The APSA Teaching & Learning Conference: Two Perspectives

Amy R. Gershkoff, *Princeton University*

It was no coincidence that the conference was not termed the APSA Conference on Teaching, but rather than the APSA Conference on Teaching & *Learning*. The difference is non-trivial, and in fact importantly reflects what made this conference so successful.

While I did some teaching at the conference during my presentation, I spent the majority of the conference learning. I was able to learn from junior and senior faculty, as well as from leaders in higher education more generally. I was able to gain insight into how instructors at a range of different kinds of institutions handle a multitude of different pedagogical challenges. The "tracked" nature of the conference facilitated learning between participants: by spending the majority of the conference with the same small group, we were able to quickly move past introductions and let the real learning between participants begin.

In addition to learning between participants, the substantive focus of the conference was not on teaching but on assisting students in the learning process. My track in particular ("Pedagogy and Technology") focused on using technological innovations to help students learn better. We discussed how judicious use of tools such as PowerPoint, message boards, and email discussion lists could potentially help students learn better, as well as how technology, if improperly used, can turn the classroom focus toward the technology itself, and thus away from student learning. My track repeatedly emphasized the goal of improving student learning, even as we discussed a variety of innovative pedagogical techniques, including experiential learning, learning communities, and multiple learning styles.

I cannot overstate the value of this conference to new instructors, junior faculty, and especially graduate students. As a graduate student, I received *de facto* teacher training, made contacts with other instructors whose pedagogical techniques I would like to implement, and learned about innovations in pedagogy that I would not have known about otherwise (there is frequently less cross-institutional fertilization of such ideas than there is with research advancements). Moreover, I learned about teaching in the profession more generally, especially information about the role of teaching in the job search, tenure review, and publishing in the teaching field. I also learned about teaching resources available through APSA.

Famous scholar V. O. Key developed a paradigm for understanding political parties in which the nature of parties was divided into three major areas: "party-in-the-electorate," "party-in-government," and "party-as-organization." In the same spirit, the conference enabled me to learn about "learning-in-the-political-science-classroom," "learning-in-the-political-science-profession," and "learning-in-higher-education." I am deeply grateful to APSA for the opportunity to attend.

Michelle D. Deardorff, *Jackson State University*

When I arrived in Washington, D.C. to attend the first APSA Conference on Teaching and Learning, I did not know what to expect. Although I have been a regular participant in the APSA Annual Meeting and attended many workshops on teaching and curricular development, this didn't seem to be the same. All of my contacts with the program committee and APSA had seemed more informal, specific, and intense. They had clear expectations of this small group of 40. Unlike the Annual Meeting, we would not be presenting our research for 15 minutes, answering questions from the audience, responding to the discussants' comments, and then spend the remainder of the conference as a passive observer. At the plenary session the expectations were made more explicit. We would spend more time in our groups of 10 or 15 throughout the weekend—but we would still only have approximately 15 minutes to formally present our work. Our curiosity was palpable, how would a group of academics spend the remainder of our time?

In the weeks leading to the conference we had heard from our moderators, using a listserv and discussion group to virtually interact. But we were not required to submit our presentation in advance, although some colleagues had already posted their presentation on the discussion group. In the working groups' initial meeting we spent time talking about ourselves, our areas of specialization, our institutions, ourselves. Topics that academics generally have no difficulty addressing—in great detail. But this initial session set the tone. The conference was not a series of monologues, but conversations. In my workgroup, at least, we interrupted each other continuously but cordially, frequently the only way that academics are able to have conversations. It did not feel so much that we gave presentations, but that we led conversations about our prepared topics. Unlike the Annual Meeting, we weren't demonstrating our research and seeking feedback, we were discussing how our projects (which varied greatly) were designed, implemented, evaluated, and changed. We all wanted to know how these various pedagogical approaches could be adapted to other situations and institutions and in what way they could be better tested and improved. It seemed more collaborative.

Most of workshops on teaching, assessment, and curriculum design I have attended over the years have been multi-disciplinary or directed by faculty in the humanities. At times, I have found them frustrating and irrelevant because they often quickly deteriorate into the anecdotal level or to concrete "teaching tips." It was exciting to talk about these same topics—innovative pedagogy and technology, service learning and civic engagement, departmental and classroom assessment, diversity and global issues—but with people sharing the same disciplinary perspective. We recognized overlap between all the sessions. As academics, almost all of us assess the success of our classroom the same as we evaluate the quality of our research—so assessment

Continued on page 162 . . .

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504004457 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Teaching and Learning in Perspective

. . . Continued from page 155

seemed to span the different workgroups. As passionate teachers, we seek active pedagogies to pull our students into the excitement of political science by forcing them to experience learning methods that are not passive—so the various workgroups considered specific classroom techniques, civic engagement, and new technology. As political scientists, we insist that our students comprehend diverse cultures and analyze the implications of differential power within these communities—so issues of diversity and the global world were continuously examined. Although we were divided into specific topic groups, the overlap was remarkable.

Each working group included representatives from all levels of the professoriate and from very different types of institutions. My working group had two graduate students, assistant, associate, and full professors, representatives from departments from two to 70 faculty members, graduate and undergraduate faculty, and members of institutions that ranged from small private colleges, historically black colleges and universities, small state universities, community colleges, and research-1 schools. Most of us did not know each other before the conference and many of us are engaged not only in our disciplinary research, but also in the scholarship of teaching and learning. And we talked for three wonderful days. The goal for each group was to provide a comprehensive presentation for our final plenary session. These presentations found the commonalities in the presentations, identified continuing questions in each area, considered how to expand this conference to bring in more faculty while retaining the wonderful attributes of the small working groups, and discussed ways for APSA to become more involved in the scholarship and issues of Teaching and Learning. We didn't want to leave. We promised to send each other material, research, and projects that we had used in our own departments and classrooms to be adapted in others.

The best endorsement of this conference is that 40 political scientists came to Washington, D.C. for three days in the spring, when the weather was beautiful. We attended every session; even when our tracks did not meet, we participated in the other groups' sessions. With institutional budget cutbacks, most of us paid our own way and no one really complained—it had been worth it.

Call for Nominations

The Rowman & Littlefield Award for Innovative Teaching in Political Science

Rowman & Littlefield Publishers proudly announce the eighth annual Rowman & Littlefield Award for Innovative Teaching in Political Science. The award, which carries a cash stipend, will be presented at the 2004 Awards Reception at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting in Chicago.

The innovative teaching award recognizes political scientists who have developed effective new approaches to teaching in the discipline. The award seeks to honor a wide range of new directions in teaching, not one particular new direction. Thus, one of the previous winners was chosen because of unique approaches taken in a variety of courses; another was honored for the way in which one particular course was designed; a third for a technological innovation that had important pedagogical implications; and a fourth for a long-term project involving a number of classes on a number of campuses. The winners were chosen from among a large number of deserving nominees whose teaching techniques in various ways have moved our pedagogy forward. The only limits on this award are the creativity and imagination of those teaching political science.

The 2004 winner will be chosen by a committee chaired by L. Sandy Maisel of Colby College. Nominations are solicited for the seventh annual R & L Award. We encourage department chairs and deans to nominate their most innovative teachers; we encourage all political scientists to nominate colleagues they believe are deserving. Nominating letters, accompanied by supporting documentation that the committee can judge, should be sent to Professor L. Sandy Maisel, Department of Government, Colby College, Waterville, ME 04901. Please include five copies of the letter and of all supporting material with your nominations. The deadline for nominations is May 1, 2004.

Have you logged onto APSANet Lately?

myAPSA
Our online system provides members with access to membership information, journals, searchable directories, and more.

PSonline
Past issues of *PS* going back to 1997. Also, check out our *PS* essay-paks, collections of articles with similar themes.

***APSR* Online**
Find full-text articles from the current *APSR* on the web. Available only to APSA members.

Centennial Center
Learn about the new opportunies available at the Centennial Center for Political Science & Public Affairs.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504004457 Published online by Cambridge University Press