sorely lacking in Europe. Alexandra Cole and John Ishiyama explore the differences in the production of quality teachers in the U.S. through an analysis of teaching awards announced in *PS: Political Science and Politics*. As they note, most of the methods used to rate U.S. political science departments have emphasized research productivity, instead of the production of good teachers. While the data is somewhat limited, they find that there are several departments that rank highly in both scholarship and teaching. Yet there are a number of departments that consistently produce good teachers, even though they are not highly ranked research institutions. These papers reveal that we still have more to learn about what kinds of training programs and experiences produce graduate students who are well prepared for teaching.

How do we prepare our students for the changing face of academia? An increasing focus on programs that cross disciplinary divides and connect to broader questions of norms and civic engagement reveals that our graduate students must meet an increasingly diverse set of interests in their professional lives. Elizabeth Lowham and Annalisa Schilla discuss the growing number of graduate programs that connect political science to other disciplines, and warn that participants need to seriously consider how these programs connect to disciplinary studies as well as the internal dynamics of such programs. James Stoner focuses on changes within the discipline itself. While some take the recurring appearance of normative questions about ourselves and the discipline as problematic, there is a legitimate perspective that sees this recurrence as formative and a worthy focus of consideration as we develop graduate students. Stephen Sussman and Kirsten Kim Loutzenheiser explore the praxis of political science, focusing on how we, as faculty, can help our students connect class material to their lives outside of the classroom through the use of self-developed case studies. These papers reveal that graduate students seek an educational experience more connected to other disciplines and the world of practice.

Professional Development

How we grow as professionals is just as important as what we teach. A wide array of studies about the relationship between student learning and faculty development are available, but it appears that faculty at most institutions fail to avail themselves of this information for their own professional development and that of their graduate students' as well. The working group discussed a variety of techniques that could help foster professional development.

Sharon Jones argued that teaching portfolios, even for the tenured faculty member, can provide a way of integrating teaching and research while at the same time opening a path for self-reflection and growth. The process of creating a portfolio can reveal precisely how vigorous teaching and diligent scholarship are inseparable. Self-reflection and constructive criticism were also themes in Dianne Long's discussion of writing a graduate thesis. Long presented practical ideas for implementing peer critiques of graduate thesis chapters using the online resources of Blackboard. This pedagogical approach provides opportunities for peers to both give and receive critiques of research writing. Sussman and Loutzenheiser's research on the use of case studies within public administration programs shows that not only do the undergraduate and graduate students learn a useful research technique, but that they then possess the ability to demonstrate knowledge to their peers both in and out of academia. Similarly, Diane Schmidt and Lauri Evans's discussion of the use of PowerPoint addresses not only better classroom methods, but allows graduate students to effectively communicate their ideas whether they enter the academy or any other workplace environment. Further, the techniques they described offer the possibility of integrating disparate learners into a conversation that may have been previously closed to them.

One of the broader concerns in our track was how to inculcate a sense of civic engagement among both faculty and graduate students. While all of the presentations touched upon some aspect of civic duty, several addressed the issue more directly. Stoner points out some of the problems associated with the scientific, "value-free" political scientist who as an expert is seemingly objective and dispassionate in her exploration of the political realm. That such experts also seem to fail to engage in practicing democracy suggests to our audiences that it may not be as important as we profess in the classroom. Thus the Michael Cain and Zach Messitte work is of quite some value; for it details the desire to engage the political science profession in civic activity directly through volunteering to serve as poll workers. Not only does this demonstrate that we practice what we preach, but it enhances our professional development as active participants in the civic experience. The tenure and promotion process should value these types of experiences as important service responsibilities that aid in the development of individual faculty members as well as serve to promote the democratic process in the wider society. These types of activities along with the others mentioned in this track summary should be pursued to promote a more holistic approach to graduate education and professional development.

Note

1. The order of author names is alphabetical, reflecting the collaborative nature of this track summary. The authors would like to thank all of the members of the track, especially Alexandra Cole for her helpful guidance in preparing this summary.

Track Three: Diversity, Inclusiveness, and Inequality

—**Marcus D. Allen,**
Wheaton College
—**Kea Gordon,**
University of California
—**Lanethea Mathews-Gardner,**
Muhlenberg College

The participants in the Diversity, Inclusiveness, and Inequality track represented a great deal of diversity themselves and included faculty and students from a rich variety of research institutions, private liberal arts colleges, and community colleges. While participants engaged issues and strategies in each of the three substantive areas—diversity, inclusiveness, and inequality in education (DIIE)—the bulk of our conversations focused on diversity and inequality. Topics included curriculum and course content issues, negotiating institutional support for DIIE, challenges of student recruitment and retention, and negotiating power relationships and identities among different kinds of student populations both within and outside of the classroom. This summary reviews four sets of questions that the group addressed and that point to critical areas rich for future research and reflection. In brief these are: (1) How can we simultaneously promote learning about difference and learning about ourselves? (2) How can faculty develop a range of strategic pedagogies and classroom environments in order to avoid some of the challenges inherent in teaching about DIIE? (3) How can we move beyond narrow understandings of diversity that limit the concept solely to a category of identity, neglecting the ways in which

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096508240898 Published online by Cambridge University Press

diversity and inequality are categories of analysis, processes, and indicative of power relations? (4) What steps are necessary to more fully integrate DIIE across the political science curriculum?

If there was one common lesson that emerged from our group, it was the notion that our roles as educators include nurturing self-discovery both in ourselves and, most importantly, in our students on their journey to understanding the complicated world that surrounds us. Put differently, instead of conceptualizing DIIE as learning about "the other," it is better conceived as a process of learning about oneself—it is about coming to recognize oneself as a social, historical, and political being. This realization is perhaps the most important liberating moment for our students and a point of freedom for faculty seeking to teach DIIE. Yet, faculty who embrace their role as nurturers of self-discovery are themselves vulnerable—open to a range of criticism, conflicts that emerge through our own processes of critical self-reflection, and potential negative reactions from our students and unsympathetic colleagues. Students may be especially wary of classroom experiences that require them to critically reflect on who they are; it safer for them to reflect on who "others" are. Similarly, faculty may be reluctant to employ strategies that cede classroom control to students. How can faculty work to minimize cognitive dissonance, or at a minimum channel it in productive ways?

We discussed several pedagogical strategies for lessoning these sorts of anxieties. Role plays, simulations, and small class activities, for example, allow students to adopt and act out multiple identities, characters, and personalities different from their own and in a way that insulates their own identities, character, and personality from direct critique. Case studies may fulfill a similar role and are especially useful in getting students to employ moral reasoning. Experiential learning, community based research, and service learning are ripe terrain for engaging students in DIIE. Innovative pedagogical strategies discussed included the concepts of empathy and compassion as points of departure for learning about difference and inequalities; others drew on critical pedagogies of a range of political theorists from Plato to Spinoza to explicitly recognize the ways in which students' emotive reactions can both hinder and aid their ability to learn about diversity, inequality, and inclusiveness. Another especially promising approach to draws on students' involvement in extracurricular and co-curricular life; similar to the institutions of civil society, it is in students' associational lives outside of the classroom that they learn how to practice DIIE. What kinds of organizational and group experiences, for instance, can we facilitate on our campuses that fulfill the mission of DIIE?

Despite the apparent range of teaching strategies, it is particularly difficult to negotiate the challenges of DIIE as a young faculty member, untrained by virtue of graduate training alone. In many cases graduate curricula fail to provide a strong intellectual basis for faculty interested in teaching DIIE. The APSA Teaching and Learning conference is one way to address these concerns—indeed, it is both reassuring and troubling that so many graduate students and recent Ph.D.s seek broader professional development in DIIE at the conference. Nonetheless the feeling of the DIIE workshop was that college and university institutions need to make a more concerted effort to employ and teach engaged pedagogy to graduate students. If we expect our undergraduate students to take DIIE seriously, then we need to do so ourselves. APSA can play an important role in providing a forum to discuss these points of departure in our discipline and can lead by example by providing sustained institutional support for DIIE at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

DIIE clearly bridges the traditional subfields of the discipline of political science and, as such, raises a number of strategic, institutional, and philosophical issues. For example, should some variant of DIIE (for example, race and ethnicity politics) constitute a separate subfield in the discipline? Should our goal be instead to integrate DIIE concerns across existing subfields? Although these alternatives are not necessarily mutually exclusive, disciplinary and institutional commitments to either remain unclear.

Diversity, inclusiveness, and inequality education is not simply about adding content to existing courses, or developing new pedagogies, however. Certainly student expectations about course and disciplinary content are related to the extent to which DIIE is integrated or segregated across the broader field of political science. DIIE educators frequently encounter complaints, for example, that "this course isn't about race!" as participant Catherine Paden put it, in courses ranging from Introduction to American National Government to classes on comparative political processes. Beyond the substance of DIIE, the methods, subjects, and objects that define subfields in political science are themselves laden with power relations. If we are familiar with students' complaints about unexpected encounters with DIIE content, we understand little about the mechanisms by which students self-select into particular courses. Yet, it is these very mechanisms that both reflect and reify the position of DIIE in political science research and scholarship, restricting the entry of women and students of color into traditionally male-dominated and white-dominated subfields of political science.

Thus truly integrating DIIE requires deliberate and deliberative reflection at individual, department, and institutional levels. Perhaps most importantly, it requires being reflective not only about the content of our courses, but the processes through which that content is revealed. One way of approaching this issue is to think of diversity as a "way of knowing" rather than simply as a category of identity or difference. Diversity can be conceptualized as a process that both constructs and is constructed by the subjects of our discipline. Integrating diversity across the political science curriculum, then, requires us to better understand how DIIE is limited, shaped, and created through institutional and political processes that cut across our disciplines and the institutions in which we teach and learn.

Participants in the DIIE working group were exceptionally aware that if we lack a framework to understand and treat these issues as legitimate, intellectual points of departure, then the barriers to engaging students in a meaningful way will be formidable. In closing, we leave you with these words of inspiration from bell hooks: "education is the practice of freedom . . . education connects the will to know with the will to become."

Track Four: Teaching Research Methods

—**Michelle Dion,**
Georgia Institute of Technology
—**Leland M. Coxe,**
Randolph College
—**Margaret Carne,**
Rhodes College

A diverse group of 25 faculty and graduate students participated in the 2008 Teaching Research Methods (TRM) track. Participants represented a range of institutions—public and private, urban and rural, domestic and international, large research universities and teaching colleges. Presentations provided evidence of the heterogeneity in methods instruction and of pedagogical innovations in course design and delivery. The

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096508240898 Published online by Cambridge University Press