

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

intentionality regarding their choice of study abroad locations, and predeparture and returnee orientation programs.

Micro Reforms: Changes inside Political Science Departments

Track participants agreed that political science departments have a special opportunity—perhaps even an obligation—to be at the forefront of internationalization in the academy. Working groups of the APSA have endorsed calls in higher education to internationalize undergraduate education in the discipline. This effort has led to greater attention to how to best examine contemporary challenges across cultures, expand student knowledge of and familiarity with the world, and broaden critical and analytical perspectives.

Papers and participants discussed characteristics that we believe are associated with strong internationalized political science degree programs. We agreed that departments should not be complacent, simply “covering” a range of global issues or areas. Rather, they should be purposeful in developing new courses that cross disciplines and force students to think critically about global issues. If the goal is to help educate global citizens, then course contents can reasonably be broadened to add dimensionality to the training of students within the discipline.

In “Teaching the Unfamiliar to a Crowd,” Meredith L. Weiss and David Rousseau focused on even more micro-level techniques for fostering global engagement. They noted, “Teaching about politics in far-away places to undergraduates with minimal prior familiarity poses inherent challenges.” Weiss and Rousseau’s paper explored the literature on instructional and learning styles to describe some best practices for comparative politics and international relations classes, such as team-based learning, interactive approaches, and “micro-writing” exercises. These student-centered active learning strategies have been used successfully for classes at SUNY–Albany.

Strategies for Internationalizing the Curriculum

Track participants concluded that a number of strategies can help us introduce students to international themes, as well as promote cross-cultural understanding. First, we recommend that departments consider curricular revisions using purposeful reflection on international engagement. We encourage departments to foster a certain level of adaptability in course development whenever possible to avoid setting arbitrary barriers between subfields. In other words, we recommend that internationalization be considered for classes well beyond those in comparative politics and international relations. The theme of internationalization can also be used to encourage innovations in course design, team teaching, or interdisciplinary approaches. These changes are not only intrinsically important in the twenty-first century, but they will also enhance the value (and marketability) of the major for a new generation of students.

Second, because internationalization involves garnering commitment from all significant stakeholders, we recommend that faculty members, students, academic departments, administrators, and key offices on campuses be included in such efforts. Not only must stakeholders agree on the objectives of internationalization—such as the achievement of intercultural competency or empathy—they should also agree on strategies to achieve these objectives. Faculty should try to form a consensus on rationales for internationalizing the curriculum and move

beyond traditional “zero-sum” thinking and competition. Administrators must be clear that internationalization represents a major institutional priority. In the end, the likelihood of success of these projects will be greatly influenced by the size of the coalition of stakeholders.

Third, we note that resources are critical to move from conceptualization to implementation. There are low-cost avenues to promote consideration of international themes, but these will likely fall short if no resources are available to enable the achievement of objectives. Papers in our track described successful internationalization efforts that relied on obtaining outside sponsorship, grants, or endorsements. Large foundation grants can provide incredible leverage to encourage curricular innovations. Assuming that resources are available and administrators have signaled institutional priorities, faculty should also be rewarded for their commitments to these goals. Such incentives might play a role in faculty recruitment, as well as reviews for promotion and tenure.

This article represents only a brief summary of the engaging discussions and paper presentations in our track. We found many points of agreement and are enthusiastic to work with colleagues in the discipline to take up the charge of global innovations for the twenty-first century.

TRACK: PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Candace C. Young, *Truman State University*

John W. Williams, *Principia College*

Wallace D. Johnson, *South Texas College*

Assessment, particularly program assessment, has reached a new height in the APSA with the publication of an edited volume, *Assessment in Political Science* (2008), followed by the appointment in 2010 of an association-wide working group on assessment. This task force has been asked to investigate current practices in program assessment and make recommendations regarding the role that the APSA should play to help departments and faculty conduct assessment better. Track participants were encouraged to think about how the issues they raised could help guide the APSA’s overall approach to assessment.

Track papers focused on many topics, including methods of course delivery, pre- and postcourse assessments, and a comparison of British and U.S. approaches to political science curricula and assessment. Participants also discussed issues related to P–16 initiatives, the vital role that top administrators play in expressing support for assessment, and the benefits of involving students in assessment programs and research. However, this track summary focuses primarily on the discussion that occurred during the last session of the conference, when each participant was asked to discuss key issues raised by track papers and discussion.

One of the challenges for improving the status and quality of program assessment in political science is the need to better integrate courses and program assessment. Several participants observed that faculty members typically think about their courses in isolation from the rest of the political science curriculum. Thus, participants concluded that faculty members may be more receptive to classroom and course-level assessment than they are to program assessment. Paradoxically, regional academic accrediting bodies require programmatic and/or institutional-level assessments. While classroom assessment is applauded, it must be