**Affordable Learning Georgia Pilot Grants**

**For Developing an Open-Licensed Historical Game Creation and Implementation beginning January 2019 Running Through May 2020**

**Applications due end of November 15, 2018**

**Description**

Faculty are invited to submit a proposal that outlines how they would create or adapt a historical game for use within their classes. Proposals may involve teams of any of the following: faculty instructors, faculty librarians, instructional designers, subject matter experts, editors, graphic designers, or others as needed.

Funding will be available at three levels:

Basic Level (maximum $5,000): This would be for a small implementation of a game in a single class. The game could be immersive for a few days or a week, or occasionally referenced throughout the course.

Standard Level (maximum $11,000): This would be for a typical implementation of a game within a class, where fewer than 500 students are expected to be impacted within the academic year. The game should be a significant portion of the class experience, with students interacting with the game on an ongoing basis throughout the course.

Large-Scale Level (maximum $30,000): This would be for an in-depth implementation of a game within a very large class, multiple sections of the same class, or at the department level, with 500 or more students expected to be impacted within the academic year. The game should be a significant portion of the class experience, with students interacting with the game on an ongoing basis throughout the course.

The proposal must make it clear how the game will be integrated into the class and address learning objectives. As this grant program is part of the Affordable Learning Georgia program, games created or modified under this grant must use freely-available materials and Open Educational Resources (OER), including a significant proportion of materials from the Digital Library of Georgia and/or the Digital Public Library of America. Faculty are expected to release student-facing materials developed under the grant as OER with a CC- BY license. We recognize that some instructor materials may need to be kept secure, but even those materials should be made available to other instructors who would like to use the game in their class.

It is expected that grant recipients will attend the Third Annual Winter Conference at University of Georgia on January 18-19, 2019. $1000 in travel funding will be assumed in the grant funds provided; if that is insufficient to attend the conference, please specifically request additional travel funding for this purpose when submitting the proposal.

Information about the conference is at https://reacting.barnard.edu/winter-conference- 2019.

**Proposal Form and Narrative**

* *Italicized text is provided for your assistance; please do not keep the italicized text in your submitted proposal. Proposals that do not follow the instructions may be returned.*

**Applicant Name**

Andrew Owsiak

aowsiak@uga.edu

**Applicant Phone Number**

(706) 542-6705

**Position / Appointment Title**

Associate Professor, Department of International Affairs

**Institution Name(s)**

University of Georgia

**Team Members**

*(Name, Title, Department, Institutions if different, and email address for each)*

Jeffrey Berejikian

Associate Professor & Josiah Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor Department of International Affairs, University of Georgia

**Sponsor, Title, Department, Institution**

*Per sponsor letter of support*

Naomi Norman, Associate Vice President for Instruction Chase Haygood, Director, Division of Academic Enhancement on behalf of

UGA Reacting to the Past, the Division of Academic Enhancement, and the Office of the Vice President for Instruction

**Proposed game concept**

U.S. Cyber Deterrence, Stuxnet, and the 2016 Presidential Election

**Course Names, Course Numbers and Semesters in which the game would be played**

\*INTL 4260: Decision Making in International Relations

\*INTL 4285: Crisis Diplomacy

\* (New Class): The Politics of Cyber Security

The authors teach these two courses regularly and will use the planned game for the first time in these courses in Spring 2020. The authors will also develop a new course with the game as a central element and offer large sections each year. In addition, the game itself is also relevant for a wide variety of other instructors and courses (see below). These courses reach several hundred additional students each year (e.g., [Introduction to] American Government).

**NARRATIVE**

**1.1**

**BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE GAME**

**Do those courses currently use OERs?**

No

**If yes, list OERs here:**

Not applicable

**Anticipated First Semester To Be Used**

Spring 2020/Fall 2020

(Spring 2020 might be in test play; a more polished version in Fall 2020)

**Average Number of Students Per Course Section**

45

(upper)

125

(intro)

25

(Summer)

19

(Small Class Initiative)

**Number of Course Sections Affected by Implementatio n in an Academic Year**

4

(upper)

2

(intro)

2

(summer)

2

**Total Number of Students Affected by Implementat ion in an Academic Year**

518

**Average Number of Students Per Summer Semester**

50

Only at UGA; similar classes are offered at other USG institutions and could raise the numbers significantly

**Average Number of Students Per Fall Semester**

234

Only at UGA; similar classes are offered at other USG institutions and could raise the numbers significantly

**Average Number of Students Per Spring Semester**

234

Only at UGA; similar classes are offered at other USG institutions and could raise the numbers significantly

**Requested Amount of Funding**

$25,000

Game Title (e.g. Napoleon at Waterloo)

U.S. Cyber Deterrence, Stuxnet, and the 2016 Presidential Election

Game Author/s Other than yourself

Andrew Owsiak, Jeffrey Berejikian

Game Location (e.g. San Dimas, CA)

Washington, DC

Game Year/s (e.g. 1989)

2008-2017 (Obama Administration)

Number of Players (Minimum and Maximum)

10-45

(Can be scaled up by running multiple sessions of the same game simultaneously; 10 allows a solid government cabinet to form; after 45, the deliberations become ominous)

Number of Set-Up Sessions (Minimum and Maximum)

1 Minimum

4 Maximum

Number of Game Play Sessions (Minimum and Maximum)

4 Minimum

8 Maximum

Number of Debriefing Sessions (Minimum and Maximum)

1. Minimum
2. Maximum

Historical Documents Foundational to the Concept

See DLG/DPLA Sources

DLG & DPLA Sources Foundational to the Concept

Primarily, government documents, including things like:

* White House (2018) “National Cyber Strategy”
* The Department of Defense Cyber Strategy (2015)
* McKenzie (2017) “Is Cyber Deterrence Possible?”

Additional relevant documents from the Attorney General, Defense Science Board, Homeland Security, Government Accountability Office, US Senate (e.g., inquiries), and so on. See, for example,: https://dp.la/search?q=cyber&page=1&subject=%22Cyberterrorism-

-United%20States--Prevention%22

Suggested Courses for Gameplay (e.g., World History, French History)

Introduction to Political Science/US Politics Introduction to the Study of Global Issues National/Strategic Intelligence

US Foreign Policy Crisis Diplomacy International Conflict Global Simulations International Law

Computing, Ethics, and Society Computer Security

Globalization and Information Systems Disaster Management (Policy/Society)

**1.2**

**apply.)**

**DOES YOUR GAME HAVE THESE REQUIRED ELEMENTS? (Check all that**

IZI Real historical setting IZI Rich written texts IZI Rich visual materials

□Rich video/tape materials

IZI Multiple meetings

IZI Roles with well-developed characters

IZI Victory objectives

IZI Indeterminacy (e.g., characters who are free to consider the debates with an open mind)

IZI Reading, writing, and speaking IZI Narrative structure with drama IZI Possibility of alternate historical outcomes IZI Accessibility to non-specialists

**DOES YOUR GAME HAVE THESE COMMON ELEMENTS? (Check all that**

**1.3**

**apply.)**

IZI Factions IZI Elements of secrecy IZI Opening vignettes IZI Central texts

**2.1**

**PROJECT GOALS**

*List the goals you are trying to achieve by writing a game to incorporate into your teaching, including goals for student learning, materials creation, and pedagogical transformation.*

*Goals:*

Through this game, students will:

Research and write an actual policy document; Conduct evidence-based policy analysis;

Revise the policy document in light of what they learn through the game; Experience course concepts first-hand (e.g., deterrence, crisis diplomacy/bargaining, misperception, and so on);

Theorize about the differences between the kinetic (e.g., land/air/sea) and cyber domains, first by sketching the characteristics that differentiate the cyber from the kinetic domain, and then by thinking through how these characteristics might alter the issues known to affect interstate conflict (e.g., state sovereignty, international law, deterrence, and so on);

Learn about the technical aspects of cyberspace, and the ethical issues that accompany them; Grapple with the complexities of group decision-making (e.g., consensus/group-think);















(New Class): The Politics of Cyber Security

* Engage in interpersonal and factional bargaining; and
* Develop the ability to express their position in writing and speech—and practice persuading others of their position.

*Overview:*

Our game asks students to engage cyber conflict issues as members of the Obama administration (2009-2017). We select this administration because it faces two prominent cyber decisions over its lifetime:

* 1. whether to encourage offensive cyber operations against Iranian nuclear facilities. This initiative’s development begins under the Bush administration. The Obama administration inherits it, however, and must decide whether to continue supporting and/or deploy it (i.e., in history, this becomes the Stuxnet Operation); and
	2. how to respond to (i.e., defend against—or not) Russian attempts to manipulate the 2016 US Presidential election.

By engaging both offensive and defensive operations, the game forces students to think about cyber conflict from both perspectives—that of the aggressor and target.

Students begin the game by receiving a character assignment; these characters perform primary and supporting roles on the United States National Security Council (NSC). After getting into character roles (and associated factions), students must then research and write a National Cyber Policy (NCP)—a document that the United States (US) government historically creates and re-creates. The NCP outlines the government’s approach to addressing cyber conflicts that *might* arise, forcing students to define the parameters of their actions *before* encountering the first scenario. They can later deviate from this policy, but not without a cost, since the American public and other stakeholders—who typically lack detailed information about cyber operations—will expect the NSC to do what they promised in the NCP.

The first scenario (Stuxnet) asks students to consider whether they support an *offensive* cyber operation against Iranian nuclear facilities. The operation stands a reasonable chance of delaying Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons, but does not promise the ability to destroy the Iranian nuclear program altogether. It is also a challenging operation to execute. Once students complete the deliberations and decisions associated with this operation, we next introduce the 2016 US Presidential election, in which the US becomes the target of foreign cyber operations that students must *defend* against. In this scenario, the government must weigh the response options available, as well as their effect on both foreign policy and domestic politics.

After both scenarios finish, students revise their NCP in light of the game’s activities.

**2.2**

**STATEMENT OF CURRICULAR TRANSFORMATION**

*The statement must:*

* *Describe how the introduction of this historical game will transform both the curriculum and the teaching of the course.*
* *Identify stakeholders who may be affected by the transformation.*
* *Describe the expected impact of this transformation on students and stakeholders.*
* *Describe the transformative impact on the course, program, department, institution/access institution, and/or multiple courses.*

A central purpose in designing this game is to assist the Department of International Affairs in meeting a key programmatic learning objective: “combining theory with practice.” Achieving this objective is critical for student success after graduation. However, it is also inherently difficult to realize given the subject matter and size of the major (approximately 850 students). Training in foreign policy does not permit traditional hands-on laboratory instruction, and the University’s proximity to DC limits easy access to international internships.

As a remedy, students in this game use both historical material and relevant academic research in drafting national policy documents to guide their actions during gameplay. Students also receive a training module on policy analysis and deploy these skills (designing metrics for qualitative outcomes, elite interviewing, decision analysis) to evaluate the effectiveness of their policies and guide their revision of these documents. This approach pushes students to use outcome data from the game to evaluate the veracity of class concepts against their own behavior, effectively realizing the departmental goal of combining theory with practice **even while students are in residence at UGA**. Through this mechanism, students also obtain practical experience with evidence-based policy making and analysis - a recent priority within the US government in the field national security.

In addition, the Department of International Affairs major will soon begin offering a dedicated cyber politics course. Given the velocity with which cyber has emerged as a political and security issue, this curricular omission was no longer sustainable. Indeed, annual surveys conducted of graduating seniors in the major consistently reveal that students seek training in cyber security concepts and policy. The interest here is not in the technical aspects - as would be part of a course in computer science - but rather in the broader ethical and security implications of cyber threats in the context of democratic institutions and public policy.

Finally, the development of this game and the associated course are consistent with emerging cyber initiatives throughout the University. While the new course will primarily service students in the School of Public and International Affairs, it will be designed in such a manner as to be broadly accessible to students with varied academic backgrounds from across the campus.

**2.3**

**TRANSFORMATION ACTION PLAN**

*Action plans must include:*

* *The specific design elements and creation process of the historical game*
	+ *Be sure to describe all required game elements checked in Section 1.*
* *The course and syllabus instructional design/redesign necessary for the inclusion of this historical game*
* *The activities expected from each team member and their role/s: subject matter experts, instructional designer, librarian, instructor of record, et al.*
* *The identification, review, selection, and adoption/adaptation of open resources available in the Digital Public Library of American and/or Digital Library of Georgia*

*Item*

*Subitem*

*Action*

Game design elements

Historical setting

Develop the history/background behind two cyber operations: Stuxnet and Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election (as certified by the US intelligence community).

Written texts

Find relevant government documents, including intelligence reports/estimates, policy, and assessments. Journalism also provides a key source of information, particularly on the Stuxnet operation (see Zetter 2014).

Visual materials

Collect maps and visual diagrams (both political and technical) for students to use in their deliberations.

Multiple meetings

Design the format of the National Security Council (NSC) meetings. These involve multiple meetings *each* on: (a) the initial design of the National Cyber Policy (NCP), (b) deliberation on Stuxnet, (c) deliberation on the 2016 Presidential election, and (d) the re-design of the NCP.

Characters

Write character role sheets for 40-45 students. Characters serve primary and supporting roles on the NSC.

Victory objectives

Define how characters (and factions; see below) win the game. They will have competing priorities and policy preferences, making their interests collide and forcing students to bargain.

Indeterminacy

Design some characters with no strong policy position, but who are voting members of the NSC. Those with strong positions will need to convince the “indeterminants” of the “best” policy to adopt. This ensures the game does not necessarily follow a pre-determined historical path.

Reading, writing, and speaking

Create numerous assignments that encourage students to research, read, write, and speak. The (re)development of the NCP offers one main vehicle through which students demonstrate these skills. Each character will also receive specific reading, writing, and speaking assignments to execute during the deliberations that take place on the cyber operations.

Narrative structure with drama

Transform the historical background (above) into a narrative. The history of the Obama administration offers a vehicle through which to do this. The drama arises from the high stakes involved in each cyber operation.

Possibility of alternate historical outcomes

Create key decision points, where the game can move in a-historical directions. We will also incorporate elements of chance (i.e., die rolls, with modifiers—as is common in these games) to assist in this endeavor.

Accessibility to non- specialists

Write background material that introduces players to all foundational concepts/information.

Factions

Divide character roles into policy-position factions, which involve characters who share

Secrecy

Opening vignettes

Central texts

Find relevant government documents, including intelligence reports/estimates, policy, and assessments. Journalism also provides a key source of information, particularly on the Stuxnet operation (see Zetter 2014).

Course/

instructional redesign requirements

Revise course/syllabus to include game. Because the instructors are familiar with the use of games in the classroom, this amounts to restructuring assignments, as well as finding the appropriate point in the course to play the game, juggling content, and re-writing course objectives.

**2.4**

**ASSESSMENT: QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE MEASURES**

*Assessment plans must address:*

*The quantitative and qualitative measures of impact on student success and experience. The quantitative and qualitative data collected will be utilized in your final report as well as within ALG program communications.*

*How the data is to be analyzed for each data source, specifically, the action plan must address the project's quantitative impact on student success (items such as Learning Objective success, Drop, Fail, Withdraw (DFW) delta rate, and any other critical factors) to measure impact on student experience.*

*Qualitative measures must include student feedback through student/faculty surveys, interviews, focus groups, or other means. Grantees are expected to use the student/faculty survey available from Reacting to the Past at University of Georgia (reacting@uga.edu); this survey includes data for similar courses across the county.*







We will assess the impact of the game using both quantitative and qualitative measures.

Quantitatively, there will be rubrics for assessing writing assignments, policy analysis, and critical thinking. In addition, there will be statistical analysis done to compare assignment and final course grades against previous sections of the courses to measure what impact the game had on student mastering of the course SLOs.

In addition, because the department offers several sections of Introduction to International Relations each semester, there is the opportunity to conduct a natural experiment comparing outcomes in courses that implement the game to those that do not within the same academic year.

Qualitatively, we will use the student/faculty survey from Reacting to the Past at University of Georgia, which includes data for similar courses across the county.

Team member expectations

Instructional designer/subject matter expert

The instructional designer and subject matter experts are the same in this project. They will undertake the design of all materials noted above.

Librarian

We will consult the librarian as needed. S/he has no formal tasks under this project.

Instructor of record

The instructional designer is the instructor of record for the initial courses in which the game will be played. Other instructors of record will need only implement the game itself. We will design an instructor’s manual t and make ourselves available to them as a resource.

Open Resources

Find relevant government documents, including intelligence reports/estimates, policy, and assessments. Journalism also provides a key source of information, particularly on the Stuxnet operation (see Zetter 2014).

**2.5**

**TIMELINE**

*This is a timeline of milestone dates for your transformation project through the end of the first semester the transformed course(s) is/are offered to students. Your interim reports will utilize this timeline to indicate if the project is on schedule. Format this as a Table.*

**2.6**

**BUDGET**

*Include overall personnel & projected expenses. Be sure to include the required $1000 in travel funding. Please keep all funding guidelines from the description on Pages 1 and 2 in mind. Format this as a Table.*

*Time*

*Purpose*

*Amount*

*Total*

January 2019

UGA Reacting Conference (Two faculty, one graduate RA)

$350 x 3

$1,050

*Time Period*

*Project Step*

*Deliverable*

January-May 2019

Planning

Preliminary Research

* Mapping of game mechanics (plot scenario timelines, characters, decision points, student assignments)
* Background guide (i.e., sketch of foundational research students will need upon entering the game)
* Document repository (i.e., collect freely available government documents that students will use in the game)

May 2019-August 2019

Writing Phase I

* Write plot scenarios #1 (Stuxnet) and #2 (2016 US Presidential election)
* Begin writing character sheets

August 2019-December 209

Writing Phase II

* Finish writing character sheets (#1-#45)
* Write game book (play logistics—e.g., structure, how to make decisions, and so on)
* Write preliminary instructor’s guide

January 2020-May 2020

Implementation

* Play test game at UGA Reacting to the Past Winter Conference (2020)
* Implement game in authors’ courses (and obtain student feedback)
* Offer workshops on game implementation at other USG institutions (note: authors to solicit invitations)
* Revise instructor’s manual after each iteration of play

May 2020 onward

Maintenance

* Continued implementation, marketing
* Revise game materials (as needed)
* Serve as resource to additional instructors wishing to implement the game in their own classroom

\* Note: In support of this project, the authors have negotiated a reduced course buy-out with the Dean of the School of Public and International Affairs. That reduction is reflected in this budget.

**2.7**

**SUSTAINABILITY PLAN**

*What is your plan for offering the course in the future, including any necessary maintenance and updating of course materials?*

*Future offerings:*

Cyber conflict constitutes a growing concern for business, computer science, political science, and international affairs. The game topic consequently seeps increasingly into a variety of courses within these various disciplines, including those we teach. We envision the game, once created, to be part of our courses for the foreseeable future—that is, we will incorporate it into our syllabi and make it a regular offering (approximately once per academic year per author).

Our interest in this game, however, is much wider. Political scientists do not make wide use of Reacting to the Past games, but they easily could. For example, because our game focuses on the US government (including characters that derive from and operate within American institutions), it is appropriate to American Politics—the introductory course that *all university students must take*. Through our proposed game, students gain tremendous insight not only into cyber issues broadly, but also the characters they play (e.g., the US Secretary of State), the positions these characters hold, how characters interact (including the constraints operating on them), and how characters make decisions together. This insight applies directly to understanding the actors, institutions, interests, and interactions that constitute American Politics. Other courses that might use the game include: Global Issues, Introduction to International Relations, Crisis Diplomacy, US Foreign Policy, Foreign Policy Decision-Making, Global Simulations, and so on.

If we are successful with this proposal, we intend to initiate a set series of workshops in which we invite graduate instructors (Ph.D. students in International Affairs and Political Science) to learn about how they can implement the approach and our specific game.

Finally, there are courses in business and computer science that might use the game as well, particularly to understand the ethical and political issues that intersect with technology (see earlier course list).

*Maintenance and updating:*

We expect to maintain the game files on the Reacting to the Past website, which is free to

January-May 2019

Graduate Research Assistant to begin foundational research for game materials

$0 (PIs will use own resources for this)

May-August 2019

No funded tasks

$0 (PIs will use own resources for this)

August-December 2019

Course buy-out for each author to research, write, finish preliminary game materials

$11,500 x 2

$23,250\*

January-May 2020

UGA Reacting Conference (Two faculty, one graduate RA)

$350 x 2

$700

*Total*

$25,000

instructors and serves as a repository to the pedagogy (reacting.barnard.edu). These files will include not only the game documents we create during the project (e.g., the background guide, instructor’s manual, and character sheets), but also the primary government documents that students need to play the game. Because these are freely available government documents, there are no copyright issues with this approach.

Once established, we expect that the game will not require significant updating. We will, however, solicit feedback from the Reacting to the Past community and make updates (as needed) on an annual basis.

**2.8**

**REFERENCES & ATTACHMENTS**

*A letter of support must be provided from the sponsoring area (unit, office, department, school, library, campus office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, etc.) that will be responsible for receipt and distribution of funding. Letters must reference sustainability. In the case of multi-institutional affiliations, all participants’ institutions/departments must provide a letter of support.*

Attached please find a joint letter of support from the Division of Academic Enhancement at the University of Georgia (UGA), the Office of the Vice President of Instruction (OVPI), and UGA Reacting to the Past.

In addition, please find a letter for support from the Department Head for International Affairs.



Office of Instruction

308 New College

205 Herty Drive

Athens, Georgia 30602

TEL 706-583-0690

ovpi@uga.edu [www.ovpi.uga.edu](http://www.ovpi.uga.edu/)

November 13, 2018

Dear members of the selection committee,

We enthusiastically support the application of Drs. Andrew Owsiak and Jeffrey Berejikian for the Affordable Learning Georgia Pilot Grants For Developing an Open-Licensed Historical Game, Creation and Implementation. Dr. Owsiak has used Reacting to the Past games in some of his courses for several years and has attended a RTTP Game Design Workshop sponsored by RTTP at UGA in the summer of 2016 to work on a game exploring the Treaty of Versailles. Dr. Berejikian has, for many years, combined theory and practice through foreign policy simulation using video games as a form of active learning. By resolving simulated international conflict, developing military postures and engaging in peace negotiations to build effective international institutions, he helps his students apply solutions to potential real-world problems in an innovative way.

Because simulations are common in Political Science and International Affairs classes, the game they propose developing entitled “U.S. Cyber Deterrence, Stuxnet, and the 2016 Presidential Election” has the potential to open this kind of immersive role play into another discipline. Thus it has the potential to be used in a wide variety of courses taught within the USG and beyond.

In addition to being active researchers, both Dr. Owsiak and Dr. Berejikian are award-winning teachers devoted to student academic success. Dr. Owsiak won a First-Year Odyssey Seminar Program teaching award for his innovative use of the game on the French Revolution in his Odyssey Seminar. Dr.

Berejikian is a Josiah Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor, the highest accolade for teaching given at the University of Georgia. Both are faculty in the School of Public and International Affairs and are frequent collaborators.

They will work closely with colleagues in the library, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and the UGA Reacting to the Past program to design and play test the game. Their topic is not represented within the Reacting to the Past library and would fill an important disciplinary and subject gap.

Sincerely,

Thomas Chase Hagood, Ph.D.

*Director, Division of Academic Enhancement*

*Co-Director, UGA Reacting to the Past Program*

University of Georgia

Naomi J. Norman, Ph.D.

*Associate Vice President for Instruction*

*Co-Director, UGA Reacting to the Past Program*

University of Georgia

*Commit to Georgia* | give.uga.edu

*An Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, Veteran, Disability Institution*



327 Candler Hall

Athens, Georgia 30602-1492

TEL 706-542-9659 | FAX 706-583-8266

murdie@uga.edu [www.spia.uga.edu](http://www.spia.uga.edu/)

School of Public and International Affairs

*Department of International Affairs Amanda Murdie, Ph.D.*

*Professor and Head*

November 15, 2018

Dear members of the selection committee:

I write to support of the application from Dr. Andy Owsiak and Dr. Jeffrey Berejikian to develop a new game and associated open-source instructional materials via the Affordable Learning Georgia Pilots Grants for Developing an Open-Licensed Historical Game, Creation and Implementation program. Their proposed project both strengthens our capacity to achieve a central learning outcome for our program while simultaneously filling a current gap in our curriculum.

From a departmental perspective, this project helps meet a critical need. A core learning objective in our program involves “combining theory with practice.” The intent is to have our students effectively incorporate course concepts with practical application and experience in a manner that prepares them for work after graduation. Meeting this goal is a challenge given our robust enrollments (over 800 majors) and UGA’s location relative to international internship opportunities. Many of our students often can not afford to pursue internships - in Washington DC, for example - to gain experience in putting their ideas into practice.

With this in mind, Drs. Owisak and Berejikian have conceived a game and set of exercises wherein students test their recommendations for cybersecurity policy against class concepts and their own decisions. Their approach facilitates the integration of academic research and practical application. Students also obtain experience with evidence-based policy making and analysis – a new priority within the US government in the field of national security. This type of classroom experience allows many of our students to meet our learning objectives at no additional cost while remaining in residence at UGA.

To extend the impact of the project, Drs. Owsiak and Berejikian will develop the game so that it is appropriate for a broad range of courses. This includes large sections of Introduction to International Relations and a new course entitled Cyber Politics and Security. To date, the Department of International Affairs has not offered a dedicated cybersecurity course. This project can help service that vital curricular need both within the department and the School of Public and International Affairs more broadly. In addition, Drs. Berejikian and Owisak

*Commit to Georgia |* give.uga.edu

*An Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, Veteran, Disability Institution*



intend to lead a series of workshops for our graduate student instructors who teach in International Affairs and Political Science. The purpose of these workshops is to help produce a new generation of teachers who are both familiar with the approach and their Cyber game.

Finally, I would note that Dr. Owsiak and Dr. Berejikian have each received multiple teaching awards. These include recognition for their development and implementation of new and creative instructional pedagogues. Both are wholly committed to the instructional mission of the University and are deeply involved in the various teaching initiatives across campus and the University System of Georgia. They are, as a result, uniquely qualified to undertake this project.

Best regards,

Dr. Amanda Murdie

Department Head, Department of International Affairs Editor-in-Chief, *International Studies Review*

School of Public and International Affairs University of Georgia

murdie@uga.edu