APSA Teaching and Learning Conference: A Summary of Four Tracks

The inaugural APSA Conference on Teaching and Learning in Political Science brought 40 political scientists from around the country to Washington, D.C., to share their ideas and models of teaching and learning. Hosted by American University from February 19–21, the conference entailed four thematic tracks: Pedagogy and Technology, Civic Education and Service Learning, Student Assessment and Learning Outcomes, and Global Perspectives and Diversity. Summaries of each track's work follows. For more information on this and future APSA Conferences on Teaching and Learning, visit www.apsanet.org/tlc/ or contact Linda Lopez at llopez@apsanet.org.

Track One: Pedagogy and Technology

—Sharon Z. Alter,
William Rainey Harper College
—Amy R. Gershkoff,
Princeton University

Improving and Enhancing Student Learning

A dynamic union of both pedagogy and technology is central to political science teaching and learning. Realizing the effectiveness of such a combination, the program committee of the pilot APSA Conference on Teaching and Learning Political Science included a session that focused on varied aspects of pedagogy and technology. The idea was not only to integrate technology with pedagogy, but also to focus on pedagogy separate from the use of technology.

The 14 Track One participants represented a range of institutions, levels of teaching experience, and areas of substantive expertise. Institutions ranged from universities to four-year liberal arts colleges to community colleges. Participants ranged from beginning teachers to those newly tenured to those newly retired. All of the discipline's major subfields—American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, Methodology and Public Law—were represented. This diversity gave rise to a workshop dynamic conducive to the sharing of ideas about what worked most successfully in political science teaching and learning.

Each of the 14 presenters described an innovative teaching technique and how to best implement it in the classroom. APSA has created a web site to facilitate the sharing of these ideas across the discipline; for information on implementing these ideas in your classroom, visit ww w.politicalscience.org. The presentations emphasized eight different themes:

1. *Uses of the web* with an entire web-based course, with web activities as a supplement to a traditionally taught course, and with an entire simulation online. John Kozlowicz, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, noted his progression from using web-based enhancements to teaching an entire course on the web with emphasis on student discussion forums. Robert Trudeau, Providence College, emphasized that the use of a web-based discussion prior to class helps make the in-class discussion more meaningful with incorporation of higher level critical thinking skills. Kathleen Young, University of Maryland, explained that online simulation promotes writing skills and allows for organized student interaction beyond the classroom.

2. *Simulations* commercially produced or student-created as a corollary to an entire course, as well as teacher-created simulations with use of email communication between students of two universities. Danny Damron, Brigham Young University, emphasized that use of simulations requires students to apply and interact with political science information and ideas in a reflective way. Donald Jansiewicz, Carroll Community College, discussed the importance of student debriefing as part of the simulation. Paul Dosh, University of California-Berkeley, explained student-created simulation as a process of making learning more lasting and memorable for students. John Forren, Miami University, focused in part on the use of email communication between two universities' students engaged in the same simulation at the same time to promote dialogue and reflection among students from diverse backgrounds and perspectives.

3. *Purposeful use of multiple teaching methods* emphasizing different learning styles and multiple intelligences. Amy Gershkoff, Princeton University, highlighted examples of varied teaching methods to promote student success in a political methodology course.

4. *Use of learning communities* both across the institution and curriculum for all full-time freshmen and on an ad hoc basis between/among individual faculty. Juan Carlos Huerta, Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi, emphasized the enhanced student learning and interaction that takes place when political science provides the context for an institution-wide learning community. Cameron Thies, Louisiana State University, focused on the importance of the appropriate learning community model plus the need for choosing faculty willing to experiment.

5. *Instructional framework* designed to facilitate review, guided discussion, and open-ended discussion. Gerson Moreno-Riano, Cedarville University, emphasized that this mode of pedagogy is helpful in a political philosophy course.

6. *Moot court* to teach complexities of controversial issues. Galya Benarich Ruffer, DePaul University, explained moot court as a technique not only to explain case law, but also to discuss nuances in the definition of plagiarism.

7. *Internships* in which students learn experientially. John Berg, Suffolk University, focused on how a political science internship achieves both political science goals and more generic academic and practical goals of experiential education.

8. *Mentoring of students*, rather than mere advising, with the goal of strategic thinking and planning by students. Craig Cobane, Culver-Stockton College, emphasized that his mentoring model encourages students to take initiative and responsibility in their decision-making process.

Each of these presentations emphasized the need to reframe pedagogical discussions from thinking in terms of how to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504244729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

improve teaching to thinking in terms of how to enhance student learning. Many of the ideas involved completely rethinking how students learn by suggesting students take a greater role in the teaching process, encouraging students to learn experientially outside the classroom, arranging for some instruction to take place over the Internet, or facilitating interdisciplinary learning. Presenters noted the positive results of such innovations, including greater student retention of the material, increased student motivation and interest in class, and attainment of higher order critical thinking skills.

The discussion at the end of these presentations highlighted that to move away from the traditional lecture format of instruction, it is imperative for faculty to have technical, institutional, and departmental support. In addition to needing technical support to implement such equipment as in-class voting machines, Internet access, or laptop projection, participants noted the need for sufficient faculty training on use of new technology in the classroom. For example, though using PowerPoint may be trendy, without faculty training on how to effectively incorporate the technology into the learning process, the classroom experience could become consumed by the technology, rather than enhanced by it.

Several participants noted the need for broad institutional support to implement interdisciplinary teaching/learning and other types of learning communities. Presenters emphasized the need for a dialogue involving deans and other administrators, staff such as the registrar, and relevant faculty. These challenges are by no means insurmountable, but they do necessitate forethought and advanced planning.

Many participants noted the paramount importance of departmental support for pedagogical innovation. Some departments are quite open to new teaching ideas, while others take a slower and more evolutionary approach. Faculty emphasized the need to keep department culture in mind when deciding to implement new approaches to student learning.

Several presenters noted that pedagogical innovation is risky, especially for untenured faculty. The present structure of the discipline rarely rewards innovation in teaching, especially because teaching is rarely as paramount as research in the tenure process at most institutions. Pedagogical innovations can take time to prepare and implement, often much more time than the traditional lecture format. While no conclusions were reached on how the incentive structure could or should be changed to encourage faculty to take the time and risk to implement pedagogical innovations, all agreed that the current incentive structure can be an obstacle.

Discussion also focused on the lack of teaching preparation that graduate students often receive. This lack of pedagogical training means that assistant professors must learn "on the job," which can make it difficult to simultaneously pursue the professional research projects that ultimately lead to tenure. Participants suggested that more training in teaching during graduate school might ease the transition from graduate student to assistant professor.

Finally, participants focused on how best to reach out to students while still maintaining social distance. We discussed, for example, the tradeoffs in a policy of requiring students to pursue internships or prestigious fellowships for which they are qualified, as well as whether faculty should be willing to answer questions on a personal level about balancing work and family when questioned by aspiring academics. These issues point to the need to come to an understanding of the role of faculty in an atmosphere of varied institutional norms, discipline specialties, and personal comfort levels.

These discussions raised many questions, but participants came to no set conclusions. However, Track One participants did unanimously conclude that articulating these issues and concerns among political science colleagues was very helpful. The discipline carves out much time for discussing mutual research interests, but rarely affords ample time for discussing mutual pedagogical concerns. Like the 2004 Conference, the expanded 2005 Conference will feature a workshop format in which participants can continue the dialogue begun by Track One.

Track Two: Civic Education and Service Learning

—Nathan Zook,
University of Tennessee
—Alan R. Gitelson,
Loyola University, Chicago

Context and Importance of Track Two

Service-learning and civic education have become popular pedagogical themes as higher education attempts to embody diversity and innovation in our teaching models. This trend, however, has resulted in disagreement over the means by which service- learning and the civic education theme should be incorporated into the classroom. Some educators have sought to jump on the bandwagon without really attempting to learn exactly what these tools entail, resulting in a diffusion of their effectiveness.

The APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, through its establishment of a track dealing with service-learning and civic education (Track Two), supports the validity of these pedagogical tools and the engagement in reflective critiques of their usefulness and applicability in subdisciplinary areas such as international relations, methods, and American Government. An in-depth forum for discussing and establishing the definitions, usefulness, and criteria for analysis of service-learning and civic education is particularly important in the discipline of political science. Of all the disciplines that seek to incorporate service-learning and civic education, it is particularly imperative that political science takes the lead in addressing these matters since it is this discipline that should be the forerunner in addressing the theory and practice of democratic participation and civil society in the classroom.

Highlights and Themes

The highlights and themes that emerged from the conference panel have relevance for educators, students, and other communities. Faculty members need to consider whether or not the push for service-learning and civic engagement derives from a singular ideological focus on the part of faculty members. In many cases, service- learning and civic education are value-laden objectives whose roles have to be understood and evaluated in the classroom setting.

In addition, the necessary resources involved in these pedagogies are costly and thus often prohibitive for many faculty. Given that many colleges and universities place higher value on traditional data-based and normative research than on teaching when making tenure and promotion decisions, should untenured faculty be encouraged to engage in developing time-consuming pedagogical tools?

A number of themes emerged at the conference. The concept of being involved in politics often has a negative connotation for many young people, especially in contrast to the feeling of good will often fostered by service to one's community. Therefore, the link between political activism and service-learning should be a focus of service-learning courses.

In addition, appropriate categories of service-learning should be utilized in accordance with carefully planned learning outcomes and an awareness

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504244729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the students' capacity to engage in a particular project. Service-learning should not be used simply because it is trendy or appears innovative, but because it will further the learning process for the student. The panel discussed many different service-learning categories and ways in which each could be applied to different learning outcomes. Reflection/analysis throughout a semester and at its conclusion is necessary to ensure that a service project has achieved its objective. Although a sense of personal fulfillment may result for the student, in-class reflection can help to ensure critical analysis of a particular service project.

While the panel consisted of educators, attention was also given to relationships with the community. Although community partners may benefit from student output, students should not feel like they are experts patronizing a needy organization. At the same time, the balance between sensitivity toward and analytical distance from community partners is particularly delicate in the learning process. An organization's structure, issues, and capacities are some of the criteria that faculty need to consider in choosing a community partner for a service-learning or civic engagement project. The level of commitment that the community partner feels in contributing to the learning process could also be an important consideration.

Obtaining the perfect balance of control over the service-learning or civic engagement process between faculty, students, and community partners is often challenging. An issue related to this balance that needs to be addressed deals with the schedule or time-line of a project. The ideal balance will result when the faculty member outlines clear learning objectives and assessment procedures, the student is able to perform the goals of the community partner and fulfill the academic course requirements while maintaining analytical distance, and the community partner and the academic partner feel they both benefit from the shared interaction.

Lessons Learned

Although the panel participants were already practitioners of service-learning and civic education instruction, there were still many lessons to be learned through evaluating and sharing experiences related to the application and assessment of these themes. Discussing teaching/learning experiences with a broader audience facilitates the sharing of pedagogical tools, successes, failures, misperceptions, and lessons learned. In every sense, participants felt that this type of panel/workshop enhances the goals of the political science discipline.

One important lesson is that the service-learning model is not "filler" that can be placed capriciously in political science courses, but rather a process/tool requiring a disciplined consciousness of both teaching techniques and learning outcomes. This is not a simple pedagogical instrument that faculty use to reduce lesson preparations, but rather a complex mechanism for directly applying lessons to the real world. Ideally, service- learning will be respected as such in the discipline. Having an influential organization like the APSA facilitate the discussion of the service-learning model in a conference setting enhances the stature of this pedagogical tool.

In addition, the far-reaching implications of both service-learning and civic education for students beyond academia should be considered. In many cases, students become more than observers in the political process. Their lives and career goals may even be changed as a result of these learning opportunities. Therefore, instructors need to consider any ethical issues as well as any personal biases that may be present in steering students toward a more political expression of the learning process.

A perception held by some political scientists has been the discipline's irrelevancy in the political arena. One benefit for the discipline of political science arising from renewed attention to service-learning and civic education is that politics becomes more connected to the political environments that are being analyzed, thus becoming more relevant both for students and society at large. In addition, a more positive model regarding the role of politics is imparted to a broader audience, whether students, community partners, or other disciplines.

Importance of Conference and Expectations for the Future

The conference was important for bringing together faculty who are interested in reflective self-examination of pedagogical tools. The rigorous self-reflective research presented by the conference participants dealing with service-learning pedagogy and why civic engagement is important was impressive in its scope, establishing the groundwork for future research. Publication of this research will hopefully raise awareness of alternative pedagogies among those who were not able to participate in this year's conference and help to establish the legitimacy of these research questions.

As a pilot conference, this meeting was particularly important for developing a model meeting for the future. For example, the European conference model of intensive tracks seemed to be quite popular among the participants. It provided significant networking opportunities for faculty that are committed to alternative pedagogies. Participants moved away from academia's tendency to focus on the individual researcher at such meetings toward acknowledgment that committed faculty can benefit from a group-oriented workshop. Participation at this conference generated substantial benefits including extended, in-depth group analysis of different pedagogical models.

One beneficial modification for the future would be to separate some of the general themes to ensure particular attention to each. In Track Two, for example, attention to service-learning seemed to dominate over civic education. In addition, while it was helpful to have these topics considered in a joint session to increase the networking potential, they could be separated in the future to allow for more conference participants and to assist in moving each panel from a survey of broad themes toward core specialization and practical classroom applications.

Finally, it is important that future panels on these topics move beyond just rehashing this year's debates, questions, and themes. The groundwork has been laid for a conference model. Using participants from this year's conference to facilitate next year's panels will ensure that the APSA Conference on Teaching and Learning does not become stagnant or repetitive, but will instead become renowned for being on the cutting-edge of the assessment of innovative pedagogical tools.

Track Three: Assessment

—John Ishiyama,
Truman State University

Assessment in Political Science

From February 19-21, 2004 the inaugural APSA Teaching and Learning Conference was held at American University in Washington, D.C. The conference was organized to emulate the "European" model of a conference, where a set of working groups (or "tracks") were convened to work on one of four issue areas that the conference program

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504244729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

committee considered important to the political science discipline. The tracks were not designed to follow the standard political science conference format where individual papers were presented and a "discussant" commented on the papers, leaving five minutes at the end for general discussion. Rather, the tracks were working groups, where each individual presented over two days with the papers discussed by the group collectively, not to fete out criticisms, but to build on presented themes. The groups then made recommendations to a plenary session at the end of the conference, suggesting what APSA as a professional association could do to facilitate advances in each of the four issue areas.

Our track focused on "Assessment and Learning Outcomes." At first, none of us really knew what to expect. We all came from very different backgrounds. Some came from very large departments, with faculty numbering 25 or more. Others were from "departments" made up of one political scientist. There were full professors as well as graduate students, tenured and untenured faculty. Some were from public institutions whereas others were from private schools. Research schools were represented as were primarily undergraduate institutions and community/junior colleges. Two participants were from Historically Black Colleges or Universities (HBCU). Still others were from departments that were integrated with other disciplines (such as sociology or history, or in a social science department or division)—others came from "stand alone" departments. It was indeed a very diverse group of 10 participants.

Nonetheless, what became almost immediately apparent was that, despite most of us having never met prior to the meeting, we had much in common. What was particularly striking about Track Three was that every one of the programs represented that had adopted an assessment program was first and foremost motivated by the desire of the faculty to improve student learning, *not* in response to pressure from an external accrediting organization. At all the institutions represented, assessment began with the simple realization that students were not learning the skills and content that the political science faculty believed were important (*especially* among those students with high GPAs), that is, students were graduating without the requisite skills and knowledge that would make them marketable.

Thus we began with the "radical" notion that assessment is really about how we can demonstrate empirically that our students are actually learning what we would like them to learn. As skeptical empirical political scientists, we are naturally unconvinced by "show and tell" literature that claims that certain teaching techniques or curricular structures promoted student learning. This hardly constitutes the standard of evidence we use in our own substantive work, and should not therefore constitute the standard of evidence in demonstrating that our teaching techniques or curricular structures work. For us, assessment's primary purpose is the empirical evaluation of pedagogy and curriculum (beyond just seeing "A's" on student transcripts) to enable us to improve upon what we do as educators.

Over the course of the next two days, each of the participants made a presentation on some aspect of assessment. On the first day, the presentations focused primarily on program assessment. One presentation discussed the history of a "successful" assessment program that had been instituted some 30 years ago; others presented material about how to build a program from scratch, recounting the challenges they faced in instituting an assessment program. Although most of the participants who established an assessment program talked about establishing goals first (particularly emphasizing skills, rather than merely content) and then developing a program to assess progress towards those goals in a planned deductive way, at least one participant noted that it was possible to start establishing a program from the "bottom up" through the efforts of individual faculty members.

On the second day, the focus shifted to particular techniques individuals employed to assess student learning. Some of these involved the use of in- class techniques (such as variations of minute papers to provide for student feedback) as well as projects that examined (in a quasi-experimental way) the effectiveness of certain pedagogical techniques. One project compared female student class participation in an online format to that in a traditional format. Another examined various ways to assess the development of critical thinking using problem- solving exercises. Still another explored the value of using peer evaluation techniques to assess student learning. Over the course of this session we also discussed the merits of both quantitative and qualitative techniques, ranging from standardized, nationally- normed tests like the ETS-produced Major Field Test in Political Science, to content analyzing online discussions and the use of electronic portfolios, as well as using locally developed instruments, senior seminar capstone courses, and exit interviews.

We were also aware of the common criticisms of assessment posed by many of our colleagues in the discipline, some of which have a great deal of merit. For instance, many question the use of standardized tests to assess student learning and are suspicious of "externally imposed" authority, viewing assessment as a threat to academic freedom. Many at the session noted that many of these criticisms are based on the somewhat faulty notion that assessment is based only on standardized tests. As with any other research agenda, multiple methodologies and multiple indicators are always better than reliance on single measures (either quantitative or qualitative).

Nonetheless, we all acknowledged that the discipline faces an ever-growing pressure from external audiences (like state legislatures and accrediting organizations) and that assessment is a reality with which we must now deal. One of the themes mentioned again and again is that if we as political scientists do not come up with our own assessment programs, tailored to political science and, devised by political scientists, someone else, whether it be from higher education or the humanities, will do it for us. We would prefer that we devise a plan ourselves; who is in a better position to devise such assessment strategies than political scientists? Who better able to engage in "policy evaluation"? Who better able to use multiple methodologies?

Further, to avoid the image that standards are externally imposed, we unanimously concluded that it was not for APSA (or any other organization) to set standards, but rather to help illustrate model programs from a variety of different kinds of institutions so as to act as a "menu for choice" for those departments that might be inclined to consider adopting an assessment program. Hence nothing is imposed—the choice remains the departments'—but at least there would be models for those interested in conducting assessment. However, the APSA can play a crucial role in providing resources and information to departments interested in devising an assessment program.

Another commonly expressed concern by some of our political science colleagues goes something like this: Assessment techniques are labor intensive and will take time away from more pressing academic responsibilities, or; is it in my individual professional interest to conduct assessment? Regarding the time and effort required to conduct

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504244729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

assessment, it is important to recognize that conducting assessment involves considerable time and energy and that most faculty are stretched thin regarding scholarly commitments, service commitments, etc. However, if we take seriously the notion that student learning is at the core of what we do, then it is in our interest to gauge whether our students are actually learning. There is also a potential professional pay off as well (in terms of publication)—increasing numbers of journals publish work that addresses the "scholarship of assessment/ teaching and learning"—including *PS* and the newly launched *Journal of Political Science Education* (the journal of the Undergraduate Education Division of the APSA).

In sum, there were a number of lessons that we took away from this meeting:

1. It is true that no two institutions are the same, so a one-size approach does not fit all. There are, however, common themes that we can learn from one another.

2. Assessment is meant to improve our teaching and promote student learning *not* just to please others.

3. If you are thinking about instituting an assessment program, expect to encounter a considerable amount of politics—battles over turf and techniques are inevitable. Map out the terrain. Who are the skeptics and why are they skeptical? If you want to persuade, do it in a non- threatening way (a theme mentioned by all). Work with those who are willing to participate.

4. Assessment fits what we as social scientists do in our own scholarship; in fact it is a natural fit.

5. There are multiple indicators (qualitative and quantitative) that can be adapted for use in multiple settings.

6. Assessment can be of benefit to faculty and programs, but the process of assessment can benefit students too (a common theme mentioned by all). Student understanding and participation in assessment is a good thing.

Finally, the workshop produced a set of recommendations that were forwarded to APSA regarding how to promote assessment in political science. First, we made the following appeal to the APSA outlining why it should play a greater role in assessment:

1. First, in an effort to promote the scholarship of teaching and learning, we need to move from a culture of unexamined assumptions to a culture of evidence.

2. If we do not set the agenda in establishing assessment in political science, others less qualified with different agendas will do so.

3. Our discipline is distinctively qualified to lead in the assessment/ policy evaluation field.

4. This is an opportunity for APSA to help enhance the quality of political science education.

5. We can increase membership by increasing the relevance of APSA to the teaching function of its profession, especially to those in undergraduate education. Only the APSA has the legitimacy and the capacity to coordinate and disseminate information on effective assessment practices.

Second, we suggested that APSA could provide essential services to political scientists by:

1. *Supporting and promoting* the publication of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) in political science;

2. *Publicizing* model assessment programs/exemplary practices at the program and classroom levels;

3. *Revisiting* the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) /Wahlke report on the undergraduate political science major;

4. *Providing* a clearing house of external program reviewers;

5. *Providing* a clearing house of assessment literature;

6. *Promoting* the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in graduate education;

7. *Establishing and nurturinge* an APSA Workshop on Aassessment training using faculty members from model political science programs;

8. *Creating* a standing APSA working group on Assessment that would assist in the implementation of the above.

However, beyond the recommendations presented, perhaps the most rewarding aspect of the conference was the realization that we were not alone—that there were others in the discipline struggling with the same issues and concerns. Finally, we had a forum to exchange ideas and explore new intellectual horizons regarding teaching and learning in political science. Indeed, perhaps the most significant and long lasting consequence of the TLC in general was the creation of a "community" of scholars dedicated to the study of teaching and learning in political science. The creation of this community was a crucial first step on the road to change in the APSA, a change that will better prepare all of us for the challenges facing Higher Education in the near future.

Track Four: Diversity and Global Perspectives

—Alan Lamborn,
Colorado State University
—Pamela Martin,
Coastal Carolina University

Moderator's Introduction

Combining the presentations on diversity and global perspectives turned out to be very productive. We discovered a natural affinity between the conference's goal of creating a collaborative teaching and learning environment that bridges the cosmopolitan and local knowledge teachers and students bring together in the classroom and the substance of what we wanted students to learn about diversity within and among countries in a period of accelerating globalization. While the contexts and stakes could not be more different, the challenges of combining a professor's "cosmopolitan knowledge" with students' "local knowledge" are theoretically analogous to the political challenges of honoring the local knowledge that grows out of our diversity while simultaneously nurturing a more shared, cosmopolitan knowledge that can connect us in mutually acceptable ways. Put differently, when it comes to understanding the politics of diversity and globalization, the classroom can be used both as an example and as an application of political theory. Working within this broad theme, we discussed a variety of very specific ideas to promote collaborative and active learning about diversity and world politics.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504244729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Creating "A Window to the World"

A Croat, a Serb, and an Albanian who left their war torn homes arrive in Thessaloniki, Greece and are suddenly sitting in the same Introduction to Politics classroom. A student in the Middle East is negotiating peace settlements in an online simulation with a student in Santa Clara, California. Students in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina and in Quito, Ecuador are speaking with one another via a videoconference connection about the impacts of globalization. The experiences of the panelists and their classes reflect larger trends in the international system in which local cultures and identities remain significant even as professor, students, and learning spaces are increasingly cosmopolitan. The embedded political science classroom is a case study of the challenges posed to states and local identities and cultures that are increasingly challenged by the processes of globalization, including travel, communication, and new technologies.

The participants of this panel presented learning scenarios that ranged from a "Clash of Civilizations" within the classroom to a borderless classroom linked via an Internet Protocol (IP) connection. Tina Mavrikos-Adamou and Patrick O'Neil stressed the value of analyzing politics through conceptual frameworks and comparisons. Mavrikos, located at the American College of Thessaloniki, uses this technique to create a common ground of discussion within a classroom filled with students from the varying ethnic groups of the former Yugoslavia. O'Neil, located at the University of Puget Sound, employs a similar technique to provide a global perspective to students who may not have ever traveled outside of the United States, yet are curious about other political systems and cultures. Both emphasize using common concepts and critical analysis to create increased understanding of global and local diversity.

Shawn Walters works with a quite different student population. He discussed the need for Air Force Academy students to have a global perspective, not only for increased understanding, but for practical implementation of their duties. To address these educational needs, faculty at the Academy have created a new multidisciplinary Geopolitics course that combines cultural geography, traditional strategic analysis, demography, global weather and environmental patterns, and international politics. Using GIS mapping software, students view not only state borders, but also global drought patterns and infant mortality rates that impact international relations. While designed to address the educational needs of a very distinctive group of students, the multidisciplinary approach to geopolitics addresses questions of diversity and globalization in ways that have broad application.

Of course, culture clashes are not only apparent on the international scene, but often occur within the state itself. William Hall discussed a course that uses an analysis of the history of civil liberty revolutions within the United States to lay the groundwork for an examination of the modern gay rights movement. As in the case of the ethnic differences that divided students in Thessaloniki, Greece, gay rights is a controversial topic about which many students have deeply held views that they are uncomfortable reexamining. Using previous civil rights revolutions as examples not only provides theoretically relevant material on revolutions in understandings of civil liberties; it also creates some very much needed analytical distance for students and an opportunity to create a set of norms for class discussion. Here again, the political science classroom provides a dynamic environment to test previous notions of self.

Glenn Hastedt embeds the international system in a capstone course through international simulations and active learning scenarios. Students assume the roles of state and international non-state actors in order to simulate historical, present, and hypothetical conflict situations. Through practical application and learner-centered strategies, Hastedt brings the "real world" to the classroom, challenging students to temporarily set aside their local views and place themselves in the roles of others. Students transcend the walled boundaries of the classroom and seek solutions to global dilemmas.

Students at Santa Clara University also experience real world negotiations through simulations, but literally transcend the classroom walls through a Web-based interactive simulation where students represent countries in the Middle Eastern region. The goal is to not only transcend state boundaries, but to also overcome ethno-centric thinking in order to develop empathy for other countries, peoples, and the complexities of global affairs. Rather than rely solely on U.S.-based information, William Stover provides nationals from the countries involved as advisers and links to Middle Eastern sources of news and media to provide students with a view that people in the Middle East may have. This, notes Stover, has increased student empathy for peoples and leaders in the region and fostered a re-assessment of their initial perceptions.

While technology is present in all of the teaching strategies and learning environments among the panelists, Pamela Martin's classroom is dependent upon technology for her class on Globalization that is taught between Coastal Carolina University in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina and La Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Ecuador. Through a videoconference connection via Internet Protocol (IP), students at both sites discuss the impacts of globalization in the lesser developed and developed world and even participate in a web-based simulation on the Cancun Round of the World Trade Organization. This classroom is the most cosmopolitan in the sense that walls are meaningless. However, local identities remain significant factors and location within a State (in this case, the U.S. and Ecuador) reinforce the bridges of cosmopolitanism with the "roots" of local identities.

Increasing the place of diversity and global perspectives in the classroom has impacted changes in teaching methodologies, materials and resources, and use of technology. Rather than lecture as the "sage on the stage," Tina Mavrikos and Bill Hall recommend encouraging open discussion and communication about sensitive issues. Through case studies and simulations, Patrick O'Neil, Glenn Hastedt, William Stover, and Pamela Martin emphasize active learning that engages students to apply concepts learned in class to "real world" situations. Tina Mavrikos and Pamela Martin noted the inability to find multicultural, non-U.S.-based literature in political science in languages other than English. Although in varying degrees, technology was a feature in all of the political science classrooms of this panel, from PowerPoint presentations to videoconference classes. The emphasis was on picking the form of technology that fit both the learning objective of the class and the expertise of the faculty member.

The classroom, in its many forms, is also an actor within the international system. During the conference presentations, panelists were reminded that we are embedded within the larger global framework in which we teach and learn; in other words, there is a politics to the process of learning. The pulls of globalization and cosmopolitan actors against the constraints of local and national identities are reflected within our classrooms each day, which leads us to the question: Could this be fertile ground for the study of International Relations? While we found students to be grounded

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504244729 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in localisms, will our own methods of teaching foster cosmopolitan global citizens of the future? The impacts of our own teaching methodologies and learning outcomes within the global environment may be one of the greatest and most exciting challenges of our discipline.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504244729 Published online by Cambridge University Press