

2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference and Track Summaries

Kimberly A. Mealy, *Director, APSA Education, Professional, and Diversity Program*

The ninth annual APSA Teaching and Learning Conference was held in Washington, DC, February 17–19, 2012. This year's theme was "Teaching Political Science: Relevance in a Changing World."

MEETING FORMAT AND PLANNING

The APSA Teaching and Learning Conference uses the working group format, which allows small groups of scholars the opportunity to interact intensively and on a sustained basis on a common theme. To facilitate this interaction, all participants attend one working group for the duration. The conference also features special workshops that focus on practical issues related to teaching.

The 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference featured 14 moderated working groups, or tracks, organized around themes such as civic engagement; diversity, inclusiveness and equality; integrating technology into the classroom; and program assessment. Two new tracks focused on teaching and learning at community colleges and conflict resolution. The conference also featured interactive workshops on topics ranging from the scholarship of teaching and learning to teaching campaigns and elections. Participants also joined interactive plenary sessions, such as the lunchtime roundtable "Pressing Issues and Innovative Approaches" and the Pi Sigma Alpha Keynote Address "Seeing through the Spin: Equipping Students to be Smart Consumers of Political Information," delivered by Kathleen Hall Jamieson, the Elizabeth Ware Packard Professor of Communication at the Annenberg School of Communication of the University of Pennsylvania.

NEW FEATURE

This year also marked the first annual APSA Teaching and Learning Conference preconference short course on accessible cyberlearning in political science, led by Derrick Cogburn and the Center for Research on Collaboratories and Technology Enhanced Learning Communities (COTELCO) and Institute on Disability and Public Policy (IDPP) teams of American University. Professor Cogburn's teams also provided live online coverage of a number of the tracks and plenary sessions—as was the case for the 2010 and 2011 conferences. The 2012 recorded sessions are available online at www.apsanet.org/teachingconference.

FINAL PLENARY SESSION

The meeting concluded on Sunday, February 19, with a plenary session in which the participants offered meeting-based strategies to address the question "Where Do We Go from Here?" Conference moderators and participants shared concrete suggestions for next steps to enhance teaching and learning throughout the discipline and within their own academic communities.

2012 CONFERENCE OVERVIEW

More than 300 participants attended this year's meeting, up from the 226 participants at the 2011 conference. According to a preliminary analysis of the postmeeting participant evaluation, 55% of the 196 respondents were first-time attendees. In terms of type of institution, 15% of the participants came from community colleges; 34% from BA-granting institutions; 21% from MA-granting institutions; 23% from PhD-granting institutions; and 6% from other organizations. Ninety-five percent said that they would recommend the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference to a colleague.

TRACK SUMMARIES

Fourteen tracks, as noted earlier, were offered as follows:

- Civic Engagement I
- Civic Engagement II: Experiential Learning
- Conflict and Conflict Resolution
- Core Curriculum/General Education
- Curricular and Program Assessment
- Diversity, Inclusiveness, and Equality
- Graduate Education
- Integrating Technology in the Classroom
- Internationalizing the Curriculum
- Simulations and Role Play I: American Politics and Institutions
- Simulations and Role Play II: International Relations and Comparative Politics
- Teaching and Learning at Community Colleges
- Teaching Political Theory and Theories
- Teaching Research Methods

Track summaries from the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference are published in the next pages of *PS*. These summaries include highlights from the research presented in each track and also include recommendations for new strategies—both on the department and discipline level—aimed at advancing the scholarship of teaching and learning. To view the recorded sessions and for more information on the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, please visit www.apsanet.org/teachingconference.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

APSA thanks the following individuals who served on the conference planning committee and as track moderators:

- Candace Young (Chair), Truman State University
- Derrick Cogburn, American University
- Michelle Deardorff, Jackson State University
- Jeffrey S. Lantis, College of Wooster

- Tressa Tabares, American River College
- Deborah Ward, Rutgers University

We also thank all the participants who participated in the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference and contributed to its success. We look forward to see them again at upcoming conferences. Join us in February 2013 for the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference to be held in the Greater Los Angeles, California, area.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT I

Rebecca JoAnn Cruise, *University of Oklahoma*

John Forren, *University of Indianapolis*

Robbin E. Smith, *Central Connecticut State University*

The exploration of civic engagement has been a central component of the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference throughout its nine-year existence. At each annual conference, conversations within conference working groups have moved well beyond the questions of definition and identification (“What is civic engagement? What does it look like?”) to examine how experience-based pedagogies of various types—including community-based inquiry, internships, field placements, volunteering, and service learning—can serve as vehicles for enhancing students’ community involvement and their commitments to core democratic values.

Participants in the Civic Engagement I track continued this rich conversation about civic engagement at the 2012 conference. Led by moderator Ronald Shaiko of Dartmouth College, the group began its work with a lively Friday session devoted to *A Crucible Moment: College Learning & Democracy’s Future*—an analysis and call to action released recently by the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. Presented by the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ Carolyn McTighe Musil—one of the report’s architects—the report’s findings and recommendations emerged as the central guideposts for much of the track’s discussion throughout the weekend. Beyond the specific ideas found in that report, track participants also focused on two other emerging issues in civic engagement that affect not only the political science discipline itself, but also American higher education more generally. The first is the role that political scientists can play in increasing and deepening the connections between students’ civic engagement activities and faculty approaches to distance learning and scholarly research. The second issue concerns how to connect civic education and civic engagement to various interests outside of the academy.

A Crucible Moment

As noted, much of the track’s conversations this year focused on the findings of *A Crucible Moment*. Released only weeks before the conference, this report details the growing crisis in civic education in the nation and urges institutions of higher education to (a) promote a *civic ethos* on their campuses; (b) incorporate *civic literacy* in the core curriculum; (c) include *civic inquiry* in all degree programs; and (d) to encourage *civic action* through community partnerships. As Dr. Musil explained, the report calls for a fundamental transformation of American higher education so that civic engagement is no longer seen as a by-product of political science teaching or the responsibility of a single campus cen-

ter or office—which, unfortunately, is still often the case on American campuses—but rather as a core institutional mission that is embedded throughout a college or university’s curriculum, cocurricular programming, core values, and reward systems. Institutions of higher education, the report asserts, should take broad affirmative steps to ensure that students of all majors and career trajectories understand the importance of democratic citizenship and civic engagement. Further, institutions should demonstrate their commitment to civic learning by rewarding “faculty, staff, and students for research, scholarship, and engagement that expand civic knowledge and that promote committed investment in the common good” (National Taskforce on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement 2012, 48). This groundbreaking report, track participants agreed, marks a significant contribution to the literature not only for the forceful case it makes about the impact of civic engagement activities on student development, but also for its provision of a broad array of concrete and practical ideas about how faculty and administrators alike might garner greater institutional support for such activities. Track participants enthusiastically endorsed its vision and proscriptions.

Connecting Civic Engagement

The following day, track participants discussed various courses and programs that purposefully integrated civic engagement into distance-learning environments and significant research projects. Additionally, the track participants examined examples of how faculty and academic departments can implement civic engagement programs with unique student populations and within distinct community and institutional settings. Robbin Smith, for example, described an innovative partnership that she developed at Central Connecticut State University that pairs university students with seventh-grade student at a local middle school to enhance both sets of students’ awareness of civic needs and governmental processes. Aida Koci of South East European University likewise discussed a teacher-training program recently implemented in Macedonia that uses various civic engagement strategies to raise awareness of the concerns of special-needs populations. In a session entitled “Empowering Students,” Bridget Hynes (University of Denver) and Dick Simpson (University of Illinois-Chicago) presented two useful models of how faculty members can incorporate students into scholarly work aimed at advancing human rights and exposing governmental corruption. Finally, in a Saturday afternoon session on technology and civic participation, Jeff Dense of Eastern Oregon University and Ivelin Sardamov of American University in Bulgaria provided two distinct visions of the Internet’s utility as a vehicle for student engagement.

On Sunday morning, track participants wrapped up deliberations with a session on “Measuring Success.” Karen Brinkley and Kelly Ellenburg presented the results of a benchmarking study conducted by the University of Tennessee about best practices in civic education. In the other presentation, Nanette Levinson of American University explored the ways in which practitioners of civic engagement pedagogies can inform—and likewise be informed by—scholarly programs aimed at enhancing social entrepreneurship, social justice, and human rights.

Discussion and Lessons Learned

These presentations triggered wide-ranging discussions among track participants throughout the weekend conference. Perhaps

most notably, participants enthusiastically and unanimously endorsed both the empirical findings of *A Crucible Moment* and its call for a significant reconsideration of the role that colleges and universities play in maintaining the health of our civil society. The participants unanimously agreed that *A Crucible Moment* deserves the increased exposure and discussion that a broader organizational endorsement from APSA would bring. Accordingly, the track agreed to ask the Political Science Education Section of the APSA to both embrace the report's call to action at the upcoming APSA meeting in New Orleans and also to act as necessary to help "get the word out" about the report's findings to the larger discipline.

In addition, track members shared a range of practical ideas about how the discussions during the conference in Washington can serve as stepping stones for individual and collective concrete action on home campuses. Among other ideas, members exchanged views about how technology can be leveraged to create shared spaces for collaboration, provide instructional resources and support for faculty and enhance classroom inclusiveness—particularly for vulnerable students who do not have a voice in campus life. Also, the group explored the benefits of faculty collaboration both with campus partners in student life and with off-campus partners—such as organizations focusing on social entrepreneurship—to promote the centrality of civic engagement within higher education. Furthermore, the group discussed various ways in which methods courses might be used as the locus for civic engagement scholarship within political science curricula. Several track members also provided insights into how political scientists in university leadership positions can better leverage their institutional authority to draw attention to the civic engagement goals articulated in *A Crucible Moment*.

While sharing these ideas, the group also struggled with at least three fundamental issues. First, is a *mandate* by faculty for students to engage in civic activities—presumably in the name of enhancing democratic citizenship—*itself* antidemocratic? As some track participants emphasized, a compulsory civic education component in a course may, inadvertently, undermine the democratic lesson for students by denying those students the ability to act autonomously. Second, what role should civic engagement-oriented education play in emerging democracies and in those societies' efforts to build civic capital? Although scholars point out declining levels of civic participation in the United States and need for our institutions to address a national "civic recession," political scientists have too often neglected the role of civic engagement in the international realm. Some noted that civic engagement may be even more important in democratizing countries because civic knowledge and the civic skills, attitudes, and values to effectively challenge governmental decision-makers are essential for the development of a democratic citizenry. Third, in an educational environment marked by declining levels of community engagement, rapid innovations in technology and increasing diversity among students, how do we reach out to students and "meet them where they are"? How do we get students excited about democratic participation and convey to them the importance of engagement work? How do we embed engagement in the college and university experience such that it is not course-rooted, but is found throughout the curriculum and the campus? What are the pros and cons of distance learning in this area?

REFERENCE

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. 2012. *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT II: A CALL FOR INTENSIVE EXPERIENCES AND DEEP LEARNING IN TEACHING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Elizabeth Bennion, *Indiana University, South Bend*

Shari Davis

Russell Mayer, *Merrimack College*

Cynthia Newton, *Wesley College*

June S. Speakman, *Roger Williams University*

In a forthcoming APSA publication *From Service-Learning to Civic and Political Engagement*, editors Alison McCartney, Elizabeth Bennion, and Dick Simpson discuss ways political scientists can build student competence and confidence while developing the knowledge, skills, and motivations required of capable citizens who will work to sustain a dynamic, vibrant democracy. In the manuscript, Brian Harward and Daniel Shea express their concern about the lack of deep political engagement and commitment among today's youth, a sentiment shared by many in our discipline. Their proposed solution to this problem is the development of pedagogies and curricula in which students must construct and develop deep engagement with and commitment to political and civic ideas. Only when such deep learning occurs can we expect a sustained, positive impact of what we do as teachers on the civic engagement of our students.

In our track presentations and discussion, we encountered several examples of the kind of deep teaching and deep learning that Harward and Shea call for. Elizabeth Theiss Smith presented on "A Campaign Course as a Bridge to Long-Term Political Engagement." Keshia Perry and M. Cade Smith described Mississippi State's Day One program, a living and learning community with a structured and intense focus on community engagement. Nathan J. Conroy and McGee W. Young offered an alternative way of engaging students in "Civic Engagement through an Entrepreneurial—Experiential Learning Model Applied in the Political Science Classroom." What united these experiential learning models for promoting civic engagement, whether they were contained within a single course, cumulative across the curriculum, or integrated into cocurricular programming, was that they were intense. They promoted the kind of deep commitment to civic engagement that more discrete, isolated, and passing civic and political engagement experiential learning pedagogies cannot hope to match. Compelled by these models, our track discussion came to center on both the value and challenges of teaching civic engagement using such intensive experiences that promote deep learning.

The Value and Challenge of Intensive Experiences in Civic Engagement

One of the most profound advantages of civic engagement pedagogy is the potential to have a lifelong impact on the students involved. Students may not immediately realize the importance of the experience; in fact, they may initially resent the level of commitment and work it entails. Yet, the engagement, if embedded in a well-designed course or internship experience, will leave

a lasting memory and develop civic skills upon which the student may draw for a lifetime. Community-based learning experiences demonstrate the power of ordinary citizens—the difference that one person, or a committed group of people—can make in the life of another person, a community, or a political system.

Despite the advantages of civic engagement pedagogy, a community-based, experiential learning model is not without its challenges. This is particularly true when building sustained relationships to existing community organizations to promote long-term solutions to community-defined problems. Challenges include student, faculty, campus, and community commitment.

Getting students to “buy in” to community-based, experiential learning projects is a hurdle that must be negotiated carefully: not all students will engage in or participate equally. If this issue is not anticipated or planned for adequately, a shallow and relatively meaningless experience, and a failed project, could result. Clear communication through course listings, syllabi, and instructor expectations help to remedy this problem.

Getting faculty to “buy in” to civic engagement pedagogy is another hurdle that must be negotiated carefully. The type of deep learning experiences needed to sustain civic engagement over the long term takes an enormous amount of faculty time and energy. Developing a course that meets departmental learning outcomes while providing authentic hands-on learning experiences for students requires planning and partnerships. Because of the time involved and the lack of rewards associated with this type of commitment, many untenured faculty members cannot afford to devote resources necessary to provide meaningful civic learning experiences for students.

One of the challenges facing faculty wanting to engage in high impact experiential learning continues to be institutional support. Colleges and universities can provide a substantial support for civic engagement by building intracampus, intercampus, and campus-community partnerships necessary to sustain service learning and promote the scholarship of engagement. Campus relationships should be developed and deepened with business, nonprofit, and governmental organizations. Campus-community partnerships can provide a path for education to “reclaim its fundamental civic and democratic mission” (AAC&U, *A Crucible Moment*). However, this cannot happen without an institutional commitment, including designated staff or faculty time. Furthermore, campuses must recognize the value of this type of learning and provide professional incentives (e.g., teaching awards, curriculum development grants, release time) as well as rewriting promotion and tenure guidelines to recognize and reward service-learning courses, civic engagement pedagogy, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and the scholarship of engagement. Colleges and universities, as well as departments, need to create a civic engagement identity or culture that goes beyond a statement of purpose to include degree requirements, professional development opportunities, and faculty rewards.

As an association APSA can ease the burden on faculty by providing comprehensive support for those wanting to promote deep learning and civic leadership through high impact pedagogies. APSA has already begun taking steps in this direction. The APSA’s forthcoming publication of a civic engagement monograph will provide opportunities for political scientists at all types of institutions to learn more about the theory, practice, and assessment of civic engagement. A repository of syllabi and assessment tools is still needed and could be developed as part of the on-line

supplement to the forthcoming monograph. Continued support for the *Journal of Political Science Education* is key in highlighting research-based best practices and providing an outlet for future educational research. The small ‘n’ problem plagues this type of research can be addressed through intercampus research. The Intercampus Consortium for SoTL Research, proposed by Elizabeth Bennion and Cherri Strachan at the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference should be supported by the APSA, allowing teacher-scholars nationwide to collaborate on high-quality research projects that aid our understanding of the most effective ways to promote deep learning and lifelong engagement. The APSA could play a vital role as an association in advertising the Consortium, providing meeting and training space, and providing financial/grant support to those gathering cross campus data.

CONFLICT AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Agnieszka Paczynska, *George Mason University*

The 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference marked the first time the Conflict and Conflict Resolution track met. Educators from across the United States, representing a variety of educational institutions participated. A common theme linking the wide-ranging discussions was a shared sense among the participants that teaching students conflict and conflict resolution presents particular challenges and encourages the adoption of active learning pedagogy.

What We Discussed

Most of the presentations and discussions during the meetings emphasized the unique challenges instructors encounter when they teach students conflict and conflict resolution. As Tina Mavrikos-Adamou (“Which Method is the Right One? Analyzing the Numerous Tools and Techniques for Conflict Resolution”) emphasized, “one of the first hurdles educators encounter with students in the classroom is to get them to understand the complexity of conflict resolution.” Thus, faculty who teach conflict need to convey to students the multidimensional nature of conflict while making conflict seem less abstract to students.

Also, teaching students about conflict resolution requires instructors to introduce students to the multiple approaches and strategies used by a diverse set of actors to resolve conflicts. Instructors also need to help students understand that there are no easy solutions to conflicts and that there is no one-size-fits-all formula for achieving peace. Adding to the unique challenges of teaching conflict and conflict resolution is that most students know very little about international conflicts. Or as Jeannie Grussendorf (“Teaching Peace When Students Don’t Know about War”) put it, “it is difficult to teach students about conflict resolution and peace when they know so little about war. Instructors must therefore balance the need to provide sufficient information to students about particular conflicts with the need to teach them theory of conflict analysis and conflict resolution.” The most effective way of accomplishing these goals, participants agreed, was the use of active and engaged teaching methods, including case studies, simulations, role plays, games, virtual history, and service learning.

The track participants discussed using simulations and role plays in teaching students conflict and conflict resolution. Most agreed that there was a close relationship between course content

and the methods used to convey that content to students. Simulations and role plays provide students with the opportunity to immerse themselves directly in the dynamics of conflict and conflict resolution on a theoretical level. Also, participants noted that when designing role plays and simulations, the instructor needs to be clear about the learning objectives of the exercise. In particular, is the exercise designed to deepen students' knowledge of a particular conflict, to allow them to explore particular theoretical concepts, to improve their understanding of a particular category of conflicts, or to deepen their sense of empathy for people in conflict situations? A number of participants noted that one of the key difficulties in constructing effective role plays is figuring out how to conduct these given the time and space constraints of a classroom while avoiding simplifying the roles and scenarios so that these remain instructive and help students understand the complexity of conflict. A poorly designed simulation or role play rather than helping students break down stereotypes they have about conflict may contribute to deepening these very stereotypes.

In her presentations Bidisha Biswas ("Teaching International Crisis through Online Simulations") discussed how simulations can help students tackle the biases they bring to the analysis of conflict dynamics. One of the conclusions she drew from teaching international security and international political economy was that students' previous, fragmentary knowledge of a particular conflict and selective learning bias resulted in students readily drawing on stereotypes to make sense of new material. Simulations that allow students to explore conflicts through role play provide students with an opportunity to more actively engage with the material, break down stereotypes, and allow them to develop a greater awareness of how their emotions or prior assumptions shape their understanding of conflict.

Neal Carter ("The Seromakran Simulation: An Introduction to Multiple Forms of Justice") discussed how simulations can help students explore issues of justice and to better understand how structural features of a community shape the understanding of issues and the choices that a community makes. A simulation allows students to experience first hand how institutional context and group size affects and constrains their actions. Students thus personally experience dynamics of conflict by participation in the simulation. Both presentations generated a lively discussion about the best ways of designing simulations and role plays that allow students to understand the complexity of conflict, break down cultural barriers and stereotypes, and develop critical thinking as well as empathy. Most participants agreed that one of the biggest challenges in designing conflict simulations is avoiding replicating biases and cultural prejudices.

The group also discussed the use of games in the classroom and the differences and tradeoffs between simulations and games. As Nicholas Vaccaro ("Moving beyond 2 x 2 Table: Integrating Interactive 'Prisoner's Dilemma' and 'Chicken' Games into International Relations Classes") pointed out, because games are shorter and players do not have defined roles, students explore theoretical concepts in a more abstract way. Although a simulation provides the space to explore nuances of a conflict and allows for more realism, a game can be more easily brought into different classrooms and, by stripping away of cultural variables and provide an opportunity for students to explore conflict dynamics that might be common across cultures.

Another approach to teaching conflict and conflict resolution the group discussed was the use of virtual history. This method,

Bruce Gilley ("Teaching the Causes of the Iraq War: The Virtual History Conference") argued, allows students to delve more deeply into the complexities of conflict. It also provides students with the opportunity to get away from determinism when exploring conflict dynamics and encourages them to explore "what if" questions and as well as issues of causality. Such an approach develops students' analytical and critical thinking skills and strengthens "the ability of students to challenge their own assumptions and consider causes they had previously ignored."

Another theme that emerged during the presentations and discussions was that teaching students about conflict is closely linked to empowering students to be more directly engaged with their local communities as well as with global issues, building their capacity, and giving them the tools to approach understanding and resolving conflicts in more constructive ways. Sandi DiMola and Allyson Lowe ("The Use of Service-Learning Model in the Teaching of Conflict Studies: The Lawrenceville Dialogue Project") argued that many, if not most, students live in contested spaces yet do not know how to effectively deal with the conflicts they encounter. Service-learning courses provide students with the opportunity to learn how to understand conflicts, teaches them how conflict is part of a democratic society, and how to navigate conflicts and resolve them more constructively. Through engagement with communities, service learning allows students to experience the complexity of conflict in ways difficult to replicate in the traditional classroom. It also fosters their sense of themselves as potential agents of change rather than passive observers of conflict. Finally, it gives them a deeper understanding of the complexities and difficulties of resolving conflicts.

Track participants agreed that when instructors design service learning courses or course components, they need to be mindful that they do not treat the community in which they will work as a laboratory rat. An essential component of a service learning course focused on conflict and conflict resolution is predicated on prior, deep relationships between the instructor or the university/college and the community in which the work will take place. For the experience to be beneficial to the students, the community needs to welcome the students and to see them as contributing positively to the community.

Finally, the group explored different methods of assessing whether active learning approaches had the anticipated learning outcomes. Preliminary data suggested that such activities as simulations, role plays, and service learning are an effective method for developing students analytical and critical thinking skills, and achieving more specific learning outcomes such as tackling pre-existing biases. Participants noted, however, that assessing the impact of these methods on developing students' empathy can be more difficult.

Lessons Learned and Conclusions

Participants agreed on these takeaways that emerged from the discussions:

- Engaged/active learning approaches are especially useful when teaching conflict and conflict resolution. There is a close link between content of what is taught and teaching methods.
- Emotions and empathy play a key role in teaching conflict and conflict resolution.

- Teaching conflict and conflict resolution also teaches students about crossing cultural barriers and addresses existing biases.
- Teaching about the complexity of conflict, showing its multiple layers and deconstructing it, is important.
- Teaching students how to be engaged, making conflict less abstract, building students' capacity, and giving them the tools to foster their sense of themselves as agents of change is important.

CORE CURRICULUM/GENERAL EDUCATION

Bobbi Gentry, *Millikin University*

Jessica Aubin, *University at Albany, State University of New York*

Joshua Su-Ya Wu, *The Ohio State University*

Aleisha Karjala, *University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma*

Fletcher McClellan, *Elizabethtown College*

At the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, new conversations emerged about how we teach and how our students learn. Based on this foundation, we continue to work and analyze what we do in the classroom to engage a variety of learners and students who may or may not be majors within political science.

We find common threads and challenges from year to year. First, what should be the appropriate balance of skills and content for political science courses serving the core curriculum? Next, how do political science courses provide students, who are taking general education courses, with new perspectives? In particular, how can we offer new perspectives with unique modes of learning for students in our classes and how do we open up the political world to our students so they can become more engaged and effective citizens? Finally, what do we do in political science that is unique to our field? What does political science uniquely or more effectively contribute to liberal learning? As political science and the social sciences come under greater scrutiny, as political scientists we have a responsibility to answer these criticisms with a clear message of what we do and what students learn. Political science should take more of an active role in addressing these criticisms and articulating our value to students and perhaps to a wider public.

In this vein, political science teachers regardless of institution have a public role to play. We make a unique contribution to students' learning, and this is the moment to communicate our relevance to politicians and the general public. A degree in political science opens doors, and the study of politics is invaluable to any society. How people and leaders engage in a political system is extremely important to understanding what gets accomplished in communities and countries.

In general education we focus on how and what, meaning the processes and content of teaching and learning. How and what we teach; how and what students learn; and how and what we study in the scholarship of teaching and learning within general education. One of the questions posed during our sessions was "Are we teaching if students are not learning?" This question is particularly daunting. As faculty we know there are days when students learn and we engage them. There are also days when students learn less. We are much more likely to discuss the good days and are challenged by the other ones. As any teacher knows, however, we learn just as much, if not more, from what did not work than from what did.

What We Do Well

We describe different content approaches to the curriculum and explore balances between skills and content. We offer clarifications of the processes of teaching within our discipline to a wider student audience and investigate what students learn. Political science is in a unique position to offer adaptive learning because we teach in a context that has real people and real situations that change before our students' eyes within days or weeks. In these learning environments, we have different approaches including problem-based learning (Maurer and Neuhold 2012), startling content of United States involvement of East Timor (Knehans 2012), political humor (Glazier 2012), or argument-based instruction (Wu 2012). Recent work has also helped us to identify two elements of a common core—American politics courses and a global course either as a comparative or international relations focus (Gentry and Richards 2012).

Within general education and core curriculum of research on teaching and learning the type that we currently conduct is descriptive, process oriented, evaluation or assessment, reflection and change.

Where We Can Improve

As a discipline, we have been careful not to advocate for a particular common core and have worked to appreciate diversity. However, if we cannot identify a common core for all students of political science, then are we doing a disservice to our students? Other social science disciplines, such as sociology and economics, have articulated a common core while political science continues to be challenged with identifying what courses are necessary to our discipline and which modes of investigation are valuable to our research. Although diversity is valuable to the field we need to acknowledge potential implications on our students and our discipline. Through further discussions of common core standards we believe that we can identify what is common and what is the core of our discipline.

Our research within the common core needs to improve, both qualitatively and quantitatively. We need to move from describing to actually measuring our teaching and students' learning. Specifically, we need to collect better data on the effectiveness of different teaching techniques measured by student knowledge and skills. We know that students would prefer a passive learning style where they are given PowerPoint notes and are provided study guides. But what students prefer is not what we know is best for learning. As professors, however, what we consider as "best" might also not always be conducive to greater student learning and engagement (Lindsay 2012). Therefore it is important for us to create a more open line of communication between students and professors related to learning styles, as well as promote enhanced teaching and learning research.

Moreover, we need to think in terms longer than a single course and look more at a process model for cumulative effect on student learning and student thought and action.

Where Do We Go From Here?

We have many objectives for the common core within our departments, but we also need more cohesion between courses and institutions. Identifying what content we want students to know and what skills are essential to any political science course is necessary if we are to move forward. We must identify the

foundational elements within the discipline. The General Education/Core Curriculum track is where we share these common objectives and discuss differences among faculty about our individual objectives within courses and our objectives for our students. From this year's conference we have tread ground of our previous General Education/Core Curriculum tracks, but we also moved forward in our research to discuss how we teach and with a more critical eye toward student resistance to the challenges of learning.

Ultimately, although there are often more questions than answers, it is imperative that we begin these conversations on what constitutes the "core" of political science education. Only if we identify areas of agreement and disagreement and begin making progress in categorizing and presenting different approaches of teaching, learning, and assessment can political science departments be more engaged participants in the public and legislative discussions of higher education requirements, funding, and expectations.

In addition to clarifying the "how" and "what" in political science education, we need to better articulate the "why." We must be reflective practitioners of political science. We must advocate for political science as essential to liberal learning because it is uniquely able to train a better educated citizenry that can engage in the processes of politics (Schneider and Buehler 2012). We believe that a Task Force for the Common Core is an imperative that we can no longer ignore.

REFERENCES

- Gentry, Bobbi, and Erin Richards. 2012. "The Tie that Binds: Exploring Community College Curriculum Design." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, American Political Science Association, Washington DC.
- Glazier, Rebecca. 2012. "Using Satire to Teaching Introduction to Political Science." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, American Political Science Association, Washington DC.
- Knehans, Greg. 2012. "Opening the Mouth of the World: East Timor and the Pedagogical Value of Startling Content." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, American Political Science Association, Washington DC.
- Lindsay, Peter. 2012. "What are Our Students (Really) Telling Us?" Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, American Political Science Association, Washington DC.
- Maurer, Heidi, and Christine Neuhold. 2012. "Problems Everywhere? Strengths and Challenges of a Problem-Based Learning Approach in European Studies." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference of the American Political Science Association, Washington DC.
- Schneider, Laura, and Melissa Buehler. 2012. "Calling All Citizens: Understanding the Value and Need for a Substantive Civic Knowledge." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, American Political Science Association, Washington DC.
- Wu, Joshua Su-Ya. 2012. "Two Is Better than One: Integrating the Teaching of the 'Political' with the 'Science' in Political Science Courses." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, American Political Science Association, Washington DC.

CURRICULAR AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Candace C. Young, *Truman State University*

Jill Abraham Hummer, *Wilson College*

Daniel Mulcare, *Salem State College*

Tara N. Parsons, *University of Missouri*

Presenters and discussants at the 2012 "Curricular and Program Assessment" track furthered the work of prior assessment tracks through papers and discussions that considered how to better

understand teaching and learning. If track papers are a reflection of the profession, then we are making important progress in our assessment efforts. Participants considered research on student outcomes as complex as citizenship, argumentation, and political efficacy. We also deliberated the importance of curricular coherence and the purposes and benefits of capstone courses, simulations, faculty feedback, and study abroad. The track format of this conference and its theme "Teaching Political Science: Relevance in a Changing World" encouraged participants to have sustained and wide-ranging discussions on issues related to political science and higher education and, in particular, on the future of political science within higher education. Assessment and curricular design are at the center of these issues. Thus, studying how to generate and use assessment evidence more intentionally and strategically to show what our students know and can do is important. As one factor in this agenda, we considered what expanded role APSA might play.

One positive development is that our papers show faculty members are making good efforts to study some of the more complex student learning outcomes associated with political science, such as civic engagement, political efficacy, and cultural awareness. Indeed, since these learning objectives help to distinguish political science's contributions to collegiate outcomes, the academy needs to find ways to structure effective learning experiences for these objectives and empirical evidence to validate them. In our discussions about implementing assessment, we concluded that finding suitable research designs to study the relationship between courses on politics and attitudinal development in students poses significant challenges. Because most assessment is assigned to faculty members as an additional responsibility, limited resources are likely to make assessing complex attitudinal changes more challenging. Despite these limitations, this year's papers underscore the potential for using more sophisticated methodologies for studying student learning outcomes with databases generated at the course, department, and campus levels. Several papers relied on content analyses of websites of various institutional units of higher education to examine the discipline more broadly in terms of the way political science programs structure their curricula and the role that the APSA plays when compared with other discipline's national associations.

It has been suggested that assessment raises more questions than it answers. This is certainly true of papers discussed this year. Findings from several studies suggest that students may become more tentative in their willingness to articulate political opinions on completion of a course than they were on entrance. Clearly, it would be discouraging if our courses actually reduced efficacy or promoted political disengagement or neutrality. However, track members wondered whether this should be interpreted as evidence of failure; perhaps students realized that volatile political issues are more complex than they thought, making them less willing to espouse a position.

Furthermore, attempts to dig deeper into the impact of particular pedagogies (such as simulations, service learning, problem solving, and study abroad) fall victim to the same complexities of student learning, especially in the areas of attitudinal and skill development. What we learned is that assessing attitudinal change is difficult to do and needs to be grounded in research on cognition and attitude development. Findings also suggest that we should be cautious about overpromising what a single course can do in terms of attitudinal and behavioral change. Although

further examination of these important issues is warranted, participants agreed that civic engagement, political efficacy, and appreciation for cultural diversity are attitudinal outcomes our discipline should enhance. Again, the APSA could help to clarify learning outcomes and goals.

Related to both attitudinal and skill development, as well as curricular structure, is the role of study abroad within political science. Currently, there is a push in higher education for these high-impact experiences. While measuring the attitudinal changes brought about by these experiences remains challenging, results could be used to justify the resources committed to them. For example, assessment results could help to determine the effectiveness of situating a high-impact experience overseas versus closer to home. Assessment results for such programs could also be instrumental in encouraging student participation and justifying such programs to external constituencies.

Although structured curricula have the potential benefits of increased coherence and intentional development of collegiate skills, to achieve these desired results in an era of students attending multiple institutions and universities increasing their reliance on temporary and parttime faculty is challenging. Capstone courses are one of the better strategies for increasing the coherence of a student's learning. However, the discipline does not show consensus in its commitment to capstones as an important curricular device nor is there agreement about the role that they should play when capstones are taught in the curriculum. Participants did confirm that capstone courses have the potential to serve curricular coherence, faculty development, and student learning purposes. However, many capstones are essentially an upper-level research course on a theme within the discipline. Other capstones might consist of a thesis requirement that students pursue as a mentored, but independent, endeavor. Campuses that use the course as an integrating mechanism may teach the course as a more challenging version of Introduction to Political Science based on readings the "classics" and senior-level writing assignments. Students may also sit for a comprehensive exam and complete a substantial research project. Others described course assignments that focused on getting students ready for the job market or postbaccalaureate degrees. Debate ensued on the relative merits of these approaches and how each of these may provide opportunities for student learning, program feedback, and faculty development. There was consensus that capstones can be effectively used as assessment, especially when student projects encourage faculty conversation and collaboration about the purposes and student learning results in their program. The 1991 APSA Task Force on Political Science recommended elements of a curricular structure, including integrative capstone courses, which would best promote student learning. APSA should now revisit some of these recommendations in light of the recent trends in higher education and developments in program assessment.

Most faculty participating in the track described mandates from deans, provosts, regional accrediting bodies, or state agencies of higher education as their motivation to complete assessments. However, faculty seemed to have wide latitude in the design of assessments, and, often, the assessments described were episodic and qualitative. Although these can provide useful information for a specific course or department question, these assessments may not work as well for communicating to external audiences the value of what we do. This lingering and consequential problem has been raised in prior assessment tracks.

In our concluding discussion, we considered how our departments and APSA might use assessment to demonstrate to our external and internal publics the value and effectiveness of our programs. Findings that other national associations for liberal arts disciplines do more in assisting faculty with assessment led track participants to ask the question, "What might the APSA do to further our assessment in political science?" Track participants suggested that APSA generate materials on commonly offered student learning outcomes in political science, job placement data for political science graduates, and best practices in curricular design and assessment. The APSA could also develop recommendations for what our graduates should know and be able to do, as well as promotional materials on the unique advantages of a political science major over other liberal arts degrees or career training programs.

This call to action reflects a significant addition to our traditional focus on assessment at the classroom, department, and even institutional levels. Now, we need to look at assessment from a discipline-wide perspective. Our constituencies are demanding that political science prove its worth. This is reflected in multiple phenomena such as the efforts of members of Congress to cut NSF funding and the difficulty graduates face securing their first jobs. The first step in convincing external constituencies that political science offers a unique and vitally important educational experience is to present a coherent plan and a unified front. As our national organization, APSA has an opportunity and responsibility to provide at least a short list of objectives that political science departments should aim to achieve, perhaps based on objectives that have been used effectively by member departments. The APSA should also provide relevant and updated resources that can help members design curricula and assessments to meet those objectives.

Most recommendations will need to offer pluralistic options and recognize time and money limitations of the professoriate and departments. Ultimately, track participants believe that the future stature of political science depends on the effectiveness of our assessments, particularly our ability to generate convincing, accessible, and compelling evidence for the discipline's contribution to desired collegiate outcomes such as critical thinking and citizenship development.

DIVERSITY, INCLUSIVENESS, AND EQUALITY

Boris E. Ricks, *California State University, Northridge*

Masako Rachel Okura, *Columbus State University*

The ninth meeting of the Diversity, Inclusiveness, and Equality (DIE) Track at the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference focused on issues of difference, diversity, and equality as these relate to pedagogical, classroom, department, and institution wide matters from multiple perspectives. This year, DIE hosted 12 participants and eight research papers. Seven of the eight papers were presented and covered the following topics: (1) strategies to introduce gender perspectives, (2) culturally responsive team teaching, (3) disability inclusive education, (4) student diversity and classroom discussions, (5) teaching urban politics through Baltimore City elections, (6) presenting intolerance to teach tolerance, and (7) the politics of gender and population aging. Track discussants provided constructive criticism, careful reflection, and useful

feedback to the presenters and participants. Substantive and lively discussions focused on student learning objectives, course content, teaching methods, classroom interactions, gender, and intersectionality issues. Three main themes emerged from presentations, discussions, and workshops: (1) difficulty within the discipline defining diversity, (2) pedagogical issues teaching difficult subject matter, and (3) inclusiveness and the role of teacher/facilitator. These themes included issues such as civic and community engagement, gender-infused curriculum, and using intolerance to teach tolerance.

Difficulty within the Discipline Defining Diversity

Throughout the meeting, we were constantly reminded that the term *diversity* entails much more than textbook interpretations. Often, we use a narrow definition of diversity to neatly compartmentalize multidimensional students (and others) into predictable categories (race, class, gender, and sexual orientation). Diversity can be defined in a variety of ways. Diversity aims to broaden and deepen both the educational experience and the scholarly environment as students and faculty learn to interact effectively within a pluralistic society.

Diversity is designed to increase educational equity for all students. In this context, diversity is a commitment to recognizing and appreciating the variety of characteristics that make individuals unique in an atmosphere that promotes and celebrates individual and collective achievement. Examples of these characteristics are age, cognitive style, culture, disability (mental, learning, physical), economic background, education, ethnicity, gender identity, geographic background, language(s) spoken, marital/partnered status, physical appearance, political affiliation, race, religious beliefs, and sexual orientation.

For many faculty who were taught and teach from a monocultural perspective reflecting a single norm of thought and knowledge base considered to be universally valid, the prospect of any curriculum transformation, diversity infusion, and or multicultural pedagogy can be extremely unsettling. To gain support from those who are lukewarm about infusing diversity into political science education, educators must reframe the issue of diversity into a broader and less controversial perspective—for instance, community and civic engagement. These attempts should not be interpreted as co-optation; rather, it should be understood in terms of a practical opportunity to increase interaction and awareness of others. Also, with a better understanding of diversity we can achieve the following:

1. Diversity enriches the educational experience. We learn from those whose experiences, beliefs, and perspectives are different from our own, and these lessons can be taught best in a richly diverse, intellectual, and social environment.
2. Diversity promotes personal growth—and a healthy society. It challenges stereotyped preconceptions; it encourages critical thinking; and it helps students learn to communicate effectively with people of varied backgrounds.
3. Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace. Education within a diverse setting prepares students to become good citizens in an increasingly complex, pluralistic society; it fosters mutual respect and teamwork; and it helps build communities whose members are judged by the quality of their character and their contributions.

In addition to philosophical discussions on defining the boundaries of diversity, the group also focused on pedagogical issues examining syllabi, teaching techniques, lecture/discussion formats, and online platforms to create the best possible learning environment in which students would feel motivated, comfortable about their identities, and connected with other students.

Pedagogical Issues Teaching Difficult Subject Matter

Teaching difficult subject matter is a challenging exercise for most faculty members. One approach to deal with uneasy, awkward, or unpleasant subject matter is to create a safe and healthy teaching and learning environment within the classroom (an environment of equality and trust works best). A second approach is to discuss uncomfortable topics in a more comfortable manner (use of vernacular language helps students to identify). A third approach is “broadening the scope” and allow for impartiality to emerge (expand the range of how we characterize “oppressed” groups). Faculty must free themselves from their narrow definition of oppressed groups without trivializing the experiences of the oppressed group’s members. For example, many focus on the plight of a single group, such as African Americans, to teach about racism, discrimination, and intolerance. However, historically speaking, we can and should include Chinese, Irish, Italian, Japanese, Latinos and others to broaden the range and allow for impartiality to emerge. Faculty must take into account the twenty-first century classroom that includes students of varying racial hues, ethnic persuasions, income levels, and lifestyle preferences. Building and maintaining a safe and healthy teaching and learning environment is a valuable asset when faculty grapple with teaching difficult subject matter. However, faculty and students alike, share the ultimate responsibility of community building. We also make the following recommendations when teaching difficult subject matter:

1. Faculty should emerge themselves in the subject matter for purposes of content reliability and validity. A firm grasp of the literature, key concepts, and core ideas helps faculty to deal with difficult themes and questions.
2. Faculty should get feedback from colleagues when they decide to engage difficult subject matter for teaching and learning purposes. Colleagues may have an approach and or method that may prove to be helpful.
3. Use the learning-centered approach; focus on how the learner will use the information as opposed to the information itself. In this instance, smaller learning communities (group exercises) are useful to help students feel comfortable in sharing their ideas and responding to the ideas of others.

Inclusiveness and the Role of Teacher—Facilitator

First, we have to remind ourselves that we are facilitators of teaching and learning, rather than dictators of teaching and learning. Gone are the days when it was considered the norm to give students arbitrary and subjective assessments and impose one-sided lectures on them. The transition from dictator to facilitator is not easy; many difficult tasks await professors in creating a healthy learning environment. First, we have to discern our audience and adjust our pedagogy in a way to build trust and a sense of community. A healthy learning environment is inclusive and allows for learning objectives to be met. Also, a healthy learning environment is one in which facilitators allow students to experience

uncomfortable issues in the most comfortable way and voluntarily acknowledge that identity differences may indeed translate into privileges or a lack thereof in society. For example, have students participate in the Privilege Walk¹ (walking through privileges). Have students line up and ask them to take one step forward if they can affirm particular statements about unearned privilege stemming from their gender, race, class, religious orientation, and other ascribed characteristics. This activity visibly illustrates that some students are more privileged than others while helping the privileged realize their unearned statuses without feeling attacked.

Second, as facilitators of learning, we also have to confront the scholar–practitioner demarcation in ourselves and put aside esoteric textbooks at times, taking students off campus, or using unconventional resources to make them feel connected to content and ideas that students may not fully grasp solely through textbooks. For example, when studying voting and elections, taking students to inner-city polling stations (to volunteer, collect data, or even vote) helps facilitate what happens in a participatory democracy. Civic and community engagement activities are practical efforts to increase our awareness of and about others.

Our role as facilitators is not to impose our perspective on race, class, gender, or other issues related to identity differences and privilege, but to enable students to learn and reflect on society's barriers and enablers. These tasks are what facilitators are expected to do—namely, challenging students to think, feel, and experience diversity rather than imposing views on them that are rarely value neutral.

Recommendations

The DIE track participants reaffirmed last year's commitment to adopting the Diversity in Political Science Education (DIPSE) Action Plan (see below) and added a new item. In the next few years, we expect to begin the following projects:

1. Create a DIPSE support website: In the past, we have considered creating a website to facilitate DIE education; however, the plan has not yet materialized. The proposed website will be consistent with several APSA organized sections that already have posted syllabi and, in addition, include links to video clips, simulations, and annotated bibliographies to assist professors interested in infusing diversity into their curricula.
2. Offer a teaching and learning conference workshop: We would like to directly communicate with those who have questions about revising their curriculum to include DIE issues.
3. Offer a short course at the APSA Annual Meeting: We plan to develop a short course in teaching DIE issues.
4. Publish APSA booklets on DIE "How to" series: This project is an extension of our website project, workshop, and short course. The series is designed to offer practical approaches for creating DIE courses. Topics may include, but are not limited to, race and ethnicity, LGBT, social class, religious orientation, intersectionality and global perspectives. It will result in an APSA book series commensurate with publications on assessment and civic engagement.
5. Organized a standing working group to allow for open dialogue about diversity, inclusiveness, and equality issues and to encourage research collaboration(s) when feasible.

NOTE

1. The purpose of the Privilege Walk Activity is to learn to recognize how power and privilege can affect our lives even when we are not aware it is happening.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

Alice M. Jackson, *Morgan State University*

Julia M. Lau Bertrand, *Georgetown University*

The Graduate Education track at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference explored the unique challenges facing faculty guiding the development of graduate students and building and sustaining excellence in graduate programs. This track was attended by both faculty and graduate students. In 2012 there were 16 attendees, up from a modest five who attended this track in 2011. Lively discussions and spirited exchanges occurred throughout the sessions. The graduate students were vocal in the discussions and highlighted some of the challenges that they face in graduate school. One constant in most of the discussions was "what are graduate schools teaching the students for them to participate in the changing world?"

The sessions focused on "Teaching Graduate Research Methods," "Models of Teacher Instruction for Graduate Students and Junior Faculty," and "Innovative Learning Models." Papers were presented by experienced faculty, faculty along with graduate students, and graduate students individually. There were also presentations by newly minted professors.

Henrik M. Schatzinger from Ripon College in his paper "So You Want to Start a Research Project? How to Help Beginning Researchers via Guided Inquiry" referred to APSA's *Report of the Task Force on Political Science in the 21st Century* that raised the question as to how faculties are helping students to frame their research questions. The report noted that issues such as race, ethnicity, and gender are rarely addressed in the flagship journals, despite changing demographics. Schatzinger shared the techniques he used in his classes. He argued for guided research to excite and engage students on topics that are seldom selected.

Shamira Gelbman and her students from Illinois State University presented on "Teaching Archival Research Methods: Reflections from an American Political Development Course." In this paper, the authors argued that although archival research is increasingly acknowledged as a valuable tool for political scientists, students are seldom instructed on its methodology. The students reflected on their experiences in the course. They focused on their research grant proposals and how they collaborated on the construction of a spreadsheet which was based on their examination of more than 2100 digitally archived slave narratives. They recommended that American political development courses and its methodology should be encouraged in political science curricula as this provides students with another transferrable skill. One of the students who participated in this project and presented as a part of the team was a history major. She indicated that she had benefitted tremendously from the course. The participants agreed that teaching methodology as an interdisciplinary course was a valuable tool for breaking down silos between departments.

Keith Hale Hollinger from Virginia Tech presented "The Teaching Assistant to Faculty Transition Employing the Learner-Centered Teaching Model." He described his experience when he transitioned from a graduate teaching assistant to faculty in the

classroom. Hollinger described changes in his teaching and explained how being able to prepare his own material enhanced his teaching skills.

Julia M. Lau Bertrand from Georgetown University presented “Those Who Can, Teach.” She raised several issues about whether graduate students are being taught to be effective instructors. She discussed how a small group of graduate students developed an informal, yet effective way of helping each other to meet the rigors and stresses associated with teaching. She stressed peer-to-peer mentoring and discussions at the PhD level.

David Adams from Auburn University presented “Enhancing Student Learning through Mutli-Course Coordination and Learning Module Integration.” He focused his analysis and evaluation of a teaching experiment that was designed to enhance student learning in applied research methods used in public administration. The goal of the experiment was to analyze coordinated instruction, assessment, and dissemination and future planning. The preliminary results showed that participants were able to identify these key concepts within the general framework of public administration, policy, and program implementation.

Shannon Scotece, SUNY, University at Albany focused on “Teaching Active Learning Strategies to Graduate Students.” She reviewed proven strategies to train graduate students in active learning techniques. Her theory is that early instruction and exposure to different methods of teaching allows graduate students to develop their own teaching styles and to experience new methods of teaching before they enter the job market. She addressed ways of alleviating obstacles such as general anxiety, time management issues, and lack of confidence.

These presentations show the variety of methods and techniques that are being used at colleges and universities to train students. They also show that there is a cry for knowledge on how to train graduate students to succeed in this changing world. Graduate students need guidance, and faculty need to show what they are doing to prepare future faculty to make them relevant in today’s marketplace.

Participants agreed that there is a need to address these questions:

- How do we teach graduate students to behave professionally?
- How do we teach graduate students to behave in the discipline?
- How do we teach graduate student to conduct research, that is, how political scientists write and speak?
- What mixed messages are faculty collectively sending?
- What should be the graduate student’s relationship to the chair, dissertation committee, and adviser?

Participants determined that to be relevant in a changing world and to address the above issues, APSA could facilitate data collection. They recommend that APSA do the following:

- Conduct a survey of all graduate departments of political science to determine what kinds of professional development is provided for graduate students.
- Support efforts to develop standardized guides to professionalism.
- Promote more short courses/working groups at the Teaching and Learning Conference and APSA Annual Meeting to

give graduate students more opportunities to participate in the organization.

- Survey junior faculty who are in the job market for the first time to find out where they are going.
- Publish in *PS* a Forum on Effective Teaching Models
- Hold a professional development café during lunch at the APSA Annual Meeting
- Form a committee on graduate education

All participants agreed that there is a need for a Graduate Education track at all future APSA Teaching and Learning Conferences to share information, discuss topics, and make suggestions. They also agreed that graduate students should play a more active role in the organization.

INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM

Suzan Harkness, *University of the District of Columbia*

Victoria Dounoucos, *Virginia Tech*

Logan Vidal, *Virginia Tech*

More than 300 participants gathered at the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference where 30 joined the conversation of integrating technology in the classroom. The track participants represented various colleges, universities, community colleges, as well as international colleagues representing the UK and the Netherlands. The panel was moderated by Derrick L. Cogburn, American University, who kept the conversation on-point and technology in-check. Technology was incorporated into the track sessions themselves as the presentations and discussions were streamed live for several online participants. The track theme provided extensive opportunity to deliberate the challenges, impact, and outcomes of increased technological innovation used in web-enhanced and online political science courses. Participants discussed the many and varied ways technology has become part of our pedagogical approach.

Technological innovation and tools are now part of everyday life within academe for students and professors alike. As such, this panel shared examples of how web-based tools and applications facilitate learning, manage large classes, build collaborative learning spaces, and achieve learning objectives. Many of the same themes repeated themselves from previous year’s discussions, such as costs, assessment, and large class size. New to the discussions, however, were issues relating to accessibility, FERPA, state and federal regulations, administrative tensions, technology support, and assessment of the impact of technology on learning.

Jackman (“When Virtuality and Reality Meet: Online Courses, Experiential Learning and Political Engagement”) presented via web conferencing from Salem, Massachusetts, and described her pilot study that explored the opportunities and challenges for experiential learning and political engagement in online courses. While recognizing that technology has the potential to have an impact on student learning, Jackman concluded that online courses may also promote information literacy and advocacy involvement. Her study explored students’ ability to analyze policy, form opinions, and become actively involved in local politics. Whereas Jackman did not observe substantial gains in online class discussion, Sussman and Kelly (“Andragogically Integrating Media Sharing Websites into University Curricula for Adult Learning Delivery”) identified increased participation when they used social media

and blogs linked to course objectives. The team concluded that the use of online discussion in the classroom enables teaching and learning to meet at a crossroads. Sussman and Kelly confronted a range of abilities and attitudes toward technology from their adult learners, but found that incorporating technological approaches created an active learning environment and increased student participation. Degnan-Rojewski (“Integrating E-book Readings into Class Through the Course Management System: A Pilot Study”) continued the theme of information literacy and active learning by discussing how the integration of e-Book readings into course/learning management systems promotes engagement to effectuate outcomes.

Star and Fernandez (“Teaching Foreign Policy across Borders without Leaving the Classroom”) set out to explore how they could use collaborative applications to engage learners in a bicultural learning environment. Star discussed how a web-enhanced course using Adobe Connect facilitated junior-level students’ cultural understanding of US-Mexico relations. The findings suggest that students gained an appreciation of other cultures responses to foreign policy issues and a thoughtful understanding of bilateral relationships.

In Lelieveldt’s (“Navigating the EU: Evaluating the Effectiveness of a New Web-based Tool to Make Students Better EU Learners and Citizens”) study of information problem solving (IPS) skills, he identified that advancing technology is also a challenge to the younger student generation. Lelieveldt argued that the open and unrestricted nature of the Internet has enabled students to retrieve results too easily without using a structured research approach or consideration of information literacy. He concluded that a shift in focus to IPS-Internet skills and a step-by-step instructional approach to instill quality research habits in light of rapidly advancing technology and available information is needed.

Confronting increasing class size and building on the 2011 presentation, Hamann, Pollock, and Wilson (“Spill-over Effects in Online Discussions? Assessing the Effectiveness of Student Preceptors”) discussed the efficacy of a conditioning intervention using student preceptors in promoting student interaction and improving the quality of discussion in a large, online American government class. The team incorporated online discussion to reorganize a large class into smaller groups to stimulate critical and higher-order thinking and encourage active learning. They defined methods to measure quantitative indicators of discussion activity and quality under two quasi-experimental conditions. The design of their discussion activities included an initial model post by a student preceptor with the intent of creating a “spill-over” effect for future student postings. The next step of their research will include content analysis to learn more about how to improve student learning in online discussion groups through the use of preceptors.

Building on the peer-to-peer learning model, Feeley (“Use of Peer Instruction to Enhance Student Participation in Large Undergraduate Political Science Courses: Impact on Student Learning and Attitudes Toward Learning”) incorporated peer instruction (PI) pedagogy and clickers (rapid response systems) into her large undergraduate course. She found that this amalgamation of technology and face-to-face interaction contributed to learning gains, increased student motivation to prepare for class, and stimulated a positive interactive learning environment. Brians, Dounoucos, and Vidal (“Assessing the Teaching and Learning Utility of the iPad”) explored the impact of clickers in a 300 student US government course and reported that clickers may enhance student attendance, participa-

tion, attention and ability to identify key factual content. Moreover, they reported that students found clickers to be useful when clicker questions served as study guides or exam topic cues. These presentations sparked a larger discussion on the accessibility of clickers, costs, cheating, universal adoption standards, and the construction of elegant clicker questions. Conversely, a resonating theme revealed that when clickers were used appropriately (not for attendance only) and when clicker questions were well-constructed, students were engaged, focused, and present.

The use of social media was incorporated into the classroom through Curtis’s (“Web 2.0, Dialogue and Learning on the New Diplomacy: Blogs, Wikis and YouTube”) use of blogs in an upper-level diplomacy course. Curtis found that this approach worked well for diplomatic studies because of the volume of material available online. By using blogs as a form of assessment, students were motivated in reflection, participation, creativity, and providing feedback to peers. Interestingly, although the blogs were available in the public domain, Curtis found that this discouraged plagiarism and invited public commentary. By incorporating Twitter into his Electoral Politics course, Russell (“#POLI30242 Psephology Matters and Elections Count! Using New Social Media to Teach Electoral Politics in the UK”) detected an increased attention and interest in course lectures as well as deeper learning and improved grades. Curtis encouraged our discussion on the larger deliberation around divided attention, for example, is it a distraction when students tweet or blog in the classroom?

In sum, this panel focused on five key themes: (1) the perpetual evolution of technology, (2) the increasing class size, (3) privacy issues associated with social media and networking sites, (4) assessment of student learning, and (5) effective uses of technology aligned to objectives. We also drew into the conversation affordances associated to increased technological innovation and implementation, technological support, bandwidth, costs, and laws and regulations. Similar to the wide-ranging scope of tools and applications available for instructional purposes, the themes, questions, and conversations experienced during this year’s panel were lively and endless.

Moving forward the panel identified salient issues that many of us have discussed and will likely persist on our respective campuses. These include federal laws pertaining to online and distance education, state-to-state MOUs for distance education, intellectual property, accessibility, FERPA, and increased demands for larger classes. As innovative faculty incorporate new and emerging technologies to facilitate learning outcomes, further valuation needs to be established on whether these methods improve student learning and performance as well as establish pedagogical best practices that benefit all. We look forward to an elucidative effect as these presentations and deliberations make their way into the literature, and scholars augment their inquiry for next year’s discussions.

INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM

Joseph W. Roberts, *Roger Williams University*

Mark Sachleben, *Shippensburg University*

Deborah E. Ward, *Rutgers University*

Since 2006, the discipline has provided support for a more organized discussion of how we fit intellectually and pedagogically

within a global movement to “internationalize.” Neither the interests nor the objectives in this movement are uniform which begets the perennial question, what does it mean to “internationalize” the political science curriculum? We have a responsibility to prepare our students for success in an increasingly globalized world, a world which is not defined by contexts and norms that most American students would find familiar. Scholars and educators acknowledge that it is critical to adjust what is being taught as well as how it is being taught and yet remain actively engaged in creating a global learning experience. Others reject the change to the status quo, arguing that American exceptionalism (however conveniently defined) will prevail. The majority probably find themselves along the spectrum in between, with feelings that range from truly interested but without resources or time to dedicate serious thought to the project, to those who profess a feigned interest in globalization because it would be gauche not to. Again, this lack of clarity or action is attributable to the difficulty in defining internationalization and the lack of resources that so many educators and institutions to robustly pursue this enterprise. Within this complexity the discipline has supported a task force, plenary panels at the APSA Annual Meeting, a dedicated track at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference devoted to this topic, and is now disseminating this work to the discipline at large on the APSA website.

The 2012 Internationalizing the Curriculum Track concluded with three critical themes. First, how do political scientists define “internationalizing the discipline?” This question is of paramount importance because before any of us might internationalize our courses, programs, or universities we must know what this means. Does it simply mean studying abroad? Does it mean using resources from other geographic locations? Does it mean rethinking what we teach and how we teach it? Does it make sense to think of American politics as its own subfield? Should it be just another case in comparative politics? The answers are yes, yes, yes, maybe, and possibly. The last two questions are obviously, and intentionally, provocative. We argue that the discipline must think about the impact of parochialism and insularity on the research and teaching of the discipline by incorporating as many global voices as possible into our work.

We contend that by embracing the vibrancy of international scholarly contributions to the discipline, political science will increase its power and reach. This second theme echoes Benjamin R. Barber, who wrote, “to be of relevance, political science needs to approach global politics and the issues the global context raises through a [newly constructed] lens” (Barber 2007, 105). Of course, for us the issues the global context raise must be done across all of the subfields of the discipline. In other words, why is internationalizing the curriculum important for political science? The *LEAP Report* of the American Association of Colleges and Universities argues, “the world is being dramatically reshaped by scientific and technological innovations, global interdependence, cross-cultural encounters, and changes in the balance of economic and political power” (National Leadership Council 2008, 2). Political science certainly accepts this new world order but it must do more than accept it. We must work towards a richer more vibrant understanding of how these forces allow us to rethink what we know and how we know it.

More importantly, why is the internationalization of the discipline important for our students? As Stephen J. Rosow argues, “global studies can take a leading role in refashioning, and reinvig-

orating, a political citizenship” (Rosow 2003, 11). While the *LEAP Report* suggests that “the major issues and problems of our time—from ensuring global sustainability to negotiating international markets to expanding human freedom—transcend individual disciplines” (National Leadership Council 2008 20), we argue that these are at the forefront of political science education. The *LEAP Report* argues that “students also need rich opportunities to explore “big questions” through multifaceted perspectives (National Leadership Council 2008, 20). Political science does this now and must continue to expand on this in the future.

The third and final theme, and possibly the most difficult, is how do we integrate the international across subfields in political science. The 2012 track addressed this theme in various ways: discipline and university trends in internationalization, strategies to engage students and remove barriers in the classroom, and finally, exposing students to the global environment.

The first category addressed discipline and university-level trends in internationalization. Anne Marie Mezzell of Lincoln University provided a rich overview of the discipline’s international course offerings. To assess the level of internationalization at her own university, she compared the number of international classes offered and required for political science majors at a number of institutions. Her findings have interesting implications for the future of internationalization. For example, political science departments in public universities typically require slightly more international courses than do private institutions. Mezzell’s concern, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, typically require less, and offer fewer, international courses for majors.

Christopher Dolan’s paper chronicled the barriers to creating an international studies major at a small college (Lebanon Valley College). Concerns expressed on his campus include funds and resources taken away from existing programs to support international studies.

The second category of papers offered strategies to engage students and methods to overcome barriers to internationalization in the classroom. In teaching American politics, Christian Olivo (University of Northern Colorado) uses the writing of East European dissidents, such as Vaclav Havel’s “The Power of the Powerlessness,” to help elucidate and enlighten current issues in American politics. Mark Sachleben (Shippensburg University) discussed the use of film (plus television and Internet video) to demonstrate how students can observe issues and problems from different perspectives, and he argued that the discipline should be conscious of the media literacy of university students. Angela Narasimhan (Idaho State University) highlighted the importance of comparative perspectives on constitutional law courses. Using the debate about the role (if any) of foreign jurisprudence on American constitutional law, Narasimhan argues that any reasonable debate on the issue must include an understanding on potential impacts from both sides of the debate.

The final theme that emerged from the papers presented was the exposure of students to international students, events, or experiences to enhance internationalization. Judithanne McLauchlan used the contacts she made while on a Teaching Fulbright in Moldova to link students at the University in South Florida with students in Moldova. The result was a collaborative class with her coauthor Svetlana Suveica at Moldova State University, which produced a book on human trafficking and helped students (in both countries) breakdown stereotypes and provide real world

experience. Joseph Roberts discussed Roger William University's initiative to create new curricula for both his institution and Providence, Rhode Island, public schools by organizing experiential activities in Egypt for instructors at all levels of education. The goal of the project is to weave more material about North Africa and Arab countries into the curriculum through the experiences of instructors. Likewise, Andra Miljanic used a short-term study abroad course by the faculty of the University of Houston to engage students who were unable to participate in such an experience. Students on the study abroad course seminar "broadcast" their experiences and knowledge through blogging. Meanwhile, students who did not participate in the trip provided research support for those participating. The activity increased support for short-term study experiences abroad among administrations, faculty, and students at the university, as well as enhancing the analysis of those participating in the trip.

Track papers generated discussion about the increasingly positive environment for internationalizing classroom learning. Technology has facilitated global classrooms that would have been unheard of several years ago; departments and schools are encouraging international experiences that are integrated with the classroom experience, and a network of departments, scholars, and teachers, who are dedicated to this enterprise, is growing. Track participants supported continued efforts that started several years ago, such as the development of globalized textbooks across the subfields, resource sharing, and developing benchmarks for self-assessment, as well as new efforts such as collecting empirical evidence on the impact of study abroad programs, the development of a blog, the use of APSA Connect to create a library of resources, and an update to the *PS* article published in 2007 on the state of internationalization in subfields across the discipline. As concluded in the past, an APSA working group tasked with both managing these different efforts as well as developing clear standards for institutions and departments is critical to this movement's continued success.

REFERENCES

- Barber, Benjamin R. 2007. "Internationalizing the Undergraduate Curriculum: Opening Commentary." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40 (1): 105.
- National Leadership Council for Liberal Education America's Promise. 2008. *College Learning New Global Century*. Washington, DC: AACU. http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/GlobalCentury_final.pdf
- Rosow, Stephen J. 2003. "Toward an Anti-Disciplinary Global Studies," *International Studies Perspectives* 4 (1): 114.

SIMULATIONS AND ROLE PLAY I: AMERICAN POLITICS AND INSTITUTIONS

Jewerl Maxwell, *Cedarville University*

Presentations in the Simulations and Role Play I: American Politics and Institutions track illustrated the flexibility of simulations within the field of American politics. At the outset, track moderator Jeffrey Lantis acknowledged that no instructor has "cracked the code" to create simulations. On the one hand, this lack of a code presents challenges to any instructor interested in adopting a simulation; on the other hand, the participants analyzed the wide variety of possibilities for simulations. Indeed, among the eight papers presented, authors identified successful simulations for large (100 students) classes, both general educa-

tion and politics-specific; medium-sized (35–40) upper level political science and law courses; small, upper-level classes (10–15) at a liberal arts institution; and large groups (100–130) of high school students. In addition, simulations varied immensely in the amount of class time devoted to role-play; from a one-week intensive-learning course, an entire semester course that is 100% devoted to active learning, and a two-day end-of-course simulation. Despite this variation, several themes emerged, including the unique skills students acquire through simulations, the practical understanding of the political process not found in lecture-based courses, and the inherent connection between advancing technology and simulations, which leads to increased student interaction and learning outside of the classroom.

Acquisition of Unique Skills

In the first paper presented in this track, "Teaching a Select Triad in Politics and Government," Ronald Petite focused on the chaotic nature of politics, and thus the need for students to respond to the ever-changing nature of the political environment. As a result, Petite created a triad of courses within American government, based primarily on the real-world electoral calendar. Each of the courses emphasizes collaborative learning, critical thinking, and effective communication. Students work in groups, but each student takes on the roles of presidential candidates and members of the president's cabinet (depending on the course). Students engage in oral communication (usually through debates or confirmation hearings) and respond to simulation experiences through a reflective journal. One of the most effective tools Petite used in his courses is assigning students roles of individuals with whom they fundamentally disagree politically, and thus forcing the students to understand their political enemies, while refining their own political beliefs.

Such oral communication and critical thinking skills were further examined by Peter Bergerson, in "Politics and Public Budget: Agency and Legislative Decision-making Strategies," and Arthur H. Auerbach, in his analysis, "United States Supreme Court Confirmation Simulation: Learning through the Process of Experience." In Bergerson's upper-level course on public budgeting, each student defends the budget request of a specific department or agency in front of a committee, receiving questions from both supporters and opponents. In this high-stakes environment, students must not only understand the process of the budget, but the strategies used by administrators. Similarly, Auerbach uses a Supreme Court confirmation simulation, in which students take on roles of senators or Supreme Court nominees and research the policies necessary to understand the specific beliefs/values of the corresponding roles. These simulations help students learn valuable content as well as develop substantial oral communication and critical thinking skills.

Practical Understanding of Political Processes

In addition to the unique skills acquired through simulations, track participants noted students' ability to understand the practical side of politics through simulations. For example, in "Balancing the Books: Assessing the Impact of a Federal Budget Deliberative Simulation," Susan E. Orr and Dena Levy tested the use of budgeting simulations in general education classes. They sought to address the question, "how do you teach something inherently boring to a class of nonmajors?" They conducted a pretest and

posttest analysis within a test group and a control group. Although the findings were inconclusive regarding the material students learned through the courses, students in the simulation course (which examined eight policy proposals over the semester) thoroughly examined the budget process in ways a standard course might not allow.

Using legislative and judicial simulations, Rosalyn Cooperman (“Lawmaking and Law Interpreting in the Land of Oz”) explained that such practical understanding of political processes occurs in small-class simulations as well. Students create their own “member of Congress” profile in this legislative simulation and experience the bill-writing/amending/voting process first-hand. Students gained a thorough understanding of the legislative process; particularly the complexities of group decision-making in a highly polarized environment. Multiple mini-moot courts were offered in Cooperman’s judicial simulation class. Again, students reported that they gained a greater understanding of what courts do and how they arrive at their decisions.

Margaret Tseng’s work (“Civic Engagement and the Millennial Generation”) with high school students during a seven-day summer program in Washington, DC, also highlights the ability of students to learn the political processes; most notably with regards to elections. Students are divided among political parties and members of the media. Tseng’s work highlights the potential opportunity that increased student understanding of political processes could spur greater civic engagement.

Technological Enhancements to Simulations

A third pattern evident in this track is how simulations can be inherently tied to the continued technological advances that help engage students in a lecture-based course in new ways. Daniel Smith (“iNcourt: Using a Virtual Supreme Court to Enhance the Traditional Simulation Experience”) worked with his university’s Center for Innovation and Technology in Education office to create a virtual Supreme Court site named iNcourt. A web-based approach would further enhance some of the already positive experiences found in other simulation courses. In this course, students create their own Supreme Court Justice profile, file mini-petitions, determine whether cases will be granted *certiorari*, and ultimately determine the Court’s docket. This website has spurred increased visualization of the process, as well as increased student interaction outside of the class.

Similarly, John Wilkerson (“Get out of the Way! How a Simulation Changed How I Think about Teaching, Turned on my Students, and Ruined My Other Classes”) has developed a legislative simulation that allows instructors to engage students directly, even in very large classes (100 students or more). This online simulation includes all aspects of a legislature (such as committees, clerks, and policy advocates), and students create their own district to represent. The students draft a personal statement, sponsor bills, form caucuses, and engage in the bill-writing/amending/voting process. Wilkerson described how this technological tool has allowed students to better understand the systems-based approach to the legislative process and has significantly increased collaborative learning; specifically the ability of students to benefit from one another’s knowledge, skills, and strategic mistakes.

Recommendations

Based on the eight papers presented and the discussions that followed, participants concluded that while the benefits of such sim-

ulations are immense, instructors need to continue to develop appropriate assessment tools to ensure the credibility of simulations. Track members identified the need to construct specific educational objectives, to develop specific roles within the simulations that are built on the educational objectives created, and to establish a clear set of procedures for students to follow to prevent collective action problems.

Well-defined and measurable educational objectives are crucial when developing simulations. One track participant (Cooperman) described this as designing “targeted simulations” with educational goals in mind. With the continual demand for assessment of course content objectives, creators of simulations must determine what students ought to know after they leave the class and how knowledge will be measured. Ideally, instructors should map course objectives to the simulation activities to ensure credibility within the class.

Based on the educational objectives created, instructors should be precise in creating participant roles within the simulation. Clearly defined roles help because such roles help to meet learning outcomes outside of the traditional class setting. Additionally, such roles place students in the shoes of real-world actors and help them learn more about political actors, institutions, and processes.

Track participants agreed that careful procedural guidelines are necessary to ensure all students are actively engaged in the simulation, and no students are taking advantage of the work output of others in the class. Therefore, some students need to take on administrative or research assistant roles to promote active learning among all participants. Ideally, in smaller classes, students can participate in multiple roles, which allows the instructor to further determine each student’s comprehension of content objectives.

Ultimately, track participants concluded that while simulations present challenges for instructors to maintain academic integrity, the results are worth the additional time, effort, and resources used to create them. With the necessary objectives, roles, and procedures, students in simulations complete the class with increased life skills and additional ownership of learning. Students also benefit from increased collaborative efforts to solve problems and gain an important sense of political efficacy.

SIMULATIONS AND ROLE PLAY II: INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Ivan Dinev Ivanov, *University of Cincinnati*

Jon Ross, *Union Institute and University*

During two-plus days members of the Simulations and Role Play II track exchanged many ideas related to the use, refinement, and mastery of simulations as pedagogical tools in international relations and comparative politics. Two major sets of issues surfaced in their discussions: (1) how instructors should assess these exercises’ effectiveness in the classroom; and (2) which strategies and techniques can improve the overall quality of role-based simulations.

Major Findings from the Track

The papers offered a variety of perspectives with regard to the effectiveness of role-based exercises in improving classroom learning. Nikolaos Bizziouras’ work found that role-playing simulations increased students’ ability to grasp complex concepts in

comparative politics, operationalize different theories of coalition government, and apply lessons of bargaining in a more precise manner. Mary McCarthy observed that this finding is accurate for abstract games as well as role-playing simulations. However, her findings were inconclusive as to whether the abstract games or role-playing simulations are more effective in general. Andrew Goodman's experience with second-run simulations validated the assertion that students tend to be more active in the second run, which is attributable to their generally greater focus on appropriate issues and a correspondingly lesser display of a "game mentality." Robert Amyot and Chad Raymond warned against great expectations from learning-based exercises because one-shot collaborative problem-based exercises (e.g., writing constitutions or role-playing Europe's international relations in 1914) did not prove more effective than standard lecture-discussion formats nor did the student performance on the exams significantly improve.

The other track presentations focused on specific techniques that can improve the conduct of the simulations and their overall effectiveness. Jon Ross suggested that improvisational work (e.g., theater performance or classroom learning), when used well by a confident instructor, has the potential to heighten both the learning and teaching experience. It also provides outside-the-box ways to approach important issues of public and political sphere. Victor Asal showed how interactive exercises that involve poetry and literature could improve the understanding the individual's identity manipulation that moves beyond rational calculation. Nina Kollars made the case that even failed in-class activities can provide valuable insight in explaining complicated learning processes such as scaffolding. Ivan Dinev Ivanov and Jim Masterson shared their experience of collaboration between several smaller institutions of higher education on a simulation dealing with inter-governmental negotiations and argued that such partnerships are beneficial and can improve student satisfaction.

The Way Ahead: Successful Strategies for Simulations and Role Plays

The track participants shared perspectives and explored potential collaborative projects on how to evaluate and grade live and virtual participation in role-play exercises; how learning skills acquired by students from simulations can be assessed actively (including related methodological questions around the design of these exercises), and how best to identify and profile participants for new and collaborative simulation projects among track participants within existing teaching settings and across different academic institutions.

The group had varying views on the evaluation of student participation, however, some form of assessment, whether in the form of a standard "grade" or not, it was agreed, should be completed. Some instructors mentioned that they currently assess students' participation via extra credit for the skills they demonstrate, but many cautioned against such policies. They warned that students should not be awarded for "winning" a game, as winning per se is not the principal goal in many such exercises, especially in courses involving international relations, conflict management, or diplomacy. The group generally concurred that grading of the exercise should be tied to its core goals' accomplishment.

Another important observation in the track was that instructors need to clarify the purpose of role-based exercises for participants. For example, while some games are process-oriented (i.e., they illustrate patterns and processes in international relations or comparative politics), others are result-driven (i.e., they are

intended to show specific outcomes). Track members also cautioned that grading occasionally creates a sense of competition for additional grade points and, thus, encourage student behavior geared toward earning extra credit, which may ultimately lead to alteration of the exercise's overall intent.

The group concluded that assessing skills and active learning mechanisms has become a critical tool for the design and execution of simulations and, therefore, a number of insights were offered on the on the subject. Several track members expressed the view that simulations provide value well beyond a tangible grade, such as by offering students opportunities to demonstrate leadership skills that are applicable and practical to real-world political settings in which they may eventually work. Consensus emerged that student-based feedback is also an instrumental component in the assessment and evaluation: some even suggested that open-ended surveys of students' impressions can be helpful in obtaining important insight about their ability to drive learning and skills development. Whether students should perceive "value" of the active learning exercise because it is "fun" or because it entails a clearly identified practical real-world experience remains an open question. While both may be applicable and important for assessing pedagogy, they may need to be put in proper perspective.

In conclusion, the track participants decided to improve coordination in two critical areas: (1) they decided to start planning in the future the conduct of joint active-learning exercises on their campuses that would increase the overall number of participants and help collect sufficient data necessary to generate plausible explanations; and (2) they agreed that the findings of such joint project(s) could be used for a common theme for next year's panel on role plays at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference. Further information about the group and its insights about active learning are available on its blog: <http://activelearnings.wordpress.com/>.

TEACHING AND LEARNING AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Ryan Emenaker, *College of the Redwoods*

James Hedrick, *Rice University*

Shaen Johnson

Although for the past two years, APSA had featured workshops on strategies for teaching and learning at community college, the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference featured a track dedicated to community colleges. As the attendance numbers show, a focus on community colleges was most welcome; 35 political scientists participated in the track, or 13% of the total conference attendees, making it the largest track at the conference in its inaugural year. We are pleased with the success of the inaugural year for this track and look forward to continuing this success.

Under the direction of moderator Tressa Tabares, several major themes from discussions emerged. First, community colleges professors, and political science instructors at all levels, must meet students where they are. Students come to college with varying levels of political knowledge, access to technology, and interest in the subject matter and this variation is only increasing. Instruction tailored to these differences is more likely to engage students and improve learning. Second, and very much related, workload is a major concern among community college instructors. We may be the only member of our department or the only political scientist

at our institution. This can create a sense of isolation as well as require completion of a variety of teaching as well as administrative duties. Finally, community colleges are the “canary in the coalmine” in political science instruction. “Non-traditional” students are our traditional students, and the many challenges instructors at four-year institutions are experiencing have been a staple of community colleges instruction for years. Given these themes, examining how political scientists at community colleges address these issues can provide the discipline with valuable insight into how to engage and educate the next generation of political science students.

Several track participants noted that community colleges provide many college students with their introduction to the discipline. In fact, for many students, community college classes are their only exposure to political science; their civic education is largely defined by these experiences. Even for students who eventually transfer to four-year institutions, their experience in political science classes at the community-college level may determine their relationship with the discipline as they pursue upper-division course work.

Therefore, it is critical for community college instructors to *meet their students where they are*. This means assessing and tailoring instruction to the level of the students, irrespective of the course number or the prerequisites. For example, Bryan Calvin (Tarrant County College) showcased a preinstruction survey he administers to his students. His survey allowed him to understand *who* his students are and what they *know* before he begins instruction. Other instructors, like Nathan Zook and Jennifer Pfeifer (Montgomery College), used simulation to gauge their students’ level of knowledge and engage them in the learning process. Zook and Pfeifer presented a simulation of the UN Security Council they developed to connect to students by working collaboratively. Despite teaching at separate campuses, both instructors improved their simulations, showing how courses can be creatively designed to engage students, no matter what their knowledge and interest, even at community colleges.

Similarly, students arrive to classes with differing levels of familiarity and access to technology; effective instruction should take this experience into account. Presenters Jason Seitz and Robert King (Georgia Perimeter College) both experimented with freeing their classroom from standard textbooks by using different versions of e-books to address student engagement and learning. Both noted the added benefits of reduced textbook prices, which is a serious concern for many community college students. One study noted that as many as 40% of students had forgone buying a textbook due to its price. Seitz and King also both discussed how e-books could be used to tailor instruction during the course and promote interactive instruction, offering yet another tool for professors to connect students to the material.

In addition, community college instructors, like political scientists at other institutions, deal with a demanding workload. At community colleges, as noted earlier, many political scientists are isolated, either as a department of one or as the only political scientist in a combined department. This produces challenges as individuals are forced to be not only instructors but also department heads, curriculum directors, facilitators of civic engagement, and more. One presenter, Terry Gilmour (Midland College), conducted a survey of instructors teaching US government in West Texas. Her results showed that on average instructors were teaching an incredible seven sections per semester totaling more than

150 students. Instructors are also increasingly teaching online courses, in addition to traditional classrooms, and are expected to be responsive to students electronically while still being physically available on campus during traditional hours. Many instructors feel pressure from both students and administrators to be “on-the-clock” 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Additionally, both Sonia Iwanek (Collin College) and Thomas S. Kolas (Troy University Montgomery) talked about the challenges of engaging students in the community college setting. Iwanek discussed arranging her classes around a theme designed to promote civic engagement using current events, going above and beyond the “requirements” of simply teaching institutions and behavior and emphasizing that the classroom is the “real world.” Conversely, Kolas discussed how instructors frequently tailor their prepared courses to special populations, such as veterans, encouraging dialogue while respecting the intense emotions that discussions about current events produce. These presentations highlighted the behind-the-scenes work that community college instructors engage in to address the needs of their diverse student populations, over and above the well-documented challenges of heavy course loads.

Furthermore, participants discussed how the challenges of community colleges often *foreshadow challenges for the discipline* as a whole. The issues of underprepared students, reductions in institutional support, and increasing workload requirements that many four-year institutions are beginning to experience are not unique to community colleges, but they are often magnified in this context. Because most community-college systems have “open access” requirements, “nontraditional” students have long been our traditional students, filling community-college classrooms with students with a variety of skills, interest, and preparedness in a context in which institutional support for instruction is often limited.

However, these challenges often encourage innovation. James Hedrick (Rice University) presented strong evidence that certain support services, specifically online tutoring, can improve academic achievement for many of these non-traditional students. Also, Mark Johnson (Minnesota State Community and Technical College) showed how in a community college setting, undergraduate research could be embedded as part of political science instruction. These are just two presentations that briefly touched on areas such as support services and undergraduate research where community college political scientists’ innovations may offer lessons to the discipline at large.

Finally, in addition to the themes discussed above, one of the strongest areas of agreement was APSA support of political science education at community colleges. Simply by including a track at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference addressing community colleges, many participants secured previously unavailable conference funding from their institutions, in addition to being able to easily network with their peers. Increasing the number of panels and workshops specifically addressing community college instructors at events like the APSA Annual Meeting may increase access to the conference as well as make it more beneficial for them. Many of our students go on to become students at other colleges and universities; we have a strong base for sharing common problems, experiences, and challenges.

To facilitate this sharing of information, we propose creating an official American Political Science Association Task Force to study the current condition, problems, and options for improvements in political science education at community colleges in the

United States. A Task Force can bring some of the challenges and innovations of political science instruction at community college to the broader discipline, identify best practices, and better engage the many political scientists employed by community colleges that provide the face of the discipline to many college students.

To conclude, community colleges face struggles that are unique only in the sense that they magnify the struggles faced by political science instructors in all institutions of higher learning. The political science teaching that occurs at community colleges has a huge impact on the state of civic education and the future of the discipline. To better understand the role that community colleges play for the future of the discipline more study is needed. The participants of the Teaching and Learning at Community Colleges track hope that the American Political Science Association will continue to strive for further inclusion of community college faculty.

TEACHING POLITICAL THEORY AND THEORIES

Kenneth Betsalel, *University of North Carolina, Asheville*

Ashley Biser, *Ohio Wesleyan University*

Michael Nordquist, *Albertus Magnus College*

David Selby, *University of Montreal*

The eclectic group of scholars participating in the 2012 Teaching Political Theory and Theories track represented a range of pedagogical approaches and theoretical commitments. In conjunction with the conference theme, “Teaching Political Science: Relevance in A Changing World,” and continuing a discussion from 2011, participants returned to the question of how teaching political theory is and can be relevant, and distinctively so, to student learning, to the discipline, and to the university at large. Perhaps unexpectedly, in light of contentious debates about the role and goals of political theory, a common concern about the practice of critical thinking and political judgment united the participants’ papers and discussions. Although the concept of critical thinking and the specific strategies used for inculcating it in students were debated, the conference provided a welcome forum to question how we can encourage students to be more active and engaged citizens.

Developing Political Judgment

One of the common themes of the three-day workshop was political theory’s role in developing students’ abilities to think critically about politics and in enabling them to evaluate alternative political propositions. We agreed that developing political judgment differs from other kinds of critical thinking, not only because politics occupies a distinctive place in social life, but also because exercising political judgment involves normative and ethical claims that conventional notions of critical thinking do not address.

Four papers explored pedagogical practices of developing students’ capacities of political judgment. Although coming from different theoretical traditions, the papers were remarkably cohesive in their aim to train students in exercises of political judgment. William M. Thomas’s “Reclaiming the Critical Self in Modernity: Individual Contention, Educational Reflection, and Political Action” focused on the content and contentiousness of political judgment. By drawing a distinction between received opinion and political contention, Thomas argued that the goal of political theory ought to be to make students aware of how politics is inher-

ently contestable. Only by unveiling the ways power manufactures the appearance of consent can students, as political actors, make political judgments on criteria of justice, right, and good instead of interest, fashion, and the desire to be accepted.

More concretely, participants discussed specific pedagogical practices to transform mere opinion into informed judgment. Benjamin Mitchell’s “Commonplace Books: A Tool of Liberal Education in Political Science Programs” detailed his use of journaling as a pedagogical tool. This journaling practice cultivates the practice of daily reflection, encourages close reading of texts, and strengthens the desire for lifelong learning. By drawing from classical, Renaissance, and Enlightenment humanism, Mitchell’s meticulously planned exercise of structured daily journaling enables students to achieve a deeper understanding of texts while training them to pursue transformative education as a life-long goal. As he rightly notes, journaling forces students to be active and critical readers, and “by extracting the most significant passages and copying them down by hand, students practice a habit of refining their judgment over time.” Personal investment and daily reflection are powerful means of cultivating political judgment.

David Selby’s “Learning by Doing: Two Republican Approaches to Teaching Political Theory” also discussed assignments that inculcate reflection on personal experience as theorizing. He detailed two assignments in which students integrate their experience as political actors and political theorists to reflexively judge and evaluate conceptual and historical categories discussed in class. Offering students opportunities to participate in a political campaign and reflect on their experiences, Selby recounted the potentially transformative learning that active political engagement and corresponding theoretical reflection can produce. Inspired by the republican tradition’s focus on participation, Selby’s emphasis on the practice of politics shows that practice with guided reflection through historical and conceptual texts can produce a unique form of learning, which sharpens students’ capacity for political judgment.

Whereas Selby and Mitchell each drew inspiration from the western political traditions, Kenneth A. Betsalel’s “A Search for a New Way of Being in the Political Science Classroom: Contemplative Practice and Political Theory” explored the virtues and vices of incorporating eastern contemplative practices of meditation in class. By using a range of focused and unfocused meditative techniques, Betsalel teaches students to focus themselves, move beyond knee-jerk reactions to controversial topics, and find more nuanced understanding through developing mindfulness. By asking students to first *let things be what they are* in silent moments of nonjudgmental perception, contemplative practices can help achieve more respectful and sympathetic debate in class. Much like Socratic *elenchus* or Skeptical *ataraxia*—practices that are meant to open up spaces of reflective judgment—Betsalel argued that the Buddhist goal of mindfulness can be viewed as a kind of preparation for political judgment.

Although drawn from very different political traditions (critical theory, liberal, republican, and Buddhist) these practices introduce reflective pedagogical experiences to achieve one of the main goals of political theory: training students to exercise political judgment.

The Role of Political Theory within Political Science

The second theme concerned the relationship of political theory to political science. Although more contentious than discussions

considering the methods of cultivating political judgment, these conversations resulted in a rough consensus. Participants agreed that the interdisciplinary aspect of political theory enhances the teaching of political science in a distinctive manner and furthers the institutional goals of preparing students to participate in diverse and democratic political communities.

These discussions were instigated by Johnny Goldfinger's "Teaching the History of Political Theory as Philosophy and Science," which explored the creative ways in which theory and social science research can be integrated in pedagogical practice. Michael Nordquist and Ashley Biser's "The Practice of Political Thinking: Teaching Politics Courses through a Theoretical Lens" demonstrated how concepts can be used in introductory political science courses to push students to critically reflect on key categories. Chris Stangle's "Bringing the Mountain to Students: Teaching Political Theory" described how to get students to apply their critical thinking skills to contemporary political events and problems. These powerful combinations of theory with other sciences and empirical evidence emphasized how teaching political theory can, and should, be effectively integrated with the other subfields. Although participants disagreed on particular approaches to accomplish integration, all endorsed "cross-pollination," that is, the integration of political theory with the more empirical subfields of political science. Indeed, as the metaphor of "cross-pollination" suggests, the intermingling of theory and science highlights the strengths of each—strengths that complement each other and, when combined, can make for a more dynamic and effective classroom.

Political Theory and the University

On the third day, track discussions turned toward broader questions about the role that political theory can play in the university at large. In light of the challenges posed to the traditional university in the twenty-first century, participants agreed that political theory can contribute in important ways to maintain the unique disciplinary identity of political science. First, political theory is uniquely positioned to address and meet the needs of the diversifying US college student body. Sarah Pemberton's "Teaching Within, Against, and Outside the Canon: Strategies for Incorporating Diversity in Core Political Theory Courses" detailed how political theory can bring the western canon into conversation with other political discourses, whether they be critical race theory, nonwestern traditions of political thought, or feminist theory. Significantly, the conversation that ensued highlighted how the changing demographics of college students necessitate changes in the content and mode of presentation of both political theory and political science.

Second, political theory can contribute to maintaining the unique presence of political science through civic education. As noted above, developing the capacity for political judgment is central to the work of political theory, and to democratic citizenship. Although nearly all of our discussions addressed the development of political judgment in some manner, Nordquist and Biser's paper sparked recurrent conversations on the publicly oriented nature of political theory and the role political theorists can play in preparing students to be citizens. Working with students from different socioeconomic and educational backgrounds, Nordquist and Biser emphasized that developing students' abilities to recognize the concepts that organize political reality is the first step of civic education—without which no citizen can navigate the waters of political life.

Overall, participants in our track disagreed about exactly how to make political theory and the study of politics relevant, however, we concurred on the distinctive and important role that political theory plays in training students in political judgment, integrating empirical and theoretical approaches within political science, and contributing to a reconsideration of the role and goals of the university in the twenty-first century.

TEACHING RESEARCH METHODS

Jennifer Bachner, *Johns Hopkins University*

Margaret Commins, *Queens University of Charlotte*

What are the best ways to integrate research methods into the political science major? How can we improve assessment of the effectiveness of research methods instruction? How do we create courses that enhance student learning and improve student research? As in the past, these questions animated discussion in the Teaching Research Methods (TRM) track of the 2012 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference. Track participants contributed fresh insights and innovative teaching ideas, reflecting a diversity of backgrounds and approaches to teaching research methods in the political science major. In anticipation of the 10th APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, we review the contributions of this year's participants in terms of the insights accumulated by nine years of TRM tracks, concluding with a set of recommendations to guide progress as well as in the political science major more generally.

Accomplishments, Past Recommendations, and This Year's Contributions

Past TRM track summaries, as well as 2012 presentations and discussions, yield a consistent set of recommendations for political science undergraduate majors. First, undergraduates should be required to complete a research methods course early in the major. This course enhances essential academic and professional skills, and better prepares students for a variety of postgraduate endeavors. Second, whenever possible, research methods should be integrated across the political science curriculum, increasing student understanding of the relevance of these methods to gain a better understanding of politics. Third, the research methods course should include both qualitative and quantitative methods, as well as an information literacy component. And, fourth, whenever possible, majors should take a capstone or senior research course that put into practice the methodological skills students developed over the course of the major. Research presented at the 2012 TRM indicates that undergraduate political science majors produce considerably less research than their peers in Great Britain; or, for that matter, than their peers in other majors (Parker 2012). TRM participants agreed, however, that all of these recommendations require rigorous assessment. Two papers focused on aspects of assessment: Fletcher (2012) found significant differences in student evaluations of research methods courses depending on question wording on the course evaluation; and, Van Vechten (2012) found that repetition and a variety of opportunities to practice skills are both essential to students' intellectual progress, as well as to their positive evaluation of the usefulness of methods instruction. Assessment now focuses on particular courses (or sets of courses) in one setting. Participants

agreed that assessment should be expanded cross-campus to make the findings more robust and useful.

TRM 2012 track participants offered a variety of insights, approaches, and tools to improve research methods instruction. In terms of teaching tools, this year's additions include a "literature grid" organized visually using an Excel spreadsheet to help students discern better what we know and how we know it (Yacobucci 2012); and an analysis of common mistakes students make when crafting a research question (Bachner 2012). In addition, TRM participants offered several innovative approaches to teaching research methods, including community-based research, problem-based learning, and team-based learning. A team-based approach to learning research methods was found to improve student performance on tests (Broscheid 2012). Two papers explored hands-on student learning combining civic engagement and student research, two "high impact practices" emphasized by undergraduate liberal arts curricula. Tegtmeier Pak, Udani, and Hendriks (2012) assess the feasibility of using this combination to improve student learning, focusing on the challenges faculty face in creating these courses. Another paper explored these challenges in detail, offering a step-by-step primer for a course using exit polling to teach research methods and civic engagement (Kasniunas 2012). Finally, this year's TRM track benefited from the inclusion of two university librarians who encouraged faculty to partner with them to create tools that enhance students' ability to manage bibliographic sourcing and to create quality literature reviews, as well as to approach the proliferation of sources (traditional and new media) analytically and effectively. One paper, the product of a collaboration between teaching and library faculty, explored the "perils and promises" of using new media in the political science classroom (Cope and Flanagan 2012).

Future Research and Recommendations

Taken together, the themes and presentations at this year's conference suggest that more systematic, cross-campus studies of the effectiveness of approaches to teaching research methods is needed. As a first step, political scientists should canvass the various pedagogical strategies and instructional tools used to teach students how to perform both empirical and normative research. When we know which practices are commonly used, we can evaluate the relative effectiveness of these practices. Although several papers presented at the conference (and at previous conferences) examine whether a particular instructional method leads to a desired outcome, these analyses are usually limited to students in a single course or university. To determine the extent to which the results generalize to student populations that differ in size, demographic makeup, institutional setting, and level of education (undergraduate versus graduate) is difficult.

In addition to taking a cross-campus approach, scholars should study how new technologies can address the challenges inherent to teaching research methods. Throughout the conference, track participants offered suggestions of new websites and software programs. The OPOSSEM website (opossem.org), for example, is a richly stocked online repository of instructional materials for methods faculty. Track participants also discussed the usefulness of Zotero (zotero.org) for helping students store and organize materials related to a research project. Research that examines how faculty can use emerging technologies to help students write better literature reviews, perform more rigorous analyses, and facilitate group work would be extremely beneficial to the profession.

To support the undertaking of this scholarship and the improvement of instruction in research methods, we recommend the following:

1. An APSA task force to examine how the discipline of political science has changed in the past 30 years and identify the goals of an undergraduate political science degree. This recommendation was echoed by several other tracks. In particular, track participants want to understand how methods coursework can be incorporated into a political science education to help students meet their academic and professional goals.
2. A short course at the 2013 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference to coordinate cross-campus scholarship of teaching and learning with respect to research methods. Participants will work together to launch surveys and experiments to evaluate research methods courses.
3. A panel at the 2013 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference to highlight career options composed of leaders in the industries in which political science students seek to enter. As methods faculty, we are well-positioned to provide students with concrete research and analytical skills that will help advance their careers. To ensure we are maximizing this opportunity, we would like to hear from those currently working in government agencies, think tanks, nonprofit organizations, consulting firms, and Capitol Hill about which skills they desire most in prospective employees.
4. A forum for cross-track sharing at future APSA Teaching and Learning Conferences. At this year's final session, we observed significant overlap in the track discussions. It would be useful to devote a session at next year's conference to the exchange of ideas and best practices across tracks. ■

REFERENCES

- Bachner, Jennifer. 2012. "The Common Mistakes Students Make When Crafting Research Questions." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Broscheid, Andreas. 2012. "Team-Based Learning in Political Science Research Methods courses." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Commins, Margaret M. 2012. "Approaching Undergraduate Methods Courses Through Skills-Based Learning: Integrating Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Effective Presentation into Methods Courses." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Cope, Jonathan and Richard M. Flanagan. 2012. "The Perils and the Promises of New Media in the Political Science Classroom." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Fletcher, Joseph F. 2012. "Bias in Evaluating the Required Research Methods Course." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Kasniunas, Nina T. 2012. "Experiencing Mayoral Elections Through Exit Polling: Any Professor Can Design this Course." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Parker, Jonathan. 2012. "The Integration of Research into Undergraduate Degrees in the Social Sciences and Humanities." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Tegtmeier Pak, Katherine, Adriano Udani and Henriët Hendriks. 2012. "Embedding Civic Engagement in Undergraduate Research." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Van Vechten, Renee Bukovchik. 2012. "Assessing the 'Longer-term' Effectiveness of Two Approaches to Teaching Undergraduate Research Methods." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.
- Yacobucci, Peter R. 2012. "Introducing the Literature Grid: Helping Undergraduates Consistently Produce Quality Literature Reviews." Presented at the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Washington, DC, February 17–19.