

Teaching Preparation in the Baylor University Doctoral Program

The doctoral program at Baylor University accepts students into four areas: Biblical Studies/OT, Biblical Studies/NT, Church History, Theology. All PhD students we enroll already have completed at least one masters degree in Religion (MDiv or MA, though more have done an MDiv). We provide full tuition scholarships plus a stipend as a graduate assistant. This assistantship obligates each student to 15 hours / week of work for a professor in the department for up to five years. Students take course work for three years, though the third year typically involves a smaller number of courses while students ramp up preparation for prelims at the end of their third year. At that point, they formalize a dissertation topic and mentor, though most have already determined their mentor as they advance through their program.

The structure of the BA at Baylor involves 6 hours of religion courses for every freshman at Baylor: a one semester course on the Bible and a one semester survey of Christian History and Theology. This requirement means that we have a significant number of freshmen service courses where we can utilize doctoral students to help teach those courses. Most of these courses have between 50–60 students. For over a decade, we have been developing a formal mechanism for preparing students to step into those classrooms. For several years now every student who will be teaching a course for the first time has to register for a teaching colloquy taught by one of our departments recognized leaders in teaching undergraduates. Prior to the Wabash Center Teaching Initiative, students took this colloquy while they were teaching their course. Students receive instruction and exposure to various topics related to instruction and the classroom environment: pedagogical models, learning styles, legal aspects, philosophies of teaching, and practice in the art of teaching.

Typically students, then, do not teach before they have completed their own course work and have passed prelims, demonstrating a proficiency in their field of research. We then provide them an opportunity to teach the freshmen survey courses as part of their graduate assistant responsibilities. While they are teaching, we also – in conjunction with the teaching colloquy – provide a faculty member to organize peer group sessions. Those teaching their first set of courses meet every 1–3 weeks throughout the year to share experiences, raise questions that come up in the classroom, and have at least one session with the faculty member going over a recorded session of one of their classes.

Summary of Findings for Baylor University

The teaching colloquy at Baylor was 10 years old, so the Wabash Center's GPTI grant allowed us a chance to reflect about the effectiveness of the program and changes through the years. In consultation with the sociology department, we developed a questionnaire for alumni from the last 40 years to assess how our students evaluated the program's efforts in the area of teaching preparedness, both from those who had participated in the teaching colloquy and from those who went through the program prior to the colloquy's establishment. We then returned 10 alumni to campus, representing a cross-section with at least two alumni from each area from the last five years.

From the questionnaire we culled several conversation themes that centered on differences between those who had taken the colloquy and those who had not. These themes included reflections on the teaching colloquy structure, course mechanics, teaching outside one's area of research specialty, and contextual issues. We explored these issues in small groups of faculty and alumni. We then held a plenary session where issues that arose were shared with the group. Both the online questionnaire and the campus conversations provided evidence that the colloquy has had a positive impact on our alumni's sense of preparation for teaching.

First, from the online questionnaire submitted to approximately 300 alumni, we learned that, in several areas, those who had taken our teaching colloquy felt better prepared than those who had not taken the teaching colloquy. These issues included: a higher concern for student learning; perception of ability to demonstrate interest in the course topic; perception of ability to inspire interest in a topic; confidence in their ability to organize a course; confidence in professor's preparation for class; ability to explain course requirements and to construct exams; ability to construct effective assignments; professor's ability to affect student learning by utilizing effective methods; and sense of readiness to join a faculty. Also, the importance of faculty mentors for teaching was considerably higher for those who took the teaching colloquy, even though the role of specific colloquy assignments was negligible for those taking colloquy;

Much of the feedback that came from the 10 alumni who visited campus coincided with the results of the online survey, but the conversations in both the large and small groups provided a significantly different, and more dynamic, lens on the data. These conversations produced significant insights that can be grouped into several categories based upon feedback from alumni and faculty, including: pedagogical issues related to the colloquy's structure, the role of faculty mentors for graduate assistants, the changing role of teaching loads, and the need for preparing future faculty whose profile more accurately reflects a changing population in terms of gender and ethnic diversity, as well as providing them with the ability to assess the nature of the student body at various institutions.

Alumni expressed confidence in their ability to prepare courses when called upon to do so. While most spoke of a steep learning curve in their first year, alumni expressed appreciation

for the basic skills developed in the program and in the colloquy. Nevertheless, some issues arose that require exploration in the ongoing shaping of the colloquy. Several alumni expressed frustration at taking the colloquy while they were teaching since, especially at the beginning of the semester, they were dealing with issues that would have been better done in advance of their teaching experience. We have subsequently adjusted our teaching colloquy based on this feedback by moving it to the spring semester before students teach.

One recurring motif from alumni that had probably been underestimated in setting up these conversations related to the importance of mentoring in the formational process. Because our focus had been on the teaching colloquy in setting up the questionnaire, it was important to hear from some alumni how much they had learned about teaching from the faculty with whom they worked as graduate assistants even before they took the colloquy. Other alumni had little or no guidance from professors on how to think about these issues. In a similar vein, alumni commented on the importance of allowing them time each semester to make a presentation to the class, and not only when the professor was out of town. Areas of conversation included:

1. Faculty surprise at the extent of online teaching expected from recent graduates;
2. The difficulty for alumni of adapting to new teaching environments with respect to student demographics and the effects upon expectations of professors;
3. The advantages of requiring graduate course work outside the Department of Religion structured into our program;
4. And the degree to which the “Teaching” Colloquy has focused upon issues related to job searches, perhaps at the expense of more exploration of diverse pedagogical styles and different types of classes (freshmen service courses vs. upper level courses).

In sum, the Wabash Center’s GPTI allowed us to formalize a review process of our decade long teaching colloquy. Largely, this review confirmed the effectiveness of the colloquy, especially in instilling confidence in our alumni concerning their own ability to construct courses, develop appropriate assignments, and institute suitable instruments for measuring student progress. This review also provided input from alumni regarding how the teaching colloquy could be improved. Some of the suggestions have already been implemented while others remain topics of conversation and assessment. In the process of these conversations four additional issues came under discussion to which we are also in the process of developing responses: 1) highlighting the role of mentoring graduate students as teachers from the beginning of their program; 2) helping graduate students develop skills in exegeting the context of their teaching in terms of institutional expectations, and in the intellectual ability and college preparation of the students themselves; 3) determining the extent to which conversations regarding approaches to employment should be integrated into or disentangled from the teaching colloquy; and 4) the need for students to reflect upon the type of courses they might be expected to offer (i.e., freshman courses versus upper level courses, courses within their area of specialization versus courses outside their area of research, and the appropriateness of lecture formats, seminars, small-group assignments, and online skills).

Boston University School of Theology Doctoral Teaching Preparation

Boston University School of Theology offers two research doctorates aimed at preparing the future professoriate: the Doctor of Theology (ThD) and the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Practical Theology. In 2010, the School of Theology implemented a new Doctoral Teaching and Research Internship Program (DTRIP) for all incoming ThD and PhD students that shifted our degree programs more toward a teacher training, research training, and mentoring model.

The DTRIP asks all doctoral students to accept one research internship, one junior teaching internship, and one senior teaching internship during their degree program. While these internships are not paid positions but rather requirements of the degree program, students are supported by yearly fellowships in amounts much higher than previous levels of funding during the first three years of their doctoral work. Research internships may be fulfilled during the first year of studies, but teaching internships may only be fulfilled in the second and subsequent years of a student's doctoral program.

Faculty Mentoring and Evaluation of Students: Faculty members who are mentoring doctoral interns are responsible for providing an evaluation of the intern during and at the conclusion of each assignment.

Other Doctoral Students: While the new program is only offered to and required of STH doctoral students matriculating in 2010 and thereafter, other doctoral students in the School of Theology and in the Division of Religious and Theological Studies continue to be assigned paid teaching assistant and research assistant positions as those become available, based on student qualifications, faculty requests, available funds, and class needs. DTRIP students, once they have completed their three internships, are eligible for paid assistantships as well.

Teacher Training: To better accomplish the aims of the Doctoral Internship program, all doctoral students are required to participate in a series of colloquia during the first year of their program and periodically thereafter. These colloquia are also made available to returning doctoral students. The colloquia treat the following topics: (1) Research Methods, (2) Pedagogy, (3) Professional Identity, and (4) Prospectus and Dissertation Writing. The Prospectus and Dissertation Writing colloquium are not be taken until that topic is relevant, but the other three are covered in the first year. Students have the option of taking a particular colloquium multiple times if they want (indeed, they are encouraged to do so). The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs office coordinates the colloquia, with oversight by the ASC.

- (1) *Research Methods:* The purpose of this 4-hour colloquium is to introduce doctoral students to primary research methods in the study of scripture, theology, history, and the social sciences with special attention to library research strategies and digital resources appropriate to those primary methods. The colloquium includes an overview of the various information discovery tools provided by libraries, crafting a bibliography and resources for bibliographic management, use of research collections and archives, the social construction of information, and intellectual rights. Some reading in advance of the colloquium is required. *Colloquium co-facilitated by faculty and library staff.*

- (2) *Professional Formation*: Professional formation is more than just diligently working on courses, taking exams, writing a prospectus, finishing and defending the dissertation, though it is clearly all of this. Over the course of the doctoral program, students also should be prepared to become a member of the world of academe, or as it was called long ago, The Republic of Letters. Of course completing the formal educational program is critical and the first part of the process, but it is only one part of the theory and praxis of joining a new professional world in the academy, religious leadership, or other kinds of professional goals and careers. This colloquium offers practical and professional training designed to assist students as they enter the teaching profession and the sometimes arcane world of the academy. Topics covered will include: joining professional learned societies, submitting papers to conferences and professional meetings, presenting articles and reviews to publication and learning about how to conduct a successful job interview, both at an initial stage and the more intense on campus interview at a prospective college, university, or other job site.
- (3) *Pedagogy*: These colloquia include all aspects of teaching including syllabi construction, preparing a lecture, classroom management, evaluation, etc.
- (4) *Prospectus and Dissertation Writing*: This colloquium includes practice in the successful development of each element of the prospectus, advice and information regarding length, breadth and depth of the prospectus, and a discussion of the elements of the submission process. The goals of the colloquium include: familiarizing students with the elements of a successful prospectus; encouraging students at the prospectus writing stage to share resources, information and support throughout the process; and creating a culture of academic rigor and intellectual excitement capable of easing students into the next phase of their program.

**Boston University School of Theology
Findings for April 2012 Summative Conference**

- (1) Boston University School of Theology's doctoral programs have always provided outstanding faculty mentoring and preparation in fields of study that have led to its international reputation as a leader in the shaping of the theological professoriate. However, students would benefit from more systematic teacher training rather than sporadic mentoring dependent upon a few key faculty persons. That training would include at a minimum: syllabus preparation, pedagogy and teaching philosophy, class mechanics, grading/evaluation, professional identity, academic publishing, and negotiating institutional politics and their impact on the classroom. It would also include facilitating the learning of graduate students in the skill of reading cultures and contexts (moving from one kind of graduate institution to teaching in a very different kind of setting).
- (2) The teaching program and culture at Boston University School of Theology is undergoing significant change with the development last year of a Doctoral Teaching and Research Internship Program (DTRIP) that includes an emphasis on intentional faculty mentoring and teacher training. Three internships (a Research Internship, a Junior Teaching Internship, and a Senior Teaching Internship) are augmented by participation in a series of colloquia during the first two years of a doctoral student's program. The colloquia include research methods, professional formation, pedagogy and teacher training, and prospectus/dissertation writing. This shift in the teaching culture at Boston is significant and radically fosters the development of teachers for undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as those whose contexts of teaching include parish and denominational settings. The new directions offer incredible gifts to current and future students in the program, as well as to the faculty itself. The changes will require ongoing faculty development around issues related to mentoring and a continual reflection upon the internship and colloquia, particularly those more focused on teaching.

Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion
GRADUATE PROGRAMS TEACHING INITIATIVE
SUMMATIVE CONFERENCE
April 23–25, 2012

TEACHING PREPARATION IN THE PH.D. PROGRAM

Dallas Theological Seminary
Richard A. Taylor

Students in the Dallas Ph.D. program have access to various opportunities to enrich their preparation as future teachers in the biblical and theological disciplines. The following are some of these opportunities.

- CE215 *Teaching in Christian Higher Education* is a master's-level elective course offered on a regular basis by the Christian Education department. Ph.D. students may take this course as a non-required component of their doctoral program. This course is described in the catalog as “a seminar on the philosophy, organization, process, and procedures of designing an academic course in a Christian college or seminary.”
- CE2005 *Seminar on Christian Higher Education* is a doctoral-level elective course that is offered on a regular basis by the Christian Education department. Ph.D. students may take this course as a non-required component of their doctoral program. This course is described in the catalog as “a seminar on the status of Bible colleges, Christian liberal arts colleges, and seminaries at the beginning of the twenty-first century, with attention to administration and teaching in those schools.”
- Ph.D. students may apply to serve as paid graders for members of the faculty. In this capacity students grade quizzes, examinations, and written assignments required of master's-level students. Graders are provided with grading keys, and assignments are discussed in advance so that graders know exactly what faculty are looking for in these assignments. The grading is reviewed by the faculty member and, when necessary, discussed with the grader.
- Ph.D. students may choose to do an academic internship with a member of the faculty. In this capacity the student may occasionally attend departmental and general faculty meetings, assist with faculty research, and engage in conversation with a faculty member regarding various aspects of the teaching process.
- Ph.D. students occasionally are asked to fill-in for a master's-level class when a professor must be out of town. Such opportunities are normally preceded by a thorough discussion of what needs to be done during the class, and a debriefing takes place afterward with the student.
- Ph.D. students sometimes travel out-of-town with professors to assist with teaching opportunities either in the U.S. or abroad. On these occasions the student provides assistance with grading, tutorial assistance, or classroom teaching.

- Ph.D. students may choose to teach a course in the Dallas Seminary lay institute. The lay institute is a non-credit program of biblical and theological study provided for interested lay persons who do not seek an academic degree.

Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion
GRADUATE PROGRAMS TEACHING INITIATIVE
SUMMATIVE CONFERENCE
April 23–25, 2012

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM THE GPTI

Dallas Theological Seminary
Richard A. Taylor

On March 30–April 1, 2011 the Ph.D. studies program of Dallas Theological Seminary hosted on the Dallas campus a Graduate Programs Teaching Initiative. The goal of this event was to evaluate how well the Dallas Ph.D. program prepares its graduates to step into a teaching ministry upon graduation and to identify ways in which we can strengthen this aspect of our doctoral program. Participants in the conference included two external consultants who led the sessions, five Dallas resident faculty who have had long involvement with the Dallas Ph.D. program, and eight recent graduates from the program who are now several years into their teaching careers. The interactive discussions affirmed certain strengths of the program that we will continue to nurture and refine in future years. There was also a general consensus with regard to certain weaknesses in the program with regard to preparing graduates to assume teaching roles within their academic discipline. The following points summarize general agreement that surfaced with regard to these strengths and weaknesses, as well as action steps for improving the program.

Strengths of the Program

- Course content is of a consistently high quality. Course offerings are available in a wide variety of areas relative to the academic emphases of the program, including a number of ancient languages.
- Professors who teach in the program are well prepared and maintain an appropriate level of scholarship in their academic disciplines.
- Professors for the most part model good teaching skill, although not all make sufficient use of varied teaching techniques.
- Professors maintain rigorous but gracious standards throughout the program.
- The confessional roots of the institution provide a distinctive framework for doing academic research.
- There is a diverse and gifted student body that is enriched by the presence of a large number of international students.
- The availability of other Ph.D. programs in the local area provides student access to certain areas of expertise that may be unavailable on the Dallas campus.

- The emphasis on ancient languages, hermeneutics, theology, and skills of critical thinking prepare students well for independent research.
- The breadth of faculty expertise in a fairly wide variety of interests provides students with exposure to many different approaches to biblical and theological research.

Weaknesses of the Program

- The program should be more intentional in preparing effective teachers than we have been in the past. Our focus has been oriented more toward academic content, with less conscious attention given to preparing students to become good teachers.
- The program should find ways to develop and nurture mentoring relationships between students and faculty. Students can learn much from an apprenticeship relationship that takes place largely outside the classroom.
- The program should become more deliberate in encouraging and fostering student development with regard to good teaching skills and effective pedagogical methods. We have not provided enough instruction in identifying these skills and methods.
- The program should provide more guidance in calling attention to common institutional expectations for new teachers. Some graduates indicate that they were insufficiently aware of the multi-faceted roles they were to enter in academia.
- The program should find ways to help students cope effectively with the length of time and the financial expenses associated with the program.

Improving the Program

- We will provide more opportunities for hands-on student involvement with such things as course structure, syllabi preparation, testing methods, course workloads, etc.
- We will provide students with more opportunities for supervised classroom instruction.
- We will encourage wider student participation in the already-available courses CE215 *Teaching in Christian Higher Education* and CE2005 *Seminar on Christian Higher Education*.
- We will implement periodic teaching workshops, when possible in partnership with the Wabash Center.
- We will implement a more structured program of faculty mentorship of students.
- We will solicit periodic feedback from current students and alumni with regard to ideas for improving the teaching component of the Ph.D. program.

DU/Illiff Joint Ph.D. Program

Graduate Program Teaching Initiative
Wabash Center for Teaching & Learning in Theology & Religion

Document 1: Teaching Preparation in Doctoral Program.

Students take a required “core” curriculum. During the first quarter of the first year our Ph.D. students take a course on theory and method in the study of religion. Building upon that course, in the winter term of the second year they participate in the seminar entitled, “Pedagogy and the Teaching of Religion.” With that preparation, students in the Program are eligible to be appointed as graduate teaching assistants at the University of Denver and/or the Illiff School of Theology. Most if not all of our students have the opportunity to serve as a GTA during their time in the Program. Most students will serve four to six quarters as a GTA, usually with anywhere from two to six different lead instructors, in classes that may range from 15 or 20 students to 50 or 75, and might include or consist entirely of masters-level students or entirely undergraduate students.

In Fall and Winter quarters we hosted two GTA workshops for faculty who are assigned GTAs from the Program. We rely on those faculty to provide mentoring, models, and guidance in teaching for our GTAs beyond the Pedagogy course. The workshops were guided by Dr. Carrie Doehring and a student, Heike Peckruhn.

In those workshops we structured discussion around values, strategies, best experiences and challenges. The outcomes we aimed for in the workshops were: emphasis on the mentoring aspect the importance of taking the time to craft the mentoring; opening lines of communication; and taking the initiative to be that mentor.

VALUES: We asked faculty to reflect on what we value about working with doctoral students and suggest the following:

- Opportunity for collaborative scholarship and teaching
- Opportunity to mentor
- Opportunity to shape our discipline by mentoring future scholars

We suggested that one way to think about values is to reflect on “living out” the care with which we select students for admission, and following up on that. We encouraged faculty to think about the value of their own GTA experiences, and what difference it made to their formation as scholars and teachers. We encouraged faculty to talk about how having a GTA is a mentoring experience and how their values can inform the mentoring experience, and to think of customizing the experience for the GTA that speaks to the characteristics of the course as well as the GTA’s strengths and program.

From the GTA's perspective, it is important to be "backed up" by the lead instructor. The GTA should be invited to share expectations – is it to get comfortable with a particular classroom style? To gain experience in classroom management? To get familiar with the subject matter? To get experience in leading small group discussion? Preparing and giving a lecture? Exit the experience with the confidence of being able to teach that particular class solo? Get a handle on how to grade? (Grading must, obviously, gel with the professor's expectations: what's the ONE THING that the professor wants to see in the paper/exam?)

STRATEGIES: It was stressed that there has to be an initial investment of time, and that meeting soon after the first class, or preferably before the first class, is crucial to establish the mentoring experience. Constant communication is important, and sometimes it is necessary to "give something up" in teaching, e.g., if the GTA is willing to do so, to prepare the GTA to give a particular lecture, or completely handle some assignment. The lead instructor should be prepared to encourage the GTA to ask about things – for example, why a certain exercise or assignment was given, or what part of a lecture a particular anecdote or tangent was intended to illustrate or emphasize. The experience is also an investment for the GTA, so how can the GTA learn the most?

BEST EXPERIENCES: We asked faculty to share their "best experiences", and talk about how those best experiences can be repeated. We suggested that faculty must ask the GTA what questions they have, and also ask if the GTA anticipates any particular stressful week in the quarter. We also suggested that if they have a GTA for winter or spring, they contact that GTA beforehand and get to know the GTA.

CHALLENGES that sometimes might make it hard to live out these values are

- time
- style of teaching
- the fit between our needs and the GTA'S background and needs

Document 2: Summary of Findings from Teaching Initiative Work

Two-Day Workshop:

We invited ten alumnae/i of our Ph.D. program who are teaching in various kinds of setting back to campus for two days in order to learn from them what we do well and what we can do better. The specific question we asked them in preparation for their time with us were: (1) How successful were we in preparing you to teach in colleges, universities, seminaries and theological schools? (2) To what would you alert our students in advance of their first teaching jobs? (3) What are the most daunting challenges you have faced in your teaching thus far? (4) What hurdles do you see looming on the horizon? (5) Were you prepared to make effective use of, incorporate in meaningful ways, new media and technologies in their teaching? How did you gain that expertise? (6) What are the sources of support upon which you have relied most as teachers? (7) What sorts of resources would be most valuable to you in achieving their pedagogical goals? (8) How have your teaching philosophies changed (or not) in light of their experiences?

In general all respondents to our request for feedback found the time on campus with facilitators, faculty, and fellow alums very productive and enjoyable (7 of the 10 participants responded). There was little consensus on what were the most and least useful sessions, with the exception of the 2nd afternoon session when alums met with current students—all found that to be very valuable. All respondents felt that they had learned a lot by exchanging ideas with colleagues over the day.

Implications for Our Graduate Program

The two most important aspects of our program that received positive feedback were the interdisciplinary nature of the program, and the core seminar in pedagogy that students take in their second year. It was clear that all the alums who had taken this seminar felt well prepared to create a syllabus and manage an engaging classroom that took into account various levels and learning styles of students. The alums who had not had this seminar wished they had. The two regular instructors in this seminar, Katherine Turpin (Iliff faculty) and Greg Robbins (DU faculty) felt the need to pay continuing attention to a couple of issues as the seminar moves forward: increased emphasis on use of new technologies in the classroom and increased focus on dealing with students with different types of learning disabilities.

There were also two aspects of the program that the alums said required more work: preparation for some of the pragmatic pieces of career development, and faculty mentoring (this was very uneven, depending on who the students' primary advisor was).

Further Steps

Of the two aspects in need of improvement in our preparation for careers in teaching, the first (pragmatic pieces of career development) is more easily addressed. As of fall 2011 incoming students are required to take a 1-hour (weekly) non-credit course offered by Miguel De La Torre (who has published a book on

faculty career development) on the nuts and bolts of career development: preparing CVs, attending conferences, getting published, networking, etc. Although anecdotal, the feedback on this class has been positive, and we will undoubtedly offer this course again in Fall, 2013.

In addition we have taken steps to regularize some of the student forums that have been sponsored by the Student Council (GSA) somewhat sporadically in past years. This fall a new faculty member at Iliff (and recent grad of our program) Sophia Shafi offered a forum on finding and securing grants. In the weeks before the AAR/SBL we provided mock interviews with faculty for students interviewing at the conferences, and mock panels at which students presenting papers (16 at the AAR/SBL this year) gave their papers and received feedback from faculty and students. In fall 2012 all incoming students were assigned a student mentor (someone farther along in the program) by the Student Council. We also initiated the GTA workshops noted above.

Richard Clemmer-Smith
Director, DU/Iliff Joint PhD Program

Teaching and Learning Preparation in the Graduate Division of Religion of the Laney Graduate
School of Emory University

The Teaching and Learning Preparation Program of the GDR reflects a Laney Graduate School Initiative called TATTO. Existing since 1991, TATTO is a required component of graduate education, which has undergone continual assessment. Currently, it consists of the following components: 1) provides a book on teaching to incoming graduate students; 2) requires each incoming graduate student to participate in a multi-day, Laney School-wide seminar on teaching and learning; 3) requires each graduate student to participate in two teaching assistantships and one teaching associateship (the parameters of this can differ among programs); 4) requires teaching evaluations. In addition to these basic requirements, the GDR embraced TATTO with Chuck Foster of Candler School of Theology playing a key role in the origins of the program design. TATTO in the GDR has added components to the Laney requirements: 1) provides a seminar on teaching and learning religion; 2) offers workshops to supplement TATTO (GDR faculty teach in both phrases); 3) requires graduate students reflect on their teaching with their supervisors and their teaching evaluations are kept on file collects teaching evaluations of graduate students' teaching.

The GDR views TATTO are more than "teacher training". As an integral part of a student's professional development, GDR faculty approach TATTO as mentoring and advising. Formal structures ensure that students move progressively through the TATTO program so that incremental instruction and advising can occur in conjunction with accumulated experience in the classroom. TATTO in the GDR allows students to experience multiple connections between creative, productive research and imaginative, effective teaching. By the time GDR students graduate, many have had teaching practice in two different educational contexts: an undergraduate department of religion (and sometimes in other departments) in a liberal arts college, and a denominational school of theology. As Teaching Assistants, graduate students learn basic tasks and skills of the classroom. As Teaching Associates, graduate students closely collaborate with a Professor in designing and teaching a course. A number of students will have

had a chance to teach their own course solo in either the Department of Religion or Candler by the time they graduate.

Students in the GDR TATTO experience have identified the following aspects of our training as significant: experiences of micro-teaching, workshops on diversity, sustainability, theory; variety within their assistantships and associateships; learning about course design in the seminar and, some basic introduction to beginning a teaching portfolio. They also appreciated the numbers of faculty committed to and speaking about their teaching and learning. The GDR's program is designed to provide a culture of conversation about teaching with and among graduate students. Built around cohorts, the program naturally offers area-related focus along with interdisciplinary reach. Because everyone in the second year class takes the GDR seminar on teaching and learning, students in different fields benefit from a comparative perspective on teaching. The required elements, assistantship, associateship, independently taught course, provide a scaffold of experiences and feedback about teaching and learning in Religious Studies. This design not only contributes to students' developing a sense of their own authority as teachers, but also strengthens a critical mass of Professors capable of mentoring teaching and learning as part of the craft of intellectual life and research.

Summary of Findings after our Graduate Program Teaching Initiative Weekend

During our two day discussions, common themes emerged, including:

- The extent to which the Emory TATTO program highlighted and validated teaching preparation as part of graduate education in theology and religion. The common TATTO requirement conveys the reality of teaching as a “craft” that professors practice
- The importance of the cohort model of the 2nd year TATTO seminar requirement in creating a culture of conversation about teaching among graduate students
- The capacity of the 2nd year TATTO seminar to introduce languages about pedagogy and education, including attention to the realities of diverse modes of student learning (the opportunity to write a teaching philosophy was frequently mentioned as an important benefit of this seminar).
- The capacity of the 3 TATTO teaching requirements (2 assistantships and 1 associateship) to link some of the material in the TATTO seminars with actual experience in teaching.
- The value of a culture of talking about teaching and doing peer problem solving for strengthening a capacity to reflect on and make incremental change in one’s practice. As one participant said, the TATTO experience had begun to form a “way of looking,” that is, an ongoing sense of pedagogical practices.
- The importance of formal and informal mentoring by faculty (although the GDR faculty capacities for such work varied).
- The range of training and support for developing teaching skills across courses of study by field and over time in the evolution of the GDR. The quality of this support is linked to the interdisciplinary nature of overall doctoral training at Emory (although a few participants noted that some aspects of the interdisciplinary training made it harder for them to “explain themselves” in more traditional religious or theological studies contexts).

While TATTO creates significant base points for teaching and learning, graduates noted challenges that remained: students far less equipped than Emory college undergrads (this was not a complaint from those who had taught Candler M.Divs.), being asked to teach a variety of courses for which they had no background training, juggling innumerable demands, etc. Noting these difficulties, participants spoke of the excitement they derived from teaching completely new material and/or teaching in completely new ways (particularly with technology). There was enthusiasm expressed for continuing these conversations in some way beyond this weekend.

There are a variety of elements of the program that could be strengthened:

1. Increased diversity of teaching experiences offered (e.g., college, seminary, and perhaps others), including more opportunities for solo teaching with some form of mentoring support
2. More opportunities for learning/discussing elements of teaching beyond the 2nd year seminar—indeed possibly even beyond graduation
3. Formation of GDR faculty as teaching mentors and more shared pedagogical conversations and training involving current faculty and students (undergraduates and Candler students)
4. Attention to mapping the fields of religious and theological studies and mapping interdisciplinary capacities so that graduates can more easily name their competencies in ways that can be better understood by departments of religion and seminaries.

NEXT STEPS

Emory's TATTO program must prepare for the evolving and fluid environments requiring pedagogical expertise. How will we prepare our students to succeed amid ongoing classroom design changes, innovative uses of media and technology, and applications of pedagogical approaches beyond the campus (business, research centers, government, etc.)? Tomorrow's Ph.D.'s must have flexible skills capable of integrating aspects of different pedagogies relevant to presenting teaching contexts and problems. Our training must develop competencies for jobs within the academy and beyond.

Specific TATTO curricular areas requiring more development:

1. Psychological and developmental dimensions of human learning and teaching
2. Assessment design, implementation, and reporting
3. Interrelationships of pedagogical philosophy and curricular planning
4. Teaching Planning: syllabi, extended inquiry-driven courses, cross-university courses
5. Development of media-based resources including videos of current students' teaching (with permission) demonstrations of "lessons learned", "typical issues", "community-partnered exercises", etc. – in dialogue with mentoring groups (perhaps peer-led building on our previous grant with Wabash)
6. Consider a program of continuing professional support – perhaps developing a blog of shared experiences, tips, negotiated changes, etc. among our graduates

Teaching Preparation at the Graduate Theological Union

A discussion of teaching preparation at The Graduate Theological Union (GTU) begins with our interfaith and interdisciplinary context. Nine Catholic, Protestant, and Unitarian seminaries join with institutes of Jewish, Buddhist, Islamic, and Orthodox studies as well as five research centers, all working collaboratively with the University of California, Berkeley, to provide a unique educational environment.

The discussion continues with our faculty. GTU faculty have published essays, articles, and books on effective teaching and learning including contributions to the Wabash journal, *Teaching Theology and Religion*; we include several among our faculty ranks with degrees in education. Over the years, these faculty and others have mentored their students one-on-one towards effective teaching.

The GTU does not require a teaching colloquy or other kind of class experience of all doctoral students. The GTU is organized around research or disciplinary “areas” and relies on areas to make available and/or require such opportunities. To support these sorts of decisions, the GTU allows students to focus one of their comprehensive examinations on teaching.

Student-Taught Course as a Comprehensive: The following guidelines must be followed if a student wishes to exercise this option. The course must be designed to require, and have evaluated, content and skills on the part of the student comparable to other examinations, with comparable faculty oversight and critical response.

- The student prepares a syllabus in consultation with a member of the comprehensive committee; the student’s presentation and written explanation of the syllabus must demonstrate that the scope and content of the sections of the course for which the student is responsible are appropriate as the academic content and scope of a comprehensive examination. The student’s explanation of the syllabus may include the extent of preparation for lectures and class sessions as well as the material actually presented, but the presentation must be specifically detailed in its demonstration of comparability. The syllabus must be approved by the entire comprehensive committee as satisfactory “as an examination”.
- The student teacher, prior to teaching the course, must also identify and label the academic content and lesson plan for each of the class sessions for which she/he is responsible. The student must be responsible for at least a majority of the class sessions; the academic content necessary for the preparation of each session must be substantial and comparable to a comprehensive examination. The criteria for evaluation of the mastery of the academic content needs to be clarified before the course is taught.
- One member of the committee normally attends each session for which the student teacher is responsible, and writes a critique of that session which is shared with the student and comprehensive exams committee. This is roughly equivalent to the reader of an examination sharing comments with other members of the committee.
- All members of the committee must see the syllabus, lesson plans and faculty observer’s comments before the oral comprehensive examination so that the content of the course may be discussed during that examination.

The specific areas below include information about teaching preparation in their respective area protocols:

Biblical Studies: Reflection on and practice of teaching are recommended for Biblical Studies students anticipating entering the teaching profession. Students are encouraged to take advantage of various opportunities available at the GTU or the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) to develop insights and gain experience in teaching. These include TA positions available in the various seminaries, Newhall Awards (see below), or other opportunities available through the Dean of Students office. Students are also encouraged to enroll in the IDS 6016 Seminar on Course Design and Syllabus Development. Those wishing to co-ordinate their teaching experience with a comprehensive exam may also consult with the area convener about a Special Reading Course involving introductions in both testaments to the field.

Cultural and Historical Studies of Religion (CHSR): CHSR students must develop an academic plan. The draft should include career goals reflecting on teaching, research, writing and/or social action/ministry. Students are also encouraged to imagine the kind of environment/institution in which they would like to work. The area protocol offers students a thought experiment: "If you are interested in teaching, make a list of courses you would want to teach. These courses should fit the sort of institution you designated and should primarily include those general courses for which you would be hired, and not the specialized interest courses you might be able to teach occasionally."

Student-Designed Course as a Comprehensive: Called the "pedagogical comprehensive examination," CHSR developed an alternative to actually teaching a course for a comprehensive exam that other areas are allowed to emulate. This examination consists of developing a full syllabus, with requirements, expectations, evaluation criteria, goals and objectives clearly identified, along with a list of readings. The syllabus is accompanied by a 10-20 page paper explaining the intellectual approach of the course and specifying the decisions made about both content and teaching approach. A student may choose to actually teach the course, but this is not required. Students taking this comprehensive exam must take IDS 6016 in order to get substantial critical feedback on their syllabus.

Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS): IDS students can use one of their comprehensive examinations to prepare for teaching. Like CHSR, this examination requires the student to prepare a full syllabus with clearly defined objectives, requirements, expectations, evaluation criteria, and a reading list for an **introductory course with no prerequisites**. The course can be an introductory course in the student's religious tradition or culture of specialization, an introduction to the study of religion, a course on world religions, or an introductory course whose scope is broader than the student's religious tradition or culture of specialization. The comprehensive exam includes a 15-20 page paper describing the intellectual approach of the course and specifying the decisions made about both content and instruction. The paper bibliography includes literature on pedagogy as well as on the topic of the course. Students are required to take the IDS 6016 Seminar as a context in which to develop this syllabus.

Liturgical Studies: Finally, Liturgical Studies allows students to frame one exam as two essays that demonstrate the integration of the students' areas of expertise. Each paper is approximately 30 pages in length. At least one of these essays must include the student's related discipline(s). One of the papers may be a syllabus for a course as described in the Doctoral Program Handbook (see above, i.e. "Student Designed Course as a Comprehensive") with the added stipulation that the syllabus be accompanied by a 20 page (minimum) paper which includes a critical evaluation of the resources in the course bibliography. These

essays demonstrate a student's ability to work within the interdisciplinarity of Liturgical Studies as well as to integrate methods/insights of related disciplines in pursuit of a specific research topic.

The GTU also does not require all doctoral students to show evidence of teaching experience gained while in the program. However, we have an endowment that supports "Newhall Awards," competitive awards for GTU doctoral students who wish to engage in collaborative teaching or research with a faculty mentor. Awards are given for fall, spring or both semesters, but the application process takes place only in the Fall. Generally, awards are at least \$3000 per semester. The design of the project should require the student to spend only about 5 - 10 hours per week. Newhall applications must come from both the student and the professor for a project involving both of them. The awards are designed to support both students (through grants) and faculty (through offering assistance to their research and teaching).

When students submit a proposal for Newhall Awards, the following items should be included and issues should be addressed.

- For Research Assistants: specific content of research and its end goal
- For Teaching Assistants: specific information on course content, learning outcomes and student's role
- For students teaching courses under faculty mentorship: a draft syllabus with course description, student learning outcomes, reading assignments, assessment methods, and outline of class sessions
- A substantial letter of recommendation from the faculty mentor outlining the student's excellence in study and qualifications for teaching or research
- Suitability of proposed project for advancing the student's professional development
- Record of the faculty member's involvement in doctoral program or consortial-wide cooperative teaching and research
- How the project enhances the goals of the consortium in promoting excellence in research and teaching among faculty and students

The GTU includes a co-curricular approach to teaching preparation to reach all students. In the late 1980s, the Academic Dean's Office began offering formal extracurricular workshops on various career-related themes, some of which focused on effective teaching. In 1995, Dr. Judith Berling offered the first annual doctoral seminar on course design and teaching strategies that remains popular today (aka IDS 6016 Seminar on Course Design and Syllabus Development). The Professional Development Program (PDP) was developed by the Dean of Students in 2003 as an outgrowth of the Dean's efforts, making doctoral student teaching preparation more systematic and strategic.

We have used grants focused on particular themes to augment our PDP efforts. Grants from the Wabash Center and the American Academy of Religion (AAR) funded two PDP workshops. In 2006, Wabash granted funds for the GTU Preparing Future Faculty project (PFF), implemented in 2007-2008, which piloted a more comprehensive teaching preparation program for doctoral student cohorts grounded in experiential learning that integrated pedagogical theory and classroom teaching. Project participants, including two

doctoral fellows, presented our program at the November, 2008 AAR annual meeting and the Summer, 2009 edition of the AAR journal, *Religion and Education* published those presentations.

We also encourage students to take advantage of the UCB Center for Teaching and Learning and all their rich resources and offerings, available to all GTU students.

We envision re-framing our Professional Development Program using Lee Shulman's notion of orienting doctoral students about the "practices of the Ph.D.," and, in our case, the Th.D. We are re-structuring the PDP around: the practices of scholarship, teaching, supervision and mentoring, and public service. (Lee S. Shulman, "Doctoral Education Shouldn't Be a Marathon" *The Chronicle of Higher Education-The Chronicle Review*, section B; April 9, 2010) Diversity will be the one consistent lens through which doctoral students will engage these practices. This approach will help us frame "GTU's brand" of teaching practices.

In the fall, 2012 the PDP will launch a multi-faceted teaching preparation plan. Students will be encouraged to complete the following steps:

- Year 1: attend the "how to teach" conference offered at UCB every August and January, designed for UCB graduate students, but open to GTU students, and including a teaching certificate.
- Year 2: apply for a Newhall award.
- Year 2, spring: attend a half day Newhall workshop including lunch with the GTU Sarlo Teacher of the Year where the professor shares his/her own best practices and offers tips and strategies, a panel discussion with prior Newhall award recipients, and breakout sessions among current Newhall awardees, with prior recipients and the Sarlo professor, to discuss concerns and answer questions about teaching preparation and practice.
- Year 3: complete the Newhall assignment; attend the Newhall workshop in the spring as a returning Newhall recipient
- Year 4, fall: attend a two day Teaching Portfolio workshop and use the Newhall experience to begin construction of their portfolio

We have developed and plan to incorporate a best practices for mentoring section in the doctoral faculty handbook that will include information about teaching support and preparation. We plan to send something similar about student best practices in mentoring to students in our doctoral program, every semester. The GTU Academic Dean will teach a course on MA thesis methodology each year beginning this spring and will invite doctoral students to give quest presentations, then, serve as a buddy to students in the class, serving as another mechanism for developing mentoring.

We believe our doctoral graduates could have an advantage in the job market with a strong background in teaching preparation. We also believe, in a climate of limited teaching opportunities, it is essential to explore how the knowledge, skills, and abilities gained and developed during doctoral study can transfer across different jobs, professions and careers. As such, what we learn from the Graduate Programs Teaching Initiative will help us enhance doctoral student employability which, in this present economy, couldn't be more important.

Graduate Theological Union

Findings for April 2012 Summative Conference

December 1, 2011

The Dean of Students Office collaborated with the Academic Dean to apply for a grant from the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion for 2010-2011. The purpose of the Graduate Programs Teaching Initiative is to help doctoral programs assess their preparation of Ph.D. and Th.D. students for teaching appointments.

Our grant proposal reflected a discrete set of questions: What role do and should the GTU doctoral program areas play in teaching preparation? Who are the “critical actors” in GTU teaching preparation? What are the essential elements of a teaching preparation program? Should there be established benchmarks that future faculty strive for in preparing to teach?

Our proposal was grounded in the belief that our doctoral graduates could have an advantage in the job market because of our emphasis and work on teaching preparation. We also believe, in a climate of limited teaching opportunities, it is essential to explore how the knowledge, skills, and abilities gained and developed during doctoral study can transfer across different jobs, professions and careers. The Wabash Center asked us to focus this Initiative specifically on teacher preparation, but allowed us to explore a variety of teaching contexts including tenure/tenure-track, multiple adjunct assignments, and part time work that supplements a career in another field or venue.

We were awarded the grant in May, 2010 and worked on planning for our event during the fall, 2010 semester. The GTU “Graduate Program Teaching Initiative” planning team included Deena Aranoff, Assistant Professor of Medieval Jewish Studies at the Center for Jewish Studies here at GTU, Arthur Holder, GTU Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs and John Dillenberger Professor of Christian Spirituality, Daniel Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, Associate Professor of Church History, CDSP, Kathleen Kook, GTU Associate Dean of Admissions and adjunct professor, and me. We worked on this project with our Wabash consultant, Frank Yamada, who at the time was Professor of Hebrew Bible and Director of the Center for Asian American Ministries at McCormick Theological Seminary (but, who will be inaugurated as McCormick’s 10th president on February 8, 2012).

On March 10 and 11, 2011 we used the \$15000 grant to bring back ten doctoral alumna/e, who had graduated five years ago and have been teaching a substantial time since, to help us assess our preparation of Ph.D. and Th.D. students for teaching appointments. Participants stayed overnight in Easton Hall and ate their meals in the PSR dining center. After an opening plenary session with Judith Berling, professor of Chinese and Comparative Religions at GTU, on “Preparing Our Future Faculty: the GTU Context; What’s At Stake?” we had four discussion periods each focusing on the following themes: teaching preparation in the GTU classroom, teaching preparation in the graduate’s current school’s classroom, mentoring to prepare students for teaching, and teaching preparation outside the GTU classroom. Two or three different graduates prepared a brief presentation for each session to help frame the discussion. We ended our second day together in working groups where the graduates used what they had learned during the project to “inform/transform GTU teaching preparation” and provide us with recommendations.

The design team and Wabash consultants heard some very helpful reflections including lots for us to celebrate: the importance of faculty as mentors and role models, the value of teaching assistantships and

Newhall fellowships, and enthusiastic appreciation for Judith Berling's renowned seminar in course design. We also heard about things we need to work harder on: encouraging students to take advantage of the option to teach a course as a form of comprehensive exam, developing relationships with Bay Area colleges and universities who need TA's and adjunct instructors, and reminding doctoral program areas that area meetings can provide significant opportunities for professional development.

We were able to draft preliminary benchmarks that future faculty would strive for in preparing to teach, something one might call some "signature traits" of our GTU doctoral alums. We learned that they are **entrepreneurs** who have discovered how to present their professional qualifications, envision innovative programs, and write successful grant proposals. They are **caring teachers** who love their students and attend to each student's individual background and aspirations. And, they are **skilled readers of institutional cultures** who know how to adapt their teaching style to fit with a school's particular mission and context. As we like to say, they are **rigorous thinkers and passionate doers**.

We plan to work with the Faculty Council, and the doctoral program's Professional Development Program to use these signature traits to help frame student success outcomes for all our doctoral students (and, include them as a part of our Equity Scorecard). And, the project reflections will serve as a source for identifying, prioritizing and developing new and improved strategies to achieve the outcomes.

We are already working with GTU alumni/ae at Saint Mary's College in Moraga, CA, several of whom are in academic leadership positions there, on a formal arrangement with the College where GTU students interested in college level teaching could gain experience by assisting SMC faculty.

Findings for April 2012 Summative Conference

Teaching Preparation in the JTS Doctoral Program

At the Graduate School of the Jewish Theological Seminary, we believe that successful training of doctoral candidates includes preparing them to be effective teachers, in academic as well as other settings. To that end, we encourage our doctoral candidates to serve as both Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Course Instructors during the course of their studies. Those who receive funding are required to TA for at least one course. Because our doctoral students teach in a variety of educational settings upon graduation, including college and university departments of Religious Studies and/or Jewish Studies, Seminaries, and public institutions such as museums, we stress the importance of effective teaching to our students and strive to assist them in cultivating the tools they need to be successful pedagogues.

JTS students are eligible for teaching assistant positions after they have completed their comprehensive exams, although some serve as grading assistants while still in coursework. When a student becomes a TA, we encourage the faculty member teaching the course to serve as a mentor to the graduate student. Because the cohort TAing at any given time is so small, we cannot sustain a full-fledged teacher-training course. Students who TA are mentored individually, and we encourage faculty to include their TAs in the processes of preparing syllabi, creating class assignments and evaluating exams. Most students also have the opportunity to teach a class or part of a class, or hold review sessions before exams. Students get feedback from their advisors throughout this process. Doctoral students generally serve as teaching assistants first in an undergraduate course within the student's area of focus, such as Bible, Jewish history, or Jewish literature. Most of our doctoral students serve as teaching assistants for 1-2 courses during their graduate studies.

Doctoral candidates who have served as teaching assistants are then also eligible to teach their own class, again, often an introductory undergraduate course in their area. However, some students nearing the completion of their degree who have demonstrated particular strength in teaching also have the opportunity to teach a specialized course in the Graduate School. This involves developing a course proposal for approval by the Committee on Instruction, crafting the course syllabus, and compiling course materials. All students who teach their own course are observed by the Dean of the Graduate School and/or their faculty advisor, and are provided with feedback soon after the observation takes place. Currently, approximately 10% of our students teach their own course at JTS, though others serve as adjuncts at other institutions of higher education and gain additional teaching experience through those positions.

Summary of Findings from Teaching Initiative Work

The Wabash workshop held at the Graduate School of the Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS) sought to assess how well we prepare our doctoral students for teaching in higher education institutions upon completion of their doctoral studies. The two-day workshop convened a group of recent alumni, faculty advisors and The Graduate School administrators to discuss the strengths of our program and areas for further growth. We held a variety of sessions dedicated to aspects of teacher training and the importance of mentorship in such preparation.

Because of the grant, we were able to successfully reflect on best teaching practices at JTS and to identify those areas in which we could improve our mentoring of doctoral students to help them become stronger teachers. Alumni stressed the excellent education they received while in their doctoral studies – they gained a broad and deep knowledge of Jewish Studies and felt that this offered unparalleled preparation for developing numerous courses spanning the Jewish experience. They also felt that the close mentoring relationships they developed with JTS faculty members were and continue to be pivotal to their success as educators. Many keep in close contact with their advisors after they complete their studies and begin their professional careers; they find this continual guidance invaluable as they navigate the waters of academia.

The alumni also pointed out areas in which we could better prepare our students for teaching careers. They felt that they would have benefitted from more explicit reflection by faculty members on how they develop, teach, and assess their courses, including the construction of syllabi, classroom teaching strategies, and the evaluation of student work. We learned that faculty supervision of TAs and doctoral student teaching is uneven. Some excel at this task while others need guidance to effectively assist their students. We need to educate our faculty on how to best help their students become great teachers. All faculty need to share their “best practices” with their doctoral students in a clear and consistent manner. The Graduate School also needs to develop a more systematic way to support doctoral students while they are serving as teaching assistants or course instructors. For example, we need to find ways to routinely share knowledge about utilizing technology in the classroom, assessing students, and managing the classroom environment.

The Wabash Workshop provided an optimal forum for conversations about how JTS trains its doctoral students for teaching careers, and we concluded the meeting with concrete ideas for moving forward with our teacher training and mentorship of students. These next steps include creating a Graduate Student Handbook which outlines advisor-advisee expectations at each stage of a student’s degree progress. We will also work to provide all doctoral candidates with opportunities to serve as teaching assistants and course instructors during their time at JTS. Finally, we are developing new programs and seminars featuring our most successful faculty and alumni that highlight best teaching and mentorship practices for current graduate students.



Loyola University, Chicago
Department of Theology

Teaching Preparation in the Theology Department

The Teaching Assistants

Our Ph.D. students on Assistantships are required to assist professors fifteen hours a week. This is usually divided so that two professors are given assistance for seven and a half hours per week.

In their first year of study, these doctoral students are only allowed to act as Research Assistants and may not be expected to teach. In their second year of courses these students become 'Teaching Assistants'. Most basically, these assist in grading, and sometimes have office hours, depending on the professor. Professors who request a Teaching Assistant understand however, that the student must be invited to give two and hopefully three lectures. We ask that the professor be a mentor here, meeting with the student, reviewing the class the student has in mind, and meeting with them afterward, to praise their accomplishments, and to invite any questions about the class, and respond to the student's request for suggestions with positive criticism. At the conclusion of each semester, professors report on the student performance. These are kept on file.

****Students who enter on Scholarship or special award**, are not required to work as either a Research or Teaching Assistant. Our professors offer these students an opportunity to teach in their undergraduate core classes so that they can begin building their teaching portfolio. Otherwise they complete their work and have no experience for their CV. They are so grateful!

Teaching Pedagogy I:

In the Spring of their second year of course work, Ph.D. students take a seven session course "Teaching Preparation I" which is offered by the Department. The chairperson is responsible for requesting the faculty member who will conduct these sessions. The professors chosen are those who have a high rating in teaching (information to which the chairperson has access). The professor designs a syllabus for the course, which is open to a variety of topics but usually including: a. outcomes and goals; b. creating a good syllabus; c. creating a fine lecture; creating and preparing for interesting group work; d. the wise use of electronics and media; e. different modes of testing and types of knowledge that go with each; f. dealing with the offended student, or the difficult student, ie: conduct issues; g. safety and law issues and the chain of

command in the Department; h. how to create a teaching portfolio and how to interview. Students are given a signed certificate from the Department on the completion of this first set of teaching sessions.

Teachers of Record:

Teaching Mentors: Once Ph.D. students successfully pass their comprehensive exams, they are scheduled to teach a core class in the next semester. Each student must write to the GPD and request a Teaching Mentor, giving two or three choices. The student is to meet with the mentor to discuss the syllabus and texts. The teaching mentor is to receive all quizzes and tests one week before they have been scheduled to be given to the class. The mentor visits the classroom of the student at least twice, once a few weeks into the course, and once a few weeks before it closes. The student and teacher mentor are expected to meet to discuss the class. At the second meeting, the mentor has seen how the student has progressed. The teaching mentor fills out a review of the student that goes to the Professor in charge of student classes.

Teaching Pedagogy II: All of our first time teachers of record Ph.D. students have four or five sessions during the semester with one of our professors named by the chairperson, someone who is known for great teaching. These sessions allow the first time teachers to share their experiences, questions and mutually helpful suggestions.

Our Graduate School holds four Friday afternoon sessions each semester, for all first time teachers of record, and various issues are discussed concerning good teaching. Although we have teaching mentors and TPII just for the first semester that the students teach, the Graduate School requires the students to come the first two semesters of teaching.

Videotaping teaching. I encourage the new teachers to have one of our Ph.D. students who is very good at videotaping to come to film them lecturing and guiding group work on a few different occasions, so that clips can be used for a diskette to accompany the portfolio. This is an area where I want to encourage the students, who seem to be shy to arrange this.

New Moves? At present I plan to encourage the professors who have first year Ph.D. students as Research Assistants to teach two lectures in a core class and meet with the student before and after. At present I plan to ask the professors who have Teaching Assistants in the Spring of the student's second year to meet with them and allow them to plan a section of the syllabus and teach it. That work should be acknowledged by the student in their teaching portfolio, with the syllabus and the section they prepared.

Portfolio: My attention needs to turn to helping students create a fine portfolio. This is an area where I could use some help.

My Question: How can I encourage extra mentoring by the faculty?

Thank you.

Summary of Findings for April 2012 Summative Conference

Strengths of the Program

- The diverse strategies and teaching methods of their professors gave them ideas of how the students themselves would teach.
- The professors of the graduate students demonstrate compassion and caring for students that they wish to inculcate in themselves
- The classes they received prepared them excellently in content, and in a variety of areas, biblical, theology, and ethics.
- The Department offers a Pedagogy I course of Introduction.
- The Department offers a Pedagogy II course that allows the first time teachers of record to gather to discuss their questions about teaching.
- The “Teaching Assistant” duties include opportunities to teach a few lectures

Suggestions

A. Topics / Techniques for the Pedagogy I Class and for Professor Mentors

- Today’s Undergraduate and how to reach them.
- How do we prepare an excellent syllabus with them in mind
- Varying methods of Instruction to Make Learning Exciting
- Setting up Goals and Outcomes Assessments for a class

B. Pedagogical Issues to Discuss in the Pedagogy I Class and for Professor Mentors

- Is it ok to teach in a way that matches my personality? That is, if I am a quiet person, does that mean I will not be effective?
- How do I convey authority in the classroom?
- How do I keep from becoming defensive in the classroom?
- How should I deal with difficult dialogues, i.e. conflict in the classroom?
- How do I deal with problem behavior on the part of a student in the class?
- What do I do when a student comes with a personal problem and I want to be concerned but I feel it is not my place to involve myself?
- How distant should I be from the students?

C. Being a Responsible Faculty Member in my Institution:

- How do I ‘read’ an institution, its ethos, and its culture? How do I come to know what matters here?
- How do I communicate to my other faculty members the so that expectations are the same of the students’ performance? Is there a way to talk about that in a Department?
- What are the “politics” of Institutional life?
- What are the main legal issues relative to teaching of which I should be aware?
- How do I prepare for feedback from my peers on my performance when I am being adjudicated?

D. Other Observations and Suggestions

- What advice can you give to a Ph.D. on how to be a teacher of record, and still attend to the dissertation?
- What advice would you give about the contents of an impressive teaching portfolio?
- Teaching mentors are very important, and could take a more active role in meeting with the first time teacher of record, to discuss their questions, and offer helpful advice.

Prepared by Dr. Wendy Cotter c.s.j
Graduate Program Director
Theology Department
Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois

Marquette University

Document 1: Teaching Preparation in Marquette University's Doctoral Program

The Marquette Teaching Assistantship, Teaching Fellowship, and Opportunities for Graduate Students to Adjunct in Courses

Marquette does not offer Teaching Assistantships to Master of Arts students, but reserves them for doctoral students. Students awarded Teaching Assistantships can typically retain them for three years if they make satisfactory academic progress towards their degree. They are assigned to work about fifteen hours a week with a faculty member whom they assist with classroom duties or research tasks. Teaching Assistants are not entrusted with their own sections of classes to teach. They typically observe the faculty member teach, hold office additional hours, grade papers and exams, and hold study sessions with students. They may also prepare quizzes and teach on occasion with the supervision of the faculty member. They assist with the preparation of online courses for faculty members developing those, typically writing quiz questions.

Marquette grants two teaching fellowships a year to graduate students who have completed their doctoral course work. These students teach three courses a year and are responsible for their own sections. Graduate students who have completed their doctoral qualifying exams and who do not have a teaching or dissertation fellowship are eligible to teach as an adjunct instructor for one course a semester. Doctoral students who defended their dissertations the year prior to the academic year being scheduled who are actively searching for a fulltime position may be considered for up to two sections for two semesters if they have not received an appointment elsewhere and if the teaching needs in the undergraduate program permit.

Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program

In 2000, Marquette became one of seventeen universities nationwide to receive funding for its Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) Program. PFF is part of a national initiative, sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the AACU, and the Council of Graduate Schools, to encourage development of new approaches to the graduate education of future professors and to prepare graduate students better for their roles in the future professoriate. For more information on the PFF program, please visit: <http://www.marquette.edu/pff/>.

PFF Workshops: These individual workshops cover a variety of topics and issues related to teaching and learning, as well as career and professional development. These workshops fulfill the PFF workshop requirements.

Graduate School Workshops: These workshops are organized by the Graduate School at Marquette. Participants can earn PFF equivalency credit for attending these workshops.

E-Teaching Workshops: PFF participants have the opportunity to attend the Electronic Teaching Workshops organized by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). These workshops focus on e-teaching/learning topics and skills that are useful in a face-to-face, online or hybrid (combined online and face-to-face) course. Participants who attend all six e-teaching workshops and present a final project can earn an E-Teaching Certificate.

Marquette Center for Teaching and Learning

Since 2003, Marquette's Center for Teaching and Learning has provided a wide range of faculty development programs, with particular emphasis on cutting-edge technologies and instructional media. Through this program, students can earn a variety of e-learning certificates for their portfolio. For more information on this program visit: <http://www.marquette.edu/ctl/index.htm>.

Department of Theology

While many doctoral students from the Department of Theology have participated in the Preparing Future Faculty Program, it is aimed at all graduate students at Marquette; it is not specifically tailored to the disciplinary needs of Theology. Consequently, over the past two years, the Department of Theology has begun conversations and initiatives designed to be more intentional about the preparation of our own doctoral students.

We launched two initiatives. First, in Spring 2010 we began shifting our adjunct teaching opportunities from persons external to the University toward A.B.D. doctoral students. We now give priority for these opportunities to doctoral students in their fourth and fifth years of study, as well as to recent post-docs. Secondly, in Spring 2010 we launched a mentoring program based on a successful program developed and utilized by Marquette's Department of Philosophy. We made three key changes in this program:

- (1) We instituted two workshops in the Spring (prior to the students' Fall teaching assignments), one to give them an overview of student demographics and other useful facts, and a second to focus on the use of the common reader for our Introduction to Theology course;
- (2) We required them to submit their syllabi for review by August 1 in advance of a day-long August workshop where the new graduate student teachers would meet to discuss their syllabi and other issues;
- (3) We moved the semester-long seminar from the semester before they taught to the semester where they were actually teaching, so that the conversations were more real-time than hypothetical; and
- (4) We instituted master-teacher observations of doctoral student teachers.
- (5) Starting in Fall 2010, we required the doctoral student teachers teaching THEO 1001 to teach under the mentorship of a master-teacher (Julian Hills, Ph.D.). Dr. Hills expanded the seminar series to include specific sessions on how to teach Introduction to Theology (i.e., the pedagogy of teaching theological content).

Marquette University

Document 2: Summary of Findings from Teaching Initiative Work

What We Learned...

From the discussions with the alumni:

1. Our alumni affirmed the basic structure of our program, which requires a major area and two minor areas. Most of our graduates are employed in smaller colleges and universities and find themselves teaching very broadly. Thus Marquette's doctoral program prepares them very well for the teaching situations in which they find themselves.
2. The TA experience depended a great deal on the particular faculty member with whom a student worked. The department does have a document, which spells out this relationship in some detail, but this document could be improved by being more intentional about and focusing on the teaching skills that should be communicated to the student through the TA experience.
3. Our graduates are very creative. They are teaching courses very different from those they experienced at Marquette. Along the line, they evidently learned how to learn and how to adapt to varying situations.
4. Most of our graduates did not take advantage of the teaching workshops available at Marquette while they were students. They found their introduction to teaching to be rather haphazard. Participation in the Program for Future Faculty is optional. We need to find a way to be more intentional about requiring student participation in a teacher formation program.

From our interaction with our consultants:

1. Marquette has some great resources available. The Center for Teaching and Learning offers frequent presentations throughout the year. The Graduate School has a Program for Preparing Future Faculty. The Department of Theology designates a faculty member who works with those students teaching the introductory course and assigns mentors to all other students teaching other courses. We have a problem tracking student participation in these programs and find that these resources are under-utilized by our graduate students. The problem is how to incentivize better participation, track participation, and make sure that what the students receive is coherent. In other words, we need to "connect the dots" of all these elements into a coherent and comprehensive vision of formation of doctoral students.
2. We need a structured introduction of graduate students to classroom instruction and need to give some thought to how these students can collaborate with faculty members in specific apprenticeship practices.
3. We need more clarity with respect to the purpose, goal and practices of teaching assistantships in relation to courses and faculty members. We need to identify specific goals to be accomplished within this relationship such as: learning how to do syllabus construction, classroom lecturing, grading and

evaluation, course assessment and planning, student-teacher conferences, etc.

4. We need to develop a program of assessment for teacher training.

Next Steps

1. Continue to strengthen the direction given to students teaching THEO.1001 and make that more programmatic so that it is replicated from year to year.
2. Revise the document governing the TA-faculty member relationship to focus on the teaching skills that students are expected to acquire through the TA experience.
3. The Chair, Assistant Chair, DGS, and director of THEO 1001 should meet and develop a program of teacher formation for our students compiled from our available resources and figure out a way to implement and assess it.

**Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University**

Teaching Preparation in the Doctoral Program

Role Models

Several of our graduates who attended our workshop identified the fact they had had good role models and mentors during their graduate education as essential to their preparation. Needless to say, graduate students who have been taught well are more likely to go on to be good teachers themselves.

Teaching Assistantships

For all our participants, the experience of being a Teaching Assistant (TA) to a professor was basic to their preparation. Our TA program is extensive. As the figures below show, in any given year approximately half of the graduate student body (including MA students) work as TAs. This is a major means of channeling funding support to students. At present, FRS does not have a formal program for giving graduate students instruction on how to be a TA. To date TAs have “learned by doing.”

Our policy is to assign one TA for every 60 students enrolled in a course. We have several large introductory level courses with student enrolments of two and three hundred students that are assigned four or five TAs and a range of more advanced courses with fewer TAs.

Teaching Assistants	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Graduate enrolment	71/71	73/80	71/69	80/82	75/79
TA in 1 Course	31	33	40	50	44
TA in 2 Courses	0	4	2	1	2

In the large intro courses, although the professor designs the course and gives the lectures, the TAs are involved in every other aspect of delivering the course. They run discussion groups, grade the written assignments, hold office hours to meet with students, answer student email, and in general act as the course’s interface with students. If the course has a website, most likely it is the TAs who manage the content of the site. Behind the scenes, the professor advises on the problems that arise: how to accommodate students who miss the deadline for an assignment, how to handle plagiarism issues, what to do with students whose first language is not English, and so on. By participating in teaching under the guidance of a senior teacher, they learn on the job the basics of teaching and of managing a course.

Teaching as Course Instructor

PhD students may apply to teach a course during the summer term. This is often their first experience as course instructor. The students submit their summer course syllabi to the Dean of the Faculty who then consults with the students’ supervisors before deciding which courses to offer.

Summer Course Instructors	Sum 2002	Sum 2003	Sum 2004	Sum 2005	Sum 2006
Graduate enrolment	56	65	61	64	79
Graduate Student Instructors	10	6	11	14	12
Graduate Student Co-Instructors			2	4	1
Total	10	6	13	18	13

In the fall and winter terms, FRS usually offers 80 or more 3-credit courses for undergraduate and graduate degree programs. A few PhD students are invited to teach in these courses during the fall and winter terms. Some of these courses are large enrolment courses employing teaching assistants. In these courses, the chief instructor is a PhD graduate student supervising other graduate students as TAs. In addition, in our Asian Religions area, quite frequently the Sanskrit and Tibetan languages courses (three levels) are taught by graduate students.

Once chosen as course instructor, the student is responsible for all aspects of the course from the first lecture to the final submission of grades.

F/W Term Course Instructors	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Graduate enrolment	71/71	73/80	71/69	80/82	75/79
Graduate Student Instructors	14	13	11	18	15

Again, this is a major means of channeling funding support to the graduate students. Our Wabash workshop concluded that some formal program be started to give first-time course instructors some preparatory training; the program should also provide first-time course instructors with some continuing forum for sharing experiences with each other.

Other Aspects of the Academic Career

Several other regular activities at FRS at McGill provide PhD students with opportunities to develop the professional skills which they will need in their teaching careers.

- PhD students are editors of the Faculty journal *ARC*.
- Graduate students are members of the Faculty Council, the Graduate Program and Policies Committee and search committees which hire new faculty. They fully participate in discussions about policy with faculty.
- FRS graduate students make presentations at academic conferences. For the Graduate Program Review which FRS conducted in 2007, an informal survey of graduate students yielded the following rough statistics.

FRS Graduate Students Conferences and Publications				
	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Graduate student enrolment (F/W)	73/80	71/69	80/82	75/79
Presentations at Conferences	16	23	41	29
Articles Published in Journals		3	8	7
Book Reviews	6	7	10	7

Source: Informal survey graduate student listserv 27 Feb. 2007

Roughly speaking, between one-third and one-fourth of the graduate student body makes a conference presentation in any given year.

- FRS hosts many academic conferences, about two a year for the last five years. Graduate students participate in all aspects of their organization and management, from writing the first Call for Papers to setting the menu for meals. In addition, the graduate students annually host their own conference, with the cooperation of the Centre for Research on Religion (CREOR). McGill-CREOR Graduate Students Conferences include

Breaking out of Subjectivity: Contemporary Challenges in the Study of Religion (2008)
Performing Self and Community: New Perspectives on Ritual Practice (2009)
Sites of Transformation: New Perspectives on Religion as Revolution (2010).

Looking forward

The task of preparing PhD students for a career of academic teaching continues to get more complex year by year. In response, FRS is moving towards a more formal series of workshops on TA pedagogy, technology in the classroom, etc.

**Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University**

Summary of Findings from the Wabash Teaching Initiative Workshop

- **Role Models**
Encourage good teaching among the faculty. Graduate students who have received good teaching are more likely to go on to be good teachers themselves.
- **Mentor and Apprentice**
Provide opportunities to graduate students to work as teaching assistant, and later chief instructor, in a variety of courses, working as a team along with the professor, who serves as role model and mentor.
- **Community**
Provide a physical place where graduate students can congregate and call their own. This space is invaluable, allowing for the development of a culture of intellectual cross-pollination as well as friendship among graduate students.
- **Participation in the profession**
Provide opportunities where graduate students can participate in the professional life of scholars, such as editing a professional journal, presenting at academic conferences, organizing and hosting conferences, participating as full members of councils and committees in the department, etc.
- **Good and Bad Practice in Handling TAs Workshop**
Conduct a workshop for professors on good practice in handling TAs. Develop written guidelines on the professor's responsibilities to TAs.
- **Pedagogical workshop for course lecturers**
This workshop gives basic information to instructors and provides a forum where instructors can ask for advice.
- **Workshops for PhD students entering their final year**
Create a series of workshops to provide dissertation writing support and also assistance with the job search. Outline post-doctoral fellowship opportunities and also alternatives to the academic career.
- **Annual Wabash Workshop**
Organize a workshop on teaching and learning resources. Invite Wabash to give it.

Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion
Graduate Program Teaching Initiative Summative Conference, April 2012

McMaster University, Department of Religious Studies
Teaching Preparation in our Doctoral Program

Prepared by: James A. Benn, Chair

March 23, 2012

- There is little explicit formal training in how to teach for our graduate students. The majority of the training is implicit and takes the form of modelling of undergraduate teaching by graduate instructors and lecturers.
- The vast majority of our PhD students serve as TAs (Teaching Assistants) for four years or more. As TAs they are responsible for running tutorial sections of larger lecture courses, marking, holding office hours, and giving occasional guest lectures.
- As TAs in our department, doctoral students receive regular feedback from their students in the form of TA evaluations (this is not common to all TAs at McMaster).
- They are able to prepare for the job market and subsequent evaluation processes because they begin to make teaching dossiers while still in graduate school. W
- The TA experience in our department provides excellent implicit modelling of how to create assignments, tests, course outlines, etc.
- The fact that our department is essentially a graduate training unit in Religious Studies, that has few undergraduate majors, but teaches large numbers of students in other Faculties prepares students well for the reality of most academic institutions in Canada.
- Many of our TAs take a course offered by Centre for Leadership in Learning (CLL), Education 750: Principles and Practices of University Teaching

General Description

“This credit course in university teaching has been offered for many years with excellent results. The focus is on assisting participants in honing essential pedagogical and practical teaching skills. This includes sessions on curriculum design, teaching strategies (ex. Inquiry, and problem-based learning), assessment strategies, developing a teaching dossier, and strategies for research on teaching and learning. The modules will be highly interactive and provide resources, activities and feedback. A number of teaching and

learning experts will participate as guest speakers. The main evaluation requirements are design and presentation of your own course materials and short literature reviews.”

- At the beginning of every year, the University runs a “Graduate Student Day” which includes workshops run by CLL aimed primarily at those new to the TA experience. <http://cfl.mcmaster.ca/programs/graduatestudentday/>
- Our departmental culture is very supportive of graduate student TAs. All graduate students have offices in our building and much information and support for the TA experience is shared among our students. The Graduate Student Association of Religious Studies (GSARS) runs a program of professional development workshops.

Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion
Graduate Program Teaching Initiative Summative Conference April 2012

McMaster University, Department of Religious Studies
Summary of Findings from Teaching Initiative Work

Prepared by: James A. Benn, Chair

March 23, 2012

We designed a closed Workshop around topics that we thought would be helpful for our alumni in their own careers and that would generate discussion around issues of interest to us. Overall, we found the design of the Workshop to be highly effective in achieving our aims, and in creating a pleasant and creative synergy within the group. There is nothing major we would have changed with the benefit of hindsight. We obtained substantial answers to our framing questions that we could not have arrived at by other means; our alumni were a joy to spend time with; and meaningful discussion flowed easily and naturally throughout the weekend.

We learned from the Workshop that we currently do relatively well in preparing graduate students for undergraduate teaching, but that our methodology is mostly implicit and not explicit. Our faculty members serve as excellent models of undergraduate teaching, but that modelling is nowhere discussed within the department. TAs are the testing and proving ground for effective undergraduate teaching, but the department presumes this to be self-evident. Our departmental culture as a whole is supportive of undergraduate teaching, but we do not consciously acknowledge that fact.

Our alumni clearly identified for us three particular areas of their McMaster experience that had particularly prepared them for the realities of teaching religion: first, their academic training in research within their own disciplinary areas; second, their years of TA experience, in running tutorials, marking, and giving guest lectures; third, in the faculty members of the Department they found models of very effective teaching that they could readily adapt to their own needs.

As a consequence of this Workshop, we will strive to make more intelligent use of the University's resources in fostering the training of graduate students as undergraduate teachers and we will apply for additional funding to hold a departmental retreat next year that will allow us to take the insights from this workshop into the larger community of faculty and graduate students.

Princeton Theological Seminary * Teaching Apprenticeship Program

The Teaching Apprenticeship Program (TAP) is an integral part of doctoral education for all PhD students at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is designed to achieve two goals: the formation of effective teachers and the cultivation of their expertise in a specific academic discipline.

PROGRAM STRUCTURE

TAP is structured so that doctoral students develop as teachers through theoretical and methodological instruction, teaching practice, and coaching and mentoring. Both doctoral students' development as teachers, as well as the impact of TAP, will be assessed regularly.

TAP entails four interrelated requirements aimed at developing students' proficiency in teaching:

- Two 1.5 credit year-long TAP colloquia on the practice of teaching and pedagogical method;
- Experience in multiple teaching roles that recognize various levels of teaching experience;
- Coaching and mentoring by faculty supervisor(s); and
- Written assessments by faculty supervisor(s) for inclusion in a teaching portfolio.

A. Theoretical and methodological instruction

Students will participate in two year-long colloquia during the first two years of the doctoral program. The colloquia begin with a one-day intensive introduction to basic teaching concepts, such as the role of the teacher, diversity of learners, classroom management, student learning assessment, and relevant seminary policies. Subsequently, students meet monthly for 90-minute sessions from October to April to discuss readings and special issues related to teaching philosophies and methods. TAP Colloquium Faculty will grade the students Pass/Fail and will provide written assessments that may be included in students' portfolios.

B. Teaching Practice

There are three possible teaching levels that a doctoral student may assume in the teacher preparation component of the doctoral program at PTS: teaching assistant, teaching fellow, and senior teaching fellow. Every doctoral student is required to serve as a teaching assistant for at least two semesters. Some students may serve as teaching fellow or senior teaching fellow based on the needs of the departments and the skill level of the PhD students.

The descriptions of the various doctoral teaching roles are as follows:

1. Teaching Assistant

Learning Tasks:

- Teaching assistants gain experience in course observation, student mentoring, small group facilitation, assessment, and course evaluation. Supervising Faculty may request other tasks as well.
- If the course lends itself, teaching assistants may also lecture or assume leadership of a session at the request of their faculty colleague.

2. Teaching Fellow

Prerequisite: At least one teaching assistant appointment or approval of the department.

Learning Tasks:

- The teaching fellow and the Supervising Faculty colleague act as a teaching team (i.e. the teaching fellow shares a teaching role in the course at the level determined by the faculty colleague).

- A teaching fellow is involved in aspects of course preparation, execution, and assessment, though spending less time on these tasks than the faculty member.
3. Senior Teaching Fellow

Prerequisites: ABD status, teaching assistant experience, completion of TAP Foundations I and II. Departments may determine that an individual student be considered as a senior teaching fellow without having served as a teaching fellow.

Learning Tasks:

- A senior teaching fellow is a PhD student who teaches a course on his or her own.
- Senior teaching fellows are responsible for all aspects of course development, instruction, and assessment.

C. Mentoring and Coaching

TAP introduces an intentional mentoring component into the doctoral program by allowing doctoral students to take on increasing responsibility in the classroom while working closely with faculty to develop and teach courses. The Supervising Faculty colleagues will offer specific feedback to students who assume a teaching role in class and will also meet with doctoral students regularly as part of the teaching process (including a period of reflection about the course as a whole at the end of the semester).

LEADERSHIP

The Teaching Apprenticeship Program includes three primary leadership roles:

A. Teaching Faculty for the Two Required TAP Colloquia

Teaching the TAP colloquia is optional for faculty. Normally the colloquia will be team-taught by two to three faculty members from varying departments. They will be appointed by the Dean of Academic Affairs upon the recommendation of the PhD Studies Committee. TAP Faculty commit to two-year cycles, which will be staggered so that in the first year, they assist with the colloquium, and in the second year, they serve as the lead teacher.

TAP Faculty will rotate into the colloquia first in an “apprentice” role with the experienced faculty member (year one) and then will become the experienced teacher (year two). This process will require two to three faculty members per year depending upon sabbaticals.

B. Supervising Faculty

Seminary faculty serve as mentors and coaches to doctoral students who are serving in teaching roles. Any faculty member who is assigned a teaching assistant, teaching fellow, or senior teaching fellow is considered Supervising Faculty and is responsible for providing assistance and feedback to help these students improve their teaching. We will set aside some time at the annual fall faculty conference to orient faculty to these responsibilities.

C. Dean of Academic Affairs

Upon the recommendation of the PhD Studies Committee, the Dean of Academic Affairs appoints TAP Faculty for the two TAP colloquia: Teaching Foundations I and Teaching Foundations II. The Dean of Academic Affairs assigns the teaching assistant and teaching fellow opportunities based upon requests from faculty and recommendations from departments.

Princeton Theological Seminary * Findings for April 2012 Summative Conference

A. Key Framing Questions for the Teaching Initiative Gathering at Princeton Theological Seminary (PTS):

- 1) The preparation our doctoral students have received for teaching: its strengths and weaknesses as they perceive them after a few years of teaching
- 2) Curricular and structural changes that might improve the pedagogical aspects of our program
- 3) How this consultation might help us to strengthen our assessment process and might also help our students to prepare for teaching in a “culture of assessment”

B. Pros and Cons of PTS program gleaned from the conversations by Wabash consultant, Joretta Marshall:

- 1) Strengths of the Princeton graduate experience:
 - Genuine sense of appreciation for what Princeton is and its commitments to graduate education in the past
 - Preparedness as scholars
 - Learnings from watching passionate scholars and mentors who became models
 - Experience received in teaching while at Princeton
 - Informal and formal mentors who were more attentive to the teaching/learning process and encouraged conversations
- 2) Areas for improvement:
 - A more intentional and structured way of gaining experience in teaching and reflecting on that experience
 - Attention to the embodiment of teaching as it shows up in issues of gender, race, power, authority
 - Learning how to “read a culture” of an institution and of the students in that institution to assist them in a more immediate way when they begin teaching
 - A more thorough investigation of teaching strategies in the classroom
 - More intentional conversation about the “telos” of theological education, or liberal arts education
 - Reflections on the life or vocation of teaching
 - Effective use of technology
 - The complexities of international and global realities
 - Increased faculty development of Princeton Theological Seminary faculty
 - Continual tracking of where graduates from Princeton find positions (including the number of graduates who teach adjunct or who have one-year placements)
 - A financial commitment for the doctoral program on part of the institution

C. PTS Program Review and Teaching Apprenticeship Program proposal:

We are in a time of transition and re-assessment of our doctoral program. A comprehensive review of our PhD program was conducted from 2007 to 2011. As the result of extensive consultation with our faculty, alums and current doctoral students, we evaluated our program and proposed some changes that were approved by the faculty in February 2011. The most important and the most challenging mandate we received was to enhance the preparation of our PhD students for their vocation as teachers. Our first step toward fulfilling this mandate was to draft a proposal for a more structured preparation of our

doctoral students for teaching, the Teaching Apprenticeship Program (TAP). It consists of four inter-related components:

- 1) teaching experience on graduated levels of independence and responsibility
- 2) structured forms of mentoring and assessment by faculty
- 3) training in pedagogical theory
- 4) opportunities to integrate and assess students' experience as teachers using the theoretical tools they have studied

The Wabash Initiative was ideally timed for this process. It was immensely helpful in our Wabash conversations to have the TAP document around which to center the many observations and suggestions of our alums.

D. Appropriating the results of the Wabash Consultation

The conversations with our alums confirmed the results of our own recently completed program review, and they added many concrete suggestions for the improvement of our doctoral program. Valued aspects of our doctoral program include: its role 1) as a preparation for advanced scholarship; and 2) as a broad preparation to teach the content of a primary academic field – these first two are what our alums called their “classical” theological training. Their mixed review of our performance in mentoring them as scholars and especially as teachers, again, corresponds with our own findings.

We have certainly been affirmed in our sense of urgency to enhance the teaching preparation of our doctoral students. The essential structure envisaged by the TAP proposal will address many of the concerns expressed by our alums. The discussion and critique articulated in the Wabash conversations also highlighted specific issues that need to be resolved as we move forward to implement this program.

At the same time, these conversations have pointed to the budgetary issues that worry PTS faculty increasingly. It is difficult to imagine implementation of TAP without substantial input of faculty time as well as additional funding. Yet we are faced with budgetary constraints that have held down the number of our faculty appointments and the number of PhD admissions for several years. These decisions, over which we have no control, hamper our efforts to maintain the traditional strengths of our program. In this situation it is difficult to move forward to bring about changes despite our agreement on what is needed. Nonetheless, we are moving ahead as well as we can.

The input from our alums at the Wabash Gathering has been central to progress toward the realization of TAP. Approved “in principle” by the faculty (February 9, 2011), its implementation has been one of the major tasks on the 2011-12 agenda of the faculty committee on PhD Studies. A subcommittee has undertaken the revision of the TAP document. We expect to bring the subcommittee’s final revision to the PhD Studies Committee for approval in mid March and then to bring it to the full faculty in early April for discussion and approval by the end of the spring term 2012. We will introduce this program as a part of the curriculum for our newly admitted PhD students in the fall of 2012.

We have also been encouraged by our Wabash conversations to move ahead with other projects: 1) more systematic assessment of student progress, 2) gathering fuller and thus more reliable statistics on our PhD applicants, students and alums. These projects are grounded in a comprehensive shift from paper to digital processes for application, for tracking students and their progress, and for keeping in touch with our alumni/-ae.

SUMMATION CONFERENCE: SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION

Prepared by Joanne Waghorne, Professor and Director of Graduate Studies

Document 1: Teaching Preparation in your Doctoral Program.

Preparation for teaching in our department has important aspects, some of which have recently changed.

1. TA assignments provide practical models for teaching, grading, structuring exams
2. Each graduate student teaches their own course under REL 320 in the 3rd year (for entering class in their 4th year.
3. In addition some students teach 100 level course in their fourth year (this has changed for the entering class—all must teach two lower division (100–200 level) courses in their 5th year)
4. We have a robust Future Professors Program designed and implemented each year by Prof. Gail Hamner.

For our current incoming PhD program F 2012, we have made 4 offers of full tuition and **Teaching Assistantship** awards for *five* years with the requirement that the 5th year be devoted to writing the dissertation and developing/teaching two lower division courses. The University Fellowships with no teaching assignments are now offered only at the MA. None of our MA students serve as TAs for courses.

We made this change partly in response to the results of the Wabash forum in September 2011, when our alums told us that the most valuable aspect of our program for their own teaching was service as TA's especially in course that were not part of their research program. Here the TA experience became part of learning and equipped them for those ubiquitous Introduction to Religion or Introduction to World Religion courses. We wanted that training to begin immediately in the PhD program.

Evaluating and discussing how the TA experience has in fact served our graduate student became a major portion of a faculty retreat held on January 18, 2012 in direct response to the Wabash report--I will return to that in Document 2.

The process of assigning TA depends on careful adjudication of requests for specific assignments by the graduate students and requests for specific graduate students from faculty. After the issue of time constraints are considered, the DGS—here I speak from my experience—tries to make assignments that enhance the students total career profile. This means assignments to courses that will become the heart of their particular specialty—Introductions to Judaism, to Hinduism, to philosophy and religion, to religion and film etc. Then I also take care to assigns courses that graduate students request to supplement to their teaching profile—some expertise in Islam or in Buddhism or in gender studies. Finally when possible, assignments often serve to fill in gaps in their own course work.

What do well but *not* always—see below—is the *conscious* use of these assignment as opportunities to teach pedagogy. Most of our alums told us that watching and modeling the professor in the classroom were the key learning experience. Most of our faculty meets weekly with their TA to discuss aspects of grading, exam construction, and content of discussion sections. Again see below.

Each student solos in his or her own upper division course number Rel 320—usually developing from research associated with the dissertation or a closely related theme. This will not move from the 3rd to the 4th year. These 320s usually enroll very well. For example this spring our 320 courses included;

- Finding Religions at the Margins
- The End is Near...Again (on *eschatology*)
- Cornel West & Prophetic Pragmatism
- Buddhist Compassion & Christian Love

Each student has a teaching mentor for the class.

However key changing are now in effect for the incoming class. We offer FIVE year of funding with the teaching distributed as:

- Year 1, 3, and 3: TA
- Year 4: 320 one semester and TA the other
- Year 5: Two 100/200 level courses distributed according to desire of the student and the needs of the department.

We are currently in discussion about the mentoring for these 100/200 level courses.

The Future Professors Program has greatly improved since 2007 when Gail Hamner took charge of the program. Her carefully devised plan over the year includes a series of reading/discussion (miniseries) on a range of important topics that she changes from semester to semester so that our students have an ongoing and wide-ranging series of discussion.

Topics have included:

- A three sessions on consecutive Mondays on the complex issue of plagiarism
- Session on handling disabilities in the classroom
- Session—really brilliant—on the classroom as an embodied experience –using *affect theory* to understand bodily dynamic lead by two advanced students.
- A multi-session series on aspects of publishing including “ Publishing Pedagogies for the Doctorate and Beyond”
- Session on Teaching Large Classes
- Session on the Issue of mental health

She selects topics based on student input—the topics are always deeply embedded in the larger world of academics. For example, in a recent email—some of the current and future topic suggested with her explications:

- Constructing classroom space: What is the relationship between the goals of a syllabus, the physical space of the classroom, and the embodied subjects within it?
- Marketing the Humanities: What are successful marketing strategies for our classes? What are the benefits and criticisms of “marketing” the humanities?
- Service Learning/Community Service and the Humanities: What is service learning? Why is it so popular now? How can it be incorporated successfully into our courses? What are the benefits and criticisms of these practices?
- The Digital Humanities: What are they? Why are they spoken of so much? How can we respond to or use them effectively?

In addition to these miniseries, our FPP program always includes sessions on:

- Syllabus review for those teaching their 320 courses attended by all graduate student about to teach and those with recent experience
- Review of CV for those entering the job market attended by faculty
- Practice sessions for those about to present at regional or national conference again attended by faculty and fellow grad students
- Finally the very successful “cake and wine” events for general sharing of issues.

Document 2: Summary of Findings from Teaching Initiative Work *(adapted from the final report prepared by James Watts, department chair)*

Patricia O'Connell Killen and Tom Pearson filed an insightful Consultant's Report to our two-day forum, September 16–17, 2011, with ten alumni, who had earned their degrees between 2006 and 2010 and were teaching full-time at the college. Our grant proposal had formulated three key questions to pose to the alumni participants in the consultation:

1. In what ways did we prepare you (the alumni) well, poorly, or not at all for the teaching situations you have encountered?
2. To what degree did our graduate curriculum prepare you well or poorly for the teaching assignments that you have received?
3. Have developments in the field of religion and/or the institutional context of religious studies changed how we should prepare current and future students for teaching?

In addition to the Killen–Pearson report, we also employed one of our graduate students to take careful notes of the conference.

Core discoveries

Our alumni were generally quite positive about the preparation for teaching that they received in the SU Religion Department. They confirmed what we have long suspected, that our interdisciplinary graduate curriculum that requires students to work across and outside their primary sub-fields produces adept and versatile undergraduate teachers. They credited that flexibility to their success in finding full-time positions and in fitting into the faculties of liberal arts colleges.

The most surprising outcome was the unanimous emphasis that the alumni placed on Teaching Assistantships as the most important training for teaching. The department's and graduate school's efforts to provide extra-curricular professionalization training (the Future Professoriate Program) also received praise, but our graduates all agreed that the TA experience was most valuable. This outcome will influence the department's TA assignments and the value in places on the TA experience in the professionalization and socialization of its PhD students.

Implications for Syracuse Religion graduate program:

The graduate alumni pedagogy conference emphasized most the need to involve PhD students more in the department's undergraduate programs (majors and minors in Religion and in Religion & Society): as teaching assistants and teachers, but as promoters and developers of our undergraduate majors as well. Our alumni called for more mentoring and feedback about their performance in TA and teaching assignments, and more socialization into the tasks of teaching and doing service in undergraduate colleges. Therefore, one major implication for the graduate program is the need to develop tighter involvement with the undergraduate program, treating them as complementary rather than distinct aspects of the department's efforts.

We found validation from our alumni for the department's integrated and interdisciplinary graduate curriculum and do not see a need to change its basic form. Their emphasis fell rather on needing to involve graduate students more in the undergraduate programs.

At the request of the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, George Langford, the graduate committee of the Religion Department developed a list of action items from the results of the Wabash Graduate Alumni Pedagogy Conference. We responded to the suggestions in writing to the dean, who had read the report with care—commenting on those items which we had already improved and leaving many as the agenda items for serious discussion among the faculty.

1. Make the structure of the Future Professoriate Program (FPP) clearer to both students and faculty.
FPP program has become better organized and publicized by Gail Hamner since 2007. Many of our alums' experience dated prior to this reorganization. However we do intend to more clearly chart the program for our current student
2. Invite students into deeper, more sustained reflection on the composition of their career
We have changed important elements of the comprehensive examinations. As part of the design of their exams, we now ask that the each student include a paragraph describing how the exams relate to each other as a whole and relate to their future self-understanding and self-description as a scholar and teacher.
3. Get graduate students involved in strengthening undergraduate program
In 2009 we created a position "Undergraduate Liaison"—graduate student serving on undergraduate committee and organizing student events and publicity about courses and majors.
4. Faculty conversation about undergraduate teaching and graduate student formation.
5. Pedagogy training through TA assignments:
6. Improve pedagogy training for REL 320
7. More faculty observation of student teaching
8. Training in writing for publication
9. Emphasizing academic writing throughout the graduate program.

In response to the report and to begin a serious conversation among faculty, James Watts prepared and circulated two questionnaires on the practices of our faculty in their use of TA support and the respective experiences of those serving as TA's in our courses. He tabulated those responses. Using the main points for improvement suggested by our Wabash consultants and this new data, we held a daylong faculty retreat on January 18, 2012 just prior to the start of classes. I append the long agenda. The stated purpose of the meeting was "not for us to make decisions but rather to *become conscious of our practices* with regard to (1) mentoring and use of TAs (2) mentoring of those who teach 320 (3) and those who teach 100 level courses. And then becoming conscious of the need for mentoring our students at key points in their careers—the comps and how we use our seminars to enhance writing skills." We had a productive session with each of us understanding the diverse practices that we adopt and learning in turn ways to improve especially in structuring assignments in our graduate seminars as well as our mentoring TAS during our undergraduate teaching.

Rethinking our assignments in our graduate seminar was one of the most significant outcomes of this retreat. We began to question the use and value of the more typical "response" papers to weekly reading and began to experiment with training in the book review genre; others have asked their students to craft final paper as journal articles—we await the end of the term for results. On the pressing issue of our use/misuse/overuse of TAs in the classroom, the survey showed that most of the faculty grades at least half of all assignments themselves. Now we all are aware of the complaints our current graduate students echo from their predecessors: many of us need to clarify and explain our expectations with grading. What constitutes any letter grade still baffles TAs; concerns about consistency in grading—perhaps never soluble—remain but all of these issues are now on the table for discussion. And most important, only some of us involve our graduate students in the design of the course. Unfortunately, the DGS cannot make TA assignments until we have enrollment figures, which means that the TA-to-course match is often made *only three weeks before the start of the class*. And, the graduate students themselves do not know their own course schedules until then for a variety of legitimate reasons. On the involvement in the undergraduate program, our new coordinator of undergraduate studies has included the graduate student liaison more deeply into the discussions of the undergraduate committee but more work and discussion remains.

The most important impact of the Wabash consultation was raising awareness of issues and allowing us to engage in conversations with our alums and with ourselves about our practices. The issues and constant need for improvement are ongoing, but we are now engaged in an ongoing conversation.

Southern Methodist University, Graduate Program in Religious Studies

Document 1: Teaching Preparation in the GPRS

For many years, SMU's Graduate Program in Religious Studies has included a Practice Teaching Requirement in its PhD curriculum. Every student must complete at least one term of practice teaching under supervision, during the third to the fifth year in the program.

There are two ways to meet this requirement. In the first, the student teaches a course of his/her own design, planned with the advice and under the guidance of the student's adviser or other supervising professor. Ordinarily the teaching venue is the Perkins School of Theology, but with the permission of the Director of the Program it may be elsewhere on the SMU campus or at another institution. For any course to be offered at Perkins School of Theology, an official new course proposal must be approved by the Perkins Faculty.

In the second, the student meets the teaching requirement by serving as a Teaching Assistant in a course taught either at Perkins School of Theology or, with the permission of the Director of the Program, elsewhere on the SMU campus or at another institution. In this case, the PhD student must be significantly engaged with the students taking the course in question, both in instruction and in the evaluation of their work. If it is to count as meeting the teaching requirement, the Teaching Assistantship must provide the student with the opportunity to lecture (or make equivalent presentations) at least twice and regularly to lead discussion sections. In addition, the student must prepare a full syllabus for the course as if he/she were teaching it alone.

When the teaching requirement has been completed, the student's adviser (or the supervising professor) submits to the Director of the Program an evaluation of the student's fulfillment of the requirement, along with a copy of the syllabus that the student has prepared.

Nearly all of our PhD students serve as teaching assistants for at least one term during their course of study, either for basic courses at Perkins School of Theology or in for undergraduate courses in the Department of Religious Studies. Many also teach introductory courses as adjunct instructors in the Department of Religious Studies. Such service is not a requirement for the PhD, nor is it tied to the financial aid students receive from the program. Compensation for it is arranged separately by the school in which they serve. The university provides an orientation workshop for all graduate students serving as teaching assistants.

An important part of our preparation to teach in a broader sense has been the Core Seminar in Religious Studies, a set of four courses in major areas of content and methodology in the study of religion that all students are required to take. From the early 1980s through the 2007-2008 academic year, the four Core courses—on the philosophical study of religion, the historical study

of Western traditions, the historical study of Eastern traditions, and social-scientific study of religion—were all taken in the first year of study (two each semester). In 2008-2009, with the latest curricular revision, the Core courses—now in the philosophical study of religion; history, theory, and method in religious studies; contemporary approaches to the study of religion; and approaches to the study of Asian religions—are spread over the first two years of study (one each semester), and first- and second-year students take the courses together. This exposure to the range of disciplines and approaches that constitute religious studies as a field has been useful to our students in shaping their own inquiries within their particular disciplines, and has also helped to prepare them for the typical expectations of collegueship in a department or faculty. In recent years the Core Seminar has included among its assignments the preparation of a syllabus for a basic course in religious studies and some orientation to a variety of pedagogical tasks.

We have also arranged informal and largely ad hoc events on issues in pedagogy over the years, though these have been sporadic. In recent years the GPRS Graduate Student Organization has sponsored some events of its own, and in the last two years we have implemented a more formal and thorough paracurricular program in pedagogy, with the help of a start-up grant from the Wabash Center. This program, “Conversations in Teaching and Learning,” features a two year cycle of sessions (three faculty-led discussions per term, with a parallel set of student-only occasions) for second- and third-year students, leading to (among other things) the development of a statement of one’s own philosophy of teaching and transcript certification that the student has completed this program as part of their preparation for teaching.

Southern Methodist University, Graduate Program in Religious Studies

Document 2: Summary of Findings from Teaching Initiative Work

- (1) Breadth of training, especially in non-Christian religious traditions, has been essential to the success of our graduates as teachers, and is a needed complement to their scholarly specialization.
- (2) Significant teaching experience as a component of graduate study is of basic importance in preparing out students to be effective teachers.
- (3) The value of teaching experience as part of graduate study depends to a significant degree on the extent of direct faculty supervision and mentoring.
- (4) The practical and theoretical aspects of pedagogy are best learned when they are deliberately addressed as a part of graduate study (as in our Conversations on Teaching and Learning program), so as to complement the learning about pedagogy that goes on in supervised teaching.
- (5) It is essential for our program to keep abreast of technological developments in teaching (at present, especially online teaching) and to help our students acquire the skills necessary to master these developments.

**Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Graduate Program Teaching Initiative Grant
Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion**

Teaching Preparation in the SWBTS Doctoral Program

1. Process of Preparing Future Teachers in Theology and Religion

In addition to the discipline-specific courses taken by Ph.D. students to prepare them for teaching and research in their chosen fields of study, each of the four graduate schools at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (SWBTS) offers students either a specific seminar or opportunities to teach in their major and minor fields, or both.

a. School of Theology/Fish School of Evangelism and Missions

The School of Theology and the Fish School of Evangelism and Missions at SWBTS offer a common seminar to their Ph.D. students, a course called "Teaching in Higher Education." The Fish School is planning a new concentration: Teaching in Global Higher Education for missionaries on the field who plan to teach in an international context.

b. Terry School of Church and Family Ministries

The Terry School of Church and Family Ministries, formerly the School of Educational Ministries, prepares future teachers in a variety of ways, including a supervised internship and peer-critiqued seminar papers presented live before the seminar group.

c. School of Church Music

The School of Church Music offers advanced pedagogy and applied areas of piano, voice and conducting. At present, there is no academic pedagogy seminar offered to Ph.D. students, although there are teaching opportunities afforded to doctoral students.

2. Content of Courses/Seminars in Teaching

a. School of Theology/Fish School of Evangelism and Missions

The "Teaching in Higher Education" course taken by Ph.D. students in the School of Theology and the Fish School of Evangelism and Missions focuses on many issues, including governance and academic administration, accreditation, and an

emphasis on different aspects of teaching. Students have to construct a syllabus for a course in the field in which they are doing research. Attention is given to issues such as faculty work, balancing research and teaching, and the use of student/peer evaluations of instruction. In the case of the Fish School of Evangelism and Missions, missionaries come to the main campus for an intensive "Teaching in Higher Education" seminar at the end of their course work and then teach for two weeks at overseas seminaries in a cross-cultural situation, including having their teaching evaluated by international faculty members and students.

b. Terry School of Church and Family Ministries

The Terry School teacher preparation program includes completing a supervised internship, with four options from which to choose: (1) Teaching—this involves teaching a portion of a regular master's level course and requires students to submit course outlines, teaching plans, and evaluation plans. The student is supervised and critiqued by the major professor; (2) Administration—assisting or leading in a project or program under the direction of the major professor; (3) Research—assisting or leading in a research project as negotiated by the student and the major professor; and (4) Clinical—this option is for psychology and counseling students, with the counseling practicum constituting their supervised internship, and will no longer be offered when the licensure program comes to an end. A second form of preparation for teaching occurs in the doctoral seminars where students are required to produce and present research papers that are then critiqued by peers and the instructors involved using rubrics that evaluate the content of the paper and the effectiveness of the presentation.

c. School of Church Music

Although the School of Church Music has no academic pedagogy seminar as such, it had at one point an interdisciplinary seminar team-taught by the chairs of the music theory, history, and ministry departments of the School that included guest lectures by faculty from the School of Church and Family Ministries on learning styles, examination design, and educational methodology. Students did a research paper that they presented to the seminar, and in addition conducted teaching sessions in regular classes that were videotaped and critiqued by the professors involved. The School decided that although the design of this seminar was well thought out, it was too demanding and no longer served the purpose of preparing future teachers as well as providing teaching opportunities in applied courses in piano, voice and conducting.

**Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Graduate Program Teaching Initiative Grant
Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion**

Summary of Findings from Teaching Initiative Work

- **Core Learnings**

A number of insights were gained about the teaching preparedness of SWBTS' alumni from the Teaching Initiative effort, including the following: (1) as expected, the graduate faculty at SWBTS are generally willing to help individual doctoral students prepare for their respective callings to teaching, but students in most of the graduate schools of the Seminary need to take the initiative to seek out that help; (2) again as expected, the formal courses and other opportunities provided to help doctoral students in general at SWBTS prepare for a teaching career cover some issues related to teaching better than others, with the non-content issues being less well covered; (3) less expected was the insight that many doctoral candidates receive relatively little help, with those who commute receiving the least help; (4) somewhat surprising was the insight that international students have difficulty contextualizing the help that is provided as far as teaching in their own culture is concerned; (5) also surprising was the insight that the current requirement of a minor field is less helpful than allowing doctoral students to take as much work in their major field as possible.

- **Implications for Graduate Program**

Based on the core learnings outlined above, it is clear that: (1) the formal courses and informal opportunities provided to research doctoral students at SWBTS to help them prepare for their callings as teachers need to be reviewed; (2) more emphasis and help need to be placed on strengthening the aspects of the preparation doctoral students receive at the Seminary in the non-content related areas of developing teaching tools, improving communication skills, as well as the interpersonal skills needed to relate effectively to students; (3) special attention needs to be paid to doctoral students who commute and do not have jobs on campus that bring them into contact with faculty members; (4) intentional teaching opportunities and feedback need to be provided to research doctoral students to insure that they do not enter teaching careers without acquiring some of the basic skills needed to be effective classroom and/or online teachers; (5) given the significant number of international students at the Seminary, a structured program enabling them to contextualize what they learn about teaching needs to be provided; (6) the issue of requiring doctoral students to take a minor field as well as a major field of study needs to be explored; (7) perhaps most important of all, research doctoral students and doctoral faculty need to have opportunities for systematic interaction outside of the classroom that will encourage as well as permit a mentoring relationship between faculty and students to occur.

- **Next Steps**

SWBTS has a research doctoral council representing all the graduate schools that meets twice a year to review matters pertaining to the various research doctoral programs offered by the Seminary. In the next several years, with the guidance of the provost and under the leadership of the vice provost, this council will be charged with exploring the implications for teaching arising out of the various graduate programs at the Seminary. The school representatives, under the leadership of their school deans and associate deans, will be charged with reviewing what is offered to help prepare doctoral students for a calling to teaching in their respective schools, and bring their schools' perspectives to bear on the discussions that will take place in the research doctoral council over the next 2-3 years. Any recommendations arising out of these discussions will be brought to the provost for his consideration and determination.

Pedagogical Training for Doctoral Students
Department of Theology
University of Notre Dame

Preface

The goal of doctoral education is to produce scholars who have begun the life-long task of becoming balanced scholar-teachers. For this reason, preparation to teach is just as essential as developing skills in academic research and writing. To this end, the Department of Theology has developed a program to prepare doctoral students to teach which has four principal elements. The process is under the immediate supervision of the Assistant Chair for Graduate Studies and the Chair of the Department's Teaching Committee, who are responsible for overseeing development and supervision of doctoral students as teachers. The program proceeds in stages to introduce and involve graduate students more and more intensively in the craft of teaching, beginning with work as a graduate teaching assistant in year two or three of the program, and culminating in teaching two classes as teacher-of-record during year five.

Elements of Notre Dame's Teaching Preparation Program

1. Graduate Teaching Assistantships

During the second and third years of the doctoral program students work as Graduate Assistants for individual faculty. While their duties vary, a critical component is the opportunity to work with a faculty member in teaching an undergraduate course. Faculty are encouraged to introduce students to all aspects of undergraduate instruction, e.g., course planning, syllabus construction, grading, lecturing, leading discussions, advising, as well as course-evaluation and revision. We have found that students who have this experience at this stage of their program are much better equipped to teach a course of their own during their fifth year. In assigning Graduate Assistants, the Director of Graduate Studies, Assistant Chair for Graduate Studies, and Chair of the Department will work together to insure that students will aid a member of the faculty in all aspects of teaching his or her course for at least one semester of their two years' service as a GA.

Teaching Workshops

Throughout their first four years students receive formal training that prepares them for independent teaching at the college level. This training falls into two parts. First, students are encouraged (and could be required, if deemed necessary by faculty review) to participate in workshops offered at the University's Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning. Second, in their fourth year (the dissertation year) they participate in a series of workshops conducted by theology faculty and organized by the Chair of the Department's Teaching Committee. In these workshops, students are introduced to the two required undergraduate courses in theology and the specific concerns that the Department has for solid performance in the teaching of these courses. The student also produces a syllabus for a course proposed to be taught in the following (fifth) year,

which is evaluated by the Teaching Committee and amended as required by that Committee. No graduate student may teach for the department unless he or she has participated in these workshops and has an approved syllabus.

If during the biannual review of doctoral students significant potential weaknesses in teaching are identified, he or she may be asked to observe several sessions of a class taught by one of our strongest teachers during the fourth year, and may also be required to attend additional Kaneb Center workshops.

3. The Teaching Mentor

The student chooses a teaching mentor during his or her fourth year. The mentor may be any member of the regular faculty from the Department of Theology. Often this is the dissertation director; but it need not be. It is important for the student to select someone with strong pedagogical skills who will be able to assist the student in the classroom and speak with him or her openly and frankly about strengths and weaknesses in teaching. The mentor's responsibilities include the following: assisting the student with the development of a syllabus, advising him or her on all aspects of independent teaching, visiting the classroom on at least two occasions and providing feedback to the new instructor on his or her performance during the initial semester of instruction, and assisting the graduate student instructor to interpret the statistics provided by the university's formal instrument to collect student perceptions of teaching: "Course Instructor Feedback Reports." Finally, the mentor will submit a written evaluation of the instructor's teaching at the end of the student's course to the Assistant Chair for Graduate Studies, who will use them for ongoing assessment of graduate student teaching and the department's teaching preparation.

4. Colloquia for doctoral-student teachers

The Assistant Chair for Graduate Studies conducts colloquia for graduate students teaching their own courses – approximately one every two weeks. These colloquia expose doctoral student teachers to a variety of teaching strategies, explore in depth teaching particular topics common to the university-required theology courses that the graduate students teach, and provide a venue for them to discuss common concerns that have arisen in the course of their teaching.

Summary of Findings and Proposed Actions
Notre Dame GPTI
2011-2012

Findings:

We found that our teaching preparation program is well-conceived and works effectively *if* all parties are aware of the rationale and outcomes at each stage and do their part. Students sometimes aren't aware of the rationale behind different stages, or the outcomes we hope form them, then they do not participate as fully or productively. Thus, we need to insure greater transparency to both students and faculty and work in particular to encourage and reward effective mentoring on the part of faculty teaching mentors. In addition, we need to work with the university teaching center (the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning) to make its programming more well-known and to help students understand the benefits they will gain from making room for that programming in schedules that are, admittedly, already very crowded. Modest additions to our departmental programming, particularly in year five, and providing more informal venues for conversation about teaching, will take advantage of the strong interest in teaching in the department which often just needs some modest venue to catalyze and channel it. These more informal venues could profitably be located as students are finishing coursework and beginning to prepare for their candidacy exams.

Our first steps have been to gather more data about the effectiveness of certain elements of the teaching preparation. After a survey of students in years four and five about their experience as graduate assistants, we concluded that the Graduate Teaching Assistantships in years two and three were not exposing students consistently enough to a broad range of teaching experiences. In response we are tweaking the GA assignment process to improve that – giving greater priority to faculty who will involve student involvement in the classroom over requests for research assistance, particularly for students who have not yet had classroom experience. We have initiated some broader faculty conversations with a report given to faculty departmental meeting in January, and will continue these discussions next year as a part of our departmental self-study prior to external review. We have a pilot program in place this year to encourage more conversation about teaching between graduate students and faculty, and between faculty, by inviting teachers to visit each other's classes and discuss their different strategies, both in dyads and then in larger group conversations over dinner. This complements a substantive expansion of the workshops for graduate student teachers and postdoctoral teaching fellows. Finally, we are exploring ways to maintain contact with graduates so that we can continue to draw on their assessment of our programming.