls         | 28.57 | 7.14  | 7.14  | 28.57 | 21.43 | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.14  |
| S 18 01                     | 60.00 | 20.00 | 6.67  | 6.67  | 6.67  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  |
| S 18 02 online, late 8-week | 33.33 | 33.33 | 0.00  | 16.67 | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 |
| F 18 01                     | 43.75 | 12.50 | 12.50 | 12.50 | 6.25  | 12.50 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  |
| F 18 03 online, late 8-week | 42.86 | 0.00  | 14.29 | 14.29 | 14.29 | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.29 |
| S 19 01                     | 50.00 | 0.00  | 12.50 | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 25.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  |
| S 19 02 online              | 35.29 | 11.76 | 11.76 | 23.53 | 0.00  | 5.88  | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.76 |
| F 19 01                     | 81.82 | 0.00  | 0.00  | 9.09  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 9.09 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  |
| F 19 03 online, late 8-week | 46.15 | 15.38 | 0.00  | 7.69  | 7.69  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23.08 |

3. Describe any changes made or proposed to better meet learning outcomes.

**As the table in the previous section shows, the late 8-week online section 02 in Spring 2018 did not meet expectations because students missed on 3 out of 5 required competencies. After evaluating the assessment instruments used, the instructor revised the assignments to include more instructions for online students. Also, with input from the department chair, a proposal was submitted to the UCC in the immediate following term, Fall 2018, to update the catalog description of the course. The update highlights the international organizations being studied instead of the analytical tools being used. The course content is still about both institutions and analytical tools but with a slight shift toward institutions. The expectation is that this pedagogic adjustment would help students achieve the required competencies. In all subsequent online sections, students met the required competencies.**

**The Spring 2019 in-seat section 01 also did not meet expectations. After evaluation, it was determined that the shortfall was due to students missing**

**assignments. With input from the department chair and another Global Studies faculty, the syllabus was immediately expanded in the following term to include not only the topic to be covered for each class but also the activities and assignment for each session. In addition, more experiential exercises were included. The result for Fall 2019 has reverted back to being satisfactory with students meeting all competencies.**

4. Describe any changes made or proposed to assessment procedures themselves.

**None at the moment.**

- B. Do you see any incongruities between the learning outcomes and the spirit of the objective? If so, how would you suggest the learning outcomes be modified?

**The table in section A.2 did not identify any incongruities between the learning outcomes and the spirit of the objective. The improvements stated in section A.3 will ensure that this will also continue into the future.**

- C. Do you believe that the objective currently serves an optimal role in the broader general education program? If not, how could its contribution be improved?

**We strongly believe that Objective 6 serves a critical role in the broader general education program. With science and technology advancing at breakneck pace, the social and behavioral implications of these advances must be addressed. This is possible only if students acquire competency in one or more social and behavioral disciplines.**

## **Appendix 1**

**This exercise on the change of voting power in the International Monetary Fund over time and on the principal-agent problem serves to assess student's mastery of the following ideas in Objective 6: history, culture, institution, dynamic interaction of groups, social science approach, reasoning, global decision, similarities and differences among and between cultures, or societies across time and space.**

**IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY  
Global Studies (GLBL)  
Fall 2019**

**GLBL 2203-01: International Organizations Today: Conflicts and Cooperation  
Section 01, Tuesday and Thursday, 1pm – 2:15pm, BA 308**

Exercise on IMF History and Principal Agent Problem  
Due in class on Tuesday, Nov 19 2019

Last name: \_\_\_\_\_ First name: \_\_\_\_\_

In this exercise you will investigate the history of voting powers in the IMF using original source material. You will also be asked to explain why IMF reforms were necessary and why it was difficult to pass the reforms from the perspective of principal-agent problem.

## 1946

The first IMF annual report was released in 1946. According to the report, the top 5 countries in terms of voting power are US, UK, China, France, and India as shown in the following table. The voting power of all the other IMF members is  $100\% - \text{top 5} = 100\% - 33.52\% - 16.00\% - 6.94\% - 5.74\% - 5.13\% = 32.67\%$ .

| Rank            | 1      | 2      | 3     | 4      | 5     |                   |
|-----------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------------------|
| Country         | US     | UK     | China | France | India | Other IMF members |
| % of total vote | 33.52% | 16.00% | 6.94% | 5.74%  | 5.13% | 32.67%            |

You can use the above table as an example of how to fill in the other tables in this exercise.

You will now investigate changes in the top 5 voting countries in the IMF over time.

## 1947

Click on the following link to the IMF 1947 annual report:

<https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/ar/archive/pdf/ar1947.pdf>

On page 48 you will find “Appendix III Executive Directors and Voting Power”. Record in the following table who the top 5 voting powers were. For each of these 5 countries, record the % of total vote. (Record the %, NOT the actual number of votes.) Also calculate the voting power in % of all other IMF members together. Fill in the table.

| Rank            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |                   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Country         |   |   |   |   |   | Other IMF members |
| % of total vote |   |   |   |   |   |                   |

1. Search Appendix III on page 48 of the 1947 annual report. You will see that Germany and Japan were not in the IMF. Why?

Answer:

---

## 1961

Click on the following link to the IMF 1961 annual report:

<https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/ar/archive/pdf/ar1961.pdf>

On page 147 you will find “Appendix IV Executive Directors and Voting Power”. Record in the following table who the top 5 voting powers were. Also calculate the voting power in % of all other IMF members together.

| Rank            | 1 | 2 | Tie 3 |  | 5 |                   |
|-----------------|---|---|-------|--|---|-------------------|
| Country         |   |   |       |  |   | Other IMF members |
| % of total vote |   |   |       |  |   |                   |

By comparing 1947 and 1961, you will see two changes: Germany became a top 5 voting country and China dropped out of the top 5.

2. With the 1961 IMF annual report open on your computer’s screen, press the control key (Ctrl) and the F key at the same time and do a search for the word Germany in the 1961 report. What is the full name of the Germany in the IMF annual report?

Answer:

---

3. Was the Germany in the 1961 IMF annual report West Germany or East Germany?

Answer:

---

4. Why did Germany become a top 5 voting power in the IMF in 1961?

Answer:

---

5. On page 194 of the 1961 annual report, you will see two China listed: China (Mainland) and China (Taiwan). We discussed in class the difference between these two Chinas. See also the notes “Some quick notes on world politics related to the IMF” on Moodle. Which of the two Chinas, China (Mainland) or China (Taiwan), represented China in the IMF in 1961?

Answer:

---

6. Why did China drop out of the top 5 voting powers in the IMF?

Answer:

---

## 1967

Click on the following link to the IMF 1967 annual report:

<https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/ar/archive/pdf/ar1967.pdf>

On page 162 you will find “Appendix II Executive Directors and Voting Power”. Record in the following table who the top 5 voting powers were. Also calculate the voting power in % of all other IMF members together.

| Rank            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |                   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Country         |   |   |   |   |   | Other IMF members |
| % of total vote |   |   |   |   |   | 54.32%            |

7. While there was no change in who the top 5 voting powers were, you will see that Germany overtook France to become sole number 3. Why did Germany overtake France in 1967?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

## 1971

Click on the following link to the IMF 1971 annual report:

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/ar/archive/pdf/ar1971.pdf>

On page 214 you will find “Appendix II Executive Directors and Voting Power”. Look under the General Account column, not the Special Drawing Account column. Record in the following table who the top 5 voting powers were. Also calculate the voting power in % of all other IMF members together.

| Rank            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |                   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Country         |   |   |   |   |   | Other IMF members |
| % of total vote |   |   |   |   |   | 54.58%            |

8. You will see that Japan replaced India as the number 5 voting power. Why?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_



## 1993

Click on the following link to the IMF 1993 annual report:

<https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/ar/archive/pdf/ar1993.pdf>

On page 166 you will find “Appendix VI Executive Directors and Voting Power”. Record in the following table who the top 5 voting powers were. Also calculate the voting power in % of all other IMF members together.

| Rank            | 1 | Tie 2 |  | Tie 4 |  |                   |
|-----------------|---|-------|--|-------|--|-------------------|
| Country         |   |       |  |       |  | Other IMF members |
| % of total vote |   |       |  |       |  | 61.10%            |

9. You will see that even though there has been no change in who the top 5 voting powers were, the individual ranking of these 5 countries have changed. What were the changes and why did the changes occur?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

## 1999

Click on the following link to part of the IMF 1999 annual report:

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/ar/1999/pdf/file7.pdf>

On page 194 you will find “Appendix VII Executive Directors and Voting Power”. Record in the following table who the top 5 voting powers were. Also calculate the voting power in % of all other IMF members together.

| Rank            | 1 | 2 | 3 | Tie 4 |  |                   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|-------|--|-------------------|
| Country         |   |   |   |       |  | Other IMF members |
| % of total vote |   |   |   |       |  | 59.87%            |

10. You will see that Japan overtook Germany as the number 2 voting power. Why?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_



## 2016

Click on the following link to part of the IMF 2016 annual report:

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/ar/2016/eng/pdf/AR16-AppIV.pdf>

On the unnumbered first page, you will find “Appendix IV Executive Directors and Voting Power”. Record in the following table who the top 5 voting powers were. Also calculate the voting power in % of all other IMF members together.

| Rank            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Two countries tie for 5 <sup>th</sup> . Put down one of the two countries here. |                   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Country         |   |   |   |   |   | Other IMF members |
| % of total vote |   |   |   |   |   | 61.55%            |

11. We discussed in class the difference between these two Chinas. See also the notes “Some quick notes on world politics related to the IMF” on Moodle. Which of the two Chinas, China (Mainland) or China (Taiwan), represented China in the IMF in 2016?

Answer:

---

12. You will see that in 2016 not only did China become a top 5 voting powers, it was ahead of Germany, France, and UK at number 3. Why?

Answer:

---

We discussed the principal-agent problem in class. Give two examples of the principal-agent problem related to the IMF. For each problem, identify who the principal is and who the agent is. Also, give a specific example of the problem between the principal and the agent.

Example 1

Principal:

Agent:

Problem:

Example 2

Principal:

Agent:

Problem:

## **Appendix 2**

**This exercise on Japanese rearmament serves to assess student's mastery of the following ideas in Objective 6: history, culture, institution, dynamic interaction of groups, social science approach, reasoning, global decision, similarities and differences among and between cultures, or societies across time and space.**

Idaho State University

Spring 2017  
IS 2203 Introduction to International Organizations  
Section 01: Mon, Wed and Fri 12 noon – 12:50pm, REND 203

Exercise on UN, US, China, and Japan  
Due in class on Friday, April 28, 2017

**Your answers must be typed. No handwritten answers will be accepted.**

Last name: \_\_\_\_\_ First name: \_\_\_\_\_

At the end of 2016, which are the top 5 voting countries in the World Bank?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

At the end of 2016, which are the top 5 voting countries in the IMF?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

Which countries are the permanent members of the UN Security Council?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

Contrast the power of Japan in the World Bank and the IMF to its power in the United Nations.

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

After losing World War II, Japan's constitution, imposed mainly by the US, limited Japan to a small military. The US pledges to defend Japan in return for being allowed to station US forces in Japan (Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between The United States of America and Japan signed JANUARY 19, 1960). Recently there have been suggestions from both sides to change the arrangement. For example, during the US presidential campaign, then candidate Trump said that Japan should defend itself against North Korea. Similarly, in Japan some change to its constitution has been passed into law in 2015 to pave the way for further changes in the future to expand its military. This is the issue of **Japanese Rearmament**. In this exercise, you will pretend that you are the ambassador of a country to the UN. Say the UN General Assembly has a debate on Japanese rearmament. Your job is to prepare a short statement on whether your country is for or against Japanese rearmament and why. You need to do this for two different countries. For the first statement, you can choose to represent US or Japan, and your statement can either be for or against Japanese rearmament. For the second statement you represent China and your statement should be against Japanese rearmament. (China will not support Japanese rearmament.) The statement for each country should be about half of a page for a one-page total.

Name of country 1 (choose from US or Japan): \_\_\_\_\_

For or against Japanese rearmament: \_\_\_\_\_

Statement on Japanese rearmament:

China's statement against Japanese rearmament:

### **Appendix 3**

**This exercise on the cost-benefit analysis of a US tax on imported steel serves to assess student's mastery of the following ideas in Objective 6: history, institution, dynamic interaction of groups, social science approach, reasoning, and global decision.**

# Exercise on cost benefit analysis of steel tariff

- 
- Idaho State University
    - Fall 2019
      - GLBL 2203 Introduction to International Organizations
        - Section 01, Tuesday and Thursday, 1 – 2:15pm, BA 308
  - Exercise on cost benefit analysis of steel tariff
  - In-class on Thursday, Nov 7 and Tuesday, Nov 12, 2019

- 
- President Trump has announced a tariff on steel imported into the US from many parts of the world.
  - A very useful tool to analyze the impact of a government policy or a business plan is cost-benefit analysis. This is a general tool that can be used to evaluate many different policies and plans, not just a tariff.
  - In this exercise you will conduct a complete cost-benefit analysis of steel tariff by completing a series of 5 tables.

**Table 1**  
**The 50 pounds of steel supplied by US producers both before and after the tariff**

|               | Before                   | After                    | Gain<br>(after minus before)  | Loss<br>(after minus before)  | Net effect<br>(+ is net gain;<br>- is net loss) |
|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| US producers  | Sold at \$10 per pound   | Sold at \$12 per pound   | Revenue from 50 pounds of steel at \$12 per pound minus revenue from 50 pounds of steel at \$10 per pound = ? | Is there any change in cost?  | ?   |
| US users      | Bought at \$10 per pound | Bought at \$12 per pound | Is there any change in value?   | Payment for 50 pounds of steel at \$12 per pound minus payment for 50 pounds of steel at \$10 per pound = ? | ?   |
| US gov't      | Not involved             | Not involved             | ?   | ?   | ?   |
| US as a whole |                          |                          |   |   | ?   |

**Table 2**  
**The 30 pounds increase in production by US producers due to the tariff**

|               | Before                                   | After  | Gain<br>(after minus before)  | Loss<br>(after minus before)  | Net effect<br>(+ is net gain;<br>- is net loss) |
|---------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| US producers  | Not produced at \$10 per pound           | Sold at \$12 per pound                               | Revenue from 30 pounds of steel at \$12 per pound minus revenue from zero pounds of steel at \$10 per pound = ? | Estimated cost of producing 1 pound of steel times 30 pounds = ?  | ?   |
| US users      | Bought at \$10 per pound from abroad     | Bought at \$12 per pound from US producers           | Is there any change in value?   | Payment for 30 pounds of steel at \$12 per pound minus payment for 30 pounds of steel at \$10 per pound = ? | ?   |
| US gov't      | Not involved because there was no tariff | Not involved because these 30 pounds are not imports | ?   | ?   | ?   |
| US as a whole |  |  |   |   | ?   |

**Table 3**  
**The 40 pounds of steel imported by the US after the tariff**

|               | Before                                   | After                                | Gain<br>(after minus before)                     | Loss<br>(after minus before)  | Net effect<br>(+ is net gain; - is net loss) |
|---------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| US producers  | Not involved                             | Not involved                         | ?  | ?   | ?  |
| US users      | Bought at \$10 per pound from abroad     | Bought at \$12 per pound from abroad | Is there any change in value?                    | Payment for 40 pounds of steel at \$12 per pound minus payment for 40 pounds of steel at \$10 per pound = ? | ?  |
| US gov't      | Not involved because there was no tariff | \$3 per pound tariff                 | \$3 per pound tariff revenue times 40 pounds = ? | ?   | ?  |
| US as a whole |  |                                      |  |   | ?  |

**Table 4**  
**The 30 pounds decrease in purchase by US users of steel when price went from \$10 to \$12 per pound due to the tariff**

|               | Before                                   | After   | Gain<br>(after minus before)  | Loss<br>(after minus before)                            | Net effect<br>(+ is net gain; - is net loss) |
|---------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| US producers  | Not involved                             | Not involved  | ?   | ?   | ?  |
| US users      | Bought at \$10 per pound                 | Not bought at \$12 per pound                                | Expenditure went down by \$10 per pound. Total saving is \$10 time 30 = ? | Estimated value of 1 pound of steel times 30 pounds = ? | ?  |
| US gov't      | Not involved because there was no tariff | Not involved because these 30 pounds are no longer imported | ?   | ?   | ?  |
| US as a whole |  |   |   |   | ?  |

- Now we can put the four tables together to get an overall net gain/loss to the US as a whole.

| Table 5<br>Overall Net Effect on US as a Whole      |   |
|---|---|
| Table 1   | ? |
| Table 2   | ? |
| Table 3   | ? |
| Table 4   | ? |
| Overall net effect of a tariff on the US as a whole | ? |