

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kristen Hudak, *Bentley University*

Mark Sachleben, *Shippensburg University*

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

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

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

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

American politics. Finally, and perhaps most critically, there is the question of determining how to internationalize assessment so that it adds value to students' education.

That said, internationalizing the curriculum presents exciting opportunities. Papers presented in this track assessed creative and valuable ideas for making international issues more accessible and relevant to students. These suggestions ranged from incorporating new readings into the curriculum and adopting student-led approaches to using media in the classroom and exploring service learning opportunities. The papers presented reflected these dynamics and synergistic opportunities. Presenters related their backgrounds, the realities of different institutions, and context-specific problems faced by teachers of political science.

Gerson Moreno-Riano, Phillip Hamilton, and Lee Trepanier ("Statesmanship and Democracy in a Global and Comparative Context") noted that the successful teacher must understand the context of his or her pupils. Thus, understanding the local context is important in bridging a student's understanding of global context. The authors argued that teaching statesmanship and democracy in a comparative context (i.e., using the local to make connections to the global) helps students to better appreciate both concepts. Mark Sachleben ("Getting Students to Think about the World: Techniques for Making the World Accessible in General Education Courses") argued that some students might be isolated from and resistant to international perspectives and described attempts to lure students into internationalization by designing assignments in which students research and plan an international educational trip as a method to "back-door" internationalization. He concluded that the current method of teaching international politics by emphasizing conflict, human rights violations, and the negative aspects of the international system was often an inhibiting factor to internationalizing students.

Two papers, one by Jon Carlson and James Ortez ("Using Children's TV to Teach Globalization: *Dora*, *Diego*, *Kai-Lan*, and the Global Generation") and the other by Christopher Cook ("American Students, African Conflicts, and Hollywood: The Advantages and Unintended Consequences of Using Film to Teach African Politics"), argued that the use of film and media in the classroom could help students observe the effects of global interaction while developing analytical skills. Carlson and Ortez proposed using children's television series, such as *Dora the Explorer* and *Ni Hao, Kai-Lin*, to explore the globalization of media and the interchange of global cultural values. Cook described an approach using film that introduces students to a topic that few understand or appreciate: African politics. By using several films, he hoped to breakdown stereotypical views of Africa and promote a critical understanding of the forces shaping the continent.

Other teacher-scholars focused on the role that students can play in educating themselves. Ann Marie Mezzell ("Learning by Teaching: A Student-Led Approach to Internationalizing the Discipline") demonstrated how student-led education can be effective at a resource-limited institution. Although not arguing that students should drive the curriculum, Mezzell demonstrated how allowing students to build competencies and interests in an African politics course created a snowball effect of interest among other members of the course. Laura Brunell ("Building Global Civic Skills: A Class-Based Service Learning Approach") described a way to capture students' excitement and interest to "do something" as a way of motivating both learning and service. Brunell's project used the teacher as a servant leader (facilitating, not lead-

ing) to help students raise awareness and educate a larger community on human trafficking as both a global and a local issue. Brunell found that the project made students feel more connected to the local and global community.

The paper presentations concluded with a consideration of the challenges of internationalization from various perspectives. Michael Jon Stoil, a professor at the University of Guam, discussed the challenges of teaching American government to students who did not enjoy the same rights as other American students ("Multicultural Political Thought and the Purpose of Political Theory Courses"). Furthermore, Stoil pointed out the need, particularly in light of the cultural and ethnic background of Guam, to incorporate a number of non-Western thinkers into the canon of political philosophy to demonstrate relevancy and broaden the intellectual horizons of students. Julia M. Lau Bertrand and Ji-Young Lee ("Asian Perspectives on Teaching International Relations to Undergraduates in the U.S.") highlighted the need to diversify the international relations curriculum, particularly for students who come to American universities from an international background. These teacher-scholars argued that international relations as it is currently taught focuses on European historical events and an "us-versus-them" paradigm that does little to explain current international politics, particularly when the audience is an international student body. Meanwhile, Gale A. Mattox ("Internationalizing the Curriculum for Future Officers") focused on a completely different type of student body: cadets at the U.S. Naval Academy. Mattox described the process of internationalization at the Academy, particularly in light of the post-September 11 context. Although she experienced resistance to internationalizing the curriculum, the needs of the future officer corps were demonstrated by the demands of the war in Afghanistan, with the lack of languages and cultural awareness among the future officers emphasizing the need for change.

The discussions that stemmed from these papers highlighted important opportunities for the discipline as well, and recommendations include the creation of new APSA membership sections, the development of globalized textbooks across the subfields, resource sharing, the creation of learning objectives and standards for the high school level, the development of benchmarks for self-assessment, the collection of empirical evidence to drive the push for internationalization, and the sponsorship of a short course at the APSA Annual Meeting. The track concluded that in addition to striving to create a strong working definition of internationalization, an APSA working group should be formed with the goal of developing both clear standards for institutions and departments and a repository of resources. Based on track discussions, four broad themes were identified that lay out a framework for both defining what is meant by internationalizing the curriculum and establishing clear goals and objectives.

First, an internationalized curriculum should provide *context*. In this sense, the curriculum should provide students with a global awareness and the understanding that by knowing others, they can better know themselves. It should promote a better understanding of and empathy for the global community while teaching the critical evaluation skills and information necessary for the kind of real-world experiences they may face (whether these experiences be studying, traveling, working, or serving abroad).

Second, internationalization demands a reconsideration of *perspective*. This reconsideration means correcting the perception that globalization equals Americanization and incorporat-

ing non-Western authors and approaches into the canon. We have a responsibility to correct biases and provide a more well-rounded education to better equip students for the realities of the world beyond their institution.

Third, internationalization needs to focus on *appeal, accessibility, and relevancy*. In many ways, and often by necessity, the study of international politics is the study of conflict. Moreover, many students come to university with limited international experience, even in their secondary education coursework. Thus, there is a need to make the international or “foreign” more accessible and positive. While context and perspective add depth to students’ global understanding, this component aims to add breadth.

Finally, internationalization provides an opportunity to *connect the global and local*. It is important to make students aware of the interactions between what goes on internationally and what happens in their own neighborhoods. In many ways, this approach is not simply to study the international world, but to actively engage in it. This aspect in particular lends itself to experiential learning that is based on the principle of “think globally, act locally.” In keeping with this principle, we can help our students access the world by helping them understand that they do not necessarily have to go abroad to have an international experience.

TRACK: INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM II: STUDY ABROAD AND INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIES

Jeffrey S. Lantis, *The College of Wooster*

Track participants engaged in rich discussions about “internationalization” in college and university curricula. We began by considering contending definitions of central concepts and educational objectives associated with internationalization. Participants discussed different possible avenues of internationalization, including the development of new classes, an infusion of subjects linked to global affairs in existing classes across the curriculum, cultural programming, and the creation of new interdisciplinary classes. We also addressed study abroad programs, language and cross-cultural training, and partnerships and exchanges.

The paper sessions began with a presentation by Thomas Kolasa on the Troy University approach to global engagement (“The Internationalization of the Political Science Curriculum”). His paper included a comprehensive survey of the higher education literature related to our topic area, providing an important foundation for discussions. The literature shows, for example, that most faculty and administrators believe that internationalization brings a number of benefits to colleges and universities. Studies also stress the importance of preparing students with knowledge, attitudes, and skills for effective global citizenship.

In the sessions that followed, participants presented six papers that explored different strategies for internationalization. Our dialogue established that although there is no one-size-fits-all model for internationalization, many of us were struggling with surprisingly similar issues. Drawing on the literature and real-world experiences, we identified successful strategies for internationalization at both macro- and micro-levels. Finally, we discussed challenges that lie along the path toward internationalization, including institutional support, faculty buy-in, departmental contributions to

interdisciplinary programs, and the need to balance globalized course offerings in departments and across the curriculum.

Macro Changes: Internationalization across the Curriculum

Several papers in the track addressed the restructuring of institutional curricula to promote the goal of internationalization. Some colleges and universities have made substantial progress in their efforts to train global citizens for the twenty-first century. Such changes are in line with recommendations made by the American Association of Colleges and Universities, such as the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative, and the American Council on Education. That said, there does not yet appear to be a common architecture of reforms, with faculty and administrators at different institutions interpreting the ends and means quite differently.

One promising model of curriculum reform was described by Will Jennings (“Miniaturizing the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Model: Hosting an Internationalizing the Curriculum Mini-Conference”). His paper reported on a university program that aimed to internationalize instruction and expose students to new ideas and cultures. The ongoing program involves new classes, a lecture series on global issues, a film series covering every continent, efforts to attract and retain faculty from diverse backgrounds, and a variety of other new campus programs. Inspired by the TLC model, the University of Tennessee sponsored an “Internationalizing the Curriculum” mini-conference to promote dialogue on active teaching and learning pedagogy and the development of globalized course offerings.

Several paper presentations also reflected on the question of just how “internationalized” many international relations programs really are. We discussed the degree to which international relations as a field transcends disciplines and whether international relations and global studies should be considered coterminous. We also analyzed differences between international relations and international studies programs.

Pierre Atlas’ paper “Internationalizing the Curriculum via an Interdisciplinary Global Studies Program: Global Studies at Marian University” described another comprehensive effort that is underway to restructure the university’s undergraduate curriculum. Students at Marian are now required to take one of several “cross-cultural” courses (including offerings from the political science department) as part of a new general education program, and they are encouraged to study abroad. In recent years, the institution has also taken a more deliberate and institutional approach to internationalizing the curriculum by creating an interdisciplinary minor in global studies, under the umbrella of the Richard G. Lugar Franciscan Center for Global Studies.

Our track also examined the goal of internationalization in relation to institutional commitments to study abroad. Participants discussed how their colleges and universities have different requirement structures for education abroad. In “Developing a Cohesive Call and Plan for Political Science Programs to Institute a Mandatory Three- to Six-Credit Course Requirement of Study Abroad for Matriculation,” Thomas Corbin proposed that universities mandate student participation in overseas study of some sort (short-term, long-term, or through university partnerships). This paper led to a discussion of academic foundations for study abroad, addressing issues such as how professors are evaluated or rewarded for developing or leading classes abroad, student