students and entailed weekly or more frequent hour-long meetings. Ishiyama and Nichols' presentation made clear how the mentoring experience benefited doctoral students both pedagogically and professionally. Considering the current state of the academic job market for many political science doctoral students and the average teaching load that an academic position will likely entail in the future, structured mentoring or teaching programs such as the one detailed at the University of North Texas will better prepare doctoral students for their future careers.

Robert McKeever's presentation "The Pedagogy of eLearning: Design Implications for the Digital Classroom" provided a conceptual roadmap for advancing the present state of online instruction and synthesizing pertinent literature exploring online learning from various perspectives. Topics included design considerations for successful computer-mediated learning approaches based on the role of interactivity in learning outcomes, theoretical frameworks such as the "Computers as Social Actors" (CASA) paradigm, and the impact of media characteristics on learning. The paper attempted to provide useful insights for educators seeking to improve online instruction, as well as offer practical recommendations for implementing these strategies in an online learning environment.

Siona Listokin's paper "Teaching 'Other' Disciplines to Graduate Students" argued that graduate programs increasingly require breadth and familiarity with outside disciplines. Faculty expertise and funding constraints can limit the availability of graduate-level interdisciplinary course offerings, leading students to take courses in other departments with less appropriate foci. The paper discussed the tradeoff between breadth and depth in a graduate program and when interdisciplinary courses are appropriate at the master's and doctoral levels. She identified the lack of unified consensus on graduate curricula in political science and public affairs as an issue of critical importance. Thus, smaller departments may choose to "outsource" methodological or interdisciplinary courses to other departments or universities. Alternatively, some departments may spread themselves too thin in an attempt to offer every subdiscipline to graduate students.

Each of the three presentations by Ishiyama and Nichols, McKeever, and Listokin underscored the lack of information that exists regarding graduate program curricula. In 2004, the APSA Task Force on Graduate Education issued a report with general suggestions for doctoral programs, and occasional reports have outlined doctoral level coursework (e.g., Schwartz-Shea 2003). However, more information is necessary. How do professional development coursework and opportunities affect career choices and success? What is the role of online instruction for graduate courses? What subdisciplines should be taught within departments instead of across units? At a base level, participants agreed that up-to-date information regarding the state of graduate curriculum is necessary to advance scholarship in this area and help departments compare their offerings with those of other programs.

More specifically, the participants agreed that the Graduate Education and Professional Development track is important, and that graduate education should command a separate discussion than undergraduate programs. At the same time, the low attendance rate suggests that more can be done to make the TLC a meeting place and useful information source for those interested in graduate education. Discussions about developing the track resulted in a number of concrete suggestions. First, the track could invite directors of graduate studies from Ph.D. departments to share their ideas about doctoral programs with other directors and faculty. Program directors could aid in efforts to gather information about common practices and curricula in doctoral programs, while also collaborating with peers about best practices. In addition, the track could target graduate students to participate in the TLC as discussants and presenters. A practical suggestion to attract graduate students might include a student-friendly conference rate. All participants agreed that the track is vital for information sharing and discussions, and that these suggestions could facilitate future productive sessions in the Graduate Education and Professional Development track at the TLC.

REFERENCES

American Political Science Association. 2004. "APSA Task Force on Graduate Education." Report to the APSA Council. http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/Final%20Report%20Formatted%20for%20Distribution.pdf.

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2003. "Is This The Curriculum We Want? Doctoral Requirements and Offerings in Methods and Methodology." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36: 379–86.

TRACK: INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM

Maureen Feeley, *University of California, San Diego*

Ben Epstein, *CUNY–Graduate Center*

The Integrating Technology in the Classroom track provided valuable insights into both the benefits of incorporating technology into undergraduate political science classrooms and the concerns these interventions can generate. The benefits discussed by the track's 24 participants were numerous and varied, ranging from enhancing participation in very large lecture classes to increasing students' "political Internet literacy" and public trust in government and to making learning more participatory and active through technological simulations. Concerns fell into three main categories: (1) legal concerns regarding student information posted publicly online and the necessity (and challenges) of obtaining institutional review board (IRB) clearance for classroom research; (2) the time required to adopt new technological techniques; and (3) the need for stronger research designs and evaluative measures to effectively assess learning outcomes of different technology interventions. Despite these concerns, there was broad consensus among track participants that technological interventions have the potential to enhance and ultimately transform undergraduate political science education. Here we highlight the central benefits, challenges, and concerns addressed by the track's five papers, and the discussions they generated.

The first paper presented in the track was Ben Epstein's "Why We Must Weave the Web: The Growing Need for Internet-Focused Political Education." Epstein's central concern was declining levels of public trust in government in the United States and the fact that this trend coincides with low levels of political knowledge and participation across the country, especially among younger Americans. To address this concern, he argued for the value of teaching students to effectively navigate Internet resources for political purposes and, in so doing, enhance what he refers to as their "political Internet literacy." This paper provided an important foundation for our track's discussions on the recognized potential and value of incorporating diverse Internet sources into our classrooms, the time and resources required to do this, and the challenges involved in effectively assessing learning outcomes.

The second paper, Sarah Spengeman's "Blog-Ed: Using Blogs in the Community College Classroom," also focused on the pedagogical benefits of teaching students to become more "Internet savvy." Spengeman argued for the pedagogical benefits of blogs because of the access to search tools, polling features, weblinks, video, and diverse news media that they afford. She found that by conducting tutorials, setting clear expectations, creating model posts, and integrating posts into classroom discussions, blogging can enhance student learning. Echoing the concerns of other track participants, Spengeman found the greatest challenges of using this technology to be the time required to effectively monitor posts and the lack of high-quality assessment tools to effectively measure how blogging impacts student learning.

The next two papers focused specifically on the challenges of providing opportunities for student participation in very large undergraduate courses. The first paper, "Assessing the Impact of I-Clickers in Large Classes" by Gamze Cavdar Yasar and Marcela Velasco, examined the impact of clickers on student learning in large (120–150 students) introductory comparative politics courses at Colorado State University. To assess the impact of clickers, Yasar and Velasco compared lectures that actively integrated clickers with those that did not. At the end of both lectures, student learning was evaluated using a series of multiple-choice questions. In addition, students were also surveyed regarding their perceptions of clickers. Yasar and Velasco found that students do indeed "learn better with clicker lectures and the results were not affected by gender, year in college and ethnicity/race." In addition, they found that students surveyed believed that clicker use "improved their learning, encouraged participation/attendance, and provided motivation."

A second paper, "The Effects of Student Preceptors in Online Discussions: Quantitative Indicators" by Kerstin Hamann, Philip Pollock, and Bruce Wilson, also addressed the problem of how to generate student-student interaction in large undergraduate classes. Building on recent research finding that the positive learning effects of face-to-face interactions can be recreated in online discussions, Hamann, Pollock, and Wilson asked how instructors can best maximize these effects, given scarce resources of both time and teaching assistants. Specifically, they asked whether undergraduate student preceptors can effectively model high-quality postings, which will have a "spillover" effect for other students. To address this question, they divided a large introductory American government course of 250 students into 26 discussion groups, with a preceptor intervening in half of these groups and the remaining groups serving as controls. Using quantitative measures, Hamann, Pollock, and Wilson ultimately found no statistically significant differences between the groups. Contributing to the track's dominant theme, however, they recognized the need for higher quality assessment measures and, specifically, content analysis of postings to better understand the potential qualitative effects of preceptor intervention on student participation.

The final paper of the track, "Born Digital: Using Media Technology in the Political Science Classroom" by Linda K. Mancillas and Peter Brusoe, administered pre- and posttest evaluations in three introductory American government classes at American University to assess the impact of technology on academic performance. The instructor and the lectures were identical for all three classes, but students in one class were required to post weekly responses to videos and articles on an online discussion board; students in the second class were encouraged, but not required, to

post; and students in the third class had no online discussion. Ultimately, Mancillas and Brusoe found no statistically significant learning differences between the groups. However, they believed their study was also limited by the lack of evaluation tools that would facilitate longitudinal assessment of the efficacy of specific types of classroom technologies.

The track concluded with two open sessions. In the first, David Martin-McCormick and Christina Barton provided an overview of a terrorism/counterterrorism simulation used in undergraduate courses at American University. This was an insightful example of the ways in which technology can provide new and dynamic learning opportunities within and outside the classroom. In the second open session, Derrick Cogburn, also of American University, discussed the development of the world's first "virtual" graduate public policy program to focus on disabilities, the Institute on Disability and Public Policy (IDPP). This institute provides an intriguing example of the possibilities afforded by technology to bring together geographically dispersed institutions and actors in promoting the educational and policy needs of underserved populations.

TRACK: INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM I: IN-CLASS AND DISCIPLINE-WIDE STRATEGIES

Kristen Hudak, *Bentley University*

Mark Sachleben, *Shippensburg University*

Deborah E. Ward, *Rutgers University–New Brunswick*

This track served not only to continue the discussion of the importance of internationalizing the curriculum, but also as an impetus for laying out a framework to do so. The papers and subsequent discussions in this track highlighted both the challenges and the opportunities for internationalization in the classroom and the discipline.

Through various actions, the APSA has acknowledged that internationalizing the political science curriculum is a responsibility we have to our students. Track moderator Deborah Ward provided a summary of the APSA's actions to date, including work conducted by the Task Force on Internationalization and the Teaching and Learning Committee, and efforts made to organize the Internationalizing the Curriculum tracks at the TLC and plenary panels at three APSA Annual Meetings. In an increasingly globalized world, with which our students are expected to interact in new ways, it becomes critical to adjust both what is being taught and how it is being taught. An international perspective is necessary to provide our students with the skills and experiences they need to succeed after graduation, and to give them opportunities that other generations have not had or have not recognized. Moreover, as universities seek to attract foreign students, there is a need to recognize and make relevant the global diversity in our classrooms. As students from around the world strive to study here in the United States, we have a responsibility to provide them with the best globalized education possible.

Discussions in the track also identified the challenges that come along with any efforts to internationalize the curriculum. We recognize that many institutional and budgetary constraints exist in higher learning. As a discipline, we must account for differences in how internationalization may play out in the subfields of political theory, comparative politics, international relations, and