It has been an exciting first year to serve as chair of this section. We have switched the newsletter to an electronic format, which allowed us to make it more inclusive to our membership. We have launched a new award, the McGraw-Hill Award for Scholarship and Teaching in Civic Engagement, and recognize our first winner in this issue. The Teaching and Learning Conference has grown in a fashion that is challenging many of the assumptions held by our discipline. Our long-time editor of the listserv, Bob Trudeau, has decided to move to other professional challenges. After a long search this issue announces our new co-editors.

On the other hand, John Ishiyama warned me he had left one major challenge. With exciting changes in the discipline, such as a more inclusive attitude toward teaching, have come new challenges. The name of our section—Undergraduate Education—has become a justification to exclude us from much of the teaching activity of the APSA. For example, although we are the only section in APSA solely oriented towards issues of teaching, the annual APSA conference committee has in recent years named a Teaching and Learning section chair to assemble a conference program parallel to ours. This year that chair (who sometimes is a member of this section) was given six panels, while our section only had four. While cooperation has been synchronized at times (affording the conference 10 panels on “teaching”), in other years the chair has used these panels to his or her own ends.

We need to address the issue of our name at this year’s business meeting, yet we only have one hour to complete all of our required annual business. So, we have dedicated the majority of this newsletter to your comments and thoughts regarding implications of the name change. Of the people who responded to my repeated requests for comments, the majority is willing to support a name change. Two primary names (or variations) have been proposed: “Teaching and Learning Section” (which seems to have the most vocal supporters and detractors) and the “Political Science Education” section (which seems to be the compromise position).

Personally, I want a name that unites us and encourages people who are invested in issues of education, teaching, and learning to join us in our work—whether they are interested in high school, community college, undergraduate, graduate, civic, international, or experiential education. I like that the name “Political Science Education” mirrors both the title of our peer-reviewed journal (Journal of Political Science Education) and our newsletter. If such a choice means we don’t alienate a substantial part of our current membership because of the loaded nature of the term “teaching and learning” on many campuses, I am for it.

Whatever we as a section decide, we will still be dedicated to the issues surrounding teaching, learning, and education.

This issue of the newsletter focuses on the APSA conference, our panels, posters, meetings, receptions, and short courses. Remember, your attendance and participation help determine how many slots we are awarded next year (as does the number of proposals we receive for next year). I hope this newsletter assists you in your conference planning. See you in Philadelphia! PSE
RE: Teaching and Learning Section of APSA
As one of the founders and first officers of the Experiential Education Section, I was supportive when we switched to Undergraduate Education. I would be supportive of a further broadening of our name and mission as indicated above. Whatever we are called, we will be the home in APSA for those who want to discuss and improve teaching.

Don Racheter
racheter@limitedgovernment.org
[Former Section Officer]

At the most recent APSA Teaching and Learning Conference in February it was introduced informally that perhaps it is time for the Undergraduate Education section to consider changing its name. I agree that this would be a wise move; let me suggest “Scholarship of Teaching and Learning” section. Although many of us currently in the Undergraduate Education section do indeed teach undergraduates this does not include all of us nor does it include all that we do. By calling ourselves the “Scholarship of Teaching and Learning” section we can more readily include those who conduct research on teaching and learning for graduate or K-12 students as well as for undergraduates. In addition, we can also include librarians and others that are interested in all aspects of translating the results of the scholarship of discovery (the more traditional research as done by Political Scientists) to students of all ages as well as to the larger public. By calling ourselves the “Scholarship of Teaching and Learning” section we will be tapping into a growing movement within the field of scholarship and within Political Science that focuses on teaching and learning as well as being potentially more attractive to all types of researchers who want to study the educational process.

Ruth Ediger
Seattle Pacific University
ediger@spu.edu

Let me respond to your invitation to offer thoughts about a possible change in the name of the section. My primary reaction is that I would happily defer to the judgment of those of you who are closest to the situation. If there are significant advantages to making the change, let’s make it.

I also think that the section has something to contribute to graduate education. The kinds of careful thinking and research that members of the section have brought to the study of undergraduate education certainly would benefit faculty and departments that have graduate programs. I think this is especially true at the level of the individual class. Departments often think hard

and well about the overall structure of their graduate programs, but faculty could use help in thinking about how best to design graduate courses.

At the same time, I feel some reluctance to give up the label “undergraduate education.” For many of us, an important attraction of the section is that it focuses on the undergraduate level. It’s striking that a majority of the members come from departments with graduate programs, but for those members the undergraduate focus may be just as important as it is to faculty whose departments do not have graduate programs. For this reason, if the decision is made to change the label, I think it will be important to emphasize that the primary focus of the section will remain the undergraduate level. (I’m assuming that this /would/ remain the emphasis, as I think it should.) I could imagine that a change in the label would be read as a signal that the section is giving up its distinctive role and embracing what is widely perceived as the APSA’s general emphasis on research. If faculty who care primarily about undergraduate education feel that they are losing an advocate and supporter within the APSA, that would be most unfortunate.

Larry Baum
Ohio State University
baum.4@polisci.osu.edu

Thanks for giving all of us a chance to comment on the proposed name change. I support changing the section’s name to reflect the coming of age of teaching and learning within our discipline as well as to get rid of the overlap between our section’s panels and those of the teaching and learning APSA panels.

A bit of history…Sheilah Mann was always our #1 supporter at the APSA office, and from those of us who were involved in the early days of the section, we can never forget that we wouldn’t be here if not for her tireless efforts. In the spring of 1995, as I remember, Sheilah, Mike Brintnall, and Cathy Rudder, then-executive director met with me and another member of the then Experiential Education section. In any case, the APSA troika strongly encouraged the section leaders to move away from the experiential education name and to call ourselves “Undergraduate Education.” Remember that the section’s first founders (folks like John Berg, Gene Alpert, Bill Pederson, and Norm Provizer) were proponents of experiential learning and education, and the section actually started as experiential learning and morphed to experiential education (or it may have been the other way around). The section was about to die for lack of members because the APSA was setting membership minimums for the organized sections because their proliferation combined with the ability to gain a place on the APSA program was creating obvious problems. Sheilah wanted to save us, so the idea of broadening...
Renaming the Section (cont.)

our name to capture a greater audience (without ever losing our original commitment to experiential education) was hatched. It was a great idea, and the membership (while perhaps somewhat saddened by losing the experiential emphasis in the section's title) understood what we needed to do to survive. A year later at the San Francisco Board meeting we survived by the skin of our teeth—we would have died with the old section name.

Since those dark days of the mid 90s, the section has flourished under the enthusiastic and inspiring leadership of Grant Reeher and John Ishiyama and now Michelle Deardorff. I could never have envisioned where we would be ten years later—unbelievably good things have happened! But we can do better…we should be able to expand into graduate education or other topics. The section has sufficient maturity to do it, and its leadership is first rate, so we can take on a broader agenda. So any section name that would embrace our new status within the discipline—not the tentative red-haired step children, but the self-confident, articulate, and well-spoken leaders of a movement—would gain my support and be consistent with our history. It does move us further away from our experiential roots, but the point is that experiential educators aren’t on the radical fringe anymore—internships, study abroad, and service learning are viewed with less skepticism than in the past.

Moreover, anything that can be done to get rid of the overlap in the APSA program between UE and the Teaching and Learning panels should be done. The real lowpoint in my tenure as section chair was when the teaching and learning panels were hijacked by the program chair who appointed a teaching and learning panel chair who didn’t give a wit about teaching and used them to expand the number of panels for POLITICAL LEARNING—the T&L panels that year were a festival of offerings on cybernetics and politics. Of course, few program chairs have ever been so brazen, but let’s not wait for that to happen again. It’s time to seize the moment.

Glen A. Halva-Neubauer
Furman University
[former Section Chair]
Glen.Halva-Neubauer@furman.edu

I am for changing the UE section’s name. I know this will be difficult for many of us who have grown attached to the name and the identity it connotes. I know there are many arguments against changing the section’s name. First it provides our members with an identity that is clear, that our primary focus has been on teaching undergraduates. There are so many places in the APSA that focuses largely on training graduate students and the needs of faculty at Research 1 schools, and so very few places for faculty at primarily undergraduate institutions. This section, for many of us, was OUR home, OUR place. Now, we have a proposal before us that will fundamentally change the nature of that place.

Nonetheless, I think such a change is necessary, because it is the best way to face the future, and our best hope to continue our efforts at transforming the way the APSA looks at teaching issues in political science. There are at least three main reasons, why, in my view, the name should change. First, our section has grown. We now include many colleagues from many different backgrounds, from community colleges, colleges, from high schools as well as from four year institutions. Further, our mission has grown to include all aspects of teaching and learning, which go far beyond only undergraduate education. (training graduate students how to teach, for instance). By having an inclusive name, like the “Teaching and Learning Section”, we maintain our commitment to what we all love to do, but expand our mission to reflect our greater inclusiveness.

Second, I also believe that such a change will significantly enhance our clout in the APSA. A name change will, in my opinion, allow us to expand our numbers, and with come numbers comes greater influence.

Third, changing our name will further institutionalize the section as the leading force in the APSA promoting teaching and learning. It will be the first step to absorbing the “teaching and learning” division, that other strange division at the APSA conference whose chair is appointed by the Conference Chairs (and
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which has not always focused on teaching and learning). This will provide for more panel slots, and hence more opportunities to present our work at APSA. Also, having a name like the "Teaching and Learning" section will better link us with the new APSA standing committee on Teaching and Learning. We need to be a leading force in the association as the APSA begins to pay greater attention to teaching and learning issues, and we need to coordinate our efforts with those of the Teaching and Learning Committee.

For these reasons I urge you to support changing the UE section's name to the "Teaching and Learning Section" and to come to the section's business meeting in Philadelphia to register your preference. This will be, perhaps, one of the most important business meetings in the history of the section and I urge you to attend if you are able.

John Ishiyama
Truman State University
[Editor, The Journal of Political Science Education]
[Previous Section Chair]
jishiyam@truman.edu

Changing Names – Changing Missions?
The Undergraduate Education section has long provided a home for me in my role as a teacher of college students. It is here where I find colleagues who are similarly interested and committed to teaching at the college level, and who are willing to give their time and resources to improving not just their own teaching, but also the way the profession values undergraduate teaching. It is to this section that I submit my APSA proposals on teaching and learning and share my ideas on teaching undergraduates. In other words, the section as it stands now—and as it is called now—has a clear identity, place, and function in the profession, and the members in the section all share their passion for undergraduate education.

Yet, I have to look elsewhere when I want to discuss teaching and learning issues related to graduate students (my department has a Master’s program), or when I look for feedback on my ideas for assessing our graduate program. The Undergraduate Education section, as its name indicates, does not concern itself with these issues even though they are intrinsically related to the teaching endeavor in higher education. While I take teaching my graduate students as seriously as teaching my undergraduates, I have to find a different place to discuss these issues.

In many ways, the split between teaching undergraduates and teaching other students—be it high school students taking AP classes or graduate students—has been overcome in other venues. The APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, which is strongly supported by the Undergraduate Education section, welcomes papers and presentations on undergraduate education as well as graduate or high school education. Librarians at that conference present papers on initiatives and skills that apply to all students. Questions relating to pedagogy, skills, assessment, or the scholarship of teaching and learning are equally applicable to undergraduates and graduate students alike. It is not unusual for departments with graduate programs to offer courses that are open to both undergraduate and graduate students. And putting undergraduate education into the larger context of “teaching”—that is, from high school through graduate school—makes sense in many ways.

What complicates things further is that there is no organized section at APSA that addresses the needs and interests of higher education more generally. The Teaching and Learning division has no members, but is allocated panels at APSA to fill the void and offer the opportunity to discuss all issues related to teaching and learning in the discipline at the annual conference. Many UG section members who submit a paper proposal for APSA also submit it to the Teaching and Learning section, and it is frequently that section rather than the UG section that accepts the proposal due to the panel allocations that severely constrain how many papers and posters the UG section can accept. Clearly, there is a need for a more general discussion of teaching and learning issues in the discipline, but currently, there is no organized section at APSA that embraces these larger issues.

A name change would certainly imply opening the section up to professors teaching graduate students (most of the time, alongside their undergraduate students) and maybe also high school teachers offering AP courses, thus potentially indicating a shift in identity of the section. On the other hand, a more inclusive approach might better serve the needs in the discipline. Education at all levels is a central issue in Political Science. Given that undergraduate education is what links the discipline together, there is no doubt that it will continue to remain a central concern of the section even if it does change its name and broaden its mission to other issues related to the role of Political Science in higher education.

Kerstin Hamann
University of Central Florida
[UE Section, Vice Chair]
khamann@ucf.edu

I like the idea of changing it to the Political Science Education Section.

Mary P. McGuire
State University of New York at Cortland
McGuireM@cortland.edu

I am in favor of the change to “Political Science Education.” I think this allows for a slightly broader mission. As an advisor for an MA program and as a faculty member who often talks to
undergrads about seeking out graduate programs, my interests stretch beyond undergraduate education, and there aren’t any other sections that adequately address these topics. The “teaching and learning” title seems to duplicate the existing section in a way I wouldn’t be thrilled with. A lot of what gets supported in their section is less interested to me than what goes on in UE, and I wouldn’t want the name change to suggest a capitulation on the part of UE. The “Political Science Education” name sounds like a compromise, or merger. I mean that in a positive way. I’ll look forward to hearing what others have to say at the meeting.

Charles C. Turner
California State University, Chico
CCTurner@csuchico.edu

I propose the following title: “Teaching and Learning Political Science.” This seems to encompass the main ideas of this section. Thanks for giving us an opportunity to comment….

Jim Corey
High Point University
jcorey@highpoint.edu

I appreciate the invitation to comment. I much prefer “Political Science Education” for the section and also, by the way, for the conference in February. I had raised my concerns with John [Ishiyama] when the conference was getting off the ground. “Political Science Education,” to my mind, is more inclusive and inviting of a number of approaches and methodologies than “Teaching and Learning,” which has become tied, fairly or unfairly, to some problematic trends in higher education, including outcomes and assessment, student-centered learning, distance education, and collaborative learning. I find some merit in all these trends, but I think we need to be welcoming of people who are working outside of and are critical of prevailing paradigms—and who see “Teaching and Learning” as loaded language.

Kent Brudney
Cuesta Community College
kbrudney@cuesta.edu

For what it’s worth, I prefer the current section name, though “Political Science Education” is pretty good too. My sense is that the current name works because of what I believe to be the undergraduate education focus of the section. Also, I think there’s something to be said for stability in a section name. But “Political Science Education” is more inclusive. As for ‘Teaching and Learning’, well, I think that’s just too broad.

Mike Baranowski
Northern Kentucky University
baranowskim@nku.edu

I think that either of the two choices are MUCH better than the current name! I have a slight preference for “Political Science Education Section”, though “Teaching and Learning Section” is fine too…and I bet that’s what people end up calling it anyway as long as the conference is still called the “APSA Teaching and Learning Conference.” But either name is better than what we’ve got now.

Wendy M. Sinek
University of California, Berkeley
wsinek@berkeley.edu

I prefer Political Science Education if a decision is made to abandon Undergraduate. Teaching & Learning is just too trendy (we in fact had a big discussion on our campus and now call it Learning and Teaching). But it would seem to me that even if we called it Political Science Education, it would need two subsections—one on undergraduate education and one on graduate education. I also suspect that membership might change and the proportionately more prominent role played by non-PhD-granting schools in the current section would give way to the larger schools take a bigger role, especially if graduate education became a focus of the group as a result of the name change.

Charles W. Gossett
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
cwgossett@csupomona.edu

I prefer “Political Science Education” to “Teaching and Learning” because it emphasizes that we are about the business of teaching something—not just teaching and learning in a vacuum. I am on the Writing across the Curriculum Committee at my school. One of the themes that guides our efforts is that generic writing skills will not suffice to secure good writing once a student has moved beyond the core curriculum to her major. She must learn to write as a chemist, literary critic, political scientist, etc. By stressing our discipline in the title of our section, we would stress the need for research that is not generic—although it would certainly use generic and cognate research.

I prefer “Political Education” to “Political Science Education” because the latter suggests a more pre-professional or passive stance than many political science classes adopt. Not all of my undergraduate students will go on to be professional political scientists, and I want those who do not to take something from my classes. That “something” is more than an objective understanding of political phenomena (although it certainly includes that). It is an ability to comport themselves well to politics—to negotiate and effect the political realities they study. In short, I want them to learn to do politics, not just recognize political patterns. I strive to contribute to their political education, not simply to let them in on what political scientists are doing. I do not think I am alone in this ambition.
The notion of “political education” is broader than “political science” education and includes all of what we are doing in the discipline including borrowing from and cooperating with other disciplines.

Larry Chappel
Mississippi Valley State University
larchap@hotmail.com

I think “Teaching and Learning Section” would be very appropriate. I say this because I think, thanks to the hard work of people like [Michelle] and John, the “Conference on Teaching and Learning” has been very successful. My recommendation assumes that a “Teaching and Learning Section” would be complimentary, and not contradictory, to the “Conference on Teaching and Learning.”

Len Champney
University of Scranton
champney@Scranton.edu

I like the name “Teaching and Learning” because 1) it coordinates with the conference of the same name and 2) it clarifies the interests of the section - those of teaching strategies, studies, and alternatives, plus learning outcomes, methods, and means of achieving greater student understanding of our materials.

Alternatively, I like the name Teacher/Scholar section because it calls to our roles in the discipline and on our campuses. How do scholars combine their teaching and scholarly research? Some of that research is classroom learning based, some is based on teaching strategy and method, and some is based on the overlap of scholarship in the classroom. This, I think, provides a broader perspective for members, as well as encourages colleagues to combine the two endeavors, rather than isolating them.

Pamela L. Martin
Coastal Carolina University
plmartin@coastal.edu

In Support of Renaming Our Section “The Teaching Enrichment and Active Learning Section”
I strongly support the increasing consensus that we adopt a more inclusive, more descriptive, and I would argue also more active section name. We need to more accurately reflect the range of innovative teaching enrichment, scholarship, service-learning, civic education, and service opportunities our section has grown to provide. It would improve the recognition and position of our section within APSA and to increase our allotment of national conference panels, coordinate teaching panels under one umbrella (preferably, ours), provide additional resources and opportunities to existing section members—and attract an expanding section membership. I believe we should act now so our 457+ member section absorbs the current “Teaching and Learning Section” (which has no members). This will raise our section profile and increase opportunities for our current and future members within the national organization. As a faculty member from a two-year open-door community college, I feel our current section name also fails to include consideration of those of us who teach civic education/engagement to often first-generation college (and gifted advance placement high school) students not seeking traditional four year liberal arts degrees at our schools.

Undergraduate Education is a passive, less descriptive section name. It does not accurately reflect some of the section’s dynamic changes, vision, opportunities, or recent achievements. These include (1) our sponsorship of the newly established McGraw Hill civic education/civic engagement award, (2) the range of short-courses/panels and focused working groups we offer, (3) scholarship opportunities in our new peer-reviewed Journal of Political Science Education (many kudos to John Ishiyama, our hard-working editorial team, and section article reviewers), and (4) our section’s lead in establishing, promoting, and coordinating the now highly visible and tremendously successful annual Teaching and Learning Conference (which had 250 participants and eight tracks in 2004).

Our section members have a deep understanding that learning is not passive—or unidirectional. It must actively engage both student and faculty of all academic levels in a mutual learning process. Each can be enriched and learn in non-traditional ways, using simulations (such as the Moot Court series and tournaments at the University of Texas-Arlington, and elsewhere), civic engagement in field projects, effectively using assessment tools, and enhancing learning using classroom technology (such as Maryville College’s Presidential elections polling site). Service learning opportunities first brought me to the UE section through the PEW/Undergraduate Education section sponsored three-year (2000-2002) service learning project coordinated by Rick Battistoni (Providence College). Participating in this project was a wonderful learning and teaching enrichment experience for me personally and for my students. It subsequently opened up scholarship/publication and grant opportunities for me, which led to the development of an interdisciplinary service learning community at James Madison University (my former institution).

We need a more active descriptive section name that reflects not only our widening mission, but our inclusiveness and the many increased opportunities we can provide to our present members—and future members.

Elizabeth G. Williams
Santa Fe Community College/University of Florida
elizabeth.williams@sfc.edu
UE Section Board Member
I’d opt for “Teaching Politics” but will give you my proxy for whatever you think best. I’m leery about being swallowed up by Division I types, who are more into political science than politics, and not into teaching at all. Teaching is something graduate students do, for many of our colleagues, alas.

Charles Burke
Baldwin Wallace College
cburke@bw.edu

I think “Teaching and Learning” best captures the focus of the section. First, we are interested in how to teach political science to enhance student learning. Yet at the same time, we strive to learn from our students, and other Political Science teachers, about ways to improve our own classroom methods. Thus, we cherish the interactive process where students and teachers both learn from, and teach, each other.

Karen Kedrowski
Winthrop University
kedrowskik@winthrop.edu

I don’t see any harm in calling it a Teaching and Learning Section if that works. It might increase membership if it covers other kinds of audiences other than undergraduates. I think the key word is teaching.

Gene Alpert
The Washington Center for Internships and Academic Seminars
GeneA@twc.edu

I strongly favor renaming it the “Teaching and Learning Section.” Our current name suggests that no one is concerned about graduate education. The phrase “teaching and learning” is consistent with the large body of work that focuses on both teaching and learning.

Dan Hofrenning
St. Olaf College
dhofrenn@stolaf.edu

I strongly support a new name initiative for the Undergraduate Education Section. Education* includes both teaching and learning. To educate means to instruct. The recipient of effective education is an educated person. How do we know that person is properly educated? By assessing what she or he has learned. As political scientists we are involved in specialized instruction: political science education. This section focuses on methods of teaching political science and assessing the effectiveness of political science education. In other words, the section has a more specialized focus than teaching and learning in general.

* “The systematic instruction, schooling or training given to the young in preparation for the work of life; by extension, similar instruction or training obtained in adult age. Also, the whole course of scholastic instruction which a person has received. Often with limiting words denoting the nature or the predominant subject of the instruction or kind of life for which it prepares, as classical, legal, medical, technical, commercial, art education” (OED).

Edward S. Malecki
Metropolitan State University
ed.malecki@metrostate.edu

I don’t see any harm in calling it a Teaching and Learning Section if that works. It might increase membership if it covers other kinds of audiences other than undergraduates. I think the key word is teaching.

Susan E. Lawrence
Rutgers University-New Brunswick
slawrence@fas.rutgers.edu

I would vote for the “Political Science Education Section.”

I have no strong preference for either of the leading two contenders, but I have a slight preference for the Political Science Education Section. Education* includes both teaching and learning. To educate means to instruct. The recipient of effective education is an educated person. How do we know that person is properly educated? By assessing what she or he has learned. As political scientists we are involved in specialized instruction: political science education. This section focuses on methods of teaching political science and assessing the effectiveness of political science education. In other words, the section has a more specialized focus than teaching and learning in general.

* “The systematic instruction, schooling or training given to the young in preparation for the work of life; by extension, similar instruction or training obtained in adult age. Also, the whole course of scholastic instruction which a person has received. Often with limiting words denoting the nature or the predominant subject of the instruction or kind of life for which it prepares, as classical, legal, medical, technical, commercial, art education” (OED).

Dianne N. Long
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
dlong@calpoly.edu

I strongly support a new name initiative for the Undergraduate Education Section. The section’s name should reflect its current mission and role in the political science organization and profession. There is, I believe, a difference in the breadth of a spectrum of issues covered by the notions of “education” and “teaching and learning.” The former appears to be broader, inclusive of the issues of teaching and learning, and surpassing those. This can be evidenced in the formulations of goals of the two major undertakings directly supported by the section, i.e., the Journal of Political Science Education (JPSE) and the APSA’s conference on Teaching and Learning (TLC). The TLC’s organizers envisioned the conference as a forum where the faculty and graduate students would share their work related to teaching and learning (e.g., cutting-edge approaches, techniques, and methodologies) as well as discuss broad themes affecting political science education (see the 2004 TLC website). In this formulation, some of the broad issues of political science education are not included into the questions of teaching and learning. The JPSE, too, defines political science education broader than teaching and learning. In its call for submission, the JPSE states, that it invites papers spanning “a broad scope of issues in political science education, including teaching-related issues, methods and techniques, learning/teaching activities and devices,” etc. (see the JPSE website). Therefore, if the section’s goals and activities will be
consistent with those of the TLC and JPSE, i.e., the section will deal with the questions of teaching and learning, as well as the broader issues of political science education, than, I suppose, the Section of Political Science Education will be a more appropriate name for the section. What also matter is the weight that the section will place on the issues of teaching and learning vs. broader question of political science education. If the primary focus will be on the former, with latter receiving only slight consideration, than the Section on Teaching and Learning in Political Science may be a better fit.

Mariya Y. Omelicheva
Purdue University
omeliche@purdue.edu

What’s in a Name? A Tentative Argument for Inclusion
I have been asked to comment on the proposal regarding a potential section name change from the Undergraduate Education (UE) Section to something more inclusive, such as the Teaching and Learning Section or the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) Section. As a political scientist, I am used to speaking and writing in ways that balance multiple competing viewpoints—even when I hold a strong opinion on the issue at hand. In this case, I have been asked to express a viewpoint on an issue about which I hold no strong or passionate belief. I am, to use a term we (informally) use for freshmen with no particular disciplinary leanings, profoundly undecided.

On the one hand, I teach in a program that offers only AS and BA degrees. I am committed to undergraduate education and believe APSA should do everything possible to ensure that our important mission to educate undergraduate students is never understated, overshadowed, or overlooked. The recent introduction of the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference and the Journal of Political Science Education (JPSE) are major steps forward in our discipline's acceptance (and celebration) of the central importance of teaching and of undergraduate education to the goals and careers of most working political scientists. It is critical that instructors at non-Ph.D.-granting institutions have an opportunity to share experiences, questions, comments and concerns about the best ways to engage and inspire undergraduate students. A designated section provides this space.

On the other hand, almost all institutions, including Ph.D.-granting institutions, teach mostly undergraduate students. Undergraduate education is not the exclusive domain of non-Ph.D.-granting institutions. Professors at “Research 1” institutions often are committed to high quality undergraduate education. They are concerned about the best way to reach undergraduate and graduate students. Teaching graduate students who have committed themselves to a life of scholarship, or to other work in the discipline, is not the same as teaching undergraduate students—particularly non-majors seeking to fulfill a graduation requirement. Nonetheless, there are certain key principles of excellent teaching. These fundamental attitudes and philosophies embraced by the best college teachers do not change whether teaching graduate or undergraduate students.

Whether teaching a freshmen survey course, a senior capstone course, or a graduate seminar, it is important to encourage students to: ask important questions, distinguish between fact and opinion, develop arguments supported by evidence, and apply disciplinary theories to real-world problems. To what extent do teaching techniques that work in one setting work in another setting with different students? This is an open empirical question—one that could be studied in the context of a new Teaching and Learning Section that incorporates both undergraduate and graduate education. These questions should be investigated in the JPSE. As the only teaching and learning journal in political science, it makes sense that the journal should discuss both undergraduate and graduate education. By extension, it may make the most sense for the section that hosts the journal to incorporate both facets of political science education. To maximize the visibility and importance of the UE section, it makes some sense to broaden its scope to make it the place for people interested in teaching and learning in our discipline. To maximize learning opportunities for section members, it makes sense to gather all the best educators, theories, and practices together in a single Teaching and Learning Section.

Section visibility and member learning will also be enhanced by a commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning. It is critical that conference papers apply the same rigorous (qualitative and quantitative) methods used in other subfields within the discipline. In order to advance our collective knowledge of teaching and learning we should read the work of teacher-scholars in our discipline and beyond. We should formulate and evaluate different hypotheses about the best way to promote student learning about government and politics. I endorse the JPSE’s decision to reject “show and tell” pieces in favor of manuscripts that provide evidence that particular teaching techniques actually foster student learning. Nonetheless, I would not support a decision to re-name the section to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Section. I believe that there is an important place for “show-and-tell” in our discussions about teaching and learning. Discussions about how much reading to require, how to have students address you, or what to wear on the first day of class, are important to new instructors. Roundtables, newsletters, and other forums allow teacher-scholars to share and explore new ideas, works-in-progress, perceived successes, and teaching “tips” that are critical to developing new teaching techniques as well as research projects. An inclusive section can incorporate such informal discussions while pushing all teachers, including those with no SoTL experience, to move toward scholarly reflection on their teaching activities.

Recently, another possible name has surfaced: the Political Science Education Section. This name has several advantages. First, it is a natural extension of the current name Undergraduate
Renaming the Section (cont.)

Education. Second, this name would link the section directly to the *Journal of Political Science Education*. Third, the broad term education suggests that the section will focus on issues outside a narrow conception of teaching and learning—issues including structuring the major, the discipline, and disciplinary associations in ways that further educational goals. This may be important as the Section seeks to shape the future and priorities of the APSA. On the other hand, explicitly using both terms—teaching and learning—in the section name reminds members that teaching and learning are not the same thing. We cannot discuss excellent teaching without discussing the ways different approaches translate into student learning.

Am I really profoundly undecided? It seems that I have made a case for changing the section name to the Teaching and Learning Section, or the Political Science Education Section, as well as a case against changing the name to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Section. Perhaps, but one important caveat remains: Any change must reflect APSAs renewed commitment to serve the needs of all its constituents. A name change will reflect a shift toward inclusion of graduate education and recognition that student learning is important to all teaching political scientists. Such inclusion must not come at the expense of professors at non-Ph.D.-granting institution who have viewed the Undergraduate Education Section as their primary link to the profession outside their home institutions. Undergraduate education, and undergraduate educators, must be prominently included within any teaching and learning section—regardless of its name.

Elizabeth A. Bennion
Indiana University South Bend
ebennion@iusb.edu
UE Section Board Member

I’d like to offer three reasons in support of renaming the section, “The Political Science Education Section.” First, our section has progressively taken a more encompassing approach to political science curricula and pedagogies. As evidenced by our short courses and panels, the section is responding to the educational and informational needs of graduate students, faculty of all ranks, chairs, and administrators. Our contributions are extending far beyond what is routinely associated with undergraduate education. Second, it is past time for graduate school faculty to comprehensively, energetically address their teaching responsibilities, building networks with their colleagues in high schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges. Similarly, as the section clearly states the breadth of its educational commitment, the APSA may become even more responsive. Third, naming the section “Political Science Education” identifies the focus of its members without limiting their pedagogies, ideologies, or curricular priorities.

The Undergraduate Education Section has provided an intellectual home for faculty from a wide range of institutions, facilitating constructive conversations among individuals with contrasting interests, priorities, and talents. The Political Science Education Section would continue to do so, providing opportunities for even richer dialogues and relationships. I hope that the membership will view this new name with approval.

MaryAnne Borrelli
Connecticut College
mabor@conncoll.edu

CALL FOR ARTICLES

For upcoming issues of *The Political Science Educator* we are currently seeking the following features:

- Debates between members on pertinent topics
- “Lessons Learned”—a continuing column on how the teaching of participants in the Teaching and Learning Conferences has evolved as a result of the TLC (approximately 500-1000 words)
- Feature articles that are “think pieces” about teaching and the discipline, discussions of teaching experiences and approaches, or preliminary research under development (@ 1000 words)
- “Teaching tips” and suggestions—including approaches and experiments that have been less successful
- “The New Professor”—essays designed to help graduate students and new faculty who are navigating the job market and early years of careers at undergraduate institutions
- “Research and Resources: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning”—a column including literature reviews on specific topics, research notes, examination of new research threads
- “Technology and the Professor”—a column examining current options available for the classroom and classroom management, including useful resources available on the web

Items for the “Notables” and “Announcements” sections.

The deadline for the December issue is November 15. If you are interested in submitting an article, essay, or announcement (or a suggestion for other items to be included in the newsletter), please contact:

Michelle D. Deardorff, Editor
*The Political Science Educator*
Jackson State University
michelle.d.deardorff@jsums.edu
The Learning Paradigm

John Tagg, in *The Learning Paradigm College*, challenges educators to question the very nature of higher education in America, which he claims is based on an instructional rather than learning paradigm. At the University of Maine at Farmington every faculty member was provided (if they desired) a copy of Tagg’s book, and the administration invited Professor Tagg to campus to speak with the faculty about institutional transformation. This was done in the context of curricular change from a three-credit system (five courses a semester on average for students) to a four credit system (four courses on average). The goal of the university is to use the change in credit hours as part of a fundamental shift in method, challenging faculty members to creatively rethink their courses and curriculum. Assessment is an integral part of the course transformation project; every assignment and activity is designed around a general assessment plan that will be shared with students, along with the criteria. Moreover, while the assessment goal is to improve student learning, it will also provide data to judge the quality of the course, and contribute to the campus-wide assessment initiative.

The Learning Paradigm

One thing students hate is when they are given an assignment without precise guidelines on the formula for avoiding failure. They want to know the minimum number of pages, of sources, what exactly the professor is “looking for.” College for many is not so much about learning, but about succeeding. College courses reflect hoops to jump through, tasks one needs to accomplish in order to reach the finish line. There are many exceptional students who are driven to learn, of course. But the “mercenary student” who is focused primarily on the grade or the result is very common.

Tagg compares two self-theories of learning: entity and incremental learning. Entity learning theory considers intelligence and ability as an attribute of an individual, fixed and unlikely to change. Thus those who have to work harder are not as bright as those who can figure things out quickly. Incremental learning theory considers intelligence and ability as malleable over time. Tagg notes that our culture, including the way most K-12 schools operate, reinforces a bias towards entity theory. This hinders learning in part because of how students respond to failure. For those believing entity theory, failure means some intrinsic deficiency on the part of the individual. This leads students who fail to withdraw and avoid similar activities or subjects. For incremental theory, failure is simply a sign that a skill has yet to be learned, and people with an incrementalist learning theory will respond to failure by increasing their efforts and trying new approaches. Task one for the transformed course will be to design it so that failure at some tasks is possible but not something to be feared.

But what is learning? Looking at different psychological theories of memory and human development, Tagg notes there is a difference between “surface learning” and “deep learning.” Surface learning is linear, such as memorizing a list of facts, while deep learning involves understanding and the ability to make connections across contexts. Tagg notes a number of attributes of deep learning vs. surface learning: deep learning is active while surface learning is inert, deep learning is holistic while surface learning is atomistic, deep learning reinforces an incremental self-theory on learning while surface learning reinforces entity theory, and perhaps most importantly, deep learning is enjoyable, while surface learning is generally unpleasant. Unfortunately, the way we educate students often emphasizes surface rather than deep learning.

Cramming for an exam with study guides, emphasizing particular units and tasks (or even discrete courses), avoiding interdisciplinarity and setting up assignments as primarily evaluative tasks rather than potentially enjoyable activities all support surface learning over deep learning. Task two for the transformed course is to build assignments and a syllabus that encourages deep learning.

Another factor affecting how students learn is the learning environment. Tagg notes that students can be motivated by intrinsic or extrinsic goals. The common extrinsic goal is that of a
grade—a student works hard on a paper to get an A. An intrinsic goal would be to learn because it is intrinsically rewarding; students enjoy learning, find it personally fulfilling and work hard not just for the grade, but because of how they themselves are being changed by the process of learning. Clearly, life long learning is only likely if someone sees learning as intrinsically rewarding; otherwise, one will just learn if there is particular external reason necessitating it.

One way to encourage intrinsic goals and support deep student learning is through what Tagg calls a “hot cognitive economy.” This involves a high ratio of feedback to evaluation, strong support within the academic community, and high rewards for high-cost activities. Task three for the transformed course is to provide a classroom environment conducive to a hot cognitive economy.

Related to this is the fact that students learn best when they perform. “A performance is in a sense autonomous, it is an accomplishment, a piece of work that stands alone to the extent of at least having value not entirely derived from its context.” Student activity, collaborating with others and being involved in activities outside the classroom is essential. Task four for the transformed course is to provide opportunities for student performance, with an effort to go outside the traditional boundaries of a discrete college course.

Transforming “Introduction to International Relations”
A quick survey of international relations text books and syllabi (which one can find on line quite easily with a simple search) show various ways the course is taught. Most have a standard survey course, covering international conflict, the international political economy, international law and organization, and basic theories. Some professors put more emphasis on diplomacy and foreign policy and others on history, but in general the topics are fairly standard. However, after the Chanda Luker talk, and discussions in that and other classes, a question emerged: Is there a deficiency in the study of international relations based on the theoretical framework we use to analyze it? The course begins and ends with the study of a genocide: the Cambodian case opens the course, with students told not to try yet to analyze it in an academic sense, but just to think about what happened and what it means. The course ends with the Rwandan genocide, though in this case students are required to look at it with the tools they learned during the semester. In between the course is heavy on theory, and covers the issues expected in an introductory course, but does so with a special emphasis on the real experience of the people involved in everything from warfare to third world poverty, including a reflection on whether or not first-world wealth translates into happiness.

Assignments and assessment are dependent on the desired student learning outcomes (SLOs). There are 25 SLOs, grouped into the categories of knowledge, skills and attitudes. All assignments are designed to achieve the SLOs, as well as the tasks identified above. There are explicit criteria both for student assessment and to allow data collection on the efficacy of the course. Assignments include a group web project, group outreach projects (student presentations to the community or campus), student activism (doing something to promote a cause dear to the student), and a variety of reflection papers and small assignments. There are peer and self-review projects as well.

The goals for assessing these tasks are: a) grading students on the basis of whether or not they achieved or made progress towards achieving the desired SLOs; b) determining whether or not particular assignments were effective in helping students achieve SLOs; and c) gleaning data for assessing the overall efficacy of the course, and its contribution towards program and institutional goals. The process of developing assessment tools involved both consideration of some of the assessment literature, discussions on campus, and a web search to identify on line examples from various universities of assessment methods, rubrics and others. These tools will be redesigned and re-evaluated based on the kind of data generated, student reaction(s), and issues of practicality.

Each assignment will have a rubric. Each rubric states the criteria to be considered in assessing the work and the expectations for superlative work. Each grade for each section of the rubric will be determined by relative closeness to the ideal; I will compare comments and grades as the process continues, both while grading one assignment and while comparing assignments.
Moreover, I will assign Assessment Control Point (ACP) scores. This will be a subjective measure of where the paper stands in relation to the ideal, 0 being failing completely and 20 being full achievement of the ideal. These will not be used in determining grades, but as an assessment tool (to compare ACP scores over courses and assignments), and as a check on subjective errors that may develop in grading. ACP scores will obviously be closely related to grades, but depending on the difficulty of an assignment or the course level they may vary (an ACP of 15 on a writing assignment in a 100 level course may be an A; it could be a B or B- in a 300 level course). The ACP is a subjective measure to compare assignments across times and courses (especially on skills such as presentation and writing). In that sense it is much like how doctors ask patients to give their level of pain a number; the number may be subjective, but presumably the patient is relatively consistent in how that number is applied, meaning that it is valid to track relative changes in a patient’s pain level.

The data on ACP scores, peer and self reviews, report on time spent on the course on various activities and as much data as possible will be saved, as well as copies of the grade sheets from the portfolios (with names removed). The goal at this stage is to try to generate data; glean what is useful and what is not; and continue working to develop a long-term assessment strategy that over time can become less labor-intensive, and more easily transferred to other classes.

Please contact me (scotterb@maine.edu) if you would like more information on the SLOs, specific assignments, rubrics, forms for self- and peer review, and the structure of the course.

Conclusion
As rational post-enlightenment thinkers, we focus on the cognitive aside over the affective side of how humans function. Emotion is misleading at best, and delusional at worst. How often does a professor get annoyed by the sense of some students that if they “feel” something it must be valid and somehow deserves respect? Yet if one strikes a proper balance between affective or emotional engagement versus cognitive or reasoned attempts at understanding, this effort is more likely to yield deep learning.

The course is designed to be an intellectually challenging course, heavy on theory, with an emphasis on the human side of world affairs. This should engage students, help them understand the meaning of the issues at hand, motivate them to want to know more, and make it more likely that they will question existing conventional wisdoms and be active in trying to use their knowledge to make a difference. The course engages students not because it tricks them into dealing with a question already solved at advanced levels of the field, but because they are dealing with an issue that remains a quandary in the study of international relations.

It is important that the assessment process be implemented, revised as needed, and continued long term in order to determine if this course works, or if assignments and approaches need to be altered. Is it unnecessary to know ahead of time exactly how the evidence will be analyzed and interpreted. Just as Tycho Brahe had to gather extensive data before Johannes Kepler could determine the elliptical orbit of planets and Isaac Newton could develop a theory to explain why that data has the form it has, gathering data is always the first step. Too often assessment strategies attempt to put Newton first: figure out the theory of gravity, then measure how and if it works by looking at the orbit of the planets. The planets are the SLOs, which we can identify. Only by ‘tracking their orbits’ and gathering data can we take the first step to effective assessment in our courses.

Chanda Luker’s talk about her experiences in Cambodia made it impossible for students to marginalize the human reality in international relations. That spread to other issues such as global poverty and warfare. This “made it real” to the students, and encouraged deep learning, engagement and moral/ethical reflection. Moreover, it reminded me that we are not just dealing with social science theory, methods, and analysis. Our desire to be objective and analytical may be blinding us to insights from the experiences of the powerless and the victims. PSE

Scott D. Erb is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Maine at Farmington. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota and M.A. from Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. He is the author of one book German Foreign Policy: Navigating a New Era, and teaches courses on International Relations, Foreign Policy, and European Politics. Erb won university teaching awards in 2002 and 2005, and is involved in a number of team-taught interdisciplinary courses.

Footnotes
1 John Tagg, The Learning Paradigm College, Anker Publishing, Boston, MA, 2003, pp. 55-60
2 Tagg, 68-81.
3 Tagg, 94-125
4 Tagg, p. 155

2007 APSA Undergraduate Education Program Chair Announced

Scott Erb, Associate Professor of Political Science at University of Maine, Farmington, has been named UE program chair for the 2007 APSA annual meeting. Congratulations to Scott!

Watch for the call for proposals for the 2007 meeting.
10-1  Power, Pedagogy, and Program Assessment

Date: Thursday, Aug 31, 10:15 AM
Location: Hotel: Pennsylvania Convention Center
Room: 104B
Chair: Bruce E. Caswell, Rowan University

Author(s): Assessment as Voyeurism: How we used a student’s experience in the major as a way to examine our own teaching, judge student learning outcomes, and re-evaluate our goals.
Lynne E. Ford, College of Charleston

Teacher Characteristics and Pedagogy in Political Science
Stephen G. Hartlaub, Frostburg State University
Frank A. Lancaster, Frostburg State University

Assessing Undergraduate Research and Writing Skill Sets in Political Science
Jason Rich, University of Connecticut
James Robert Bourbeau, University of of Connecticut

Balancing the Power—An Egalitarian Model for Course Evaluation and Assessment
James M. Sloat, Washington & Jefferson College

Discussant(s): Michelle D. Deardorff, Jackson State University

UE Section’s 2005 APSA Conference Best Presentation Award

David M. Rankin: “U.K.-U.S. Identity, Political Knowledge, and the War in Iraq”

David Rankin is an Associate Professor at the State University of New York, Fredonia. The award committee selected this paper from those nominated because they believed it demonstrates how information about attitudes is related to political opinions, and by extension, citizenship. It points to the importance of political science education to help students form their political opinions. The paper looks at colleges in the US and the UK and has a sound methodological approach based on survey data. The paper employs political science methodology to explore a relevant educational issue.

We would like to thank the Award Committee (formed of the 2003 and 2004 Award winners) for their time investment. In addition, the section would like to thank The Washington Center and Gene Alpert for their sponsorship of this annual award.

2005-2006 Best Presentation Award Committee
Bernard Bray, Talledaga College
Larry Chappell, Mississippi Valley State University
Kerstin Hamann, University of Central Florida
Bruce M. Wilson, University of Central Florida
Phillip H. Pollock, University of Central Florida
### 10-2 Introducing Power to Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Friday, Sep 1, 2:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td><strong>Hotel:</strong> Marriott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Room:</strong> Salon D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td><strong>Quentin Kidd, Christopher Newport University</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Author(s):  | Power & Politics in the Classroom: One-Session Legislative Simulations in Introductory American Government Classes  
Michael K. Baranowski, Northern Kentucky University  
Kimberly Weir, Northern Kentucky University  
Teaching Power to Undergraduates  
Bernard L. Bray, Talladega College  
Larry W. Chappell, Mississippi Valley State University  
Teacher Neutrality Reconsidered: Recommendations for the Political Science Classroom  
Josh Corngold, Stanford University  
David Isaac Waddington, Stanford University  
This isn't a Democracy: Distributing and Redistributing Power in the Classroom  
Mary P. McGuire, SUNY, Cortland |
| Discussant(s): | **Richard M. Battistoni, Providence College** |

---

**New Editors Named to the UE Section’s Listserv—H-Teachpol**

After many years of service, Bob Trudeau has indicated his desire to step down as the editor of the section’s listserv, h-teachpol. Established in 1997, the h-teachpol listserv was designed to be a discussion list focusing entirely on the teaching of political science. The current membership in the list is about 570 email addresses, representing an international audience. [If you wish to join this listserv: either Google h-teachpol or go directly to http://www.h-net.org/~teachpol/ and click on Subscribe.] Bob has done a wonderful job keeping the listserv active. His work is greatly appreciated.

After much deliberation and discussion of the applicants for the position, the Executive Board of the UE Section and H-Teachpol representatives decided to ask two of the applicants to consider co-editing the list. David P. Dolowitz from the University of Liverpool and Scott Erb of the University of Maine, Farmington have agreed to work together on this task. The Board is excited by the potential of an international collaboration between Dolowitz and Erb.

David P. Dolowitz received his Ph.D. in 1996 from the University of Strathclyde and is currently Reader in Public and Social Policy, University of Liverpool, School of Politics and Communication Studies. Dolowitz's research embraces both American and British Politics, with three primary foci: 1) the ways different political systems look to one another for inspiration in the development of their indigenous socio-political systems; 2) the debates developing around New Labour; and 3) the different ways the Internet can be utilised in the teaching and learning process.

Scott D. Erb earned his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. He is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Maine at Farmington and the author of *German Foreign Policy: Navigating a New Era* (Lynne Rienier Publishers, 2003). Erb won university teaching awards in 2002 and 2003, teaches courses on International Relations, Foreign Policy, and European Politics, and is involved in a number of team-taught interdisciplinary courses.

After an initial meeting in Philadelphia, Erb and Dolowitz plan on making the transition from Trudeau in September.
### 10-3 Empowering an Active Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Saturday, Sep 2, 4:15 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Hotel: Pennsylvania Convention Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room: 111B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td>Paul I. Weizer, Fitchburg State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s):</td>
<td>&quot;Who Are You Wearing?&quot; Using the Red Carpet Question Pedagogically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jon D. Carlson, University of California, Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning from Peers: Assessing the Value of Discussions in Online Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerstin Hamann, University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce M. Wilson, University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constitutional Engineers: An Active Learning Approach to Comparative Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Ishiyama, Truman State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can We Talk?: Overcoming the Effects of &quot;Group Polarization&quot; in Political Science Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Kristopher Pinaire, Lehigh University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussant(s):</td>
<td>Jeffrey L. Bernstein, Eastern Michigan University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Call for Proposals and Workshops for the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference

The American Political Science Association invites political scientists and graduate students to submit proposals for the fourth annual Conference on Teaching and Learning in Political Science. This year’s meeting will take place in Charlotte, North Carolina from February 9-11, 2007.

Using a working-group model, this meeting is a forum for interested individuals to develop models on teaching and learning as well as to discuss broad themes and values affecting political science education. The meeting will consist of 12 tracks constructed around such themes as:

- Program Assessment/Learning Outcomes
- Graduate Education
- Diversity and Inequality
- Internationalizing the Curriculum
- Simulations and Role Play
- Teaching Research Methods
- General Education
- Civic Engagement

To spark conversation, presenters will make brief presentations on a topic related to their track theme. Individuals interested in applying to participate as presenters should submit a proposal on an idea or model for teaching and learning in political science as it relates to one of the themes listed above. Proposals should be submitted online through MyAPSA (http://www.apsanet.org/) by September 15, 2006.

For more information, visit the Teaching and Learning Conference webpage at http://www.apsanet.org/section_236.cfm.
10-4  Assessing Outcomes in Experiential Learning

Date:  Saturday, Sep 2, 10:15 AM
Location:  Hotel: Pennsylvania Convention Center  Room: 203A
Chair:  Johnny Goldfinger, Indiana University-Purdue University
Indianapolis

Author(s):

- Do International Internships Make a Difference in Undergraduate Student Learning? An Early Assessment
  Danny Damron, Brigham Young University

- Using Service Learning to Teach International Relations and Encourage Student Activism
  Heather Heckel, Bridgewater College

- Measuring Student Outcomes in a Political Science Internship Program
  Duane D. Milne, West Chester University of Pennsylvania

- The Role of Experiential Education in the Undergraduate Political Science Major
  David A. Rochefort, Northeastern University
  John Portz, Northeastern University

Discussant(s):  Lanethea Mathews-Gardner, Muhlenberg College

FROM ROUTLEDGE . . .

Journal of Political Science Education
Sponsored by the Undergraduate Education Section of the APSA

Editor-in-Chief: John Ishiyama, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science and Director, Ronald E. McNair Program, Division of Social Science, Truman State University, Kirksville MO 63501 USA, Tel: 660-785-4096 • Fax: 660-785-4337
E-mail: jishiyam@truman.edu
Editor: Marijke Breuning, Ph.D.
Truman State University. E-mail: jpse@truman.edu or mbreuning@truman.edu
Volume 2, 2006, 3 issues per year, ISSN Print 1551-2169, ISSN Online 1551-2177

The Journal of Political Science Education publishes the highest quality scholarship on teaching and pedagogical issues in political science. The journal aims to represent the full range of questions, issues and approaches regarding political science education, including teaching-related issues, methods and techniques, learning/teaching activities and devices, educational assessment in political science, graduate education, and curriculum development.

To view a free online sample of the Journal of Political Science Education, to download articles of interest — or to review complete contents from archived issues, visit the journal’s web page at: http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/15512169.asp

Members of the Undergraduate Education Section of the APSA receive JPSE at the special individual rate of US$30!
Call our Customer Service Department at 1-800-354-1420, ext 216 or email: customerservice@taylorandfrancis.com.
### POSTER SESSION III: TEACHING AND LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Friday, Sep 1, 4:15 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Location: | **Hotel:** Pennsylvania Convention Center  
**Room:** Hall A |
| Posters: | **Reflections on the APSA Report on Graduate Education: International Students and Their Teacher Training**  
*Masako Rachel Okura, University of Connecticut*  
**Analysis of Dynamic Models with Ordered Categorical Variables**  
*John E. Jackson, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*  
**Management by Results: Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching and the Mismeasurement of Performance**  
*Laura I. Langbein, American University*  
**Military Recruiters, Corrupt Presidents, and Tenure Votes: The Birth, Development and Implosion of a Student Rights Movement**  
*Peter W. Brusoe, American University*  
**The Power to Enhance Administrative Capacity through Case Research: The Executive Education Case Writing Workshop**  
*Lina Svedin, Syracuse University*  
**Student Experiences in College, Enhancing Participation in Campus Life**  
*J. Cherie Strachan, SUNY, Albany*  
**Rubrics as an Empowerment Tool for Students: Eliminating the Perception of Arbitrary Grading**  
*Marybeth Dillon Beller, Marshall University*  
**Teaching about Controversial Subjects**  
*Richard J. Powell, University of Maine*  
*Amy Fried, University of Maine*  
**From the Classroom to the Community: Reconsidering Service Learning in a Critical Pedagogical Context**  
*Zahra Ahmed, UC Irvine* |

---

**Working Group on Undergraduate Education**

Greg Domin of Mercer University is spearheading our first section working group for the APSA conference. Please contact Greg at DOMIN_GP@Mercer.edu if you have any additional questions.

This group will attend panels and poster sessions related to teaching and learning in political science and identify any other interests they may have in the field. At our first meeting, participants will identify a list of panels and posters they would like to attend. Such topics may include, but are not limited to, teaching with technology, teaching research methods, assessment and learning outcomes, incorporating diversity in the classroom, service learning and community involvement, and using simulations and role playing in the classroom. The working group sessions will be used to identify potential fields of research as well as exchanging ideas and information on the topic.
SC 8: “Making the Most of Assessment: Creating Outcomes from Departmental Assessment”
August 30, 2006: 9:30 am to 1:00 pm
Michelle D. Deardorff, Jackson State University
Kerstin Hamann, University of Central Florida
E. Fletcher McClellan, Elizabethtown College
Candace Young, Truman State University
TO REGISTER CONTACT: michelle.d.deardorff@jsums.edu

“Making the Most of Assessment: Creating Outcomes from Departmental Assessment” is a morning workshop designed for any political science department which is preparing for departmental review or starting the implementation of an assessment program. The session will begin with an overview of the differing models of assessment, the process of designing and implementing an assessment program, and a discussion of the ways we can leverage effective implementation plans for additional benefits in our institutions. The workshop will lead these teams through the assessment process of designing a mission and identifying departmental strengths, articulating goals and objectives, identifying expected outcomes, and designing means of measurement. We are hoping chairs, those who have had assessment delegated to them, and other departmental members will use this opportunity to begin assessment planning. Political scientists who have successfully implemented departmental assessment plans lead the workshop; they represent a variety of institutions and provide actual implementation experience.

SC 9: Getting a Job at a Teaching Institution and Then Succeeding!
August 30, 2006 1:00 pm to 5:00 pm
Grant Reeher, Syracuse University
Michelle D. Deardorff, Jackson State University
MaryAnne Borelli, Connecticut College
Bill Hudson, Providence College
Lanethea Mathews-Gardner, Muhlenberg College
Glen Halva-Neubauer, Furman University
TO REGISTER CONTACT: michelle.d.deardorff@jsums.edu

This workshop will walk applicants through the process of applying for a position at a teaching institution. A panel of faculty will discuss the ways in which these institutions differ from the universities at which most political scientists complete their graduate degree. Using vitae and cover letters provided by some of the participants, the panelists will make suggestions as to how applicants can best improve their presentation with an eye towards employment. This workshop will also include discussions of the interview, the “job talk,” academic life at private liberal arts institutions, the tenure and promotion process, and other specific strategies for success. Please contact us ahead of time if you are interested in having your materials discussed at the workshop.

SC 17: Integrating Civic Engagement into the American Government Curriculum
August 30, 2006 1:00 pm to 5:00 pm
Brigid Harrison, Montclair State University
Suzanne Samuels, Seton Hall University
Jean Wahl Harris, University of Scranton
Susan Tolchin, George Mason University
CONTACT: harrisonb@mail.montclair.edu

“Integrating Civic Engagement into the American Government Curriculum” is a short course geared at those who teach introductory undergraduate American Government courses, and who seek to infuse their pedagogy with tools that will combat what seems to be a growing lack of engagement among their students, and apathy toward governance in the United States. The course will focus on strategies that encourage students to be active learners and to think critically about the way our government works. The participants will explain their own experiments with encouraging students to participate actively in their governing institutions, including assignments that emphasize technology, political participation, and service learning. Each participant will focus on a specific area within the standard American government curriculum. It is hoped that a significant portion of the short course will consist of a dialogue between presenters and attendees of useful strategies and tactics for increasing students’ civic engagement. PSE

Undergraduate Education Business Meeting and Reception
The business meeting will be held on Saturday, September 2 at 6:00 PM in the Pennsylvania Convention Center, Room 111B. Sponsored by McGraw-Hill, the reception will follow at 7:00 p.m. at the Marriott in Salon I. We apologize that the events are held in different hotels—we are assured they are adjacent sites. We hope to see many of you there.