

2006 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference

February 18-20, 2006

Renaissance Hotel

Washington, DC

The 3rd Annual [APSA Conference on Teaching and Learning in Political Science](#) hosted over 300 participants in lively discussions of trends, techniques and models in teaching in political science. Held in downtown Washington DC on February 18-20, the conference was organized as a workshop-based forum to develop models of teaching and learning as well as to discuss broad themes affecting political science education today. Joining the discussion, APSA President Ira Katznelson (Columbia University) and keynote speaker Thomas E. Cronin (Colorado College) shared their thoughts on teaching and learning in the discipline.

Track Summaries

Internationalizing the Curriculum

Moderator:

Dr. Steven L. Lamy, University of Southern California

Session A: Internationalizing the Classroom Experience

Session B: Adding Tools to the International "Tool Kit"

Session C: Hands-on Interactive Learning Abroad

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

An ongoing challenge to scholars in the discipline revolves around ways in which we might bring knowledge of the world into the classroom. In an intimately globalized period in history, where students' very roommates may be from the other side of the world and international interactions drive political and market-based decisions, the importance of internationalizing the curriculum becomes immediate and compelling. To rise to the challenge, this session focuses on flexible strategies that provide guidance in teaching students to collect and assess information, particularly with respect to making sense of events in, and people from, other countries through a discussion on curriculum needs, methods and hands-on experience learning abroad.

TRACK SUMMARY

by Dr. Steven L. Lamy, University of Southern California

There were approximately 28 participants in this track representing two and four year institutions from the US and three representatives from European universities. At least two participants were from educational research or service organizations. The discussions after each session were lively, informative and constructive. Those participants not presenting papers added a great deal to our conversations.

The first session focused on internationalization strategies for university instructors. We heard from professors who had developed interdisciplinary courses combining English and international relations. This course presented several innovative teaching strategies for using film and novels to teach about the Cold War and international conflict. The instructors successfully used collaborative learning to achieve their goals. Another detailed presentation introduced the ICONS project, an international policy simulation that is very useful for encouraging student participation. The presenter provided detailed evidence that student interest and learning improved with the ICONS experience.

Another presentation focused on ways of adding comparative examples to an American Government course and the final presentation discussed ways universities could provide support for secondary school international studies courses.

The second session focused on ways of bringing international experiences into the classroom by using new technologies and the Internet. One presentation shared strategies for using newspapers and other Internet sources of information to study the Middle East. Two of European colleagues described a new information service (epSNET) that provides a comprehensive introduction to study abroad options at universities all over Europe. Finally, we learned about an international videoconferencing program that encourages service and civic engagement across countries and cultures.

In the third and final session, we were introduced to a number of innovative study abroad programs that combine travel with service learning, problem-based learning exercises and student led global partnerships based on a pedagogy of discovery and encouraging activism and problem-solving. We also learned about the importance of pre-departure preparation courses.

A final presentation provided an overview of the challenges facing any university or college interested in internationalizing the curriculum or other educational programs.

A general overview of themes raised in our discussion sessions:

- There is still a need for a good definition of internationalization-what does it mean? What are some best practices and strategies?
- How do we provide access to international programs to all of our students?
- The importance of involving international scholars in our discussions and in our program efforts.
- The value of going beyond the traditional "island" study abroad experiences and involving students in service learning experiences, internships and problem-based learning abroad.
- How do we encourage the development of international experiences that involve using new technologies to link students with the world?
- The need to encourage cross-national research to assess exchange and study abroad programs.
- How best to provide access to information about best practices.

Messages to APSA:

- Embrace the global imperative
- Political Science seems to be surrendering the control of internationalizing efforts to other disciplines and professional programs
- Sponsor more demonstrations of active learning teaching and learning practices that will assist internationalizing efforts
- Provide an internationalizing section on the APSA website
- Promote discussions among scholars and teachers in various subfields of political science about how best to internationalize their courses.

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Internationalizing the Classroom Experience

"International Relations Meets English Studies: Collaborative Learning in the IR Classroom"

Linda Racioppi, Michigan State University; Colleen Tremonte, Michigan State University

"The Foundations of American Government: How to Introduce International Comparisons"

Henrik M. Schatzinger, University of Georgia

"Internationalizing the Secondary School Curriculum"

Michael A. Morris, Clemson University

"ICONS and 'Resistant Populations'"

Denise DeGarmo, Southern Illinois University

Session B: Adding Tools to the International "Tool Kit"

"Using the Web to Study Middle Eastern Newspapers and Activists"

Vickie Langohr, College of the Holy Cross

“Bringing Europe Closer to American Students: Meeting epsNet (European Political Science Network)”

Bob Reinalda, University of Nijmegen, Netherlands; Gabriela Gregušová, Comenius University, Slovak Republic

“The Use of International Videoconferencing to Enhance the Undergraduate Experience”

Kathleen Claussen, Indiana University

Session C: Hands-on Interactive Learning Abroad

“Poli Sci Hits the Road: Internationalizing Experiential Learning”

Edward G. DeClair, Lynchburg College

“Internationalizing the Political Science Curriculum: The Travel Course and Liberal Education”

Gordon A. Babst, Chapman University

“Global Partnerships for Activism and Cross-Cultural Training: Putting Students in Charge”

D. Michael Shafer, Rutgers University

“Internationalizing the Curriculum: Impediments, Imperatives, and Rationales”

A.C. Harth, Global Studies Foundation

Participants

Amy Ross Acord, Cy-Fair College; Cristina Beltran, Haverford College; Kathleen M. Collihan, American River College; Melinda J. Frederick, Prince George’s Community College; A.J.R. Groom, University of Kent; Tina Mavrikos-Adamou, Hofstra University; Wesley Milner, University of Evansville; Carol Nechemias, Pennsylvania State University-Harrisburg; Eugene D. Schmiel, Washington Internship Institute

Diversity and Inequality

Moderator:

Dr. Ange-Marie Hancock, Yale University

Session A: Methods for Incorporating Diversity in the Classroom

Session B: Diversifying the Curriculum

Session C: Identifying and Overcoming Obstacles Related to Diversity and Inequality

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

This track focuses on incorporating diversity into the classroom. Presentations examine diversity and inequality, first through a discussion of teaching techniques and ways of incorporating diversity into classroom discussion; second, by assessing routes in which professors and teachers can take in manipulating departmental and classroom curriculums to account for diversity and inequality; and finally through a discussion of obstacles related to diversity and inequality and how we as scholars can work to overcome these obstacles in the classroom.

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Methods for Incorporating Diversity in the Classroom

“Achieving Success: Learning Communities and First-Year Latino Students”

Juan Carlos Huerta, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi

“Taking the Status Quo Out of Statistics: Other Forms of Data as Ways of Knowing”

Niambi Michele Carter, Duke University

“Deliberative Democracy and Emancipatory Learning in Action”

Reilly Hirst, Portland State University

Session B: Diversifying the Curriculum

“Teaching ‘Diversity’ at the Intersections of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender”

Pei-te Lien, University of Utah; Toni-Michelle Travis, George Mason University; Manuel Avalos, Arizona State University

“Gender and Global Norms: Incorporating Feminism into International Relations”

Tiffany Turner, Georgia Institute of Technology; Ellen Cimino, Georgia Institute of Technology

“What Should We Do? Inviting New Groups of Students into Theory through Action”

Khristina Haddad, Moravian College

Session C: Identifying and Overcoming Obstacles Related to Diversity and Inequality

“How the Irish Became White and the Liberians Black: Race Defined through Relative Social Power”

Paula Mohan, University of Wisconsin

“Evaluating Race and Gender: Women of Color as teachers in Political Science”

Anna Sampaio, University of Colorado-Denver

“The Urban Community College: Diversity, Inequality and Common Ground”

Diana M. Judd, Manhattan Community College

“Insiders and Outsiders: Negotiating Identity and Audience through Peer-learning and Small Groups”

Anas Malik, Xavier University

Participants

James W. Corey, High Point University; Nikki Givens, Tulsa Community College; Max Guirguis, Shepherd University; Rebecca J. Hannagan, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Hoon Jaung, Chung-Ang University; Amy C. Rasmussen, Chapman University; Laurel Sprague, Wayne State University; Andrew Stigler, Naval War College

Teaching Research Methods

Moderator:

Dr. Kim Quaile Hill, Texas A & M University-College Station

Session A: Literacy, Techniques and Teaching

Session B: Teaching Undergraduate Research Methods

Session C: Approaches to Teaching Research Methods

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

This track engages recent disciplinary debates on research methods covering three seminal themes: 1) Literacy, techniques and teaching; 2) Teaching undergraduate research methods; and 3) Approaches to teaching research methods. Track sessions concentrate on promoting the exchange of ideas regarding each of these issues with the goal of formulating proposals of how to better incorporate research training in political science programs.

TRACK SUMMARY

by Dr. Kim Quaile Hill, Texas A & M University-College Station

Teaching Research Methods

Kim Quaile Hill, Texas A&M University, e339kq@polisci.tamu.edu

TRACK SUMMARY: A course in research methods is a common though hardly universal elective option or requirement for undergraduate political science majors in American colleges and universities. Yet the role of this course in a department's curriculum and the approaches to teaching it vary widely. One could say that many models exist for the course, but we have little systematic information on the success of these different models. Little formal evaluation appears to be going on either in this regard. In keeping with this situation, the participants in this track explored a range of fundamental ideas about this course, its content, how it should literally be taught, how it might be integrated into a student's course of study, and how it might contribute to a range of educational goals. Some attention was provided, as well, to graduate-level instruction in research methods. The papers presented at our sessions offered information on comparative and department-specific models for the course, on the integration of methodological education with information literacy, and on a range of specific education goals for the class. Two papers in our sessions were particularly distinctive from those in past Teaching and Learning Conference workshops on this topic because they offered insight into incorporating the expertise and efforts of professional university librarians into the course.

ESPECIALLY NOTABLE CHALLENGES FOR THE TEACHING OF THIS COURSE

1. Many students enter these courses intellectually or otherwise ill-prepared, because of weak writing, information literacy, critical thinking, and abstract thinking skills.
2. Many students have a difficult time separating their normative beliefs about political affairs from the kind of neutral, empirical assessments typically expected of them in this class.
3. Many students are unmotivated and difficult to engage in the work of the class.
4. Because little systematic evaluation of alternative teaching methods has been carried out or disseminated in the profession, instructors often feel uncertain about optimal methods.
5. Expectations for systematic assessment, however, are rising – from regional accrediting associations, state governments, and the federal government. Thus the track participants recognized that such authorities may impose assessment routines on these courses in the near future and that the community of political science educators should lead or even anticipate and pre-empt such efforts.

ESPECIALLY NOTABLE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE TEACHING OF THE COURSE

1. Despite some disagreement and uncertainty about particular course models and objectives, there was wide agreement among the track participants on some learning objectives for this class – including exposure to the intellectual fundamentals of the scientific method, exposure to one or another “nuts and bolts” method for literally doing scientific work in this discipline (whether via an introduction to simple data analysis on a range of political and policy questions, survey research, mathematical modeling, or some other particular methodology), education in how to recognize the relevance of the ideas and tools taught in the class for later course work and for various kinds of post-baccalaureate career work, and education in how to be discriminating seekers *and* consumers of systematic information about political matters.
2. Many alternative approaches and designs for teaching this course exist. Thus instructors have many options, and they can tailor their choice to their, or their departments, most important educational objectives.
3. There are also many opportunities for innovation in the teaching of the class.
4. There are many opportunities for collaboration between the instructor in such a class and other members of his or her department (especially when the course is integrated into the full curriculum), with other social science departments when one course might serve them all, and with university librarians as noted above.

NEXT STEPS

1. We encourage members of the profession generally to engage in more systematic evaluation of their research methods courses, and we encourage the APSA to encourage the submission of papers featuring such assessment for next year’s Teaching and Learning Conference.
2. We encourage more dialogue between the authors of the many undergraduate research methods textbooks and the community of those who teach the class. This dialogue could be supported by panels and roundtables in appropriate Sections of the APSA at its annual meeting and by such events at next year’s Teaching and Learning Conference.

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Literacy, Techniques and Teaching

“The Politics of Information Literacy: Integrating Information Literacy into the Political”
Patricia J. Campbell, University of West Georgia

“Literature Review and the Library: How to Help Students Make Effective Use of the Library”
Wendy Highby, University of Northern Colorado

“Research Methods in the Field”
Dan A. Lewis, Northwest Nazarene University

“Teaching Research Methods”
Dina A. Zinnes, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Robert G. Muncaster, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Session B: Teaching Undergraduate Research Methods

“Teaching Practical Data Analysis Skills”
Gary Klass, Illinois State University

“Teaching Research by Doing It”
Natalie M. Davis, Birmingham-Southern College

“What We Mean by Scope and Methods: A Survey of Undergraduate Scope and Methods Courses”
Cameron G. Thies, Louisiana State University, Charles C. Turner, California State University, Chico

“The ‘Tipping Point’ of Teaching Research Methods to Undergraduates”
Rick Mayes, University of Richmond

Session C: Approaches to Teaching Research Methods

“Interactive Teaching of Key Social Scientific Concepts and Tools”
Leanne C. Powner, University of Michigan

“Research Methods Across the Curriculum – A Developmental Approach”
John W. Williams, Principia College

“Changing Teaching Practice in a Research Methods Course Utilizing a Student-Centered Approach”
Richard Shingles, Virginia Technology; Raquel Becerra, Virginia Technology

“Teaching Research Methods Online”
Jennifer A Van Heerde, University College London

Participants

lotte Andersen, University of Aarhus; Amy L. Brandon, University of Houston; Mitchell Brown, American University; Dieter Burrell, University of Michigan; Erika Franklin Fowler, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Fabio Franchino, University College London; Florencia Ines Gabriele, Northeastern University; Hahrie C. Han, Wellesley College; Angela High-Pippert, University of St. Thomas; Christopher N. Lawrence, Duke University; James A. Norris, Texas A&M International University

Teaching with Technology I

Moderator:

Dr. Robert H. Trudeau, Providence College

Session A: Utilizing New Technologies in the Classroom

Session B: Assessing Technological Tools

Session C: E-Learning and On-Line Instruction

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

In an age of high-tech and global information, research and teaching tools available to political scientists are rapidly increasing, often at a pace faster than our awareness of them. Tracks on teaching with technology cover three specific themes: 1) Utilizing new technologies in the classroom; 2) Assessing technological tools currently used among political science scholars and teachers; and 3) Effective strategies for E-learning and on-line instruction. This session seeks to enhance our understanding of effective strategies for utilizing technological tools in teaching political science.

TRACK SUMMARY

by Dr. Robert H. Trudeau, Providence College

The program for the third annual Teaching and Learning Conference included the following as a description of this Track: "In an age of high-tech and global information, research and teaching tools available to political scientists are rapidly increasing, often at a pace faster than our awareness of them. Tracks on teaching with technology cover three specific themes: 1) Utilizing new technologies in the classroom; 2) Assessing technological tools currently used among political science scholars and teachers; and 3) Effective strategies for E-learning and on-line instruction. This session seeks to enhance our understanding of effective strategies for utilizing technological tools in teaching political science."

All three of the themes were discussed in a profitable way, and not solely in each theme's dedicated Session. The net result was a clear increase in awareness among the presenters and participants of the varied ways in which colleagues have been using technology. These new ideas in some cases reflected newer technologies, such as Google Earth or Audience Response Systems. In other cases, research by presenters showed some of the costs and benefits of more widely used technologies, such as Power Point presentations, Internet-based message board and discussion forums, and even computers in classrooms.

While a more detailed report on the contents of the Track is forthcoming, a couple of key themes emerged from the discussions:

- Teachers who use technology as part of their pedagogy are not necessarily technologically sophisticated – we can work with support people to have our pedagogical requirements met without understanding technology at the level of mechanics.
- Teachers who use technology must undertake assessment, study their practices, and evaluate outcomes. We must continue to consider whether technology is worth the costs.
- It is critical to evaluate the context, including institutional support and constraints, if faculty deviate from a more traditional lecture-based technology.
- Ultimately, it is about Teaching, not Technology.

As Moderator of the Track, I am particularly grateful for the contributions of the members of the Track who were able to attend all four scheduled Sessions, consistent with the "workshop" model around which the Teaching and Learning Conferences have been organized. The quality of the presentations was excellent, but the ensuing discussions, especially from one Session to the next, generated the most value for participants, and certainly for myself. I can say with confidence that for most of the participants, one perhaps unexpected outcome of the Conference – in addition to what we learned about Teaching and Technology -- was an enthusiastic embracing of the "workshop" model.

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Utilizing new Technologies in the Classroom

"Teaching Theory through Technology"

Antonio L. Rappa, National University of Singapore

“Using GIS to Analyze Public Policy Questions”
Bob van Dyk, Pacific University

“Using Technology to Foster Active Learning in Public Policy”
Mark E. Tompkins, University of South Carolina

“Teaching the World: Knowing the Location of the Nation-States Using a Computer Based Geoquiz Program”
Ruth M. Ediger, Seattle Pacific University

Session B: Assessing Technological Tools

“Interactive Keypads in the Classroom: A Comparison of Student-Response Systems”
Roger C. Lowery, University of North Carolina, Wilmington

“Fear on Film: Using Hollywood to Teach about Terrorism”
Gregory D. Miller, William & Mary College

“Helping Some Hurting Others: An Assessment of the Effects of Power Point in the Classroom”
John H. Riley Jr., Kutztown University

“A Chicken in Every Pot, a Computer for Every Student”
David J. Alperin, University of Wisconsin, River Falls

Session C: E-learning and On-line Instruction

“Real Politics, Virtual Debates: The Advantages of Creating Online Debates in Introductory and Advanced Political Science Courses”
Francis Moran, III, New Jersey City University

“Teaching American Government Online”
Chunmei Yoe, Oklahoma State University

“Serving Cooperative Security through e-Learning”
Sean S. Costigan, ETH Zurich; Ulrich Gysel, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology ETHZ

Participants

Donna Axel, New Jersey City University; Thomas Raymond Boudrot, Delta College; Robert T Carey, Clemson University; Monica Eckman, McGraw-Hill Company; Izabela M. Kaczorowska, University of Illinois at Chicago; Kristine Kern, University of Minnesota; Lynn Paredes-Manfredi, Valencia Community College – Osceola; Stephanie A. Slocum-Schaffer, Shepherd University; Christy Raye Stevens, University of West Georgia

Teaching with Technology II

Moderator:

Dr. Stephen E. Frantzich, US Naval Academy

Session A: Utilizing New Technologies in the Classroom

Session B: Assessing Technological Tools

Session C: E-Learning and On-Line Instruction

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

In an age of high-tech and global information, research and teaching tools available to political scientists are rapidly increasing, often at a pace faster than our awareness of them. Tracks on teaching with technology cover three specific themes: 1) Utilizing new technologies in the classroom; 2) Assessing technological tools currently used among political science scholars and teachers; and 3) Effective strategies for E-learning and on-line instruction. This session seeks to enhance our understanding of effective strategies for utilizing technological tools in teaching political science.

TRACK SUMMARY

By Dr. Stephen E. Frantzich, US Naval Academy

META CONCLUSIONS

TRACK SUMMARY: New communications technologies have tremendous potential in teaching for enhancing classroom presentations (i.e. PowerPoint, videoconferencing), expanding the raw material for political analysis (i.e. music, images, video), and increasing participant interactions (i.e. class blogs, webquests). The judicious use of technology engages students, overcomes physical barriers, reduces the constraints of fixed class times, and/or makes the efficient use of new learning materials possible. Technology should neither replace the instructor nor serve as a crutch. Rather it allows the creative instructor to develop new learning venues while covering the essential material in an effective way by supplementing tried and true traditional technologies. More controversial is the question as to the degree political science courses have the responsibility to enhance student technology skills to better equip them for the learning and civic environment of the future. All teaching involves some technology (even if it is simply a blackboard and a piece of chalk). Our challenge lies in choosing the appropriate technology and using it well.

TECHNOLOGY CONTEXT: Among the specific applications we reviewed in order to create meta conclusions were communications technologies such as required blogging, hybrid online courses and guided webquests. Other applications were more clearly classroom presentational tools such as PowerPoint and video conferencing.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Importance of academics controlling technology. Technology must be pedagogically driven with the goal of increasing the learning of substantive knowledge and analytical skills.
2. Technology allows and "unlocking effect" in which old things can be taught in new ways, with new (and generally positive) effects
3. Most success comes with a hybrid approach in which technology is a supplemental tool blended with traditional teaching methods.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF APPROPRIATE USE OF TECHNOLOGY

1. Increasing the ability to bring powerful (emotionally and intellectually engaging) images (images, music, etc) into the political analysis process. In the doing so, students develop the broader information literacy for the multi-media age they will operate in
2. Giving voice to a broader range of student proclivities and learning styles
3. Promoting equal or enhanced student satisfaction by meeting students where they are and channeling their learning
4. Enhancing the potential to extend learning outside the class period in a structured way, often resulting students coming to class better prepared

5. Facilitating connections between participants (student/student, student/faculty, and the wider academic community)
6. Capitalizing on communications technology applications which allow time and space shifting. Students and teachers can participate according to their schedule and can overcome geographic distances.

POTENTIAL COSTS/ DANGERS OF TECHNOLOGY FOR TEACHING

1. Technology failure and/or technology limitations which disrupt class or undermine good learning
2. Increased time commitment for faculty (development, updating and monitoring) which, for some applications, may decline with repetition
3. Need to adjust class (and faculty) incentive structures to make technology use rewarded
4. Potential for dealing some students out of the learning process (digital divide)
5. Allowing the technology to become an inappropriate end rather than means. An open question is whether teaching technological skills are legitimate ends for political science courses.

NEXT STEPS

1. Need for peer review and archival of tested technology applications (This may be a new role for APSA.)
2. Necessity to clarify copyright issues for using and sharing proprietary materials
3. Need to assess the strengths and weaknesses of specific technologies for specific learning tasks

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Utilizing new Technologies in the Classroom

“State Court Watch: A Web-based Teaching Tool”

Pamela Katz, College of Saint Rose

“Teaching with the iPod: Engaging Students through Analysis of Political Content in Popular Music”

Brett S. Sharp, University of Central Oklahoma

“Web-quest on the American Constitution as a Learning Tool for Undergraduate Students”

Maria Victoria Perez-Rios, CUNY Graduate Center

“Web-Based Mapping of Latino Voters in Texas”

Jose Angel Gutierrez, University of Texas at Austin; Joshua Been, University of Texas at Arlington

Session B: Assessing Technological Tools

“Using Multimedia to Enhance the Learning Experience in an Undergraduate Research Methods Course”

Bruce Pencek, Virginia Technology

“A Classical Perspective on Technology for Learning and Teaching about Politics”

Robert H. Webking, University of Texas, El Paso

“Trend or Teaching Tool? Blogging and Teaching World Politics”

Gerald M. DiGiusto, Bowdoin College

Session C: E-learning and On-line Instruction

“Forpol Online 2005: Using E-Learning in Teaching Comparative Foreign Policy across National Borders”

Tomas Karasek, Charles University; Anja Hennig, TU Dresden

“Teaching Introduction to Comparative Politics”

Richard Vengroff, University of Connecticut; Mr. James Robert Bourbeau, University of Connecticut

“Effective Communities of Practice: Empowering Faculty to Take the Distance out of Distance Learning”

Rosa Gomez Dierks, Northern Arizona University

“Global Encounters: Incorporating Global Voices into Local Classrooms”

Joachim Karl Rennstich, Fordham University

Participants

Kellie Sims Butler, Pennsylvania State University; Christopher Francis Michael Goldsmith, De Montfort University; Lela Michelle Long, Troy University; Rani D. Mullen, College of William and Mary; Joseph E. Vorbach III, US Coast Guard Academy; Pierce B. Wilkinson, Bergen Community College

Assessment/Learning Outcomes I

Moderator:

Dr. Kerstin Hamann, University of Central Florida

Session A: Politics of Assessment

Session B: The Art of Designing Evaluation

Session C: Design Implementation and Measurement

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

This track focuses on student assessment and learning outcomes in political science. Themes include: 1) A discussion of disciplinary, departmental and classroom politics in assessment; 2) The art of designing effective evaluation tools; and 3) A discussion of design implementation and measurement issues that arise in evaluation. Each of these themes attempts to contribute to current disciplinary debates on the issue of assessment by discussing the validity and reliability of current approaches and bringing new ones to the table.

TRACK SUMMARY

By Dr. Kerstin Hamann, University of Central Florida, and Russell Mayer, Merrimack College

Track Summary:

Assessment is a topic of ever-increasing importance in Political Science. Sometimes by choice, sometimes by legislative, institutional, or departmental order, political scientists are increasingly involved in assessing the effectiveness of their teaching. Classroom assessment is closely linked to program assessment since programs are often required to document student learning. While assessment can be an important tool to improve teaching and learner outcomes as well as stimulate curriculum review and program innovations, the politics of assessment sometimes make faculty members hesitant to embrace assessment with open arms and skeptical about its usefulness. Our track was divided into three parts. First, we discussed the politics of assessment at the disciplinary, departmental, and classroom levels; second, we concentrated on the art of designing effective evaluation tools, and third, we looked at design implementation and measurement issues related to the assessment process.

While there was a general agreement that assessment is useful and important for faculty members in all institutions from community colleges to Ph.D. granting Ivy League programs, the group also identified some challenges related to assessment at all levels.

General Considerations:

- Assessment might not be desired by all departments or faculty members, but politicians, accreditation requirements, and university administrations put increasing value and weight on assessment. Consequently, it is useful to take a proactive approach so the discipline has some input in what is assessed and how.
- The tools of social science analysis equip political scientists well to design and implement assessment.
- Classroom and program assessment are linked; goals need to be defined as objectives before we can decide what to assess.

Potential Benefits of Assessment:

- improved teaching and student learning
- potential to stimulate discussion among departmental faculty members
- the opportunity to restructure the curriculum
- the opportunity (and necessity) to foster partnerships not just among departmental faculty members, but also with other units within the university
- assessment results can be used to leverage resources
- assessment is helpful in demonstrating the value of the discipline for education

Potential Challenges of Assessment:

- Uncertainty of what happens with the assessment results, especially if they are less positive than expected
- potentially negative consequences for departments and faculty members
- assessment demands resources from departments and faculty, such as developing or purchasing assessment instruments, and faculty time

- problem of how to align assessment, which is expected to result in improved departmental curricula, better teaching – by knowing what really “works” – and, consequently, improved learning outcomes, with the pressures to counter grade inflation
- when assessment is imposed on departments, it can lead to decreased autonomy in identifying goals and objectives on the part of the department
- collective departmental assessment does not necessarily mesh well with an academic culture that tends to evaluate and reward individuals

Next Steps:

Finally, our track thought about the position of APSA in the assessment process and recommends that APSA take a more active role. To the extent that assessment is increasingly being pushed by politicians at all levels, APSA should take more initiative to engage in the national debate, help preserve institutional autonomy in defining and directing the assessment effort instead of having standardized, externally imposed tests, and become more active in coordinating resources and training for assessment in the profession. In doing so, APSA needs to be particularly sensitive to the different challenges faced by political scientists at different types of institutions.

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Politics of Assessment

“Lost and Found in General Education: Political Science in General Education Programs and Assessment at New Jersey Colleges”
Joseph Moskowitz, New Jersey City University

“Assessing the Academic Learning Compact”
Edward W. Schwerin, Florida Atlantic University

“Embracing the Path of Least Resistance: The Politics and Promise of Program Assessment”
Russell Mayer, Merrimack College

Session B: The Art of Designing Evaluation

“Assessing Politics 101: Improving Teaching and Learning via Backwards Design”
Eric R. Giordano, University of Wisconsin-Marathon

“Topography of Teaching: Which Routes Serve Desired Learning Outcomes?”
Mariya Y. Omelicheva, Purdue University; Olga A. Avdeyeva, Purdue University

“85% of the Grade: Designing and Implementing Effective Assignments in Political Science Courses”
Amy L. Shuster, Princeton University

“Classroom ‘Political Challenge’: Using Exam Review Sessions as a Learning Assessment Tool”
Wendy M. Sinek, Monterey Institute of International Studies

Session C: Design Implementation and Measurement

“The Critical Portfolio: Facilitating the Reflective Political Science Student”
Veronica Donahue DiConti, American University

“Assessing ‘Communication Intensive’ General Education Courses: A Quasi-Experimental Approach”
Mark Nicol, Saginaw Valley State University

“Assessing Change: Observations on Learning Outcomes and Measurement”
Dianne N. Long, California Polytechnic State University

“Measuring Active Learning: Discussion Participation in Online Classes”
Philip Pollock III, University of Central Florida; Kerstin Hamann, University of Central Florida

Participants

John C. Berg, Suffolk University; Iva Ellen Deutchman, Hobart & William Smith Colleges; Kathleen Carlisle Fountain, California State University, Chico; David Alan Gosser, Christopher Newport University; William E. Hrezo, Radford University; Michael G. Jackson, Brown University; Traci M. Levy, Adelphi University; Dewayne L. Lucas, Hobart & William Smith Colleges; James Magee, University of Delaware; Fletcher McClellan, Elizabethtown College; Cristina Ruggiero, Chabot College; John Queen, Glendale Community College

Assessment/Learning Outcomes II

Moderator:

Michelle D. Deardorff, Jackson State University

Session A: Politics of Assessment

Session B: The Art of Designing Evaluation

Session C: Design Implementation and Measurement

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

This track focuses on student assessment and learning outcomes in political science. Themes include: 1) A discussion of disciplinary, departmental and classroom politics in assessment; 2) The art of designing effective evaluation tools; and 3) A discussion of design implementation and measurement issues that arise in evaluation. Each of these themes attempts to contribute to current disciplinary debates on the issue of assessment by discussing the validity and reliability of current approaches and bringing new ones to the table.

TRACK SUMMARY

By Michelle D. Deardorff, Jackson State University

TRACK SUMMARY: As one of the three workgroups on assessment, we addressed many of the same issues as the other two; we considered issues of departmental assessment and program review, classroom and pedagogy assessment, and we asked questions surrounding our ability and means to evaluate skill development. Our participants were graduate students and full professors, a librarian and a visitor from Germany, and they represented undergraduate colleges, research institutions, MA programs, community colleges, and high schools.

With this broad diversity, we had very different perspectives and clearly raised multiple concerns and points of inquiry. However, we quickly discovered an agreement that assessment must serve the learning process and not the contrary. This initial point of consent served as a touchstone for the remainder of the conference. Our workshop has resulted in three institutions deciding to share a methodology to create comparative data on skills evaluation, a score of new research questions that many of our participants are enthusiastically pursuing, and a new glimmer as to how we might demonstrate how our departments improve students' political participation.

- I. Fostering a measurable assessment culture
 - A. Assessment: If we don't do it, someone will do it for us
 - B. Embed Assessment, teaching and learning in a larger learning context
 - C. Close the feedback loop! Use assessment to improve classroom teaching, program review, experiential learning
 - D. Assessment should reinforce active learning pedagogy

- II. How much we don't know in political science:
 - A. Impact of Gender, GPA, and Class Rank in on knowledge acquisition, and civic participation
 - B. How can we effectively evaluate critical thinking
 - C. National data on political science departments

- III. Future areas of research
 - A. How do we begin gathering data cross-institutionally and cross-disciplinarily (date base)
 - B. Assessment does not have a clear theoretical framework
 - C. Need for comparative research
 - Public/private
 - Graduate/undergraduate
 - Distance learning/classroom
 - Study abroad/on campus
 - Elective/required service

- IV. Measuring political participation/active citizenship

- A. Understanding of information
- B. Manifest a form of engagement (defined by students)
- C. Efficacy
- D. Critical thinking skills

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Politics of Assessment

“Prestigious & Nationally Competitive Scholarships: Developing Students & Focusing PS Departments”

Craig T. Cobane, Western Kentucky University

“Factors in Information Literacy Education”

Michelle Hale Williams, University of West Florida; Jocelyn Evans, University of West Florida

“Teaching Indirectly: On Liberal Learning in the 21st Century”

Christopher J. Voparil, Lynn University

Session B: The Art of Designing Evaluation

“Crafting Assessments: A Strategic Approach to Study Abroad”

Nanette S. Levinson, American University

“Developing and Assessing Global Awareness”

Mariano J. Magalhaes, Augustana College

“DL Course Assessment, Inside and Out”

Richard P. Strada, Ocean County College; Janet B. Hubbs, Ocean County College

“Translating Experience into Political Science: A Writing Model of Student Assessment”

Kenyatha V. Loftis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Session C: Design Implementation and Measurement

“Active Learning and Assessment in US Government”

Alvin C. Quackenbush, SUNY, Binghamton University

“Is Attention to Current Events Among PS Majors Habit Forming?”

Jean Wahl Harris, University of Scranton; Leonard Champney, University of Scranton

“Assessing Sources of Students Prior Knowledge in Introductory American Government Courses”

Paul R. Edleman, Sauk Valley Community College; Halima Khan, Northern Illinois University

Participants

Christopher Baker, Penn State University; Nandini Deo, Yale University; William Merrill Downer, Thiel College; Shawn L. Easley, Cuyahoga Community College; Michael Tate Fay, The Williston Northampton School; Shiela Harmon-Martin, University of District of Columbia; John J. Hernandez, Princeton University; Margaret S. Hrezo, Radford University; Christopher Price, SUNY Brockport; Jessica Simone Schattschneider, Freie Universität Berlin; Neil Smith, Potomac College

Assessment/Learning Outcomes III

Moderator:

John Ishiyama, Truman State University

Session A: Politics of Assessment

Session B: The Art of Designing Evaluation

Session C: Design Implementation and Measurement

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

This track focuses on student assessment and learning outcomes in political science. Themes include: 1) A discussion of disciplinary, departmental and classroom politics in assessment; 2) The art of designing effective evaluation tools; and 3) A discussion of design implementation and measurement issues that arise in evaluation. Each of these themes attempts to contribute to current disciplinary debates on the issue of assessment by discussing the validity and reliability of current approaches and bringing new ones to the table.

TRACK SUMMARY

By John Ishiyama, Truman State University

Our track discussed several important aspects regarding assessment in political science. We began with a general discussion regarding the politics of assessment, coming to the collective conclusion that whether one likes it or not, assessment has become a fact of academic life. However, we all agreed that it is far better for political scientists to take charge of assessment and to determine what it is we want students to learn, as opposed to having assessment imposed on us by external forces. In other words moving from “assessment under duress” to “assessment for learning” is the goal to which we should strive. Second, we discussed, via the paper presentations, several benefits of assessment—assessment enhances student learning; assessment enhances teaching; assessment enhances the curriculum; and assessment enhances institutional public relations (promoting resource acquisition and accreditation).

One very important common theme that emerged from our track’s discussions was thinking of assessment in three different ways: Assessment *of* learning, Assessment *for* learning, and Assessment *as* learning.

- **Assessment *of* learning** is generally how we conceive of assessment --as Institutional and classroom measures of student learning. Generally this is akin to the notion assessment can generate summative measures of learning. We all agreed that what is currently necessary is to develop our own multiple measures of student learning in political science, including both quantitative and qualitative measures.
- On the other hand, **assessment *for* learning** essentially involves using formative assessment, or using assessment techniques to adjust pedagogy and teaching to promote student learning. This might include “minute papers” or in class continuous evaluation to improve upon teaching techniques. This might also involve reorganizing the curriculum in response to assessment data.
- The third, or **assessment *as* learning**, emphasizes the student role in the assessment process. Indeed we spent much time discussing student reflection as a powerful learning experience, and one very innovative project presented by Professor Aron Tannenbaum on the “political autobiography.” This is used in a senior capstone course at his university, where students were asked to reflect upon their own political experiences and write about their own lives and development. It was a powerful learning experience for students and directly engaged them in the process of self assessment.

Another conclusion we drew from our discussions, is that, even if one is skeptical about assessment (and there is much to be skeptical about), engaging in assessment has some powerful effects on political science faculty. First engaging in assessment makes ones goals clearer. Professor Mel Cohen emphatically made this point by noting that engaging in assessment makes you think about what you want your students to learn, and then you can do something about it. So even simply beginning the conversation about assessment is of great value.

During the course of our three days together, presentations were made on a variety of topic including assessing experiential learning (such as international internships in the Scottish Parliament as presented by Danny Damron), the use of pre-course inventories and curriculum assessment (by Professor Kay Wolsborn), devising an institutional assessment plan from the ground up (by Professor James Sloat) assessing “significant learning experiences” (by Lindsey Lupo), student motivation (by Professors Stephen Lange and Lisa Cave) and graduate student training programs (by Melissa Buehler and Anthony Marcum) and classroom assessment in International Relations (by Scott Erb). In addition nine other participants contributed greatly to the conversations and together we helped fashion a summary

presentation of our Track's efforts. These included Kenneth J. Campbell, Mark J. Chadsey, Andrea Ciliotta-Rubery, Allison Marie Johnson, Jeremy Keith Morales, Rosemary Nossiff, Marian Lief Palley, Eric Stein and Connie Salyers Stoner. Over the course of the three days, working together, we believe that we have fashioned a "learning community" of sorts that helped us come to some common ground on the difficult issue of assessment. We strongly recommend that our colleagues in the discipline interested in assessment join us in future years to help take control of the assessment process in our discipline.

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Politics of Assessment

"Looking into the Teaching Crystal: Graduate Teaching and the Future of Political Science"

Melissa J. Buehler, Purdue University; Anthony S. Marcum, University of Maryland, College Park

"Teaching Indirectly: On Liberal Learning in the 21st Century"

Christopher J. Voparil, Lynn University

"Student Motivation: Finding the Carrots"

Stephen Lange, Morehead State University; Lisa Cave, Morehead State University

"Teaching and Assessing Civic Engagement: Lessons from a Campuswide Initiative"

Allyson M. Lowe, Chatham College; Douglas Camp Chaffey, Chatham College

Session B: The Art of Designing Evaluation

"Rethinking the Introductory Course to International Relations"

Scott Erb, University of Maine-Farmington

"Bringing Life to the Classroom through Classroom Assessment"

Mel Cohen, Miami University

"Bridging the Gaps: Designing Assessment that Work for Institutions, Departments, and Individuals"

James M. Sloat, Washington & Jefferson College

"Culminating Experience: Writing the Political Autobiography"

Aron G. Tannenbaum, Lander University

Session C: Design Implementation and Measurement

"Using Pre-Course Inventories in Curriculum Assessment: Advantages and Limitations"

Kay G. Wolsborn, College of Saint Benedict

"Significant Learning Experiences: Assessment and Learning Outcomes"

Lindsey Lupo, University of California, Irvine

"Assessing Learning Outcomes in International Internships: A Work in Progress"

Danny Damron, Brigham Young University

Participants

Kenneth J. Campbell, University of Delaware; Vira Ceci, Educational Testing Service; Mark J. Chadsey, SUNY, College at Brockport; Andrea Ciliotta-Rubery, SUNY-Brockport; Victoria A. Farrar-Myers, University of Texas, Arlington; Allison Marie Johnson, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Jeremy Keith Morales, California State University Fullerton; Rosemary Nossiff, Marymount Manhattan College; Marian Lief Palley, University of Delaware; Eric Stein, Catholic University of America; Connie Salyers Stoner, Clark Memorial Library

Simulations and Role Play I

Moderator:

Dr. Patrick A. Pierce, Saint Mary's College

Session A: Exploring the World Through Simulations

Session B: Reflections on Classroom Simulations

Session C: Role-Play and Domestic Issues

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

This track examines several modes of experiential learning in teaching political science, including: exploring the world through simulations, role-play and domestic issues, and reflections on classroom simulations. Discussion will focus on the design and implementation of simulations and role-play and how to maximize the benefit of such experiences in the classroom while avoiding the inherent dangers that might accompany "learning by doing."

TRACK SUMMARY

By Michael Alan Brittingham, University of Louisville, Janet E. Day, SUNY-Oneonta, and Kimberly Zagorski, University of Wisconsin-Stout.

A simulation is a pedagogic strategy that utilizes a variety of learning modes, encourages active student engagement in the learning process, draws upon and develops skills in critical thinking, analysis, problem solving, and communication, and can accommodate both cognitive and affective learning goals. By adopting the role of a particular political actor within a defined scenario, students are able to participate in an interactive activity intended to highlight important political features. The potential simulations that can be utilized are as varied as the political contexts and processes they are intended to model.

The papers presented represented an accurate cross-section of the potential uses for simulations in classroom teaching, including various political contexts, levels of technology, time spans, and target subjects. Some simulations focused on international political decision-making, while others focused on domestic political processes, including both American politics and politics in other countries (real or imagined). The levels of technology used varied greatly, with some utilizing computers and/or Blackboard technologies, either as a stand alone learning mode, or as an integrated component of an interactive, face-to-face exercise, while others were decidedly 'low tech.' Time spans ranged from single class periods to 'real-time' events that transcended the typical class period. Finally, the subjects targeted included various aspects of political decision-making, relations among and between political actors, the balancing of goals and the necessity of compromise, conflict resolution, and the process and norms of politics. Regardless of specific designs, such simulations provide an opportunity for students to apply their knowledge, and to experience, if only vicariously, the complexities of politics in a manner that makes what is often abstract and theoretical more concrete and understandable.

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATIONS

From our discussions sprang a variety of observations regarding the planning, operation, and widespread acceptance of simulations as an active learning tool within the modern political science classroom. Central to all of these suggestions is the underlying concept of commitment.

Planning – Planning a class simulation does not automatically mean huge investments of time and energy. At a basic level, these are inversely related to the learning objectives the instructor wishes to achieve. The most important factor in any simulation is instructor commitment. Even the most elaborate and thoroughly researched event simulation will not succeed if the instructor is not committed to carrying out the technique in the classroom.

Operations – Many elements are involved in a 'successful' simulation, including student acceptance. Students will not fully participate in a simulation without being convinced that it has a point. This is where commitment once again comes into play – the more the instructor is excited about the simulation and committed to making it work, the more likely the student will be fully engaged.

Acceptance – Although active learning is slowly gaining acceptance, there is still resistance in many departments for alternative class activities like simulations. In order to raise the prestige of this technique, it is necessary for practitioners to make a committed effort to demonstrate the utility of these new methods for both students and colleagues alike.

FRAMEWORK FOR SIMULATION DEVELOPMENT

Toward this end, track participants developed a general framework for thinking about using simulations. This framework has four basic parts.

Goals – The most critical aspect of any decision to use simulations in classroom teaching is to have a clear goal in mind. While simulations can be enjoyable for both the students and the instructor, they must have a well-defined goal if they are to have any educational value. While potential goals may vary enormously, it is generally better for instructors to keep their goals relatively narrow in order to avoid problems down the line.

Design – The number of possible simulation designs is almost infinite; there is no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ design. How a simulation should be structured depends almost entirely on the goals that the instructor has laid out. Form should always follow function. If goals are too many or too ill-defined, design flaws are almost inevitable.

Debriefing – Scheduling time at the end of the simulation to debrief students is critical to its ultimate success. Instructors are not omniscient; there is no way to know all of the actions and/or decisions taken by students during the simulation, nor the reasons why they took them. Additionally, students may lose track of the simulation’s place within the context of the class without the instructor working to tie it back in.

Assessment – If instructors are to demonstrate the utility of simulations, they must develop methods to assess whether or not the simulation achieved the intended goals. This includes both assessment of the students and assessment of the simulation itself. Both are intertwined and require careful thought in the construction of assessment techniques. Such techniques should also provide feedback for fine-tuning the simulation for later use.

In following this framework, it is important for the instructor to keep in mind the potential problems that could come up – free-rider and role integrity problems, the loss of students playing critical roles, excessive competitiveness, and the inevitable tradeoffs in time and effort vs. educational payoffs. However, simulations offer definite benefits, not just for students, but for instructors (e.g., better course evaluations) and institutions (e.g., higher student retention) as well. Thus, to make the most of those benefits, participants suggested developing a website to serve as a forum for the exchange of ideas, posting of simulation models, as well as moral and creative support

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Exploring the World through Simulations

“Resolving Nationalistic and Domestic Conflicts: A State Building Exercise”
Wesley D. Chapin, University of Wisconsin, River Falls

“Putting ‘Reading Lolita’ on Trial: Teaching Non-Democracy in Introductory Comparative Politics”
Janet M. Laible, Lehigh University

“Teaching Levels of Analysis through In-Class Simulations: A Comparative Assessment of Three ‘Crises’ in the Taiwan Strait”
Michael Alan Brittingham, University of Louisville

Session B: Reflections on Classroom Simulations

“Classic Texts Meet Non-Traditional Pedagogy”
Victoria C. Williams, Alvernia College; Daniel G. Lang, Lynchburg College

“An Old-Timer’s Reflections on IP Simulations”
Vernon J. Vavrina, Marist College

“Simulations and E-learning in International Relations”

David Sadler, University of Northampton

Session C: Role-play and Domestic Issues

“Mooting as Pedagogy”

Becky daCruz, Armstrong Atlantic State University; John Kearnes, Armstrong Atlantic State University

“Effect of Congressional Role-Playing Experience on Students’ Attention to Constituency & PACs”

Michelle L. Chin, Arizona State University

“Fairness, Information and Coalition Building in Tax Policy: An Experimental Learning Approach”

Amy Lauren Lovecraft, University of Alaska, Fairbanks

“Simulating Presidential Decision Making in a National Security Crisis”

Brian J. Cook, Clark University; Kristen Williams, Clark University

Participants

Janet E. Day, SUNY-Oneonta; Frank Franz, Fairfax County Public Schools; Stephen P. Hoffmann, Taylor University; John Messmer, St. Louis Community College; Elizabeth A. Oldmixon, University of North Texas; David C.W. Parker, Indiana University South Bend; Jonathan C. Smith, Presbyterian College; Cindi Unmack, American River College; Kim Zagorski, University of Wisconsin-Stout.

Simulations and Role Play II

Moderator:

Carolyn Shaw, Wichita State University

Session A: Exploring the World Through Simulations

Session B: Reflections on Classroom Simulations

Session C: Role-Play and Domestic Issues

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

This track examines several modes of experiential learning in teaching political science, including: exploring the world through simulations, role-play and domestic issues, and reflections on classroom simulations. Discussion will focus on the design and implementation of simulations and role-play and how to maximize the benefit of such experiences in the classroom while avoiding the inherent dangers that might accompany "learning by doing."

TRACK SUMMARY

By Carolyn Shaw, Wichita State University

Simulations and Role Play II

Carolyn Shaw, Wichita State University, Moderator, carolyn.shaw@wichita.edu

Track Summary:

This track examined experiential learning in political science through the use of simulations and role play exercises to explore domestic politics and the world. Presentations included simulations for comparative politics, international relations, political theory, constitutional law, political leadership, and American government. Discussion focused on the design and implementation of simulations and role-play scenarios and how to maximize the benefit of such experiences in the classroom while avoiding the potential pitfalls that can accompany "learning by doing."

Overall Theme: "One size does not fit all, but there is a shoe for every foot"

General Discussion:

- Simulations are a valuable active learning tool available to instructors.
- Simulations can be adapted to fit almost any class, context or learning objective.
- Presentation of learning assessment data from simulations is critical to expanding the use of the exercises in the classroom.

Benefits to Using Simulations:

- Help students gain a deeper understanding of abstract concepts and facilitate retention by applying course materials to a specific context
- Promote understanding of different perspectives
- Create a sense of student ownership and responsibility
- Provide growth opportunities / promote leadership and greater engagement
- Allow an alternate presentation of course materials for greater variety
- Improve student writing skills, research skills, and critical thinking.
- Promote student interaction through negotiation, compromise and consensus building
- Promote civic awareness and engagement beyond class
- Create links between courses
- Allow faculty to demonstrate teaching innovation and mastery

Design Considerations:

- Learning objectives
- Class size / course level
- Level of student preparation needed

- Instructor time commitment and comfort level
- Length of simulation
- Real, fictional, or hybrid context
- Clear communication and instructions
- Debriefing and assessment plans
- College/University environment
- Necessary resources (technology and/or classroom space)

Next steps:

- Many instructors might benefit from an edited volume with specific simulation design considerations for creating their own simulations.
- A library of ready-to-use simulations would be very helpful for those instructors who do not want to custom design a simulation for their classroom.
- It would be valuable to promote further discussion of simulations at regional conferences.

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Exploring the World through Simulations

“Making International Events Come Alive in a Political Science Classroom: EU Simulation Challenges”
Gretchen J. Van Dyke, University of Scranton

“Modern State Building Simulation”
Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham, University of California, San Diego

“Simulating Ethnic Conflict: A Non-Case-Specific Approach”
Michelle C. Boomgaard, Muskingum College

Session B: Reflections on Classroom Simulations

“Playing Political Science Games: Some Benefits of Adding Short Games to Political Science Courses”
Andrew K. Wahlstrom, Millersville University of Pennsylvania

“Political Theory Simulations? Using Reacting to the Past Explore the History of Political Thought”
Christopher H. Anderson, Hartford University

“Experimenting With Expression: A Test of Free Speech on Campus”
Christopher Budzisz, Loras College; David C. Cochran, Loras College

“Encouraging Leadership and Learning through ICONS: Students Teaching Students at an Undergrad Institution”
Alison Rios Millet McCartney, Towson University; James L. Hardin III, Towson University

Session C: Role-play and Domestic Issues

“One Style and Size does not Fit all: How to Develop a Constitutional Convention Simulation”
Paula O’Loughlin, University of Minnesota, Morris; Angela L. Bos, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

“Appellate Court Simulations in the Classroom – Faculty and Student Views from the Field”
Daniel E. Smith, Northwest Missouri State University

“Creating Civic Competency: Using Simulations to Teach Citizenship Skills”
Jeffrey L. Bernstein, Eastern Michigan University

“Federal Budget Policy Simulations in the Classroom”
Joshua Gordon, The Concord Coalition

Participants

Eva Borreguero, Georgetown University; Thomas C. Ellington, Wesleyan College; Michael Charles Grillo, University of Delaware; Daniel Jenkins, University of South Florida; Rachel J. Kirkland, Wayne State University; Steve Majors, Northeastern University; Xavier Marquez, University of Notre Dame; Emily M. Neal, Northeastern University; Jeanne Sanford, Monroe County Schools; Tressa E. Tabares, American River College

Community-Based Learning I

Moderator:

Dr. Elizabeth A. Bennion, Indiana University South Bend

Session A: Service Learning

Session B: Community-Based Research

Session C: Reflections on Experiential Learning

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Service Learning

“Breaking Out”

Kathy B. Smith, Wake Forest University

“The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Democracy in Action Model of Service Learning”

William L. Niemi, Western State College of Colorado

“Fighting Apathy: A Course Plan for Civic Education through Service Learning”

Holley E. Tankersley, University of Georgia; Laura P. Moyer, University of Georgia

Session B: Community-Based Research

“Teaching Political Engagement and Research Methods through Community-Based Research”

Corey Cook, San Francisco State University; Francis K. Neely, San Francisco State University

“Service Learning in Urban Politics and Policy: Incorporating the Big Picture”

Shannon Jenkins, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth

“Community-Based Learning in Faith-Based Service Organizations: Case Study and Simulation”

Alan Holiman, William Jewell College

Session C: Reflections on Experiential Learning

“A Curriculum for Internship Programs”

Bruce E. Cain, University of California, Berkeley; Michael Goldstein, University of California, Berkeley

“Capstone for Political Science Majors: The Content and the Service”

Cheryl A Brown, Marshall University; Robert W. Behrman, Marshall University

“Cultivating a Dedication to Ethical Leadership and Civic Responsibility: Reflections on Service Learning”

Patrick F. McKinlay, Morningside College; Lillian J. Lopez, Morningside College

“Does Service Learning Enhance Student Performance in the Classroom?”

Mary A. McHugh, Merrimack College

Participants

Vasiliki Anastasakos, Northampton Community College; Antonio Brown, Loyola Marymount University; Amy Carter, Westminster College; Shawn Paul Healy, University of Illinois at Chicago; Douglas R. Hess, George Washington University; Bruce Anthony Jones, University of Missouri - Kansas City; Robert Glenn Moore, Delta College; Howard Potts, Waycross College; Margaret Tseng, Marymount University

Community-Based Learning II

Moderator:

Dr. S. Suzan J. Harkness, University of District Columbia

Session A: Service Learning

Session B: Community-Based Research

Session C: Reflections on Experiential Learning

Session D: Moderator Wrap-Up

Community and service-based learning have been the buzzwords of teaching in political science classrooms throughout the past decade. Rooted in our traditional views on civic engagement in democratic countries and constantly readdressed through the research of scholars in political science, professors and teachers are increasingly faced with questions of how to best fit elements of community and service into traditional approaches in political science curriculums. This track seeks to address questions of how to incorporate community and service and what strategies work and do not work through discussions of service learning, community-based research, and reflections on community and “real-world” experiential learning.

TRACK SUMMARY

By S. Suzan J. Harkness, University of District Columbia, and Sylvia Ramirez Benatti, University of District Columbia

Community or service-based learning and research have been the buzzwords of teaching in political science classrooms throughout the past decade. Rooted in our traditional views on civic engagement in democratic countries and constantly readdressed through the research of scholars in political science, professors and teachers are increasingly faced with questions of how to best fit elements of community and service into traditional approaches in political science curriculums. This track seeks to address questions of how to incorporate community and service and what strategies work and do not work through discussions of service learning, community-based research, and reflections on community and “real-world” experiential learning.

TRACK SUMMARY: Professors and graduate students were drawn to this track to share their experiences in designing, implementing, and assessing community-based or service-learning. Participants were diverse, in part, because they represented large research oriented universities, small private colleges, liberal arts colleges, women’s colleges, progressive non-traditional institutions, and historically black college universities, but also the papers presented included a broad range of themes. Community-based learning (CbL) as discussed in this track included experiential and service-learning as a pedagogy to facilitate students self discovery of their civic awareness and their purpose, while recognizing and validating their current levels of engagement as they formulate life-long learning goals and life-objectives. The transformative experiences of CbL as presented were rich and powerful and impacted students. All of the papers demonstrated direct involvement in things political whereby students gained a greater understanding of the process, the community, civic mindedness, and democratic responsibility while serving and empowering communities. More challenging than the positive observations and benefits were the areas yet to be defined that include the theoretical frames in the changing patterns of participation, engagement and social capital in today’s society. In fostering the pedagogical elements of community-based or service learning and community-based research, the participants identified several challenges from lessons learned and proposed suggestions to validate and reward the scholarly commitment of engaged faculty within our discipline.

KEY OBSERVATIONS:

In addressing questions of how to incorporate community-based/service learning, what strategies work and do not, this track identified three areas: planning, methodology, and assessment as key attributes to a successful strategy. The track also identified challenges from lessons learned and offered suggestions to validate and reward scholarly commitments to the pedagogical approach.

1. Planning

a. In designing the pedagogical approach to CbL, traditional academic research starts the process as it unfolds community needs. As research yields elucidation into communities, this information drives the course design for CbL as specific teaching goals and learning outcomes are folded into syllabi. In this planning stage, it was emphasized that knowing and identifying key players in the community, within the institution, among administrators and colleagues were vital to the success of any community-based or service project.

Becoming acquainted with the key players within the community forms the trust that is necessary to build cooperative experiences and sustain CbL projects.

b. Participants in this track also identified the importance of identifying the curriculum and mission based objectives as they relate to the course as well as identifying student outcomes that include cognitive, affective, and behavior goals.

2. Methodology

The pedagogy that was shared through papers included guided journaling, story telling, writing reflection, field notes, portfolio building, group reflection, long-term commitments, oversight and feedback loops, and contracts.

3. Assessment

As participants shared their experiences and lessons learned, our discussions emphasized the value and importance of layered assessment. A wide spectrum of assessment approaches was shared. These included: pre/post/formative/summative assessments; stakeholder summit; program evaluation; community-partner evaluation; evaluations for different audiences; student: pre/post/formative/summative assessments; and student knowledge-skills/disposition assessments. Participants shared their experiences of assessment and how it provided a place for critical reflection for all participants as it facilitated social ties within the communities. Assessment was also used to enrich the community-based research approach as well as provide evidence for the scholarship of teaching and offer opportunities for publication in the discipline.

A general viewpoint expressed in our panel exposed the challenges of creating CbL projects. An initial challenge faced by many participants included a stereotypical viewpoint whereby CbL was undervalued and unrecognized for its scholarly contributions. All participants committed substantial amounts of time outside of their primary teaching and research interests in establishing CbL projects. The projects also cost money in terms of time and resources. The level of institutional support varied among participants but all agreed CbL requires institutional support and recognition. Additional challenges included the incorporation of CbL into the academic portfolio for tenure and promotion, building trust within the community and within the administration, building coalitions to sustain CbL, and overcoming student's personal commitments and challenges beyond the classroom.

4. Next Steps

All of our presenters agreed that the next steps would include increased support for the scholarship of teaching; support and recognition of CbL; and getting CbL to count in tenure and promotion process.

TRACK PARTICIPANTS

Session A: Service Learning

"Local Political Involvement and Service Learning" David P. Redlawsk, University of Iowa; Nora Wilson, University of Iowa

"Lessons from Hammond Heights: Service Learning and Race in an Oklahoma Town" Christine Pappas, East Central University

"Increasing Students' Civic Engagement through Internships and Intensive Leadership Programs" Brigid Harrison, Montclair State University; Quentin Kidd, Christopher Newport University

Session B: Community-Based Research

"From Service Learning to Civic Learning" Steven G. Jones, Purdue University

"Civic Engagement and Community-Based Learning: A Hybrid Approach"
Edward M. Warzala, SUNY Empire State College; Michael Stone, SUNY Empire State College

"Community Building through Hands on Learning: The Lynwood Park Experience" Kendra King, Oglethorpe University

Session C: Reflections on Experiential Learning

"Practicing Democracy: An Engaged Approach to Teaching and Learning" Margaret Post, Brandeis University; Adam Reich, University of California, Berkeley

"Learning to Write and Chew Gum at the Same Time: Combining Internships and a Writing Intensive Course" Leanne Doherty, Simmons College

"The Courtroom as Classroom: 'Soaking and Poking' in the Judiciary in Public Law Courses" Judithanne Scourfield McLauchlan, University of South Florida – St. Petersburg