Chair’s Introduction
Professor Graham Wilson, Department Chair

This issue of our alumni newsletter focuses on the most fundamental aspect of a professor’s job, teaching. Although we all are excited by research and our professional reputations rest on our publications, we would not be here if we did not teach. Teaching is the basic expectation that the State of Wisconsin has of us, and as this issue of the newsletter demonstrates, we are enthusiastic about that aspect of our work.

Political Science is known as a great teaching department. We have over 1,100 majors and through our contribution to the general education mission of the university teach about 6,000 students in our courses each semester. Contrary to common criticisms of top universities like the UW, my colleagues take teaching very seriously and excel at it. Assessments of teaching play a major role at both the department and university level in decision on whether or not to tenure assistant professors. They continue to play a major role in decisions about merit increases and awards for tenured professors.

Students’ evaluations of our courses are extraordinarily favorable. In the Spring Semester, for example, the average evaluation of our courses on a five point scale was 4.7. We take particular pride in the fact that student evaluations of our introductory American government courses enrolling literally hundreds of students are as high as student evaluations of our smaller seminar courses. We also take pride in the fact that introductory as well as upper division courses are taught by senior professors. For example, our Introduction to American Government courses are taught by a gifted team of full professors, one of whom, John Coleman, writes in this issue on the secrets of success in teaching a course with over 500 students enrolled in it!

One of the key messages we intend to convey in this newsletter is that we offer very different types of educational experiences to our students. The Introduction to American Government, Introduction to Comparative Politics and Introduction to International Relations courses take the classic format of a course taught by a faculty member with the aid of numerous teaching assistants responsible for discussion sections small enough to give every student a chance to participate in discussions. Because in such courses the teaching assistant is the instructor with whom undergraduates have the most direct contact, we take great care to train and evaluate our TAs. Like our faculty, they do a great job and the quality of their teaching here helps them become professors later in other departments. However, many of our courses give undergraduates the opportunity to take a small enrollment course taught by faculty alone. We believe that taking such a small enrollment course should be part of the experience of all our undergraduates.

We also believe that education does not stop at the classroom door. This issue of our
When I craft lectures, I am aware that attentive to important broader tasks we have in educating our students. It is not just that, on the whole, our faculty is skilled beyond the reach for financial reasons of too many of our students. This newsletter contains an exciting appeal from Terry Lienman for funds for the Penniman Opportunities Fund that will assist undergraduate in undertaking exciting but unpaid internship opportunities in Washington D.C. Again, Washington is less expensive than London, but internship opportunities there are still beyond the reach for financial reasons of too many of our students.

Second, our alumni can directly generate opportunities. Second, our alumni can directly generate opportunities.

Teaching and learning: the view from Bascom Hall
Virginia Sapiro, Sophonisba P. Breckinridge Professor of Political Science and Women's Studies, Associate Vice Chancellor for Teaching and Learning

Three years ago, after more than 25 years of teaching in the Department of Political Science, known for teaching more students than almost any other and for the high quality of its teaching, I moved a few yards up the hill to become Associate Vice Chancellor for Teaching and Learning, in the Office of the Provost. My portfolio includes both undergraduate education and teaching and learning more generally.

What did I learn by assuming the all-campus perspective? First, it has sustained my pride in the Department of Political Science. It is not just that, on the whole, our faculty is skilled and dedicated as pedagogues – and some are awe inspiring – but that many of our faculty are attentive to important broader tasks we have in educating our students.

It is common for faculty to think about their curricula and individual teaching primarily in terms of how they teach their particular discipline, and whether they provide a good major. But a major is only one element in an undergraduate degree and ultimately, for most students, not the most important one. A major provides experience in going deeply into one branch of knowledge. But also important are these aspects of students' education: developing abilities and experience in communicating clearly in written and oral forms; gathering, evaluating, integrating, and using information of many types; engaging in analytical and mathematical reasoning; understanding and appreciating the breadth of ways of knowing across the arts and humanities, social sciences, and fields of science, technology, and mathematics; engaging in an active, productive, and ethical life in a multicultural and global world; and becoming self-generating students who will never stop learning.

Which faculty teach these things? The same people who, simultaneously, teach political science, or any other discipline. Professors like Charles Franklin, whose "Understanding Political Numbers" helps students understand a political world couched in numbers. Like Kathy Cramer Walsh, whose "Citizenship, Democracy, and Difference" integrated classroom learning with work in community-based organizations to learn about citizenship and communication in diverse societies. Like Graham Wilson, who teaches writing-intensive courses that require students to experience writing in many different modes. Like Kenneth Goldstein, who integrates many undergraduates into major research projects giving them hands-on experience with first-rate research. Like Jon Pevehouse, winner of a campus-wide teaching award this year, who has long made a practice of engaging in systematic observation of varieties of teaching styles and methods, and mindfully choosing the best for his own teaching.

Good teaching requires constant learning, self-assessment, and professional development and substantial infrastructure, such as technology and assistance with that technology; assistance to learn new techniques or develop new materials; support for complex learning activities such as service-learning or collaborative research. It requires time to develop new courses and improve old ones. Unfortunately, few of these resources can be provided by basic university funds, so many faculty find they cannot always provide the opportunities for their students they would like. But students in our department benefit from a culture that values teaching and a talented group of faculty. I have learned this, too, from taking the campus-wide perspective.

Large Lecture 101
Professor John Coleman

"Professor Coleman," the University of Texas student said to me, "I want you to know that I really enjoyed your class. I used to think that I wanted to go into politics but, after taking your class, I’ve decided there’s no way I’d want to.”

Okay, that wasn’t exactly the effect I was hoping to have. I’d like to think I’ve learned a few things about teaching the large introductory class in American politics and government since that memorable exchange back in 1991.

For someone like me, who went to a small undergraduate university where a large class might be 100 students, the lecture hall of 400 or more students was a very new experience. At MIT, where I did my graduate work, I’m pretty sure all the political science undergraduate majors could have shared a ride in a single taxi, so "large" classes there were also not large by Wisconsin standards.

Faculty often point to three challenges in teaching the introductory class. First, the audience is diverse, consisting of certain or potential majors; those who are at least mildly interested in the subject matter but not considering a major; those who know they have to be somewhere to round out their schedule, and their schedule says it is in Political Science 104. Second, deciding what to include and exclude from an introduction to an entire field of knowledge, and deciding how to present it, can be daunting. And third, there are so many people.

The audience: When I craft lectures, I am aware that not all students will be interested with the most intricate details of a particular topic. My goal, therefore, is comprehension more than comprehensiveness. I believe there are core concepts and approaches that make sense to convey whether a student is a future major or will never take another political science course. When I look back at the introductory class I taught at UT-Austin, I am amazed by the amount of material I covered. But going pedal-
to-the-metal because they simply must hear about this is not a good teaching approach. Now, this does not mean “dumbing down” the material. It simply means trying to pare out content that can safely wait for future political science classes. This also means realizing that you may not get to a particular topic in a course, or that you may have to snip out some content along the way. Unless it is something vital—say, for example, that the United States has three branches of government—chances are both your students and the republic will survive.

The instruction: This leads directly to the second challenge: what to include and how to present it. Unlike the sciences or some of the social sciences, there is a fair amount of latitude regarding what to include in an introductory course in political science. I try to maintain a healthy modesty about what students absolutely need to know to have a good grounding in the subject, rather than assuming that every one of my undoubtedly brilliant students is going to retain all the information. Teaching the large introductory course in American politics and government at the University of Wisconsin has been a pleasure for me. As for the students, they appear to emerge mostly unscathed. I haven’t had any UW-Madison students tell me I had scared them away from politics or political science, so I’ll mark that as progress. I’ve been given the opportunity to provide thousands of them the grounding they needed for their major, their career, and their citizenship, and that has been richly rewarding.

A Word of Advice
Undergraduate Advisor Liane Kosaki

When I was asked to write this piece for the newsletter, I thought about what people would want to know about advising in the political science department. By far, the most common questions that are asked of me are: who are you and what do you do?

The brief story of my life is that I was born and raised in Hawaii. I did my undergraduate education at the University of Hawaii, graduating with honors in political science. I then decided to go somewhere really different, and earned my Ph.D. in political science at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. I have taught as Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, Washington University in St. Louis (where I also served as director of undergraduate programs), and Beloit College. I moved to Madison and joined the Academic Affairs Office in the athletic department where I served as an advisor for 6 years. I then became the advisor in the International Studies Program, and then joined the political science department as advisor.

One of the major reasons that I moved into advising is that I enjoy working with students. After my experiences at Washington University and now here at Madison, I realize that helping them negotiate the “maze” that college life is vital to students getting the most out of their college experience. To explain what it is I do, consider a quote from Francois, due de la Rochefoucauld:

“Nothing is given so profusely as advice.”

This little nugget of wisdom can be looked at in many ways. As the advisor for over 1000 majors (political science is one of the largest majors in the College of Letters and Science) I certainly have to give lots of advice. Advising students about the requirements for the major and for the undergraduate degree is an important part of what I do as an advisor. But it is also important that I provide information about how the major can fit into students’ future career plans as well as about how to enrich their undergraduate experience in the meantime. And I spend a part of my time not only providing that advice directly, but finding others to provide that advice to students. So besides providing pre-law and career advice, I coordinate events that provide pre-law and career advice. I work with students who want to participate in the myriad of study abroad programs offered here at Madison and elsewhere, but I also publicize events that provide information about study abroad opportunities, internship programs, and community service opportunities.

But advising students is only a part of the “advising” I do on a daily basis. As a part of the academic staff, I also provide advice to the department about course offerings and department policy related to the undergraduate curriculum; to various other schools/colleges and offices on campus about admissions, administrative, and curricular issues; to various individuals and outside agencies about internship opportunities that might interest our majors; and to faculty about college policy as it relates to course requirements, grading, and student conduct. Thus, I not only provide large amounts of advice, but I provide it to a lot of different constituencies.

The profession of advice provided to students and others is a reflection of the role of advising at a large campus like UW-Madison. Consider that the number of undergraduate majors in political science is almost equal to the entire undergraduate population at a liberal arts college like Beloit College, and the sheer size of the Madison campus is a little easier to grasp. The complexity of a large university can be daunting to the average student. Thus, the advisor can, and to my mind should, be a crucial link between the individual student and the university and its services. Using an advisor can help students take advantage of the many research and scholarship opportunities available to students at a large university like UW Madison, alert students to great courses and gifted faculty, help students navigate the bureaucracy that is almost the inevitable companion to a large institution, and do it all in a timely and friendly fashion. In short, the advisor can make a large and intimidating institution more manageable, humane, and understandable to students.

The rewards of working with students include working with our former students who are now alumni. Now that I've
been in the department long enough to have seen students through all four years of their undergraduate careers, it's really rewarding to hear about what they're doing out in the wide world. I have already worked with alumni on the Board of Visitors and in other venues, and I continue to be impressed and grateful for the contributions that they make to the department and to the university. I look forward to a growing and continuing working relationship with all our students, old and new!

**POLITICAL SCIENCE** has become one of the two largest majors in the College of Letters and Science, according to a new review of the undergraduate program. The number of majors almost doubled between 2000 and 2004, rising from over 600 to just short of 1,200.

Professor Charles Franklin

The surge in majors has also accompanied growth in number of students enrolled in all Political Science courses. By that measure, the department ranks as either the first or second largest teacher of undergraduates in the college, with some variation from semester to semester. Political Science and History compete for this honor, with both departments teaching over 6,000 students per semester.

This growth in majors and in enrollment has not been accompanied by faculty growth, however, as the Department's full time equivalent faculty (FTE) has remained around 30-33. There were 32.4 FTEs in the 2004-05 academic year with 38 people holding appointments in the department. As before, each student is examined in two fields. Now, how are the exam results? To discourage “citation dumps” and encourage the use of students’ own work, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it.

The department significantly reconfigured its field exams. As before, each student is examined in two fields. Now, how are the exam results? To discourage “citation dumps” and encourage the use of students’ own work, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it. T o discourage “citation dumps” and encourage the use of students’ own work, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it.

To provide more background on the profession, we revised Political Science 800, “Political Science as a Discipline,” a required first-year course. The revised 1-credit course still acquaints students with research approaches such as behavioralism, rational choice, interpretivism, and historical analysis. But the second half of the course now covers the professional life of a scholar—conferences, publishing, teaching, consulting, grants, tenure, and the like. Through this course and by encouraging conference presentations, publications, attendance at campus talks, and participation in department research groups, the faculty urges students to become involved in the life of the profession.

In place of the previous first-year oral examination, the department now holds a First-Year Assessment meeting in May. At this meeting, the faculty gather to share observations and insights as we discuss how each student performed during the first year. The student receives a written assessment of their performance and suggestions about what should be attended to over the summer and in the following academic year. The student must meet with his or her advisor to discuss the assessment.

The department significantly reconfigured its field exams. As before, each student is examined in two fields. Now, however, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it. To discourage “citation dumps” and encourage the use of students’ own work, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it. To discourage “citation dumps” and encourage the use of students’ own work, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it.

A mixed blessing of the department is that the major is flexible, giving lots of choices, but as a result can seem unfocused and not directed at specific career goals:

"The thing I love about the department is that there is so much freedom to take your own path of classes - but at the same time you can easily end up fulfilling the major without any type of direction."

A mixed blessing of the department is that the major is flexible, giving lots of choices, but as a result can seem unfocused and not directed at specific career goals:

"The thing I love about the department is that there is so much freedom to take your own path of classes - but at the same time you can easily end up fulfilling the major without any type of direction."

The Department is actively working to find a balance between serving the very large demand for our courses and our major while at the same time creating opportunities for students to take smaller seminars. One student offered a solution that would certainly meet with the approval of the Department, even if it is somewhat unlikely:

"The people in the department who I worked with were wonderful. At the moment, I can’t think of any suggestions that would make the department better, other than having the University double funding to Political Science because it’s the coolest."

The changes begin at step one before new students even arrive: the Admissions Committee now requires applicants to submit a research abstract and paper, so we can be certain that they have an interest in and aptitude for political science research. At orientation, students learn about grad school, teaching, and the importance of developing quality research skills.

Undergraduate Advisor, Dr. Liane Kosaki, developed a survey of a random sample of graduating seniors during the spring of 2005. Senior Frank Woodruff compiled and analyzed the data and the Department’s IT specialist Joe Stathus implemented the web-based survey. The results were both gratifying and point to areas of concern.

The good news is that the overall evaluations of the department are very positive. On a 10 point scale, where 1 is "terrible" and 10 is "perfect," the median rating of the department was an 8. Students like the major, often find their faculty “amazing,” and think the flexibility of the major is very attractive. Some of the comments included:

"I absolutely loved the political science department. There was never a class that I didn’t enjoy."

"I really loved being a part of the program. It did a very good job preparing me. I just wish I could have taken more classes!"

"The professors in the department were amazing. I feel I really learned a lot. In fact, coming to the University is what actually really sparked my interest in politics."

"Great job overall. I thought I wouldn’t like my theory class but I loved it. All my profs have been amazing. It seems that Poli Sci puts more emphasis on great teaching than other majors."

But other comments pointed to our problems related to the difficulty of getting into some courses:

"I was really disappointed that there were some classes I was unable to get into registrado for, even as a senior. I mean, seriously, a second semester senior."

A mixed blessing of the department is that the major is flexible, giving lots of choices, but as a result can seem unfocused and not directed at specific career goals:

"The thing I love about the department is that there is so much freedom to take your own path of classes - but at the same time you can easily end up fulfilling the major without any type of direction."

The Department is actively working to find a balance between serving the very large demand for our courses and our major while at the same time creating opportunities for students to take smaller seminars. One student offered a solution that would certainly meet with the approval of the Department, even if it is somewhat unlikely:

"The people in the department who I worked with were wonderful. At the moment, I can’t think of any suggestions that would make the department better, other than having the University double funding to Political Science because it’s the coolest."

**Revamping the Graduate Program**

Professor John Coleman

Editor’s note. The department has just revised its graduate program comprehensively for the second time in fifteen years. Looking at the new program, graduate alumni might wish they had their time over again. Take home prelims…. Five years of guaranteed funding….what’s going on in North Hall?

Improving students’ professionalization and strengthening the research component of graduate training are key goals of the recent restructuring. We wanted students to have a clear sense of life as a professional political scientist, especially in academia, and the skills necessary for success. For research, we wanted students prepared to write a high-quality dissertation, which is crucial for job market success.

The changes begin at step one before new students even arrive: the Admissions Committee now requires applicants to submit a research abstract and paper, so we can be certain that they have an interest in and aptitude for political science research. At orientation, students learn about grad school, teaching, and the importance of developing quality research skills.

To provide more background on the profession, we revised Political Science 800, “Political Science as a Discipline,” a required first-year course. The revised 1-credit course still acquaints students with research approaches such as behavioralism, rational choice, interpretivism, and historical analysis. But the second half of the course now covers the professional life of a scholar—conferences, publishing, teaching, consulting, grants, tenure, and the like. Through this course and by encouraging conference presentations, publications, attendance at campus talks, and participation in department research groups, the faculty urges students to become involved in the life of the profession.

In place of the previous first-year oral examination, the department now holds a First-Year Assessment meeting in May. At this meeting, the faculty gather to share observations and insights as we discuss how each student performed during the first year. The student receives a written assessment of their performance and suggestions about what should be attended to over the summer and in the following academic year. The student must meet with his or her advisor to discuss the assessment.

The department significantly reconfigured its field exams. As before, each student is examined in two fields. Now, however, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it. To discourage “citation dumps” and encourage the use of students’ own work, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it. To discourage “citation dumps” and encourage the use of students’ own work, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it. To discourage “citation dumps” and encourage the use of students’ own work, the exam is take-home, open-book, and students have 56 hours to work on it.
encourage thoughtful, refined, revised essays that critically assess research, all students are limited to a specific word count in their answers. Expecting that students’ first field is their major research area, we require first-field students to answer more questions than do second-field students and to take an oral exam in addition to the written. Students must satisfy three other department requirements prior to working on the dissertation proposal (fields may have additional requirements). By the end of the second year, each student must submit a research paper of acceptable quality. Each student must take at least three additional credits of quantitative or qualitative methods beyond the required research design course. And each student must participate in a research presentation panel before the faculty and other graduate students. These panels simulate the professional conference experience of presenting one’s research and responding to questions. Each panelist receives an assessment form from each faculty member in attendance.

The final stage in a student’s journey toward obtaining the Ph.D. is the writing of a dissertation. We were concerned that under our previous system, too many students effectively bypassed a dissertation proposal and began their dissertation research without an adequate research roadmap. We eliminated the “dissertation prelim” and now move students directly to writing and defending a proposal detailing the research path to be taken.

The department made other changes to improve the student experience. We guarantee financial assistance for five years. We increased funds available to defray conference expenses. All first-year students are made members of the American Political Science Association. We adjusted teaching assistant schedules to concentrate sections on one or two days. Each semester, an excellent TA is selected to mentor TAs, especially by providing advice and feedback to first-time TAs. We aim to put first-year students without fellowships or research positions in less-overwhelming TA positions that do not include discussion sections. The department introduced a standardized form so that TAs receive comparable feedback from their faculty supervisor. And we moved the placement meeting from the end of summer to the beginning so that students on the job market had adequate time to put together a strong application package.

Faculty will carefully monitor benchmarks such as the department’s ranking, surveys of former graduate students, participation in conferences, publishing success, and results on the job market to determine how effective each individual reform has been. After giving the new system time to work, we will be pleased if we have met our goals but, if not, the drawing board is always available.

The Morgridge Center for Public Service

The UW-Madison Department of Political Science is fortunate to share a campus with the Morgridge Center for Public Service. The Center, started in 1996 through a generous endowment from John and Tashia Morgridge, is the heart of the Wisconsin Idea in undergraduate education. Through it, students, faculty, and staff learn about and become involved in volunteer opportunities in Madison and throughout the world. Students also apply for fellowships that enable them to merge their coursework with service to the community. And faculty can receive support, advice, and inspiration as they attempt to incorporate direct experience with civic engagement into their courses.

Shortly after joining the faculty here at Wisconsin-Madison in 2000, I learned about the Morgridge Center through then-director Mary Rouse, who retired this past summer. (Many of you know her as the former UW Dean of Students). With their financial and administrative help, I designed a course on civic engagement that I have taught each subsequent year. The course is a 20-person undergraduate seminar in which each of the students chooses to work with one of a slate of community-based organizations, such as neighborhood organizations and refugee assistance organizations. We use this seminar work, alongside course readings on democratic theory and empirical studies of participation, to guide our seminar discussions and course writings.

Year after year, I am moved by the insights the students reach through their service and academic work in the course. At the end of the term, we usually agree that thinking and talking about civic engagement is just a starting point. As the students move out into the community and recognize the hard work, the tensions, and the reward that working on community problems with people in the broader Madison community entails, the lessons in our books come to life. Their hands-on experience enlarges their understanding of civic engagement far more than my instruction alone could ever accomplish. It seems to even spark career goals. Many of the students have changed career paths because of the course, and go on to work in the Teach for America corps of teachers in underprivileged communities, as staffers in legislative offices, or seek to start nonprofit organizations of their own. The course has allowed our students to develop, and put into practice, personal conceptions of good citizenship that they carry with them into their lives as alumni.
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The American Center for Public Service is fortunate to share a campus with the Morgridge Center for Public Service. The Center, started in 1996 through a generous endowment from John and Tashia Morgridge, is the heart of the Wisconsin Idea in undergraduate education. Through it, students, faculty, and staff learn about and become involved in volunteer opportunities in Madison and throughout the world. Students also apply for fellowships that enable them to merge their coursework with service to the community. And faculty can receive support, advice, and inspiration as they attempt to incorporate direct experience with civic engagement into their courses.

Shortly after joining the faculty here at Wisconsin-Madison in 2000, I learned about the Morgridge Center through then-director Mary Rouse, who retired this past summer. (Many of you know her as the former UW Dean of Students). With their financial and administrative help, I designed a course on civic engagement that I have taught each subsequent year. The course is a 20-person undergraduate seminar in which each of the students chooses to work with one of a slate of community-based organizations, such as neighborhood organizations and refugee assistance organizations. We use this seminar work, alongside course readings on democratic theory and empirical studies of participation, to guide our seminar discussions and course writings.

Year after year, I am moved by the insights the students reach through their service and academic work in the course. At the end of the term, we usually agree that thinking and talking about civic engagement is just a starting point. As the students move out into the community and recognize the hard work, the tensions, and the reward that working on community problems with people in the broader Madison community entails, the lessons in our books come to life. Their hands-on experience enlarges their understanding of civic engagement far more than my instruction alone could ever accomplish. It seems to even spark career goals. Many of the students have changed career paths because of the course, and go on to work in the Teach for America corps of teachers in underprivileged communities, as staffers in legislative offices, or seek to start nonprofit organizations of their own. The course has allowed our students to develop, and put into practice, personal conceptions of good citizenship that they carry with them into their lives as alumni.

The Morgridge Center for Public Service

Editor’s note: Many Americans worry that we are losing our sense of community and that, as Robert Putnam writes, we are all “Bowling Alone.” Kathy Walsh teaches a course that educates students on how to give back to the community while they learn political science.

Professor Kathy Cramer-Walsh
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Undergrads in Research

Editors Note: Teaching versus research. That’s how many people think about the dilemma for universities. But at Wisconsin undergraduates as well as graduate students take part in professors’ research. Professor Ken Goldstein is leading proponent of involving undergraduates in innovative research.

Professor Ken Goldstein

In recent years, the Department of Political Science has become the premier center for research on political communication in the United States.

Since 2000, the University of Wisconsin Advertising Project has documented the nature and flow of political advertising in the United States. During this time, it has become the source of record for journalists, policy makers, and scholars trying to understand the use and effect of political advertising. During the 2002 and 2004 elections, the University of Wisconsin NewsLab conducted a major data gathering and archival project of local news broadcasts. The rationale for this study was that even though most Americans now get most of their information from local TV news, there has been little systematic study of local television news and no systematic capture and storage of local news coverage. Basing servers in media markets across the country, we were able to monitor local television and bring the content back to Madison over the internet.

These research programs have attracted significant grant moneys and media attention while providing research opportunities, funding, and unmatched data for faculty and graduate students. Just as important, these projects have also provided invaluable research experience for scores of University of Wisconsin undergraduates. During an election year, NewsLab and the Advertising Project employ almost one hundred undergraduates who are responsible for coding and managing the immense amount of data that flow into the projects’ home base in B5 Ingraham.

The research center in Ingraham has the feel of a campaign war room. Students are responsible for every stage of the research program coordinating the capture, coding, and dissemination of massive amounts of data on the flow of political messages. On a typical day, students may find themselves trying to track down the funding of an interest group ad or fielding questions from a New York Times reporter.

The experience of conducting research in real time and preparing reports that must be accurate is not only valuable experience for those who hope to pursue scholarly careers, but provides crucial experience for those students who want to work in politics, the media, and public relations.

Getting to know students and seeing how they work under the pressure of real time deadlines gives me the confidence to contact friends in politics and the media and help place NewsLab and Ad Project alumni in political campaigns and in national news organizations. In 2004, Jesse Derris ’03 was a press secretary with the Kerry campaign while Noreen Nielsen ’03 directed press operations for Americans Coming Together in New Hampshire. Ben Tablesin ’06 cites his experience with the Wisconsin Ad Project as one of the prime factors that helped launch his application and become a finalist for the prestigious Rhodes Scholarship this year.

It has now gotten to the point where political directors of national news organizations and former project alumni call me to see who I can send their way. Someday soon, I’m confident that we’ll see two Ad Project or NewsLab alumni facing off against each other in a presidential campaign that is being covered by other Ad Project and NewsLab Alumni.

Experiences Outside the Classroom

PARLIAMENTARY INTERNSHIPS: A WONDERFUL LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENTS.

Two interns discuss their time in the British Parliament.

Elizabeth Fischer: Working as an intern in the British Parliament was an incredible experience. I had studied the British political system before I left Wisconsin, but no amount of studying could compare to actually spending each day in Westminster Palace working in the office of the Chairman of Foreign Affairs Committee. The setting of my internship was amazing in itself, but the type of tasks I performed at work enhanced my experience. I learned a tremendous amount about Britain’s role in foreign affairs by writing briefs every day for my Member of Parliament on current events and relevant debates in the House and by attending meetings and debates put on by various London think tanks. I also helped in compiling research for some of his speeches in the House of Commons on Zimbabwe and Iraq. Some of the most rewarding work I performed was handling the office’s human rights work. By researching and writing letters to representatives of other countries on behalf of my MP I discovered an interest in human rights law which I plan to pursue after college. One of the most interesting parts of my internship was witnessing the personal side of British politics when attending a dinner at the home of the Speaker of the House and a reception at the Slovakian Embassy.

Outside of working in Parliament, living in London for the summer was the experience of a lifetime. I lived with other interns and we spent most weekends traveling to other parts of England and the UK. I spent one week hiking in Scotland, and another horseback riding in Wales. The experience caused my independence and confidence to grow and I value every second of it.

Dan Hammer: The British Parliamentary Internship Program was, undoubtedly, one of the best experiences that I had during my four years at UW-Madison. It gave me the opportunity to experience a new culture as well as bring to life my studies in the classroom on comparative government. Being able to work during my summer in Britain made
are open to me if I choose to pursue a career in another environment, rather than just in the classroom. In fact, I forged connections with my co-workers that exist to this day as I still keep in contact with the office that I worked in. Without a doubt, in terms of gaining cultural experiences, there is no better way to do it than on the summer parliamentary internship program.

I also was able to apply many of the lessons that I learned in my British Politics class back home in Madison. I had a familiarity with the British system which was appreciated by my superiors (and I even out-scored one of my bosses on a test about British politics). It gave me an opportunity to see how the British political system actually worked, rather than just trying to extrapolate from course books. The parliamentary internship program was a great experience, both culturally and academically.

**Job Shadowing with an Alumni**

Rita Zakulo

Last year I had the privilege of meeting a UW-Madison Political Science graduate, Theresa E. Mentel, who is currently the General Manager of Government and Community Relations for the Chicago Transit Authority. I took this opportunity to meet Theresa because as a Political Science major myself, I did not know what type of post-graduate career options I had available to me, other than working within the realm of politics. I met Theresa at her office and spent the majority of the day observing her work, rather than just trying to extrapolate from course books. The parliamentary internship program was a great experience, both culturally and academically.

The parliamentary internship program significantly better than a traditional study abroad program, since I was able to live as an actual British citizen would live, rather than just as a student in a foreign country. It gave me the opportunity to interact with British people in a workplace environment, rather than just in the classroom. In fact, I forged connections with my co-workers that exist to this day as I still keep in contact with the office that I worked in. Without a doubt, in terms of gaining cultural experiences, there is no better way to do it than on the summer parliamentary internship program.

I was also able to apply many of the lessons that I learned in my British Politics class back home in Madison. I had a familiarity with the British system which was appreciated by my superiors (and I even out-scored one of my bosses on a test about British politics). It gave me an opportunity to see how the British political system actually worked, rather than just trying to extrapolate from course books. The parliamentary internship program was a great experience, both culturally and academically.

**The Santa Fe Trail of Political Science: In Search of the Multiracial West**

*The Santa Fe Trail, June 2-16, 2005, Professor Ben Marquez*

This summer session course took thirty-five graduate and undergraduate students by bus from Madison to Texas and the Southwest. The course focused on issues of race and ethnicity in the U.S. West and, in particular, the complexity and diversity of the western past and the historical roots of contemporary struggles for civil rights and social justice. It was organized around the theme of how the mythic West, which has figured so prominently in the national imagination, has obscured a complex past. By invoking the Santa Fe Trail, we called attention to the journeys diverse peoples made across the Great Plains in the nineteenth century, even as the course itself ranged from the earliest era of American Indian occupation to the late twentieth century. This diversity means that the black/white binary, which normally frames discussions of race in the U.S., does not hold west of the Mississippi River. Thus, we considered the lessons the West’s multi-ethnic past holds for contemporary American society.

This course consisted of two days of classroom work in Madison and fifteen days on the bus traveling to the Southwest and back. The initial classroom work included readings and lectures designed to provide all students with the necessary historical background for the sites we will visit and the issues we will discuss en route. The charter bus served as a moving classroom where students listened to faculty lectures, read assigned texts, view documentaries and feature films, and discussed topics that arose over the course of the journey. This exercise in experiential learning was designed to make history matter to the students by giving them the tools to think critically about race and ethnicity, in both historical and contemporary contexts. By bringing students to the sites of history, this project aimed to create a real-life context for learning about the people, places, and events of history.

The 4,600-mile trip took us to many historically significant sites. From Madison we traveled to Collinsville, Illinois, the site of Cahokia, the largest and wealthiest Indian community north of Mexico and the center of Mississippian culture between A.D. 900 and 1100. Crossing the Mississippi River, we visited St. Louis, the eastern terminus of the Santa Fe Trail. Our visit to the Gateway Arch and the Museum of Westward Expansion allowed us to assess some of the more familiar stories of U.S. westward expansion. Continuing south to Oklahoma, we visited Tulsa’s historic Greenwood neighborhood, center of the city’s African American community and site of the 1921 Tulsa Riot. We also took a guided tour of the Cherokee Nation and Rentiesville, a historically black community in Eastern Oklahoma.

In Texas, during our visits to Houston, San Antonio, and El Paso, we investigated the complex historical roots of the state and its formation as a unique cultural borderland. In Houston, we toured Freedmen’s Town, the oldest black neighborhood in Texas, and learn about the efforts of local activists to protect the historic neighborhood from gentrification. We also visited two former plantations outside of Houston. Students received lecture on slavery in Texas and an on site tour from University of Houston Anthropology professor, Kenneth Brown. In San Antonio, we visited the Spanish Missions, including the Alamo.

In New Mexico, we visited historical sites in Isleta, Santa Fe, Taos, and Bandelier National Park. We met with community leaders, local historians, and activists in order to learn about the deep historical roots of modern-day struggles over water rights, concerns regarding economic development, and the preservation of sacred lands. In Granada, Colorado, we considered similar issues, this time with a visit to Amache, the World War II-era internment camp. We met with the students and staff at Granada High School who have worked with the Japanese American community to restore and preserve the site. While in Colorado, we visited Bent’s Old Fort, built by Charles Bent in 1833. For much of its history, the fort was a trading post and the only major permanent white settlement on the Santa Fe Trail between Missouri and the Mexican settlements. Finally, we went to the Kiowa County Public Library where we heard a panel discussion on the development of the Sand Creek Massacre site where the United States Army killed hundreds of Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians. Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho representatives discussed plans to turn the site into a national monument, the superintendent of the Sand Creek National Historic Site, called it a place of dialogue and healing.
I began my career in 1965; at UW in 1969 without any settled expectations about teaching. This may seem odd, but I suspect it is fairly typical. Most professors do not have any specific pedagogical preparation (unlike teachers in primary and secondary schools). They are driven as much by intrinsic interest in politics as by any desire to impart wisdom to students. In any case, if they are going to be good teachers, they know they don’t possess any wisdom to impart when they are barely out of school themselves. In short, my views of teaching evolved as a result of trial and error—mostly trial, since one rarely has much direct information about error (despite student evaluations).

Nor did I have any settled views about what I wanted my teaching to accomplish. What makes a “good teacher?” Each teacher must answer that for himself or herself. On bad days, I used to exit classes saying to myself what medical students are taught: “First, do no harm.” I would say to myself, “Well, at least they are probably no worse off than they were before.” On good days, I would walk out feeling certain vaguely defined exhilaration, which, on later reflection, may have had more to do with my own performance than with what students learned.

Eventually, however, I came to the following realizations. The courses I taught reflected my interests in political behavior; for this reason, political institutions would not give the subject matter clear boundaries. Plus, I approached political behavior very broadly; I slipped around between disciplines. While academics pay lip service to interdisciplinary teaching and research, they rarely actually practice it. Certainly students could be confused by it in the classroom.

I don’t know how successful I was. It is always refreshingly curious to run into ex-students whom I remember, but who don’t remember me. I occasionally hear from a student who says something nice. It’s a wash. In any case, you’d have to spend a lot of time with a person to know whether he or she exhibited a particular “habit of mind.” Evaluations won’t tell you, for they are too close time-wise to the class.

At the same time, I’m convinced that what I wanted to do must be done. Current knowledge about politics is always tentative, and quickly dated. So if we use it as a guide to success in teaching, we are misled. Ask yourself how well the substantive course knowledge from ten or even five years ago helps you understand, say, how we got into Iraq, or the recent conflict over the filibuster in the Senate. See what I mean? It takes you so far, but not far enough.

I may as well end on a thoroughly shameless note. What I’ve really been saying is that I would have liked students to come out thinking about understanding politics like me! Most academics—after a couple of beers—would probably say the same. Now, if this is generally the case across higher education, it leads to the question of whether what I did and my colleagues do has much effect on American political thinking. Based on recent political debate in America and the decline in book-reading, I don’t feel sanguine about the answer to that question. But nothing in politics is permanent as change; what happens in political science classes at their best is exploring political change. It pleases me to think that the students I had are better prepared to understand what precipitates change, as well as what holds it back. In fact, I can think of nothing that makes me happier.

Eventually, however, I came to the following realizations. The courses I taught reflected my interests in political behavior; for this reason, political institutions would not give the subject matter clear boundaries. Plus, I approached political behavior very broadly; I slipped around between disciplines. While academics pay lip service to interdisciplinary teaching and research, they rarely actually practice it. Certainly students could be confused by it in the classroom. Why, for example, should the way Americans think about the layout of their residences tell us anything about their politics? Why, indeed?

Most important, my strengths as a scholar involved a distinctive perspective on my subject matter: skepticism; irony (always risky; many students don’t like it); distrust of conventional wisdom; appreciation for multiple explanations; respect for, but not subservience to, what passes for evidence; and research is mainly a cop-out. What could be more involving to students than being drawn into the instructor’s own research journey?

The bottom line: I best served students by familiarizing them with my own way of thinking about political science. I wouldn’t be a crowd pleaser (though I simultaneously scorned and envied my colleagues who were), and I wouldn’t be to every student’s taste. But some would groove on me; students wouldn’t come away with permanent command of subject matter or firm political commitments but with a distinctive habit of mind. And, since I enforced high standards of grading, they would expect much from themselves and their leaders.

And research is mainly a cop-out. What could be more involving to students than being drawn into the instructor’s own research journey?

The Emeriti Reflections continue on page 16)
strategy.

This simple game is an example of a more general class of games called “beauty contests,” so called because the economist John Maynard Keynes famously compared professional investment to “those newspaper competitions in which the competitors have to pick out the six prettiest faces from a hundred photographs, the prize being awarded to the competitor whose choice most nearly corresponds to the average preferences of the competitors as a whole.” (Newspapers were apparently a bit less politically correct in Keynes’ day.) In professional investment, as in the beauty contests Keynes describes, the optimal action depends on beliefs about what others will do. But what others do depends in turn on their beliefs about what everybody else will do, ad infinitum. Over time, this process of belief formation and adjustment stabilizes to a point where everybody knows what everybody else is going to do, and acts accordingly.

Our version of the game corresponds to an environment in which you want to beat your competitors to the punch (since the winner is the player who chooses some number less than the average), as with investors who want to pull out of a market bubble just before everybody else does. In politics, a close analogue might be entry into primary races from a hundred photographs, the prize being awarded to the competitor whose choice most nearly corresponds to the average preferences of the competitors as a whole.

We were a small department teaching large numbers of undergraduates while sustaining a long-established and highly ranked graduate program. In 1948, our faculty, including me, had seven tenured and two non-tenured members. Another tenured professor came soon afterward, but stayed only a few semesters. In 1950-51, the department offered, as it had for several decades, only about twenty courses a semester (compared with over twice as many twenty years later). In the next half-dozen years, four new assistant professors were recruited. So by mid-1950’s there were about thirteen of us—still not very many to cover a rapidly growing discipline. Almost all courses were at the undergraduate level. The regular exception was a year-long course in political thought that graduate students took to prepare for a preliminary exam. By 1952, we had added two courses in international relations, state government, and local government, and certain foreign governments-Latin American, British continental European, Far Eastern, and, after a hiatus of a few years, the USSR. (Work on India, Africa, and other areas came later.) The courses on foreign governments, under the comparative rubric, were usually taught by area specialists, but there was at least one exception. For several years, I taught the continental European course—which at first included even the USSR along with France, Germany, and Italy—though I had neither linguistic nor cultural familiarity with any European nation apart from Great Britain. In addition, the department even in the early post-war years offered a few courses reflecting new specializations of faculty members: politics of pressure groups, government and natural resources, international organization, civil liberties, and administration of U.S. foreign policy.

In contrast, we had no political philosophy specialists during my first decade in the department. Four or five of us, each with an empirical field of his or her own, taught the political philosophy courses at the undergraduate and graduate level, and also supervised theses and dissertations in that field.

Notably, we lacked courses in quantitative methods. Beginning in the early 1950’s, however, we began to encourage undergraduate students to take an interdepartmental course in survey research taught by a sociologist.

Several of us had entered specialized fields only after graduate school. Although our senior faculty members had established scholarly expertise in their respective fields before coming to Wisconsin, even a few of them drew more heavily on their governmental experience than on their earlier PhD work. And three of us who came as assistant professors (Hart, Huitt, and myself) began, while on the faculty, to specialize in areas different from those of our dissertations. Perhaps because the whole field of political science was less specialized than it soon became, graduate training, itself then limited in scope, was not so closely tied to what a new assistant professor would develop as a principal teaching and research field. American government and politics, as always, enrolled large numbers of freshmen and sophomores as many as 800 at a time. In my first several department years, the format of the course was a single large lecture twice a week with small discussion sections meeting three times a week with a professor or a graduate teaching assistant. That meant that almost all of our faculty took a section, often a large one; teaching assistant sections were kept small.

Other undergraduate courses were also three-credit hours (as they remained until the late 1960’s). Then, to fulfill the expected eight or nine hours a week of classroom teaching, most of us taught three courses although it was possible to meet the requirement by adding discussion sections or a second lecture section to one of only two courses. Whatever the disadvantages of the teaching load, for us as well as for students, it did allow a small faculty to offer the array of courses that I have described. Supervising graduate students took more time than their... (Continued on page 18)
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