

be difficult because of the institutional culture that exists at some schools, which may negatively affect these faculty members' opportunities for grants, tenure, promotion, or publication. As the well-read "Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Assistant Professor" teaches us, "at faculty meetings and elsewhere, assistant professors should be seen but not heard" and should "never volunteer" (Wuffle 1993).

At the same time, DIE track members acknowledge that we, the political scientists, are all in a unique position of power to become agents of change and make students and naysayers realize that racial, gender, class, and sexual discrimination all still exist. To what extent are we willing and committed to sacrifice our personal successes for the good of the political science community and for the students who expect us to set an example of juggling the two? This was one of the most difficult questions that the track members examined, and we will continue to explore it at the next TLC meeting.

II. Responsibilities of Political Scientists in Issues of Diversity and Inclusiveness

As we acknowledge the existence of the oft-neglected tensions, it has also become evident to us that we have an inescapable and unavoidable responsibility to speak up about what we believe is right and beneficial to our students. One paper (Guadalupe Correa-Cabrera and Oralia De los Reyes, "Measuring Up Student Success: Discovering Factors Contributing to Student Success in a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) in South Texas") focused on teaching political science in Spanish to native Spanish-speaking students at a large Hispanic-serving institution (HSI). This study found that compared to students in the English-speaking section, students in the Spanish-speaking section were more engaged in discussions, earned higher grades, were better able to think critically about American political systems, and expressed a higher sense of satisfaction about the coursework.

These findings may provoke English-only nationalist policy-makers, as well as college administrators who may already be concerned about the "balkanization" of campuses. We have to remind ourselves that if we keep silent about our findings, we will remain a part of the system that has historically deprived people who are "different" of their rightful opportunities. In addition to taking a new approach to assisting students in the classroom, we recognize that we are also capable of assisting students outside of the classroom to generate more support at historically white institutions (HWI).

III. Commitments of Participants to Future Efforts

In the past two years at the TLC, the DIE track members stopped short of making a firm commitment to going one step further to take action. This year, the DIE track participants made a firm commitment to fulfilling their obligation by adopting a five-year Diversity in Political Science Education (DIPSE) Action Plan. In the next five years, we expect to complete the following projects:

1. *Create a DIPSE support website.* In the past, we have entertained the possibility of creating a website to facilitate DIE education; however, the plan has not yet materialized. The proposed website will be consistent with several APSA organized sections that currently post syllabi; in addition, the DIPSE site will post links to video clips, simulations, and annotated bibliographies to assist professors interested in infusing diversity into their curricula.

2. *Offer a TLC workshop.* We would like to directly communicate with instructors who have questions about revising their curricula to include DIE issues.
3. *Offer a short course at the APSA Annual Meeting.* We plan to develop a short course in teaching DIE issues.
4. *Publish APSA booklets in a DIE "how to" series.* This project is an extension of our web project and our workshop and short course plans. The series is designed to offer practical approaches to creating DIE courses. Topics may include but are not limited to race/ethnicity, LGBT, social class, religious orientation, intersectionality, and global perspectives. The series will result in an APSA book series commensurate with publications on assessment and civic engagement.

REFERENCE

Wuffle, A. 1993. "Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Assistant Professor." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 26 (1): 89–90.

TRACK: GRADUATE EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Siona Listokin, *George Mason University*

Robert McKeever, *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

Given the unique challenges of graduate education, the need for dynamic and up-to-date research is paramount. Changes in the delivery of postgraduate education and the postgraduate job market necessitate that faculty continuously develop and improve graduate programs and professional development. While much of the scholarship concerning undergraduate education and curriculum is relevant to graduate studies, dedicated research on graduate education in political science is also necessary.

The Graduate Education and Professional Development track at the 2011 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference addressed the issues of curriculum and professional development for doctoral students and e-learning at the master's degree level. This year's track highlighted the need for more research on teaching and learning at the graduate level, as evidenced by the track presenters' constant mention of a lack of previous research in their particular areas. Even more plainly, the Graduate Education track only had five participants, including discussants and presenters. The low attendance may indicate that typical TLC attendees are interested primarily in undergraduate education, but it in no way alleviates the need for a larger conversation about teaching and learning practices for masters' and doctoral students.

John Ishiyama and Angie Nichol's paper "Teaching as Learning: The Transformational Effect of Teaching on Graduate Instructors" examined the issue of doctoral students' teaching experience prior to entering the academic job market. This study argued that most research on professional development focuses on undergraduate students, leaving it unclear whether the absence of teaching-focused professional development programs for Ph.D. students is harmful to both the graduating students and the general profession. Compounding this lack of information is the decrease in graduate opportunities in mentoring and teaching. The study detailed the development and results of a mentor-mentee program at the University of North Texas. The program, the product of a National Science Foundation grant, paired a graduate student mentor and a professor mentor with eight undergraduate

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

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

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

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

More specifically, the participants agreed that the Graduate Education and Professional Development track is important, and that graduate education should command a separate discussion than undergraduate programs. At the same time, the low attendance rate suggests that more can be done to make the TLC a meeting place and useful information source for those interested in graduate education. Discussions about developing the track resulted in a number of concrete suggestions. First, the track could invite directors of graduate studies from Ph.D. departments to

share their ideas about doctoral programs with other directors and faculty. Program directors could aid in efforts to gather information about common practices and curricula in doctoral programs, while also collaborating with peers about best practices. In addition, the track could target graduate students to participate in the TLC as discussants and presenters. A practical suggestion to attract graduate students might include a student-friendly conference rate. All participants agreed that the track is vital for information sharing and discussions, and that these suggestions could facilitate future productive sessions in the Graduate Education and Professional Development track at the TLC.

REFERENCES

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

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

TRACK: INTEGRATING TECHNOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM

Maureen Feeley, *University of California, San Diego*

Ben Epstein, *CUNY–Graduate Center*

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

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