

PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE NAIRTL/CASTL GRADUATE EDUCATION SYMPOSIUM AT UCC IN NOVEMBER 2007

VOLUME I

Edited by Professor Áine Hyland

October 2008



BUILDING A CULTURE OF SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING WITH THE CASTL PROJECT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

Contributors:

Dr. Barbara E. Bender, bbender@rci.rutgers.edu

Dr. Monica Devanas, devanas@ctaar.rutgers.edu

Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey, in the United States has a long tradition of preparing its graduate student Teaching Assistants (TAs) for the college classroom. Under the auspices of the TA Project (TAP) and the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research, we have provided programs and services to help graduate students learn to teach from both general and discipline-specific perspectives (see <http://www.tapproject.rutgers.edu>). With our inclusion in the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) graduate education group in 2006, we dedicated our efforts to broaden the leadership of those involved in planning and implementing activities pertaining to the scholarship of teaching and, specifically, expanded our assessment efforts related to the CASTL initiative.

The CASTL Leadership Team, with more than 100 years of combined experience in higher education, proved to be an insightful group providing guidance and diverse perspectives on strengthening the scholarship of teaching at Rutgers. The team, comprising faculty and administrators, worked diligently throughout the year to insure that the project was on track and that we were meeting the multiple goals of our proposal. Ultimately, the year was an unqualified success in every realm. The Graduate Student and Faculty Fellows Programs have born exceptional results, participation from students in our new programs was the best that we have ever seen, the assessment programs were effective, and we have rejuvenated our commitment to myriad issues pertaining to the professional development of graduate students.

Fellows

The CASTL Presidential Faculty and Graduate Student Fellows Programs were the critical components in making CASTL at Rutgers a success this past year. Representing multiple disciplines, the faculty and students provided a dynamism that energized our efforts. The Faculty Fellows participated in monthly meetings, planning sessions, presented their own programs, and taught Introduction to College Teaching I (all activities were in addition to their normal teaching and institutional responsibilities). These faculty are respected academic leaders who work diligently to spread enthusiasm about the importance of good teaching practices at a research university. The graduate student fellows presented sessions for other graduate students, participated in planning sessions, and helped to develop Introduction to College Teaching II. Without the graduate student fellows, our CASTL Project could not function. Their insights, leadership, and dedication to college teaching provided us with the direction and context for our efforts. Both educational and very enjoyable, our monthly Fellows meetings brought the faculty and students together to discuss such issues as classroom management, dealing with difficult students, and ethical matters pertaining to teaching.

Introduction to College Teaching Courses

With the guidance of the graduate student Fellows we have developed Introduction to College Teaching II, an interdisciplinary course that was offered for the first time in fall 2007

(http://taproject.rutgers.edu/college_teaching2.php3). A true “product” of the CASTL initiative, this semester-long course provides graduate students with the opportunity to develop their own class under the guidance of the CASTL Graduate Student Fellows. Every student in this class will develop a syllabus, reading list, measures for assessing student progress, activities for group work and active learning protocols, and a class management plan. These courses will be taught either at Rutgers or at the institutions where the graduate students become employed.

Introduction to College Teaching I continues to be a thriving class. The evaluations of each individual session were excellent as were the summary evaluations for the entire course. The only concern we receive about this course is that students report that they would like more time to discuss some of the topics. This course is taught by the CASTL Faculty Fellows and members of the Leadership Team.

Programs

More than forty programs were presented in 2006-2007 with an almost astonishing increase in attendance at the sessions. In some cases we had to develop waiting lists for program attendance and/or present some programs on multiple occasions. One of the reasons we have achieved such successful participation is our development of theme-based certificate options enabling graduate students to earn a certificate if they attend 4 sessions in a particular theme group (see list of programs at end of document). The programs were presented, in many cases, by the faculty and graduate student CASTL Fellows who all gave their time to this aspect of the Project. In addition to the various sessions, we also offered the Master Faculty Observation Program, Teaching with Technology seminars and a short course on Public Speaking.

The CASTL Career Panel aspect of the project has been organized with the support of the Career Services Office whose director is a member of the CASTL Leadership Team. Designed to acquaint future faculty with the different types of institutions they should consider when applying for academic jobs, the first session focused on faculty positions in the sciences. Future panels will be organized to concentrate on the humanities and the social sciences. Rutgers Ph.D. graduates employed in various regional institutions serve as invited experts for the sessions.

Monograph

The initial three-year plan was to develop an on-line monograph that would be available, world-wide, to graduate students to help them learn about the different types of higher education institutions in the United States. After 12 months, our research and writing have only captured information on the two-year college. This endeavor has proven to be far more labor-intensive than we had anticipated. At this rate, we will try to focus on the four-year college during 2007-2008 and the research university in 2008-2009. By the end of our CASTL Project, we hope to have the monograph completed and available on-line.

Assessment

We have been evaluating TAP activities for the past twenty years. From the many surveys and questionnaires that we have administered, we have learned that graduate students want to know about very specific (how to) issues related to teaching, including which formats are best. These data have helped us to determine the types of sessions we need to create for graduate students and how to proceed in subsequent semesters. With the CASTL Project our

assessment activities have expanded tremendously thereby contributing to what we know about the outcomes of our efforts and how we can improve in future years.

Survey data gathered after workshops, for example, indicate that 256 participants attended seventeen workshops convened in the spring 2007 semester; 201 were graduate students, 13 were post-doctoral fellows, 13 were staff, and 11 identified as "other." Utilizing a scale of 1-5 (5 being high), the mean response regarding the quality and usefulness of the presentations in spring 2007 was 4.15. Comments from the participants were positive about the helpfulness of the instructors, the clarity of the presentations, the usefulness of teaching tips, and the information learned from discussions and examples.

Especially important, all CASTL Graduate Student Fellows were interviewed regarding their first semester of participation in the program and gave the program very high marks. While members of the Leadership Team were concerned about the time commitment that the fellows devoted to the Project, the fellows reported that they enjoyed participating in the program and that the commitment of their time to the Project was appropriate and not a burden. They found the meetings were most helpful for providing opportunities to talk with faculty and students from other disciplines about teaching and learning the art of teaching. The CASTL Fellows sessions provided the graduate students with the opportunity to view their own work from a different perspective, given the interdisciplinary nature of the group. Expectations, pedagogy, and challenges in the classroom are all viewed so differently between the disciplines, but through "bridging the gap," the fellows learned to consider multiple issues pertaining to the scholarship of teaching both institutionally and in their own classes.

The program held value to them in the opportunities it gave them to think about pedagogical issues across the disciplines and helped them better understand the work of their future academic colleagues in other disciplines. All of the graduate fellows reported that they benefited from providing presentations to other graduate students and that they developed important connections and validations about their own ideas and philosophies of teaching. They reported improved confidence in their teaching abilities and a better awareness of pedagogical best practices in their own teaching. Acting on these positive results, two of the fellows produced materials to share with their peers to be used in the training of new teaching assistants. Other fellows reported that they were adopting some of the teaching strategies and methods that they had discussed and were already seeing positive outcomes.

Based on the positive responses, we will continue the fellows program and continue to provide opportunities for them to consider issues related to the scholarship of teaching and learning. These fellows, clearly, will contribute to Rutgers with their enthusiastic approach to teaching and will be ready to assume faculty positions when they complete their Ph.D.s.

Acknowledgements

The Project would not have made it this far without the support of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the collaboration between the Teaching Assistant Project and the Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research. The commitment of these three offices to advancing the research and assessment component of teaching at Rutgers has been invaluable.

Selected Spring 2007 CASTL Programs

Balancing Family & Career in the Sciences

Certificate in Public Speaking

Dealing with Different Levels of Academic Preparation

Designing a Syllabus

Developing Creative Assignments

Developing a Teaching Portfolio

Developing Your Teaching Style

Engaging Students in Large Classes

Group Work & Grading

Improving Your Teaching Evaluations

Interacting with Students: Emails, Letters of Recommendation, & Office Hours

The Job Talk

Master Faculty Observation Program

Teaching Anxiety and Pedagogical Authority

Teaching a Class for the First Time

Teaching a Summer Course

Teaching with Technology Certificate Program

- Basic RefWorks
- Basic Web Design
- Creating Excel Spreadsheets for Grading
- Creating PowerPoint Presentations
- Detecting Plagiarism and Cheating
- Enhanced Classroom Orientation
- Gradebook and Communication
- Introduction to Sakai
- Podcasting
- Scanning Documents, Creating PDF Files and Copyright Issues

Using Media in the classroom

HOW AUTHORITY FIGURES: PEDAGOGICAL PERFORMANCE AND THE GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTOR

Contributor: Paul Benzon, Rutgers University, New Brunswick

In “Inventing the University,” David Bartholomae suggests that university education and the teaching of writing in particular require students to appropriate the discourse of academic authority before they are fully conversant in it, and thus to participate in a sort of intellectual ventriloquism on the page. Within Bartholomae’s model, students speak through the “‘distinctive register’ of academic authority” (162) but also—perhaps in part knowingly, if not necessarily willingly—conversely allow it to speak through them and thus assimilate them. Successful beginning students distinguish themselves by “their abilities to take on the role of privilege, by their abilities to establish authority” (162). While potentially productive, such criteria for success are also nonetheless undoubtedly problematic in the central positions they occupy for both instructor and student, as are the assumptions and conclusions through which Bartholomae critiques them. Instructors and students both enter the university with personal and social histories that may be engaged—even if only by way of opposition or detachment—with the discourses and roles that structure the academy, but are far from wholly or necessarily dictated by them. Indeed, it seems impractical, if not somewhat detrimental, to presume that either instructor or student will occupy the roles that authority assigns to them with such little difficulty or disturbance, even, and perhaps especially, in the cases of “successful” individuals. On the contrary, as opposed to the largely single and fixed dynamic of student writer, instructor-reader, and paper that structures Bartholomae’s model, instructors and students of writing operate in a relationship that spans multiple contexts and correspondingly hinges on both parties’ performance of multiple roles. These roles stretch beyond the simple dynamic of textually determined authority: just as our students must “write and sound . . . like someone else” (142) in order to invent and/or resist the university on paper, in the classroom, and elsewhere, we as instructors must in turn become a variety of “someone elses,” responding to the public, multiple, and constantly shifting nature of the student audience with a form of pedagogical self-invention and performance that is equally public and mutable.

A politically progressive pedagogy would initially suggest that such a multiple performance should incline predominantly toward the destabilization and diminishing of authority (including, and perhaps particularly, its own) within the university, and the political and cultural critique implicit within such a suggestion is undeniably central to both the content and the methodology of teaching writing and the humanities in general. However, such a goal should be pursued with due moderation and objectivity for both pragmatic and political reasons, lest it ultimately become itself as controlling and problematic as Bartholomae’s own opposite reliance upon such authority as the fundamental attribute of the academic instructor and thus as the dominant validating criterion for beginning students. Patricia Bizzell raises the consequences of this unchecked skepticism toward authority:

because [anti-foundationalist pedagogues] must answer no to the all-important question

[about the existence of foundational knowledge and unimpeachable authority], they feel they have no authority to offer any strong alternatives[.] . . . All they feel they can do is to speak up for their own and everyone else’s autonomy. . . . [T]he defense of autonomy leads to a dangerous sort of political quietism. (265)

Bizzell articulates a central paradox within liberal pedagogy: with the absolute impossibility and invalidity of authority taken as *a priori* conditions for education, education risks becoming not merely ineffective but ultimately disempowering, reinscribing the very fixity it seeks to displace. Her response to these dangers introduces a further layer of performative complexity into the role of the instructor: “if no unimpeachable authority and transcendent truth exist, this does not mean that no respectable authority and no usable truth exist. . . . Indeed, we might imagine the public function of the intellectual as precisely rhetorical: our task is to aid everyone in our academic community, and in our national community, to share a discourse” (261-262). The facilitation of such a sharing of discourse through authority is itself certainly paradoxical. However, given the inherently performative nature of the instructor’s role within the classroom, such a paradox contains the potential to become empowering rather than constrictive. Instead of relying upon authority in order to deny or disavow it, Bizzell’s conception of pedagogy imagines authority as stable yet not permanent. By extending its agency to a broader sphere of the classroom and the community, such a pedagogy becomes both practical and politically progressive.

The beginning graduate student instructor occupies a social role within the classroom and the university that is particularly well suited to such a mutable performance of authority. While the graduate instructor’s position “somewhere along the authoritative line between teacher and student” (Cole and Huth 81) makes his or her relation to pedagogical authority perhaps doubly overdetermined, this relation is at the same time doubly fluid. It allows for both the performance of multiple positions within the teaching dynamic and, perhaps more importantly, the performance of roles which are themselves explicitly and deliberately multiple, intermediary, and/or transitional. These roles in turn aid beginning undergraduate students in understanding and negotiating the newfound discourses, demands, and authorities of higher education more fluidly and ably.

Cole and Huth focus on the most common form of the graduate teaching assistant, namely that of a graduate student “work[ing] under a supervising professor . . . grading essays and, in many cases, leading required, weekly discussion sections” (81) rather than operating as a full-fledged instructor. They see such a position as a productively disruptive force within the dynamics of the classroom and the institution as a whole, noting that while the pedagogical “structure as it exists assumes a binary model of exchange” between professor and student, the introduction of the teaching assistant “complicates this model by placing a third approving and desiring body into the previously binary model” (82).

The independent authority of the beginning graduate student instructor exponentially intensifies this complicating force. While not necessarily any more qualified or experienced than the conventional teaching assistants discussed by Cole and Huth, he or she is nonetheless invested with the primary responsibility for his or her own classroom of students without the governing presence of a supervising professor. Graduate student instructors not only become the new third term in the traditional binary model but also take on the roles of the original two bodies as well: just as the traditional teaching assistant “can play an important role by embodying the space where interpretive negotiations between teacher and student take place” (88), the graduate instructor possesses the potential to perform both this space of negotiation and the positions of the negotiating entities themselves. Within such a performance, the instructor’s transition between the roles of teacher and student is the site for the simultaneous deployment and critique of authority, as he or she becomes able to engage with students as a result of unstable status. More importantly, that transition

is itself the manifestation and critique of authority, as the instructor becomes able to present and perform the multiple and unstable nature of his or her own role as itself indicative of the central methodologies of critical reading, thinking, and writing. Thus through such performative manipulations by the instructor, authority within the lived experience of the teaching dynamic becomes, both in its presence and its absence, a powerful practical avenue for activating critique of authority both in the classroom and in the larger social sphere.

Masking and Unmasking Authority in the Classroom

This manipulation exemplifies what Elizabeth Ellsworth terms “paradoxical modes of address” (139) within the performance of pedagogical authority. Ellsworth claims that the paradoxes of teaching—points of pedagogical confusion such as the somewhat arbitrary nature of the teacher’s authority or the irresolute, ongoing generation of difference that arises from teaching within a given sociocultural context—are productive rather than paralytic in their undecideability. She argues that “[r]ewriting the teacher-student relation” in light of such paradoxes “means working in and through the oscillating space of difference between teacher and student as positions within a structure of relations” (140). Moreover, the constant motion of each individual party’s position over time is implicitly bound up within this overall dynamic of differential motion. Just as a given group of students shifts and evolves both as individuals and as a group over the course of a semester, their instructor must not only evolve along with them (and/or perform this process of co-evolution) but also constantly shift him- or herself in response to and anticipation of their evolution, using this transitional pedagogical authority to negotiate and facilitate their increasing purchase on intellectual and critical authority. For graduate student instructors in particular, this motion entails harnessing their already multiple roles within the classroom and the university as a whole, and thus rewriting teacher-student relations internally as well as in conversation with undergraduate students. I am a graduate student in the Department of English at Rutgers University, New Brunswick. Like any beginning graduate student instructor, I myself faced the problems and potentials of this multiple approach in my first semester as an instructor of Expository Writing at Rutgers. Through a discussion of several moments within my classroom over the course of that first semester, I want to argue for the practical and political efficacy of a pedagogical mode of address that appropriates authority precisely in order to perform shifting relations with it. This strategy, I will suggest, exploits both the paradoxical nature of the teacher’s role in general and the transitional status of the graduate student instructor in particular in order to facilitate an analogous intellectual multiplicity and mobility within the students he or she teaches.

I began my first semester as an expository writing instructor by conducting myself in the classroom with what might be described as a sort of pedagogical poker face. I was friendly without seeming like a friend, relatively informal but hardly casual. I identified myself at the outset as Paul Benzon, and shortly thereafter as Mr. Benzon, but never simply as Paul. This deliberately ambiguous persona was an attempt to establish an initial form of authority that might be compatible with and conducive to the multiple, public nature of the expository writing classroom. Such a persona situates the distance and difference between instructor and student as central to the work of critical thinking: while the complexity of the material at hand in a class of this type invites and perhaps even necessitates collective unpacking by the students, a correspondingly peer-oriented persona on the part of the instructor may not necessarily be the ideal or even the most practicable means by which to facilitate this unpacking. In order to begin bridging this incongruity, I introduced our first class discussion

by asserting that I wanted our classroom to be a community of thinkers in which we were all equally responsible for coming to terms—both as individuals and as a group—with the texts and issues we would be discussing. However, in establishing the tone and structure of the class in this way, I implicitly performed an authority position that undermined the collegiality I spoke of as much as it encouraged it. In order to help my students begin to assume their own authority as thinkers and interpreters, I myself became, at least on one level, a “someone else” that both was and was not on an equal plane with them.

Conversely, I can only assume that my students had at least a hypothetical or provisional understanding of the pedagogical persona I had begun to invent for myself. Aware of my relative youth and versed in the social discourses surrounding the university’s required expository writing class (a course in which many instructors are graduate instructors early in their teaching careers if not teaching for the first time altogether), they must have at least given thought to the relative inexperience and lack of authority that I was attempting to simultaneously perform and conceal through such a gesture of collegiality. My status at such a moment and my students’ acceptance of this status (whether at face value or with an appreciation of its performative nature) together embodied the dynamic of manipulation that Ellsworth describes as a central paradox of pedagogical relations. She notes that

[a]s a paradoxical mode of address to students, “manipulating students into taking on responsibility” is not yet another version of, The teacher empowers students by exercising her own power and authority. It’s not, The teacher empowers students by giving up her authority. And it’s certainly not, The teacher empowers the student by practicing reciprocal, dialogical relations that equalize power among teachers and students.

“Manipulating students into taking on responsibility” exceeds these formulations; it can’t be contained by any of these resolutions. Yet it can be enacted. It can be performed in the classroom. (150-151)

The almost flippant tone with which Ellsworth discounts what she views as more traditional “formulations” of teacher-student interaction here attests to their solidity as discursive scripts for the classroom dynamic, and consequently speaks volumes about the subversive potential that the reappropriative performance of such formulations holds for the extension and facilitation of student “power and authority.” Indeed, my own opening description of the classroom as a community of thinkers played upon a number of these possible relationships at the same time that it implicitly disavowed them, setting my own responsibility and authority as the teacher into play in an attempt to open a space for the emergence of parallel student responsibility and authority as transitional forces circulating between the more traditional dynamics of complete control, renunciation, and reciprocation of authority by the teacher that Ellsworth lists respectively above.

As this initial moment of classroom interaction suggests, the performative manipulation of authority serves as an effective strategy for manipulating students toward their own authority with regard to a variety of contexts and issues present within university-level academic discourse. The most basic and fundamental of these contexts is that of the instructor-student relations that structure the daily protocols and dynamics of a given class. The significance of these relations for both instructor and student extends well beyond simple discipline or conduct: just as courses in introductory expository writing provide students with an introduction to the practices and discourses of critical thinking, reading, and writing that are central to higher education in the humanities, they also aid in

acclimating students to the practical and tangible responsibilities that are inseparably bound up with these intellectual responsibilities. In doing so, they provide the opportunity for the development of student agency within both spheres simultaneously. In an attempt to stimulate a fusion of these two categories within my classroom, approximately halfway through the semester I instituted an in-class office hour during a time when students were reviewing each other's drafts. During this time, students had the opportunity to discuss their papers and their work in the course in general with me individually. At first I made these discussions optional, walking around as students worked on peer review and asking each of them if they wanted to come talk or ask questions at my desk. While this produced some successful response and initiative, most of the students interested in talking were unsurprisingly the strongest and weakest in the class, with few mid-level students (and consequently a relatively small portion of the class as a whole) opting to discuss their work with me.

During the subsequent peer review session, I made these conferences a requirement, calling each student up to my desk for a few minutes and asking questions—"Did you have any questions about my comments on your last paper?;" "I know a lot of people felt at sea on this assignment. How do you feel about your draft?;" "Do you feel like you have a better handle on the reading after writing this?"—that in effect allowed them, and indeed perhaps required them, to ask questions in response. Within this dynamic, most students articulated a much greater engagement and interest in their own work (as well as in the material and course as a whole) than I had initially expected, expressing analytical and self-analytical thinking about its content and complexity as well as concern about the grade it might earn. Ellsworth notes that "[f]or pedagogy to be performative, that is, for the teacher to paradoxically manipulate the students into a position of taking responsibility for the meanings and knowledge they construct, it must be situated within its specifics of time and place. . . . Performative pedagogy's only life, therefore, is in relation to its context and moment" (160). Through these in-class meetings with my students, I attempted to create a context for (self-) evaluative discussion and learning that occupied a dynamic and transitional time and place and was thus itself intrinsically dynamic and transitional in its performative impact upon my relation with each student. Seated at my desk at the front of the room, each student was within both the moment of office hours and the moment of class time, as well as within both the public space of classroom work and the private space of outside conference with me. This deliberately transitional context allows for the adoption of correspondingly transitional relations to authority on the part of the student, with each student becoming able to reflect upon his or her own work in a manner that is both fundamentally structured and required by the instructor and also (at least seemingly) self-generated by him or her. Thus the transitional nature of such a relation simultaneously requires the student to take responsibility for his or her work and invites him or her to assume authority over it.

The more fully public nature of the typical classroom dynamic offers a parallel opportunity for the manipulation and cultivation of students' authority and independence with regard to the content of the course material and their approach(es) to it. The combination of the "respectable authority" of the instructor, in Bizzell's terms, with the emergent authority of the student makes possible on a number of levels the sharing of discourse that she sees as central to the instructor's task as a public intellectual. Indeed, the capacity for manipulating a fusionary conversation between these two authorities—one stable, one at least partly potential—provides a fertile context for the emergence of what Bizzell refers to as "the authority created by collective discursive exchange" (261). Such a conversation emerged

within my classroom during a discussion of several passages in Alexander Stille's essay "The Ganges' Next Life." Stille's essay explores the tensions surrounding the effort to preserve the sustainability of the Ganges River in India through western technology. Reflecting on the complexities of this situation, Stille discusses the tiny, undeveloped island village of Dhab, whose villagers, in his words, "can see the lights of a distant railroad yard. They stand and watch this bright symbol of the world they yearn to be a part of—a world of lights, power tools, modern appliances, and, of course, television." Following this moment, he quotes the great "moral responsibility" (607) that Veer Bhadra Mishra, the protagonist of his narrative, expresses in the face of such a scene. Elsewhere in the essay, Stille articulates a similar tension in his assessment that the overall Indian nation's "extremely open attitude toward the outside . . . has—so far, at least—in no way lessened the country's religiosity" (610). Discussing these passages side-by-side with my students, I hoped to point them towards considering the tensions present in the language of the essay, and thus towards entertaining the possibility that moments within the essays such as Stille's "so far, at least" suggested the potential for a damaging, compromised future as well as a positive one.

Initially, they responded with relatively linear and superficial readings of these moments. Numerous students suggested that matters in India would—as Stille seemingly proposed to them here—continue to improve in a fashion that would leave the country's religious and cultural foundations still untainted and unharmed by western influence. Others argued that Mishra's moral responsibility was nothing more than the seemingly simple tasking of importing this influence to the villages that so deeply desired it. My subsequent questions about what other possible outcomes might arise from such influence initially met with virtual silence. Finally, after several different formulations of the question, one student responded with the phrase "mo' money, mo' problems." These words are from the title of a song by the rapper Notorious B.I.G. that articulates a complex relationship to the rapid acquisition of capital that closely resembles the dynamic Stille explores in "The Ganges' Next Life." However, while this student conveyed a nuanced understanding of Stille's complexities through such a comment, his words more importantly relocated and refigured these complexities within a discourse widely familiar to his peers (as made clear by their subsequent grasp upon and engagement with the concept). I, in turn, acknowledged "mo' money, mo' problems" as a legitimate reading of the situation and consequently reappropriated and refigured its discourse to suggest our class' consideration of other possible future narratives—"mo' money, fewer problems;" "mo' money, no problems;" "no money, mo' problems;" and so forth—that Stille's essay itself might or might not make room for within the situation it discussed. Within such a classroom situation as this, the space for expanding student authority becomes possible not from the instructor's manipulation of the students as such but rather from the manipulation of their pre-existing authority and the discourses upon which it relies. The "authority created by collective discursive exchange" that Bizzell argues for arises from both the introduction of student discourse and the instructor's complementary (as well as complimentary) direction of this discourse in concert with that of the text. Through a dialogue that situates student discourse as connected to that of the text rather than as separate from or in opposition to it, the instructor simultaneously exercises and suppresses his or her authority in order to catalyze student authority.

The performance of pedagogical authority can also serve to shape and enact student authority within the practice and process of writing itself. In this context, the transitional status of the graduate student instructor again becomes a particularly pertinent and effective tool for catalyzing student work. In most cases visibly younger than a full-fledged professor,

and virtually by definition less experienced and established as a writer and scholar, the graduate student instructor possesses the capacity to perform the role of a fellow student writer among his or her students, and thus to exploit his or her own process and evolution as a writer in order to model them for these students. When discussing writing techniques and strategies with my students during my first semester as an instructor—within both groups and one-on-one situations—I often found myself articulating direction and advice within the trappings of my own experience as a writer. “Even I write things in my first draft that don’t entirely work within the paper,” I would say, or, “I realize all the time that my project doesn’t really address what I’m saying in a paper, or vice versa,” always following these sorts of statements with a disguised and displaced exhortation along the lines of, “but then I always go back and rework it.” Shifting between the roles of a still-unpolished fellow writer and a self-aware mentor through comments such as these allows the graduate student instructor to represent his or her own process as a paradigm of both strength and weakness, and thus to model the process of writing itself as one of perpetual change and transition. Within such a dynamic, the sharing of common weaknesses and vulnerabilities on the part of the instructor becomes a conduit for the subsequent sharing of his or her strengths and experience as a writer with students.

“Out” with Authority!?: Towards a Politics of Pedagogical (Anti-) Authority

The performative manipulations discussed here admittedly raise as many political uncertainties about the repressive nature of pedagogical authority as they provide potential resolutions through empowering destabilization and modeling. Indeed, the specter of the instructor’s authority, in whatever form it might manifest itself, is never fully eradicable from the teaching dynamic, nor, perhaps, should it be, even in the most autonomous and democratic of classrooms. Bizzell acknowledges this reality in her critique of the paralytic paradox of antifoundationalist pedagogy, and argues that instructors “must be . . . forthright in avowing the ideologies that motivate our teaching and research” if we are to come to terms with the reality of our position within a politically informed classroom. She suggests that politically motivated members of the academy “might openly exert their authority as teachers to try to persuade students to agree with their values instead of pretending that they are merely investigating the nature of sexism and capitalism and leaving students to draw their own conclusions” (272-273). While Bizzell’s candor with regard to the political motivations of academics and the ways in which academics sometimes fail to acknowledge these motivations is refreshing, the refiguration of the pedagogical position she suggests here poses the possibility of a repressive impact upon students that would be perhaps far deeper and more profound than that of the affectation of detachment she critiques, and almost certainly more direct and explicit. She herself acknowledges the potential for an instructor in such a role to become “a propagandist” and notes that the authority of such a hypothetical professorate is ultimately “derived from ideologies that already have some currency in the community the orators or teachers serve” (273). Yet her response to the threat that such a position poses relies upon an equally tenuous system of logic and politics rather than suggesting a methodology that might address these dangers more directly:

[n]ot everyone in America is against sexism, for example, but an argument against sexism can make use of values concerning human equality and fair play that even some sexists hold. In other words, the orator can point out that a contradiction exists among the values that people hold and try to persuade them to rectify it in favor of the values the orator supports. The orator can urge, don’t believe in both equality and sexism: give up the sexism. Thus the oratorical

exercise of authority does recommend a positive position but does not impose it.
(273)

While such a schema seems potentially practicable in theory, in actuality it poses the risk of reinscribing the very authority it seeks to critique within a different set of values.

A more secure and effective strategy along similar lines might instead take shape through the destabilization of pedagogical political authority by means of explicitly addressing it; in other words, instructors might effectively “out” their roles as authority figures in order to situate their authority as both an object of critical inquiry within the classroom and a means for this inquiry. I attempted to employ such a strategy in the classroom in a discussion of Lani Guinier’s essay “Second Proms and Second Primaries: The Limits of Majority Rule.” As we considered the political situation that Guinier describes, many students refused to take seriously the socioeconomic reasons she suggests for racially disproportionate voting and the consequent lack of representation for African-Americans, responding with the notion that if the economically disadvantaged African-American population wanted to vote badly enough, they could or would find a way to do so. Rather than explicitly engaging with this underreading of the text’s claims as such, I instead asked my students how many of them were age 18 or over, and then how many were registered to vote, and finally, how many voted in the recent elections or on a regular basis. Across a classroom of 20 diverse students, a progressively smaller number answered in the affirmative to each question. As they began to realize the practical unfeasibility and the political predication of their initial reaction to Guinier’s claims, I expanded this same perspective to explicitly implicate myself, stating to the class that I was an upper-middle-class straight white male, and even I did not vote in every single election. By including myself in the discussion, I invited students to think critically about the political underpinnings of authority in terms of relatively intrinsic (and indeed relatively self-evident) personal social categories rather than through adopted beliefs or positions as Bizzell would suggest; moreover, I invited them to take my social position as a central object of their inquiry. In doing so, I attempted to point up my status as an individual who was not necessarily more or less determined by this social position than them but rather merely more attentive to its connotations and implications. Thus the destabilization of political and pedagogical authority within such a situation took place not through the propagandic oration that Bizzell considers or through any sort of political or methodological modeling per se, but rather through an invitation both to critical awareness through the instructor’s pedagogical and political persona and to critical awareness of this persona. By inviting students to evaluate my authority critically, I likewise attempted to invite them to assume their own authority as critics as well as the intellectual and political responsibilities that come along with such a role.

This strategy is admittedly predicated upon my status as a white male of means and the privileges of self-identification and self-assertion that come with this position, and as such its overall efficacy beyond such a context is somewhat limited. Indeed, assertions of imperfections similar to mine by minority instructors seem as if they would be counterproductive, and assertions of agency by minority instructors, while undoubtedly possessing the power to catalyze and enfranchise students to similar action, do so from a fundamentally different position and perspective. Nevertheless, the cultural capital and authority intrinsic to the role of the instructor within both the classroom and the university at large cut (to a certain extent, if not broadly or deeply enough) across lines of race, gender, class, and sexual orientation, and are themselves well worth “outing” in order to invite and engender student access to cultural capital and authority in response. Additionally, the transitional authority of the graduate student instructor is perhaps a partial

exception that is at the heart of this rule, as it is always already exposed as contingent and constructed in relation to the position of the undergraduate student. Indeed, while authority on the whole—whether intellectual, pedagogical, political, or otherwise—is perhaps unstable, it is nonetheless far from vanishing from the classroom, the university, or the world at large. As such, politically and intellectually empowering pedagogy must go beyond training students merely to critique authority in any and all forms, and it must certainly go beyond training them to criticize without restriction. Instructors, both beginning and veteran, must instead perform an appropriately complex relation to authority in order to aid students in recognizing, critiquing, and manipulating it, both within students and instructors as individuals and within the broader structures of the university and culture at large.

Works Cited

- Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing-Process Problems*. Ed. Mike Rose. New York: Guilford, 1985. 134-165.
- Bizzell, Patricia. *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1992.
- Cole, Jean Lee and Huth, Jennifer. "Reclaiming the Teaching Assistant: Dissent as a Pedagogical Tool." *Situating College English: Lessons from an American University*. Eds. Evan Carton and Alan W. Friedman. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey, 1996. 80-89.
- Ellsworth, Elizabeth. *Teaching Positions: Difference, Pedagogy, and The Power of Address*. New York: Teachers College, 1997.
- Guinier, Lani. "Second Proms and Second Primaries: The Limits of Majority Rule." Miller and Spellmeyer 338-350.
- Miller, Richard E., and Kurt Spellmeyer, eds. *The New Humanities Reader*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2003.
- Stille, Alexander. "The Ganges' Next Life." Miller and Spellmeyer 597-612.

A MORAL GEOGRAPHY OF GRADUATE EDUCATION¹

Contributor: Stephen L. Esquith, MSU CASTL Fellows Program, Michigan State University

Discussions of graduate education tend to be empirical and aspire to universalistic conclusions, even if they have to proceed one discipline at a time. This is a good thing, since we want to know how graduate education occurs, what the common problems are, and what the common goals seem to be, even if they have to be adjusted to particular disciplinary circumstances.² However, it underestimates the importance of integrative work across disciplinary boundaries.³

This essay considers one experiment in graduate education in the arts and humanities within a particular integrative locale: an undergraduate residential college in a research university. Its goal is to identify some of the pitfalls and opportunities that face graduate students working on this emerging terrain, and make a few qualified recommendations, hence the term moral geography.⁴

A Tale of Two SoTLs

Over roughly the last twenty years since the publication of the work of Ernest Boyer, Lee S. Shulman, and others, faculty in higher education have expanded their view of research, at least on the margins, to include research on teaching and learning. Some have done this directly, taking teaching and learning as an object of research, applying some of the research techniques they rely upon traditionally to the study and improvement of teaching and learning. Others have done it by expanding the notion of research so that a broader category of scholarship that includes a more interpretive reflection on teaching and learning as a social practice. One might call these two approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) a narrow and a wide approach.

The narrow approach is analytic, focusing on teaching and learning as if teaching and learning were objects of research just like any other research problem. Teaching and learning must be scrutinized objectively, and the results of SoTL must be replicable and the must help teachers weigh the costs and benefits of teaching and learning one way rather than another. Modifications in research methods are necessary to take into account some of the special features of teaching and learning, but on the whole it is still research.⁵ In

¹ I am grateful to my colleagues Karen Klomparens, Mark Sullivan, and Colleen Tremonte at Michigan State University for their comments and suggestions. The work described in this essay is the result of my collaboration with them on our CASTL project. The section describing the reflection seminar for the CASTL Fellows is written by Mark Sullivan who has been leading this seminar in 2007-08.

² An important impetus for re-examining graduate education in the U.S. was the 2000 survey of graduate doctoral students, <http://survey.nagps.org/>.

³ This essay imagines a future in which the best graduate education in the arts and humanities (similar to the work in the sciences in environmental studies, neuroscience, cognitive science, and evolutionary biology) integrates methods of investigation and creative expression. We can see this approach emerging in areas such as performance art, world history, global ethics, and cultural studies. This configuration of integrative practices is sometimes called transcultural studies. See, for example, the Center for Transcultural Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/transcult/whoware.html>

⁴ For a general overview of the field of moral geography, see David M. Smith, *Moral Geographies: Ethics in a World of Difference* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2000).

⁵ For example, see Kathleen Gray, Rosemary Chang, and Alex Radloff, "Enhancing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Evaluation of a Scheme to Improve Teaching and Learning Through Action
Footnotes continued on the next page.

contrast, the wide approach is historical. What are the appropriate goals of the social practice of teaching and learning? We cannot simply call them knowledge (anymore than we can call the goal of medical practice health simpliciter), because what counts as knowledge (or health) is heavily contextual and changes over time.⁶

Most scholars of teaching and learning have, for good reasons, adopted the narrower analytic approach. It has probably been necessary in order for SoTL to gain some legitimacy within academic disciplines outside colleges of education. The narrow approach also has been more successful among natural science and social science disciplines where analytic research is valued above historical interpretation. In the arts and humanities, however, where cost-benefit analysis is not the standard measure of scholarly achievement, the assessment of the effectiveness of some of the techniques developed in the STEM disciplines are less attractive to many faculty. There are exceptions, of course. Faculty who teach writing, composition, and rhetoric or who teach studio art have embraced the idea of more systematic assessment using student, course, and faculty portfolios. However, in other areas of the humanities even portfolio assessment, let alone more quantitative ways of measuring the success of teaching and learning are not as common. In fact, they are sometimes actively resisted by faculty who argue that phrases such as “student learning outcome” and “student-centered learning” are slogans developed by colleges of education that have little to do with the discipline-specific ways in which students are taught and learn. This is unfortunate.

For political as much as intellectual reasons, more faculty in the arts and humanities have become interested in the wider approach to the scholarship of teaching and learning. It offers them a way of describing what is working and not working in their classrooms and programs in language they feel at home with at a time when the political issue of accountability is front and center for higher education.

Graduate students play a critical role in teaching and learning in the arts and humanities. Most of these graduate students earn their keep as instructors or teaching assistants, not research assistants. If they go on in higher education after they have completed their degree, it is at a teaching institution more often than at a research institution. And many of the research institutions where they are earning their degrees rely upon them more and more heavily to improve the quality of undergraduate education because in the US, at least, where state and federal funding for higher education research is declining, undergraduate tuition revenues are playing an increasingly large part in the university’s overall budget.

What role, then, should graduate students play in the scholarship and teaching of the arts and humanities where accountability for the quality of undergraduate education is a political-economic reality? In other words, how can graduate students improve the quality of undergraduate teaching at a time when there is so much pressure to increase undergraduate tuition revenues *and* the quality of undergraduate education?

The MSU CASTL Fellowship program has tried to address this from one particular angle: the role that graduate students in the arts and humanities might play in an integrative residential living-learning program at a research institution. How can these graduate

Research,” *The International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Vol. 19, No.1, 2007, pp. 21-32.

⁶ For example, see Vicki Gunn and Leah Shopkow, “Doing SoTL in Medieval History: A Cross-Atlantic Dialogue,” *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education*, Vol. 6, No.3, 2007, pp.255-71.

students who must meet the demands for a disciplinary doctoral degree, also learn how to become more self-reflective practitioners as instructors in an interdisciplinary undergraduate residential college so that their own teaching as future faculty will be better?

Four Models of Graduate Teaching

What roles do today's graduate students play in research universities. As future researchers and scholars, they play two very different but now somewhat convergent roles as apprentices and vassals. As apprentices to a faculty member, individual graduate students work under the tutelage of a faculty member, reading what they are told to read, learning the trade, and generally following the master's instructions. As vassals, they may find themselves working within a larger network or hierarchy, careful to pay appropriate respect to different faculty who may be on their guidance committee but who occupy different places within the departmental and professional hierarchy. These are the two research roles graduate students play, but in the arts and humanities where research positions are relatively rare and teaching is the primary source of support for graduate students, the roles of the graduate students are very different. Admittedly, they must continue to work under a major professor in order to have their dissertation approved, and in many systems they must also take courses demanded by their guidance committee. However, as teaching assistants, they are thrust into another nexus that binds faculty and undergraduate students.

One way to describe this nexus of teaching and learning is to liken graduate teaching assistants to nomadic herders or hired hands. They wander from one course to another, sometimes in groups working for a faculty instructor of record to whom they may have little or no research relationship. Their jobs include interpreting the sphinx-like lectures of the faculty member to confused undergraduates, grading essays, responding to student complaints about grades, and generally herding the students through the course without too many mishaps. Their job is to protect the faculty member, the owner of the course, from the herd, and protect the herd from the faculty member.

A second role that graduate students play in this grade-nexus is the dual role of informant and informer. While this language appears to be derogatory, in fact, it contains the seeds for a more positive form of teaching and learning.

On the surface graduate teaching assistants work as informants in the sense that they provide faculty with valuable information about what undergraduates can and cannot understand. They tell faculty how much time students are likely to be spending on homework and out-of-class assignments, how well they write, and generally what undergraduates mean when they say they understand or do not understand the lectures and materials in the course. Graduate students are close enough in age and experience to undergraduates to play the role of informants in this ethnographic sense.

They are also informers in a more clandestine sense. They not only translate student language into a vernacular the faculty can understand, graduate students also have to inform on students. They must selectively to the faculty who is not attending discussion sections and who is actively subverting the course. I say "selectively" because the graduate informer has to be careful not to create suspicion among the undergraduates in the class. Graduate teaching assistants must earn the trust of students if they are to gather useful information, and at the same time they must also be willing to reveal information to the faculty member that jeopardizes those students who disapprove of, not just disagree with the faculty member. Like the informant, the informer must be able to move back and forth between the

future world of faculty the graduate student hopes to join and the present world of undergraduate students where teaching evaluations are written.

The dangers are many. For example, if undergraduates are dissatisfied with the faculty lectures and the informant cannot translate this into a language that the faculty member is willing to accept and act upon, the informant may be blamed by the faculty member for declining attendance in lectures and disapproving student comments about the faculty member. The most dangerous undergraduate student evaluation for an informant is something like: "Had it not been for the graduate student's explanations in discussion section, I would not have understood anything the professor said in lecture." To offset this, the graduate student as informer must gain the faculty member's trust as well as the students. When the faculty member feels uncertain about how the course is going, the graduate student must be able to provide a more accurate assessment of how the course really is going. Declining attendance and dissatisfaction by a vocal minority of undergraduates must be balanced with other information about student interest and satisfaction that is less visible. This does not mean that the graduate student as informer must mislead and console the faculty (although this is a temptation when things are going badly), but rather provide a more complete picture based upon other information to which the graduate student informer has privileged access.

In other words, as informants, graduate teaching assistants must be able to understand the words of the faculty member so that undergraduates can be tested, and then the graduate student must be able to give the faculty member a reliable version of what the undergraduates said in response to the questions posed to them. As informers, graduate students are not translators as much as they are sensors, walking gently among undergraduate students to find out where divisions exist between the faculty and the undergraduates so that they can be bridged or avoided.

To see how these apparently compromised and derogatory roles of informant and informer may provide graduate students with opportunities to function as agents of positive change, let me trace these two terms back to their origins in anthropology and politics, respectively.

Consider the role of informants in the ethnographic research of Bronislaw Malinowski in the Trobriand Islands in the early 20th century. Malinowski thought of himself 'as a camera' able to see objectively into the most intimate corners of his subjects' lives with the help of informants he interviewed.⁷ However, his diary revealed a darker, ambivalent side to this objective field work method – race and gender.⁸ To get a closer look at his subjects, Malinowski believed that he needed the help of someone like Jomo Kenyatta. This informant could tell him things that others couldn't. He spoke the native language and the language of the ethnographer. He could provide a medium for transculturation: conveying information to Malinowski at the same time as he could help the Kiriwina benefit from the knowledge he has to impart. But, Kenyatta was not a naïve informant (he was Malinowski's graduate student at Oxford), he was also using the knowledge he gained to help attain his own political objectives.⁹

⁷ Michael W. Young, *Malinowski's Kiriwina: Fieldwork Photography 1915-1918* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

⁸ Bronislaw Malinowski, *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*, introduction by Raymond Firth (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1989).

⁹ See Bruce Berman, "Ethnography as Politics, Politics as Ethnography: Kenyatta, Malinowski, and the Making of *Facing Mount Kenya*," *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 30, No.3, 1996, pp.313-344.

The model of the informer that I have in mind is not the blackmailed agent of a cloak and dagger spy, but rather the reluctant informer who uses his passport to travel as a way of informing the public back home about their own conditions, not threats from abroad. The Polish journalist Ryszard Kapuściński was one such informer. In his autobiographical reflections, *Travels with Herodotus*, he intimates that (like Herodotus) he had to conduct himself very carefully during the Stalin era. Like Herodotus who was concerned about the direction of Athenian democracy but could not speak about it directly, Kapuściński had to code his concerns about communism through his interpretations of developing countries and their woes. He never spoke openly of his role as an informer,¹⁰ and there may not have been any reason to, since the reports to the state police apparently had little value for them.¹¹

Kapuściński praised Malinowski for his refusal to lord it over so-called lower cultures,¹² and like Malinowski he relied heavily on photographs to capture the life of “the other.” However, his photographs do not have the stilted, artificial quality of Malinowski’s. He was not interested in extracting cultural norms from patterned behavior. They seek to capture the rhythm, pleasure, and sadness of everyday life. The informer’s truth, we might say, is not the informant’s truth. Not only was Kapuściński a photographer and informant, he was also a poet (that was his undercover name, in fact). In the following untitled poem he distinguishes between three forms of truth.

To locate the true word
which is in its prime
is calm
breaks not into hysterics
has no fever
experiences no depression

it can be trusted

to locate the pure word
which didn’t slander
didn’t snitch
didn’t take part in a raid
didn’t declare black white

one can hope

to locate the winged words
which would allow one
be it by just a fraction of an inch
to lift oneself above this all¹³

¹⁰ Ryszard Kapuściński, *Travels with Herodotus*, trans. Klara Glowczewska (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007).

¹¹ Colin Thubron, “The Credo of a Great Reporter,” *The Nation*, Vol.54, No.13, August 16, 2007.

¹² Ryszard Kapuściński, *Encountering the Other: The Challenge of the Twenty-First Century*, trans. Katarzyna Mroczkowska-Brand and William Brand (Krakow, Poland: Universitas, 2007)

¹³ Ryszard Kapuscinski, *The Selected Poetry of Ryszard Kapuscinski: I Wrote Stone*, trans. Diana Krupel and Mark Kusiba (Emeryville, Canada: Biblioasis, 2007), p.57

Let me suggest that the “true word” that “can be trusted” is the word of the informer. It is conveyed calmly and can be trusted. What Kapuściński calls the “pure word” is in fact illusory. One “can hope,” but the chances of finding this decontextualized truth are slim. The promise of unbiased information from well-trained informants with no agendas of their own is empty. All informants, whether they have ambitions like Kenyatta or simply survival needs, must pick and choose what they report. What about the “winged word?” Here, Kapuściński resists drawing any conclusions. This is a matter of faith, not hope.

Graduate students are “agents of change” but not in some perfect or ideal typical sense. They are agents because they can balance their work as trusted informants about the existing state of student opinion and their work as informers who must provide useful information about the next generation of Kenyattas. Their dual role is to coax faculty to see things differently at the same time that they are empowering undergraduate students to demand more. When this happens it can lead to changes in the research and scholarship that they are able to do as graduate students.

The Roles of Graduate Students in a Residential Setting

To see how this dual role can transform graduate education, not just the grade nexus in the undergraduate classroom, we have to take a look at particular cases. At Michigan State University something like this is beginning to happen on a very small scale.

The information graduate students pass back to the faculty is a necessary step in helping the faculty see the need for a new set of criteria and values governing graduate student research. The graduate students, more than the faculty, realize that the orthodox formulations no longer function well. For example, in Agriculture Economics at MSU, pareto-optimality can no longer solve basic problems. Should a country try to raise the price of staples so that some farmers who produce them can earn enough money to afford the technologies needed for higher yields OR should the price of the staple products remain within the reach of poorer farmer? This is only one ethical dilemma that graduate students studying in this area face. How, for example, should they handle the question of investments and savings for future generations in the form of education infrastructure? Investments for future generations may come in the form of fewer programs for the most needy today. Of course, there is no ethical algorithm that you apply to problems such as these. They are only alternative ethical theories that have to be applied to these problems cautiously before any learning outcomes can be addressed.

The new Residential College in the Arts and Humanities at Michigan State University is designed to meet complex ethical challenges like this at several levels. It offers a structured, interdisciplinary curriculum in the arts and humanities. It includes a foreign language proficiency program as well as substantial emphasis on civic engagement and the visual and performing arts. In addition to common core courses on world history and transcultural studies, first year students take a seminar on a special topic offered by faculty in their particular area of research and expertise. In the second year, students participate in creative workshops, student-initiated tutorials, and civic engagement projects. Then, in the third and fourth years they specialize along several elective pathways leading to courses in other departments and programs. The study abroad programs in other countries and similar study away programs locally or in other regions of the United States are designed to enrich global and cultural understanding as well as contribute to world language proficiency.

Why a residential college in the arts and humanities at Michigan State University? The virtues of residential living and learning experiences are now fairly well-known. So are some of the problems that experiments such as these have encountered. On the positive side, close student-faculty contact motivates students to devote more time to their academic work and leads to greater balance between academic and social life. Student participation in academic governance and student initiated co-curricular programs further strengthen the culture of teaching and learning. On the other side, small living/learning programs can be fragile and difficult to sustain, especially for faculty who have to meet the expectations of a research institution as well as the expectations of students in a residential college setting. So, why create a new residential college? Primarily because it creates an environment where teaching and learning is valued and more effectively achieved than what we find in larger, more impersonal settings.

Second, why create a residential college at Michigan State University? One reason that is peculiar to MSU is the fact that it has had two residential colleges for forty years in the natural and social sciences. Early on, there was a third in the arts and humanities, Justin Morrill College. However, because of declining enrollments and a poorly structured curriculum that did not address students' legitimate concerns about careers and future graduate study, that program was discontinued in the mid-1970s. By restoring parity across the liberal arts broadly defined, the new Residential College in the Arts and Humanities creates an opportunity for cooperative and collaborative programming between the three residential colleges. It also highlights the University's commitment to undergraduate education for a larger public audience. In fact, this fall 2007 MSU was identified by *US News & World Report* in its August 27, 2007 issue as having one of the "stellar" residential living/learning programs with the creation of the RCAH. Another reason for creating a residential college in the arts and humanities at a research institution such as MSU is the enormous variety of programs, guest faculty, and international students that can be found at MSU. RCAH students have the opportunity to pursue additional majors and specializations in academic programs as diverse as Asian Studies, Film Studies, Peace and Justice Studies, Dance, and Music Performance. They can also begin to chart a career in pre-professional programs such as Social Work, Journalism, and Criminal Justice. The calendar of visiting artists, guest speakers, and international researchers allows students to learn about new areas of scholarship and performance. The large number of international undergraduate and graduate students offers opportunities for direct contact with other cultures, languages, and traditions. The phrase that the RCAH offers the benefits of a small liberal arts college coupled with the resources of a large university is not hollow gesture. For example, the College of Music has created a new Minor in music performance for RCAH majors. The planned Book Arts Specialization and Performance Art Specialization combine faculty expertise in the RCAH and other visual and performance arts departments. The RCAH Center for Poetry has already sparked a new interest in poetry in the Department of English and the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures.

Finally, why create a new residential college at MSU in the arts and humanities in particular? This is not an easy question to answer. The economy of the State of Michigan is among the most beleaguered in the U.S., with the highest unemployment rate and one of the highest percentages of college graduates who leave their state after graduation. With a state budget that has been sliding into deficit over the past five years and a legislature which has grudgingly agreed to increase taxes marginally, the near future does not look much brighter. Undergraduates need to understand the causes of these problems and how the problems affect families, communities, and individuals in Michigan but also elsewhere. To do this

they need candid mentors and tutors. Faculty could perform this role, but there are several ways in which it is almost impossible for faculty to play this role. They are not close enough to undergraduates to discuss convincingly the personal choices undergraduates will face. But graduate students working alongside undergraduates in a residential living/learning community have a better chance. They share with undergraduates a position on the doorstep of this future world in flux and the limitations of orthodox disciplinary theories to make sense of it.

Some have argued that investing in the arts and humanities is good economic public policy, and there is some wisdom to this, especially when we realize how a richer culture of artistic expression interacts with the knowledge economy. At the same time, the arts and humanities can be valued for their own sake. MSU has declared the current year 2007-08 The Year of Arts and Culture, the same year that the RCAH has enrolled its first class of 125 students. The ground for a new fine arts museum will be broken will soon be broken. The creation of the RCAH is one way of expressing the value that the University seeks to place on the arts and humanities precisely because of the dire situation we face, not despite it.

The basic structure of the curriculum is a necessary but not sufficient explanation for why this particular residential living/learning experience makes sense at this point in time. Much more than the structured curriculum, what has attracted students and faculty to this experiment in its very first year is its ethos. Mission statements, that lofty language that colleges and universities use to announce their highest goals and ambitions can be important. They can remind us of our basic commitments as well as introduce new members of the academic community to the values we share.

The mission of the RCAH calls upon students, faculty, and staff *"to weave together the passion, imagination, humor, and candor of the arts and humanities to promote individual wellbeing and the common good."*

Let me begin with "passion." Originally, passion referred to the story of the suffering of martyrs and saints, but gradually it came to mean any disorders, pains, and afflictions of the body. Today, we are more likely to associate passion with a wide range of feelings or mental states such as anger, temper, excitement, and probably most of all, intense desire and love. The most talked about passion these days, at least in the U.S. mass media, is fear: fear of immigrants, fear of illness and disease, and especially fear of terrorism.

This pre-occupation with the passion of fear is hardly new. Thomas Hobbes, the 17th century British philosopher argued that fear of violent death was the most important human passion. Since it is hardwired into human nature, we should build our social, economic, and political institutions around it. Use it, don't fight it, Hobbes might have said.

It is useful to note, however, that Hobbes tended to exaggerate his own timidity. He liked to joke that his mother was frightened into giving birth to him in 1588 when the Spanish Armada set sail. Fear, he said, was his twin. Nevertheless, Hobbes was not afraid of taking on some of the most powerful figures of his time, bishops as well as kings; it is one reason why he was forced to live in exile in France for part of his life.

We can learn a lot from Hobbes's single-minded description of the fearful "state of nature" where life is "nasty, brutish, and short." Fear still has to be reckoned with. But, we know that even under the grimmest of conditions, we are capable of acting on other passions

besides feelings of suffering, pain, and affliction. We are also, even when we are fearful, capable of imagining what the world looks like from the perspective of others, describing it honestly, and recognizing that sometimes we are taking ourselves a bit too seriously. Hobbes tried his best to reduce all of our passions to variations on a single theme. The arts and humanities are the best evidence we have that fear no matter how powerful an engine, does not blot out our other passions or de-activate our imagination, sense of humor, and candor.

Imagination plays several roles in the RCAH. The first role is in the creative work of the students, faculty, and community partners. The curriculum provides students with the opportunity to work creatively in the visual and performing arts, and there are also co-curricular projects such as a new Books Arts program (with its own letter presses) and an anticipated Performance Art interdisciplinary program in collaboration with faculty in Music, Theater, and Studio Art Departments. But, there is an ethical dimension to imagination that is just as important as its role in creative modes of expressing. Imagining what we look, sound, and feel like to others is a critical step in creative work and also in developing an ethical perspective of our own. For example, the College is imaging a set of creative gardens alongside the residence hall. Imagining what shape these gardens should take and designing gardens that will encourage this additional dimension of ethical imagination are two complementary functions the gardens will play. (see Charles Taylor)

The third dimension of the RCAH ethos, after passion and imagination, is candor. This intellectual virtue begins with the unflinching ability to acknowledge and scrutinize uncomfortable facts, and not sweep them under the rug. But candor goes beyond intellectual honesty and discipline. Candor also involves a certain self-consciousness and willingness to put one's cards on the table. In other words, candor is more than just being candid, at least as we understand it. It means turning the ground we stand on over and over until the underlying assumptions have been thoroughly exposed and sized up. Where do we stand is not just a question of our spatial coordinates. It is a question about our basic commitments.

The final dimension of the RCAH ethos is humor. Here too, we think of this capability in a somewhat different way than it is conventionally used. Recalling Hobbes once again, humor is usually nothing more than "sudden glory": that is, the pleasure we feel at other's misfortune. We are amused because what has happened to them has not (yet) happened to us. This sardonic view of humor, like Hobbes's narrow view of passions, does not capture the capability we have in mind. By humor we mean the capability that all members of the RCAH, not just those with the good fortune to escape danger and calamity. In other words, humor requires modesty and the ability to acknowledge our own mis-steps and shortcomings. With these four faculties or capabilities in mind (passion, imagination, candor, and humor), RCAH students and faculty will be in a better position to keep their eyes on the prize: individual human wellbeing and the common good. Exactly how can graduate students, typically trained as specialists in hothouse disciplinary environments, work with undergraduates in an inter-disciplinary program, to realize these capabilities with at least one eye on ethical outcomes?

The CASTL Fellows Program

The CASTL Fellows program that is now in its second semester provides graduate students from a wide range of departments and programs across the University with an opportunity to

advance their teaching skills and give teaching the kind of scholarly attention that it often does not receive in a research university.

The RCAH CASTL Fellows are mentoring, advising, and collaborating with undergraduate students on several special projects outside the classroom.

- *The Building Stories Project.* This project is a compilation of the individual stories of the many people who have been and will be involved in building the RCAH and also a way of writing the story of the College as a whole. For those who choose to participate, there will be opportunities through some sections of regular creative workshops and writing courses. There will be ample time for casual conversations among students, workers, and their families. Stories will be told on blogs and on stage in dramatic re-enactments, on paper and canvas on exhibit in our gallery. *Building Stories* will be at once an archive, a celebration, and a living conversation.

The first stage in the Project has been to have undergraduate students in two of the College's composition and rhetoric courses interview and present the stories of several of the workers who have played a part in the creation of the College. These undergraduate students are working with CASTL Fellows to organize the existing archived material, add new material, and present their findings in the College art gallery in late fall 2007. Approximately 40 undergraduates and four CASTL fellows are working with the two RCAH faculty members on this initial project.

The second stage of the project will be in spring 2008 as part of a College creative workshop on the photo-essay. Students will work with CASTL Fellows and the faculty instructor in this creative workshop to design an exhibit of their work in the art gallery at the end of spring 2008.

- *21st Century Chautauqua.* Students and faculty in this project, co-sponsored by the Association of American Colleges, will be developing a series of dialogues and programs to help the campus community deal with difficult questions and issues. Students are being trained as dialogue facilitators, and student groups and organizations are identifying the issues that they believe ought to be addressed in these chautauquas. Another goal of the project is to create a range of curricular and co-curricular projects that will institutionalize some of the ideas agreed upon in the local dialogues. These projects may include new service-learning, field experience, internship, and civic engagement courses; new study abroad and more local study away programs with a service-learning or civic engagement component; and new trans-college courses on professional and civic responsibility.

The first stage of the 21st Chautauqua will be a 'traveling chautauqua' designed by and lead by students, faculty and staff. The subject of this program in spring 2008 is Sustainability and Human Rights, and the discussion will migrate from the Residential College in the Arts and Humanities to the two other sister residential colleges in the natural sciences (Lyman Briggs College) and the social sciences (James Madison College) which share the same ethos of student participation and civic responsibility.

- *The Center for Poetry.* This program will host poets who will share their work with students through readings, formal workshops, informal conversation, and one-on-one tutorials. The guest poet in the opening series in fall 2007 was MSU graduate Carolyn

Forché, known for her work with human rights organizations. There will be a poetry archive for Michigan writers within and outside the MSU community, and undergraduate poets will bring poetry to local public schools. The Center also will have ongoing relationships with other similar programs and conference centers, allowing students to be part of a community of writers. In the future the Center will host similar summer workshops of its own.

- *The Senior Refugees Project.* This project began in the Lansing Refugee Development Center and is now migrating to the RCAH. Senior refugees who have been relocated in the Lansing area from Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, Viet Nam, Cuba, and probably Iraq are participating. It has several parts, including a gardening project, an English as a Second Language component, and a component stressing arts and culture. Using material culture, music, photography, and other modes of expression, students and senior citizens from will share experiences and help one another improve their language skills.

In addition to their participation in these major initiatives in the RCAH, CASTL Fellows are working with individual groups of undergraduates on more specialized projects. Alongside the CASTL Fellows we have five music and language Mentors who are participating in several of the projects listed above as well as organizing a range of informal music groups (ensembles, choirs, etc.) and world language immersion activities. Both Fellows and Mentors are also involved in additional activities such as organizing a film series, a museum studies research group, a college newsletter, a sewing circle, a photography gallery, a creative garden, and a student government organization.

Reflection Seminar

The CASTL Fellows Program began in spring 2007 in something of a vacuum. The faculty for the RCAH had yet to be hired, and the undergraduate student body had not yet arrived. The 10 Fellows in that spring semester met with a small set of faculty mentors to discuss how they might interact with the incoming students and how they might work with faculty mentors, but the actual work and interaction could not start until fall 2007.

The primary topics of conversation for this group was the anthology *How People Learn* published by the U.S. National Research Council in an expanded edition in 2000. Using chapters from this anthology, the Fellows discussed how some of this research on teaching and learning could be related to their own experiences as instructors and teaching assistants. However, since their roles in the RCAH would be more informal than this (they would not be shouldering formal instructional responsibilities), there was a bit of a mismatch between the anthology and the kinds of co-curricular projects that the Fellows were being asked to imagine (without the help of students or faculty in the RCAH). While some found the content of the research summarized in *How People Learn* of interest, they understandably did not see how they could apply it as non-teaching Fellows in the RCAH. (One important reason that the Fellows were not to be assigned instructional duties is that their stipend as Fellows was not in line with the labor relations agreement with teaching assistants at the University.)

At the end of spring 2007, the University Office of Outreach and Engagement interviewed several of this first cohort of CASTL Fellows. Some were happy to have the opportunity to meet several faculty who were doing research the fell broadly under the heading of the Scholarship of Teaching, Learning, and Engagement. A few enjoyed the open-ended

monthly seminar meetings organized around the common reading anthology. But, it is fair to say that all were disappointed in several ways. The structure and mission of the RCAH was opaque to them. They felt that they did not receive adequate guidance in formulating a SoTL project of their own. Perhaps their greatest dissatisfaction was that they were not able to work with faculty and students in the RCAH. Obviously, some of these frustrations were unavoidable. But, as the UOE assessment team correctly observed, should be asked of the second cohort of CASTL Fellows. They should formulate their projects more clearly and they should meet more frequently to review their progress.

It is too early to tell whether we have made the right changes in fall 2007. We are only three months into the semester. However, one of the distinctions of this year's CASTL Fellows seminar has to do with the dual thrust of the activities: we are striving to have the Fellows develop and carry out a SoTL project related to their own disciplines; and at the same time, we have encouraged them to pursue activities that connect their research to other projects, and to activities beyond or outside of their discipline.

- Each of the Fellows has initiated a project that relates directly to their discipline and to the activities of the students and faculty in the RCAH. Various clusters of interest and activity have emerged and solidified as described above. Each fellow will be asked to present an interim report and presentation (a "work in progress" report), and some final written published material, as well as supporting multimedia material, when appropriate, a final "polished" presentation, and some parts of a teaching portfolio related to the project.
- To encourage critical self-reflection, the Fellows have written narratives reflecting on their own experience with construction, they have written various kinds of poetry, some reflecting on teaching; and they have been involved in writing a range of dialogues, and dialogues that respond to their peer's dialogues, all of which center on issues of controversy that they have identified and want to address. There are also plans to work with them to develop strategies and skills relating to initiating, supporting, and sustaining dialogues in their teaching, and in the environments that surround their teaching.

Assessment in 2007-08

In addition to requiring that the CASTL Fellows are meeting more frequently and formulating clearer project goals, they are also expected to participate in the Graduate School's Certificate Program in College Teaching.

The UOE is conducting a more systematic assessment of the work the Fellows are doing this year based on what they learned through their informal interviews in spring 2007. This will include interviewing the undergraduates and faculty in the RCAH who have worked with the Fellows this year, as well as a critical assessment of the outcomes of their projects. We will want to see, for example, if they have done any work in the Scholarship of Teaching, Learning, and Engagement coming out of the projects in the RCAH they have developed.

A special emphasis thus far in the seminar has been the content and form of dialogue as a technique for teaching and learning. Several Fellows are explicitly addressing this through the 21st Century Chautauqua project. Others will be encountering it through their work on the Senior Refugees Project and a related project to bring RCAH undergraduates together

with international students on campus. Assessing the effectiveness of these dialogues and assessing how CASTL Fellows have incorporated this technique into their own research and teaching will also be an important feature of the 2007-08 experience.

“WRITING FOR THE FORMATION OF SCHOLARLY AND REFLECTIVE TEACHERS OUT OF GRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS AT AN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY”

Contributor: Joanna Renc-Roe, CRC Development Manager

Abstract

The value of developing scholarly teachers through reflection underlies the assignments designed for the participants in the CEU's Curriculum Resource Center's two-semester training program 'Teaching in Higher Education: Key Skills and Professional Development'. The scholarly teaching and scholarship of teaching are underlying principles for the program as we go about institutionalizing it at our own university. Therefore it is important to analyse the development of graduate students' thinking on teaching and learning that we have stimulated in this particular program and context.

This paper starts by outlining the program and its context and proceeds to establishing the connection between the current conceptualizations of reflection in professional development of university teachers and our own student assignments. The main aim of the paper is to use some theoretical tools coming from this literature in order to gain a way of understanding and analyzing particular examples of reflection generated by the doctoral students-participants of the CRC program.

The 'going public' intention of this paper is also a first step to a further inquiry into a model that may be meaningful for young academic teachers of social science/humanities, especially those coming from a highly international and changing academic context. The model outlined here, and investigated in one particular aspect, comprises of a combination of face-to-face training workshops on key skills in teaching at university, seminar discussions on context and formats of teaching and faculty work, and students own self-driven experiments in teaching and reflections on themselves as teachers and learners.

1. Introduction

The value of developing scholarly teachers through reflection underlies the assignments designed for the participants in the CEU's Curriculum Resource Center's two-semester training program 'Teaching in Higher Education: Key Skills and Professional Development', and therefore it is important to review and analyse student reflections on teaching and learning that we have stimulated in this program and context. This paper starts by outlining the program and the university context in which it operates and then proceeds to establish the connection between the current conceptualizations of reflection in professional development of university teachers and our own practice.

The main aim of the paper is to use some theoretical tools coming from this literature in order to gain a way of understanding and analyzing particular examples of reflection generated by the doctoral students. The categories that underlie the analysis come from two broad theorizations of reflection: Shon's (1984) concept of 'the reflective professional' reflecting in action and on action, and Kreber's (2005) analysis of reflection among university teachers, using the transformative learning theory, which includes reflecting on curriculum, teaching and learning (as well as other categorizations of reflection on teaching).

Following analysis of a small sample of various written pieces of student work coming from the patchwork text/ teaching portfolio course assignments, I find that the selected categories of reflection are present in the sample, but I also find that reflecting on the teacher's identity is as prominent as reflection on practice. Therefore other conceptualizations of reflection will need to be applied in order to really engage with the findings that are emerging from our training program. In the concluding section, I point out to the need for further research and conceptualization and reconsider the possible connection between training reflective teachers in a graduate teacher development program and developing future scholars of teaching in our own context.

2. The program: design and the institutional context

The training program for CEU doctoral students was first piloted in 2004-2005 academic year. By designing this program we began to take an active part in preparing the doctoral students as future faculty, in conditions where such a development was missing from most of their departmental doctoral programs. We were able to use our own trainers and our experience of designing training sessions for faculty from many post-soviet and new EU countries and we managed to secure university funding for the basic running costs of the program, following the first pilot year.

After a year of experimentation in intensive three day long workshops and several potential designs of the program, it has been divided into two ten-week-long courses. The first of these courses address areas of teaching such as basic course design, student assessment and key teaching methods and issues (lecturing, seminars, course design, lesson planning, student assessment) and the second course also adds issues of higher education policy, student and faculty evaluation, further specific areas of teaching such as tutoring, supervision, teaching academic writing or critical thinking, various teaching methodologies. Participation is open to all doctoral students, it is voluntary, non-credit (pass/fail course) and it appears on student transcripts.

We started the program by focusing mainly on in-class training sessions or seminars designed essentially for beginner higher education teachers, but the program has been gaining in complexity every year. In contrast to the first, workshop-intensive pilot year, we have added teaching simulations, optional classroom observation, student-led final workshops, faculty-led roundtable discussions on teaching and professional development and most significantly, a set of individual written assignments.

As an important contextual issue, it needs to be said that the doctoral students of CEU are a specific and unique type of our training participant based in a specific educational context. Our students study social sciences and humanities at a small, private, graduate American university in Central Europe, which now is simultaneously part of the American and European educational structures. The university is characterized by its international character, a strong sense of unique mission in its region and an increasingly global perspective in student recruitment, research-oriented approach to teaching. Most of these students are of Eastern or Central European origin, and we usually have one or two African or Western European/North American students in the course as well.

Numerous questions could be asked of this professional development process and its products: what is and is not being achieved by the students during our training program?; what is the nature of the learning processes at work?; And, how can we better stimulate and support student development in order to achieve the aim of creating effective, but also

reflective and scholarly teachers in this particular context and program? These are all questions that could start entire research projects, but in this paper I would like to grasp one particular aspect of the learning process: the possibilities for reflexive thinking generated through the student assignments as a first step to forming scholarly questions in teaching and learning.

3. The program: first assessment of impact

Three years down the line can see the first signs that the institutionalisation of a teaching and learning program for doctoral students is, first, possible and, second, beneficial for the university as a whole. As one of the trainers and the coordinator of the program, I have a feeling that students became more engaged in the program every year and our own confidence in finding the formats and methods to work with them has developed.

There are now some formal and informal indicators to suggest that the institutionalisation of the program is proceeding well. The comprehensive student survey undertaken in 2007 spring semester, revealed a good level of satisfaction with the course, which was bigger than with some other components of the student doctoral experience even if it was still not very high on the list of student priorities during the course of their PhD studies. In the same university survey, students stressed the importance of teaching experience as an integral part of their studies. During a student-organised PhD orientation weekend last September aimed to air student voices in all areas of the CEU doctoral experience, our course was included in student draft position as 'a good idea'.

We have now several alumni reporting success at job or fellowship interviews or help in their ongoing professional development at other universities, in particular in the UK educational system. The course has by now engaged over 60 doctoral students.

There are some signs from the university administration that further institutionalization may be possible in the near future. Although we have been running this program for several years, many trends are now coming together to produce an impetus for further development. These trends include a need for redesign of the support for doctoral students including additional sources of funding, the ongoing process of institutional self-study for reaccreditation that our department is also engaged in, and of course our own ongoing efforts in both the spheres of graduate education and faculty training, including within the CASTL network.

As far as formal evaluation of the course outcomes is concerned, the student evaluation forms are returned by some but not all students, and the numbers of student overall are still small enough not to make statistical or numerical data the most important source of knowledge on impact. In general, the returned evaluations show high overall satisfaction with the program, with only very occasional lower scores. In this case, more qualitative data seem to be the only meaningful measure of the type of learning that is being achieved by them.

These qualitative data could come from written feedback also present in the evaluation forms or from student ongoing communication with the trainers and feedback submitted as part of their final reflections of the course. I found the reflections in the more structured writing assignments by far the most relevant for the purpose of assessment of student learning:

"I learned a lot during this course, and the more I learnt, I realized the immensity of what I still do not know. I also understood certain things - for example why I did not like what 'teaching' meant back home, or even in some cases at CEU, and now I also have some shallow ideas about how this could have been done differently."

"I had the chance to learn about teaching - in a program that otherwise would never occur to me to join - and I discovered that I truly enjoy 'teaching', if this statement can be taken seriously after three classes."

"The course I have just undergone at the CEU Curriculum Resource Center has now led me to start questioning some of my own earlier assumptions about what teaching and learning ought to be."

'(The training course) made me aware about the methods and about the multiple choices that the teacher, consciously or unconsciously makes in the teaching process. I believe that this training gave me some tools to navigate my passion for the topics I wish to teach in my future carrier in a fruitful directions as well as it helped me to be a relatively good teacher of the themes that are not close to my heart.'

These are not complete data on what students turned towards when asked to reflect on the course but they are certainly good glimpses of potential for reflective teaching that we were hoping to generate and that deserve to be further inquired into.

4. The program: written assignments

In designing and implementing the program we have attempted to apply the concept of 'scholar in the classroom' based on our own (CRC's) mission statement and our increasing engagement with the field of scholarship of teaching and learning as it is being developed internationally, in institutions and across disciplines and in individual faculty lives (e.g. Boyer 1990, Hutchings and Shulman 1999, Hubner and Morreale 2002, Hubner 2005, Whitman and Richlin 2007). In this particular program, the SOTL approach was introduced as an underlying principle of inquiry rather than as a fully fledged research project for students to complete. We have tried to expose the students to the concept through reading and discussion, and by integrating it into our sessions whenever possible, and by hoping for them to approximate it in their written work, so that they may develop in the direction of scholarly teaching in the future.

It is the written assignment component, or rather what can be learnt from introducing it, that is the main focus of this paper as this is the main strategy trying to transform a regular training experience into an experience of developing a scholarly teacher, by integrating reflection into thinking, planning, and evaluating of their teaching (and ultimately, in researching their students' learning). This is done through the usage of two course assignment formats: that of a patchwork text and teaching portfolio, for each of the two courses/levels respectively. Both formats are under constant development and change to match the needs of the program and student expectations and they do not necessarily resemble closely other portfolio or patchwork text formats very closely.

The patchwork text consists of around four short pieces of writing: an initial educational autobiography, a lesson plan, a draft course syllabus, a reflection on the course undertaken with some reference to readings. The teaching portfolio is less specified in format or less

guided and more demanding, though a teaching philosophy statement is expected to open it, and some form of reading-based and teaching-based components are expected. The reading-based components can be an annotated bibliography, a review of some focused readings or a brief essay. The teaching-based components are called 'teaching objects' but they may also be reflective pieces or pieces of teaching evidence or teaching products, with annotations or explanations. The elements are designed to combine practical learning with insights from reading, usually related to a specific discipline, subject area, or methodological approach. Our experience of at least five student groups who have gone through the program, (excluding the current academic year and the pilot year) already allows us to analyse the outcomes most often achieved by students and learn from our attempts at these formats.

The basic question I wish to ask in analyzing student work is: what can we already come to understand about our students thinking on the basis of these reflections, and what would require further research with perhaps additional methods of data gathering?

In order to do this, we first need to establish some understanding of what categories of reflective thinking exist and can be used to start such an analysis from some conceptual starting point.

5. Reflecting on Reflection: Conceptual points for departure

5.1. Reflection-on-action in the professions

Perhaps, the most well known originator of the concept of reflection in higher education (and in the professions) is Shön (1983) with his research on the 'reflexive professionals' and their distinct ways of thinking and problem solving. Shön's theory is underlying much literature on scholarly teaching and it is also notable that he postulated for a different epistemology that SOTL scholars would require. Similarly to thinking in the professional context, in the educational context of scholarly teaching we are not faced with simple issues of technical application of theory, rather we are in the domain of 'swampy lowlands of practice' (Shön 1996) where interesting and complex questions present themselves for reflection and analysis. Certainly developing new teachers also requires attention to this complex and unstable nature of knowledge on teaching that may be more easily developed through personal reflection and the development of preliminary and self-constructed theoretical perspectives than through direct application of educational theory to practice.

In brief, Shön distinguishes between a process of 'reflection-in-action' - an ongoing reflexive inquiry during a decision-making process that is indispensable for professional thinking and occurs naturally, even if it is rarely verbalized fully (Shön, 1983, 49), and 'reflection on action' (Ibid, 278) which is a process of reflecting back and analysing one's own decisions and dilemmas in a particular situation. The first process becomes particularly important when a professional (a teacher, a lawyer, a doctor, a designer) is faced with a surprising or complex situation that needs a careful and innovative resolution. This form of reflection is of a problem-solving kind and is of immense practical and developmental value, as it allows for *contextual learning* (in specific situations). But it is also notoriously difficult to capture as it occurs in real time in direct relationship with an action. The second occurs, for example when replaying and analysing a video of one's own performance in such a situation. This second type of reflection (the second-level observation of action) requires some sort of format in which to take place, otherwise it may not always occur as naturally as the first. Thus, interviews, counseling or training sessions, in-depth consultation sessions, or reflexive

writing formats would make such reflection possible and this sort of reflection may be able to start the process of critical transfer into future situations and decision-making processes.

Moreover, Shön is quite clear in stating that reflective thinking may be important in developing innovative and more critical approaches to the profession of teaching, including an approach to framing questions of classroom practice that we now may classify as underlying scholarship of teaching:

‘What happens in such an educational bureaucracy when a teacher begins to think and act not as a technical expert but as reflective practitioner? Her reflection in action poses a potential threat to the dynamically conservative system in which she lives? She starts to listen to her students. She asks herself, for example, How is he thinking about this? (...) The teacher’s isolation in her classroom works against reflection-in-action. She needs to communicate her private puzzles and insights, to test them against the views of her peers (Shön, 1983, 332-333)’

This theory constitutes perhaps the most developed way of looking at teacher’s thinking on their own practice and we can use this to judge if our program is also capable of at least starting such a process in the mind of the young academic teacher.

5. 2. Reflection as transformative learning (on teaching)

We should also consider the formats of reflection coming directly from the scholarship of teaching literature as it is practiced and slowly being theorised. Kreber’s (2005) research into science teacher’s views (and their preparation for scholarship of teaching and learning as a way of thinking) presents perhaps the most direct engagement with different formats of reflection. Kreber makes an important contribution of SOTL literature in suggesting that concrete categorization of reflection is needed in speaking about scholarly thinking of teaching rather than some generic notion of the reflective professional that is often mentioned but not built on (Kreber 2005, 326).

Kreber’s approach is an attempt to specify how reflective thinking is not only a style of professional analysis of ongoing or past practice, but it is also a tool in the building of individual teacher’s content knowledge on teaching: ‘Clearly, reflection needs to knowing, indeed as many argue, is a process of knowledge construction, and if knowing is not considered relevant reflection is not to take place (Kreber 2005, 333). Obviously the first step in the development of teachers is to take them to the stage where they will reflect on teaching in order to begin to know what they are doing, and that will take them away from the notion of teaching as either an inborn skill, a simple imitation of available models or a bag of ready tricks to deploy in a problematic classroom situation.

Utilising Mezirov’s (1990) transformative learning theory derived from adult education, Kreber tests whether science educators display reflection as part of professional thinking. Mezirov’s theory of reflection is complex and focuses on many potentially important aspects of the process, for example he distinguishes reflection on content, process and premises, in this confirming the understanding of reflection as part of professional thinking in relation to what one is doing or wanting to do, how one is wanting to do something, and whether or not something is in fact worth doing or needs reconceptualising altogether (Mezirov 1991 quoted in Kreber 2005, 325-326). These three categorizations may in fact be related to the stages of development of reflective teaching into scholarly teaching. We could start from what teachers know and how they attempt can solve usual problems (content reflection) to how teacher’s challenge their understanding of what works (that would already imply framing

questions in terms of evidence, thus marking a beginning of scholarly thinking on teaching) to critical reflection that questions the validity of the initially selected problem for analysis and attempts to begin asking new questions (reflection on premises) (Kreber 2005, 326).

Another contribution from the same research and adapted from Mesirov is the understanding of three key domains related to teaching and learning in higher education: **instruction, pedagogy, curriculum** (or teaching strategies, student learning processes, and content of teaching) (Kreber 2005, 327). This categorization being more concerned with the three dimensions vital in understanding teaching is a good thematic way for categorizing what teachers reflect on most. In her research, Kreber is looking for these forms and domains of reflection in interviews with science instructors, both those experienced and those relatively new to the field of teaching. The domains of reflection are obviously particularly directly related to the content of teaching development and programs that seek to advance such a development (that is issues such as course design, teaching methods selection, theories or evidence of student learning) thus they seem promising starting points for this analysis.

6. Data sample and the process of analysis

For the purpose of this paper, I analysed three pieces of student work from five courses (altogether fifteen pieces of work coming from different individual students) that could be expected to be reflexive in nature such as statements of teaching philosophy, autobiographical narratives, literature reviews/essays, final course reflections. I was interested to understand what sort of reflection were in fact present in the sample. The sample consists of the work of students from International Relations, Political Science, History, Law, Environmental Science and Policy, Philosophy, Sociology and Anthropology departments. Most of the students represented here are Eastern European, one is British, one is American and one is Nigerian. I decided to sample pieces of work from courses before this academic year to gain a certain minimum amount of distance from the written pieces. As someone who would have commented on them when they were originally submitted, I wanted to take a fresh look at these pieces of student writing.

My analytical strategy was to first identify and then summarise basic reflective considerations made by the students in each short piece of writing which could be understood as of reflective nature, and then to categorise them using theoretically derived concepts on reflection in teaching as outlined in the previous section. However, when other categories of a reflective nature seemed to present themselves, I also included these in my analysis alongside the more focused reflections on teaching areas or teaching actions that I was most interested to find. This simple qualitative analysis was then transferred to the table format to facilitate the overall view of the data thus generated. (Table1)

7. Discussion of forms of reflection generated

Shön's Reflection on action did in fact occur in almost all cases where students had some teaching experience. There were at least three instances when reflection on action was clearly identified in my sample. These were reported as a summary of main things learnt or experienced in one's own teaching thus indicating the process of reflection on action that had taken place during the teaching process. Below is an example of this form of reflection:

'As I already designed and taught one course in human rights, I have some idea about my teaching abilities. In terms of weaknesses, I am not satisfied with my ability to motivate students, while in terms of strengths, I believe I succeeded in

designing an interesting and challenging course and I managed to a certain extent to encourage students to think critically and to argue for their point of view.'

There were no explicit samples of work, however, dedicated to a very *systematic* and step by step reflection of recent teaching process. The reflection undertaken rather concerned general educational principles or values to be adopted by the teacher based on first teaching experiences, rather than concrete practices and ways of solving problems. Often when a concrete experience was implied, no step-by-step reflection on action was developed and the experience became a source of general reflection on the student's teaching ability:

'I could establish good relationship with students well whenever I was in a teaching situation, I could lead a class to success and had positive feedback (also some criticism of course)'

'Still, when I started to teach I found [it] very difficult to manage the class chemistry as no matter how much do you prepare your notes, materials and questions, there are still situations when you cannot make students speak or react positively to your efforts.'

Thus, reflection on action as such was only marginally present in the sample even though the student's ability to perform it could clearly be understood as already in place.

It has to be stressed here that for our students, the action itself is often a future event, thus not quite compatible with Shön's theorization (though he makes reflection for future action part of a function of reflection in action). It seems therefore that more work needs to be spent on developing the skill of reflection on action and for action and in combining the experience of teaching (where such experience can be available) with writing/thinking about it. The capacity for this format of reflection may be best served by additional formats for this sort of reflection, particularly those that allow a more thorough analysis of an experience, in particular when not far removed from that experience in time. For example, additional formats for reflection on an ongoing or just completed teaching assistantship could be developed. Nevertheless, it was clear that professionally informed thinking about the action of teaching seemed to be stimulated by some of the formats of the portfolio documents (and other analyses of students thinking right after a teaching simulation or an observed class would probably stimulate more systematic reflection on action but for that a different source of data would be required). If Shön's (1983, 277) point that the reflection on action need not be very good descriptions of a situation to be productive in terms of future actions and new understanding is accepted then we can say that the beginning of such reflection is occurring in our program.

As far as the second source of theoretical categorization is concerned, that is Kreber's analysis of different domains of reflection, examples of each domain certainly present in the sample, though maybe sometimes again in underdeveloped format. From the sample analysed, it seems that reflection on teaching practices and less so, reflection on curriculum, were present whereas reflection on student learning was still more often implicitly approached through some implications of different teaching approaches. Four students reflected on the curriculum in their own educational histories and in syllabi reviews. It became obvious that explicitly structured task of reviewing some target syllabi combined with a curriculum related reading is a good format in which this form of reflection can be quite prominent though not necessarily immediately translated into one's own future practice:

'Syllabus can be a good source of information about formally articulated goals and teaching methods, although it does not reveal much about pedagogical strategies.... However the syllabus can represent how the sociological requirements and conventions are incorporated into teaching the subject.... Thirdly, the review of syllabi also sheds light on what is understood under teaching 'sociological thinking'.

Reflection on teaching practices was the most widespread, and could be identified clearly in at least half of the student texts. Students clearly focused on developing their knowledge of instructional approaches which they could claim as their own and apply:

'for achieving this [aim of developing critical thinking and practical skills] the widely practiced lecture-seminar model is suitable, with certain small amendments. Lectures, unlike their traditional format, will also accommodate teacher-led discussions, to practice oral argumentation and creative thinking, while seminars will be dedicated to practical activities: presentations, debates, hypothetical etc.'

Other teaching strategies that became the focus of reflection were lecturing issues, setting appropriate written assignments or stimulating classroom discussion. However, often this format amounted to general concepts and orientations to teaching that imply a form of practice rather than a focused discussion of a specific method and what using this method would actually involve (however, following feedback on their pieces of writing, most were later able to specify their practices to some extent)

Despite my expectation that reflection on student learning was going to be less developed, following Kreber's findings from interviewing science instructors, in my sample it was as present as reflection on teaching strategies. Granted, in some cases this reflection was more hinted at than fully developed, but the capacity to theorise on student learning, often based on one's own student experiences was clearly present:

'I have for a long time theorized my own structures for how people learn, based on...well how I learned. My personal pet thought, my hobby horse, if you will, is that people benefit from their struggles to learn'.

The most developed examples offered tentative definition of what student learning involved usually focusing on one or two aspects of it, in a process of personal theory building: My own definition of critical thinking refers to the capacity of the student to apply the knowledge acquired to a particular situation, in order to obtain the best outcomes. Therefore critical thinking should be oriented towards problem-solving. This involves the participation of various mental processes, from the most basic to the most complex. As I am not a psychologist and I still believe that a comprehensive definition of critical thinking is an almost impossible task, I will limit myself to this partial and perhaps one-sided understanding of the issue.

The difference was clearly in the format of the reflection, often generated after reading articles and linking these readings to own experience. It seems that statements of teaching philosophy and reviews of reading were what made this form of reflection possible.

Virtually all of the reflections on teaching remained in the sphere of content reflection, that is attempted to point out what the student knows, and what they would do with that knowledge. There was no notion of challenging how their knowledge could be challenged or

proven to be acceptable to others and no notion of problematise the premises of their knowing something and asking new questions altogether. Most of the students were preoccupied with the things any beginning (and most other) teachers consider the only valuable topics for reflection, how to use what is know to create effective classrooms and to create their individual teaching strategy.

What is even more interesting for the purpose of this paper are cases where students reflected on reflection or became aware that they were in fact developing reflective thinking. The presence of at least three such cases suggests perhaps more clearly that development of reflective thinking on teaching is possible and not at all inaccessible or difficult to stimulate and is occurring in our program. In one specific case the student reflected on reflection as a source of their own knowledge on teaching: 'As I do not have much teaching experience as of yet, I can start from my critical ☺ reflection on my own experiences as a student an act upon those.' Another student clearly identified 'critical reflective learning' as the main outcome of the training program from her and yet another reflected on how the training experience might transform her own view of not only learning but of knowledge production as such. This suggests that at least some of our students were able to reach a stage of meta-reflection, thus beginning to understand the role of reflection in their own learning as a cognitive tool they can deploy to understand teaching and their own development as teachers.

8. Other forms of reflection and need for further research

The analysis of the sample of student writing shows that it is possible to stimulate reflection on teaching and learning also at the very beginning of teaching experience. Both reflection on action and reflection on teaching practice, curriculum practices and student learning were present in the sample. More interestingly, in addition to the above categories of reflection, more or less present in the sample, other topics of reflection emerged in the data.

Namely, apart from reflecting on their teaching and learning experiences and approaches, students reflected most of the time on their own identities as students or researchers in a particular discipline, which underlies their overall teaching approach. This sort of reflection was perhaps more important to them at this early stage in their professional formation that determined the students' sense of purpose and approach in their teaching:

'I definitely feel very committed to what I would teach eventually. Ever since I made the acquaintance with anthropology as a discipline I have felt that I am growing from it both as an individual and as a social being in this sense I deem it to have been an obvious decision to follow this path. In that sense, it is representative of what I consider of utmost importance in the social sciences: interdisciplinarity and social responsibility.'

This form of reflection on the self was often almost indistinguishable from reflection on teaching or curriculum practices:

'I believe that as a teacher I should appear as knowledgeable and approachable. Part of the way to ensure that I am knowledgeable about my courses and confident in my teaching is by integrating teaching and research. I believe that good teachers should be aware of the state of the art in their subjects in order to inspire students and to help them appreciate the dynamic nature of scholarship'

Perhaps this discipline bound identity work was unavoidable in this stage of postgraduate formation of both the future teacher and the young researcher, or perhaps reflection on teaching practice and reflection on disciplinary identity are more closely bound than we understand them so far, and maybe they continue to be bound together at any stage in the career. Considering the ongoing socialisation process in the discipline that is part of graduate study it seems that reflection on disciplinary identity is also a form of ongoing professional development that underlies teaching approaches and pedagogical perspectives and therefore it deserves to also be studied systematically. But understanding reflection on disciplinary identity would require some new conceptual starting point. The closest categorization of this type of reflection is Davidson's (2004) notion of 'de-centering disciplinary identity' or peering across disciplinary divides as a part of learning about teaching and in some cases such a comparative perspective was present in student reflecting on teaching practices that could be applied from other fields. But in most cases the purpose was in fact entrenching or centering disciplinary identity in the selected field or discipline and that may be an approach that is either more characteristic of early disciplinary (and professional) teaching development or simply needs further theorisation.

Moreover, still another topic for reflection, perhaps even broadly conceived appeared in the sample. Namely students often reflected on their own route to higher education, on changing educational contexts and practices that made them develop (or slowed down their development) in particular ways and on things they generally did not like about their own experience of higher education. This was also reflection on identity, but this time of a broader sociological-biographical character. In the case of the majority of our students perhaps the most pronounced topic was the experience of contrasting educational systems and institutions that became the underlying topic for reflecting on different teaching practices. Most students who employed this sort of reflective thinking were able to combine critique with some notion of their own development or integration most notably between east or central European and Anglo Saxon systems of education:

"Having experienced both the Prussian style instruction up to the end of my secondary education and the Anglo-Saxon style of education during a brief yearly stint during high school and throughout my tertiary years, I believe that in fact both clutter one's way to become a critical and responsible individual with many obstacles ... Without factual knowledge no criticism can substantiate itself, while, overall, one cannot afford ceasing to criticise all factual knowledge s/he is confronted with."

For some students, comparison between different national educational systems was a source of own perspectives, for others their CEU experience became classified, alongside other 'western' universities, as a source of clearly more positive models of teaching and learning than those experienced at Central or Eastern European universities during undergraduate years:

"The faculty I was enrolled in at the time of my undergraduate studies conforms to the instruction paradigm as described by the two aforementioned authors. Instruction and not learning was provided. The lectures were placing students in a

rather passive role, and I remember that for most of the courses, seminars did not exist.'

This form of reflection is very visible in some of the other work of other students in this course, it seems to have been partly well stimulated by a discussion on changing paradigms in undergraduate education (Barr and Tagg, 1995) during the first course session and reflected in student educational autobiographies. But the readiness of students to classify educational experiences in the light of different teaching approaches based on their own experience seems to have a far more important identity creation purpose, thus being far more than a commentary. Based on their own life trajectory in education the students form the basis of their espoused theory of learning and teaching and in this sense this form of reflection also deserves more research.

Together with comparative reflection on disciplinary identity, this area of reflective development would require further analysis using new conceptual or theoretical tools. In order to analyse and understand better this type of reflection a different conceptualization is needed. This may come from professional development literature as a source of such a conceptualization, for example from Mezirow's (1998) categorization on critical reflection on assumptions as part of the transformative learning theory is an obvious candidate for starting such an inquiry. This form of reflexivity is a form of critical self-reflection, (as part of critical thinking skill) and for social scientists, it is also part of their ability to contextualize, to be aware of one's own position in society whilst attempting to study it, it is related to what sociologists called 'sociological imagination' (Mills 1959) and what has become perhaps the central skills of any individual in current social context.

Whilst this form of reflexivity is mentioned in relation to purposes of higher education learning, it is less directly visible in literature on learning to teach and on scholarship of teaching. And yet, this process is key to becoming aware of where one is coming from as a teacher, what accounts for one's professional formation and choices, and what accounts for either a positive or negative evaluations of all such experiences. It seems obvious that we cannot fully account for the formation of scholarly teachers without understanding also this type of reflection on identity, which underlies any concrete teaching approach and the view of student learning that the future teacher will adopt.

9. Conclusion

Leaving aside further research on reflecting on identity, following the initial analysis of the forms of reflection on teaching generated through our program, the question still remains: to what extent can reflection be a first step in developing scholarly teachers? Or, what does all this have to do with the scholarship of teaching?

If we thought of our course participants as already candidates for scholarly teachers the reflections generated by most of the students fall short of the ideal. At first glance, they risk focusing further on the teachers themselves and their own identity instead of making the all important leap to reflection (and more than just reflection) on student learning. There are certainly very few notions of evidence of student learning used or implied in such reflective texts. At best, direct experience is quoted as an underlying justification for beliefs or approaches.

However, if we switch from a focus on SOTL as the highest form of contribution to knowledge on teaching and learning that a lecturer should be able to undertake (e.g. Bass

1998, Huber and Hutchings 2005, Kreber 2002), to the process of developing as a scholarly teacher, more varied formats of reflection become extremely helpful analyses of various aspects of teaching that may lead the teacher to a future inquiry. Leaving aside this problem of definition of what constitutes scholarly teaching, teaching scholarship or scholarship of teaching and learning, it becomes clear that an SOTL is also a *developmental process* and a process partly concerned with the change in teachers' understanding of their own work as they develop more sophisticated ways of learning about teaching (Sharpe 2004). Here the focus on reflection and on teacher's own self understanding of their own teaching is a necessary first step to SOTL for all teachers, but even more vital for the younger academics who have to establish their own identities and practices before they can fully investigate their effectiveness, or their impact on student learning.

This form of scholarship is a general orientation of the teacher who wishes to 'become, and remain, well-informed and critically reflective, regarding the entire universe of salient events, activities, intentions and outcomes that comprise the practice of teaching' (Andresen 2000, 142.) It may be expressed in many formats that go beyond (or are produced before) the scholarly article or research report (Nelson 2003).

Recently, Kreber wrote about the main purpose of SOTL as focusing on an ability relate better what truly matters most in one's own teaching and how to form better the linkages between the teacher the learners and the discipline, and also among teachers and among learners (Kreber 2007). So, the scholarship of teaching is partly an ongoing reflexive improvement of teaching, concerned with making it a worthwhile and authentic experience, both for the teacher and the students, as well as making it speak back to the discipline itself and develop its knowledge.

This process is what the CRC course for doctoral students is attempting to initiate. My own analysis shows that on the one hand, few of our students are ready to move beyond reflection on content of what they know about teaching, but also they do seem to develop critical reflexivity based on their own learning experiences. Thus in this broader conception of SOTL, we are making the first step in development of young academics as scholarly teachers. We are not getting very far along the trajectory of developing scholars of teaching as the first stages of reflection we tend to stimulate tend to focus on content of teaching rather than its premises, however we also see much identity work occurring at the same time as teaching reflection or as an integral part of it. Undoubtedly, the simple model we have developed for teaching reflections generated through writing is suitable for a graduate program that is concerned about developing the teaching individual as a potential scholar of teaching and may be of interests to others who wish to take a similar approach to teacher development.

Table 1. Summary of topics and forms of reflection found in student work sample analysed

Student sample	Type of assignment	Reflections generated (summary or main topic)	Type of reflection present or hinted at
1	Educational autobiography	Describes struggles with own learning and remembered generalizations from it (dyslexia, moving schools, poor quality of high school teachers, efforts to develop academically, through individual effort	Reflection in biography and identity (in and out of formal structures)
2	Review of syllabi in the topic of interest	Presents a general assessment of what can be learnt by studying sociological syllabi (goals, approaches, gaps, nature of the specific field of interest)	Reflection on curriculum, teaching and learning is implied but not personally owned Hints at the process of academic identity creation
3	Statement of teaching philosophy	Presents own definition on teaching based on facilitation, mentoring, based on inspiring teachers met Specifies own preferred teaching goals, assignments, behaviours Links teaching to research expertise	Reflection on student learning Reflection on own development is hinted at Reflection on teaching strategies Reflection on disciplinary identity is implied
4	Educational autobiography	Mentions own educational motivation, family background and place of life, choices of discipline Notices on changes in higher education system in the field Criticises the average teachers of own system and their approaches Points out the importance of teaching intuition versus trainable skills to be developed	General reflection on personal development Reflection on own institutional and generational position in the system is implied Reflecting on past experience General reflection on past teaching General reflection on future learning in teaching

5	Review of two articles on teaching the subject	Presents a General assessment of possible sources of innovation by introducing new methods into the teaching of own discipline from other fields	Reflection on disciplinary socialization is implied, Reflection on crossing over to other fields and their approaches is hinted at
6	Reflective response to the training	Identifies key insights and feelings from training	Reflection on the development of teaching identity and approach is hinted at
7	Reflective response to the training linked to educational autobiography	Builds own history on women teachers in the family, Points out the faults of educational system, Reflection on own fears in teaching Summarises own learning in the course: deconstruction and critical thinking as a key result	Reflection on personal identities Reflection on own history in educational system Reflection on reflection
8	Expectations for the course and autobiography	Mentions future learning on methods, Summarises own teaching experiences Reflection on the nature of the field Reflects on educational systems experienced as student Responds to article on the learning paradigm	Reflection on teaching strategies Reflection on action Reflection on curriculum issues Reflection on distinct academic identity across two discipline areas Reflection on own approaches taken from comparative systems is implied Reflection on student learning is implied
9	Statement of teaching philosophy	Sums up the state of the discipline in the region and its gaps Enumerates on desirable approaches in teaching, content	Reflection on wider history impacting own institutional position Reflection on curriculum, Reflection on teaching goals and methods

		<p>Reflects on own teaching experience</p> <p>Considers the gains from training course: offering alternative teaching methods, reading literature on teaching</p>	<p>Reflection on action and shortcomings of action</p> <p>Reflection on further professional development</p>
10	Statement of teaching philosophy	<p>Identifies own feelings towards and key belief about teaching</p> <p>Identifies contrasting educational systems encountered and their shortcomings</p> <p>Comments on feelings towards and attachment to the discipline as a field for teaching</p> <p>Comments on the importance of a specific key topic and the need for including insights from other disciplines</p> <p>Lists contrasting traditions and creative and interactive methods of teaching</p> <p>Points out his own critical reflection as a source of knowledge</p>	<p>Reflection on student learning</p> <p>Reflection on own history in education</p> <p>Reflection on personal identity through discipline</p> <p>Hints at reflection on the offerings of other disciplines</p> <p>Reflection on student learning, reflection on teaching practices</p> <p>Reflection on student learning</p>
11	Essay based on reading (lecturing)	<p>Argues for retention of lecturing method but in a more student centred manner</p> <p>Considers techniques for engaging students in their own knowledge production</p> <p>Argues for non-monolithic view of knowledge as underlying good lecturing</p>	<p>Reflection on teaching practices</p> <p>Reflection on student learning is hinted at</p> <p>Process of disciplinary identity building is implied</p>
12	Teaching philosophy statement	Links instructional paradigm to own educational experiences with their shortcomings	Reflection on own history in education

		<p>Identifies a new vision of education due to experiences at CEU</p> <p>Identifies approaches appropriate for learning paradigm Identifies teaching strategies to be used</p> <p>Identifies oneself as a disciplinary practitioner within a learning paradigm Describes the classical and personal view of the nature of the discipline</p> <p>Identifies functions of the syllabus and sources toe used in teaching</p> <p>Outlines some outcomes from the course</p>	<p>Reflection on student learning</p> <p>Reflection on teaching practices and goals</p> <p>Reflection on teaching strategies</p> <p>Reflection on disciplinary identity</p> <p>Reflection on the curriculum</p> <p>Hint of future professional development planning</p>
13	Reflection on reading (lecturing)	<p>Accepts the prevalent format of teaching as inevitable in own system</p> <p>Disagrees with some cal views of lecturing, Considers innovations</p> <p>Identifies some problems with the method based on experience</p>	<p>Reflection on own history is implied</p> <p>Reflection on teaching strategies</p>
14	Educational autobiography	<p>Identifies oneself as a special need student (as a child)</p> <p>Mentions pre-university teaching experiences abroad</p> <p>Reflects on how the course</p>	<p>Reflection on personal history</p> <p>Reflection on learning from teaching experiences (role of cultures in learning)</p> <p>Reflection on learning across fields</p>

		materials might help also with the view of the discipline	Reflection on learning about teaching as part of disciplinary learning
15	A response to reading	<p>Presents own understanding of critical thinking as focused on successful application of theory or problem-solving</p> <p>Presents strategies to help achieve critical thinking in teaching the field</p>	<p>Reflection on student learning</p> <p>Reflection on teaching strategies</p>

References

- Barr, B., Tagg, J. (1995) 'From Teaching to Learning – a New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education' *Change*, November-December 1995,
- Bass, R. (1998) The Scholarship of Teaching: what's the problem', *Inventio*, Department of Instructional Improvement and Instructional Technologies, George Mason University,.1-9. Available at:
- Boyer, E. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Washington DC, Carnegie Foundation
- Davidson, M. (2004) 'Bones of Contention: using self and story in the quest to professionalise higher education teaching – an interdisciplinary approach' *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9 (3), 299-310.
- Huber, M., & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The Advancements of Learning: Building the teaching commons*. The Carnegie Foundation Report on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Huber, M. (2005) *Balancing Acts: the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Academic Careers*, Washington, D.C., The American Association for Higher Education and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
- Huber, M. T., Morreale, S. P. (2002) (Eds.) *Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: exploring common ground*, Washington, D.C., American Association for Higher Education
- Hutchings, P., Shulman, L. (1999) 'The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments' *Change* 31 (5).
- Kreber, C. (2007) 'What's It Really All About? The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as an Authentic Practice' *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* <http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/>, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January 2007)
- Kreber, C. (2005) 'Reflection on Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching, Focus on science instructors' *Higher Education*, 50, 323-359.
- Kreber, C. (2002) 'Teaching Excellence, Teaching Expertise, and the Scholarship of Teaching' *Innovative Higher Education*, 27 (1), 5-23.
- Luddeke, G. (2003) 'Professionalising Teaching Practice in Higher Education: a study of disciplinary variation and 'teaching-scholarship' *Studies in Higher Education*, 28 (2), 213-228.
- Nelson, C. (2003) 'Doing it: Examples of Several of the different Genres of the scholarship of teaching and learning' *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*, 14 (2&3), 85-94.
- Mills, C.W. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*, New York, Oxford University Press
- Mezirov, J. (1998) 'On Critical Reflection' *Adult Education Quarterly*, 48 (3), 185-198
- Witman, P., Richlin, L. (2007) 'The Status of The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in The Disciplines' *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* <http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/>, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January 2007)
- Schon, D. (1995) 'The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology' *Change*, 27 (6), 26-35.
- Schon, D. (1983) *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*, New York, Basic Books.
- Sharpe, R. (2004) 'How do Professionals Learn and Develop' in Baume and Kahn *Enhancing Staff and Educational Development*, RoutledgeFalmer

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: EDUCATING THE EDUCATORS!

Contributor: E.M. O'Sullivan, Cork University Dental & Hospital, UCC

INTRODUCTION

The *sine qua non* of a great university is academic excellence. This is measured by the quality of scholarship and research output and also by the caliber of its graduates and their collective impact upon society as a whole. To be a great university, therefore requires excellence in all endeavours. This can only be achieved when all parts of the University are committed to the highest standards of performance.

However, it must be acknowledged that in today's world, academic excellence requires skills and experiences far beyond those traditionally associated with academic life. The last 50 years has been a period of unprecedented change in Higher Education, combining tremendous growth and pedagogical advances with unparalleled challenges for all involved. Faculty members therefore face many complex challenges including, increased public accountability, higher student expectations, increased student diversity, as well as the impact of technological advances, and changing paradigms in teaching and learning (Figure 1). Dental faculty, particularly those operating within a tertiary care health centre, must meet many additional challenges due to a changing societal culture affecting demand for treatment, shifting disease patterns and patient demographics, ever evolving interdisciplinary expertise and practice requirements, coupled with the need to integrate scientific advances and emerging technologies into practice. Furthermore, the revolution in information technology has eroded the role of the teacher as the exclusive holder of expert knowledge, and created more informed, more demanding students and patient clientele. Higher education in 21st century therefore requires talented, motivated, adaptable faculty members committed to educational best practices. willina to enaaae in effective educational

**This functionality is disabled,
because you are using the
Demo version of the program.
For purchasing the full version,
visit www.conceptdraw.com**

Figure 1: Challenges facing Higher Education in the 21st Century

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

“Faculty development is a tool for improving the educational vitality of academic institutions through attention to the competencies needed by individual teachers, and to the institutional policies required to promote academic excellence” - Wilkerson & Irby, (1998).

Faculty development is a key factor in improving educational quality and introducing effective educational reform. While numerous definitions of faculty development exist, the above definition by Wilkerson & Irby (1998) is particularly apt as it emphasizes the link between faculty development and the promotion of academic excellence. However, despite the plethora of articles published on the importance of faculty development, relatively few universities have as yet taken adequate steps to develop comprehensive, systematic faculty development programs to meet the ever changing faculty needs. MacKinnon, (2003) decried the lack of attention being given to faculty development, which “pervades all of higher education, from the humanities to the health sciences”. Indeed, while the Commission on Dental Accreditation Standards for dental schools (CDA, 1998) stressed the need for ‘evidence of an ongoing faculty development process linked with teaching, patient care, scholarship and service’, international reports indicate that ‘the vast majority of medical and dental educators still have little or no formal training in education either at the undergraduate or graduate level’ (Spencer, 2003; Vassilas et al., 2003). In medical and dental education, the situation is compounded by the traditional practice of employing a relatively high number of ‘expert clinicians’ i.e. experienced general practitioners who generally have little or no formal training in education. This paper examines the profile and educational status of Irish Dental Faculty, their engagement with educational support systems and explores their attitudes towards faculty development.

METHODS & MATERIALS:

There are currently two dental schools in the Republic of Ireland namely, Cork University Dental School & Hospital (CDH), UCC and Dublin Dental School (DDH), Trinity College Dublin. All dental faculty members i.e. all part-time/ full-time professors, assistant and associated professors, clinical specialists, statutory, clinical and college lecturers, clinical tutors, and laboratory instructors involved in teaching undergraduate and postgraduate Dental Students and/or Dental Hygiene students, were invited to participate in a national study on the perceived educational needs of Irish Dental Faculty. The study population therefore comprised 130 faculty members, 75 in DDH and 55 in CDH. A custom-designed questionnaire was distributed to each faculty member. A ‘mixed-method’ approach was adopted, with quantitative elements providing structure while complementary qualitative elements provided ‘richness and colour’; several inter-relating points were designed to provide opportunities for triangulation. Study variables are listed in Table 1. An extremely high response rate was achieved at CDH (91%) with a lower rate recorded by DDH (45%), resulting in an overall response rate of 64.6%. Analysis was undertaken using SPSS-14 statistical package, standardised statistical descriptive techniques and Chi-square tests.

1. Gender	16. Informal courses
2. Age category	17. Formal courses
3. Academic degrees	18. Currently enrolled
4. Year of last degree	19. Level of support received
5. Rank	21. Interested in attending training
6. Contractual agreement	22. Reason
7. Years clinical experience	24. Training topics required
8. Years teaching experience	25. Top three topics
9. Contact hours	26. Preferred instruction medium
10. Faculty duties	27. Compulsory/voluntary nature
11. Preferred teaching format	28. Preferred frequency
12. Reason	29. Preferred timing
13. Least preferred teaching format	30. Barriers
14. Reason	31. Free comments
15. Any teacher training completed	

Table 1: Variables Extracted from Study Questionnaire

RESULTS:

Age & Gender Profile:

This study sought to develop greater understanding of the professional and demographic profile of the Irish Dental Faculty. Several international reports have commented on the aging profile of dental faculty, expressing concern regarding the impending retirement of many senior academics (Hand, 2006; Livingstone, 2004; Kennedy & Hunt, 1998). The study indicates that the age profile of the Irish dental faculty is in line with international trends, as 75% of the respondents are over forty years of age and almost a third (28% CDH, 33.3% DDH) are over fifty, including 89% of the professorial staff.

Dental faculty in Ireland appears to be male dominated (64%), with a marked gender imbalance noted among the 30-39 year age group (85% male). Males also occupy a somewhat disproportionate number of senior academic positions, accounting for 57% of the lecturer/consultant positions and 89% of the professorial appointments. Lower rates of advancement among female faculty have also been reported in other countries, such as the US where females comprise 52% of the overall population, but just 24% of the dental faculty (Haden et al., 2000). Indeed, Waldman (1995) noted that just 6% of female dental educators achieved professorial level compared with 22% of their male colleagues, while Nesbitt et al., (2001) reported rates of professorial achievement of 43% in men versus 15% among women.

Educational Profile:

The study suggests that the Irish Dental Faculty is largely comprised of highly educated professionals as 89% had completed a five-year Bachelor of Dental Surgery Degree, while a high proportion had attained Professional Fellowships (FDS 44%), Masters Degrees (39%) and Doctorates (16%). However, it is worth noting that 43% of the respondents admitted that they had not engaged in formal education for over ten years while a sixth, including all the professorial staff, had not done so in 20 years ($P < 0.001$).

Irish Dental Faculty members also have a wealth of clinical experience as 77% have at least a decade of clinical experience behind them while 47% have been involved in the provision of dental treatment for over twenty years. Many are also experienced teachers, as 54% have been teaching for at least ten years while most (78%) of the professorial staff have over 20 years teaching experience ($P=0.002$). However, the survey revealed that while dental faculty are clearly experts in *what* they teach, most of them have little or no training in *how* to teach. Indeed, while 45% of the respondents said they had attended a teacher training programme, the vast majority (92%) had merely attended informal sessions. Only eleven (13%) respondents had completed any formal teacher training; these were largely (10/11) CDH members who had participated in the recently introduced teaching and learning programmes in UCC. Seven (18.9%) senior academics had obtained a formal teaching qualification while none of the professorial staff had done so.

This situation is by no means unique to the Irish Dental faculty or even to dentistry as a whole. In fact, the lack of teacher training was accepted as the norm for most educators in tertiary education until quite recently (Spencer, 2003; Yip, 2003). Medical education traditionally operated under the concept that a doctor's professional qualifications and experience were "sufficient to guarantee at least adequate teachers and that teachers were 'born and not made'" (MacDougall & Drummond, 2005). However, while expert clinicians have much to contribute to health care education, the gap between effective practice and effective teaching can be wide as these faculty members tend to rely, pedagogically, on their years of practice experience and teach as they themselves were taught (Masella & Thompson, 2004).

Engagement with Existing Educational Support Mechanisms:

While both universities provide a broad range of teaching support services for academic staff, faculty members appear to be largely unaware of these services. A review of available documentation indicated an extremely low level of engagement between dental faculty members and available support structures. This is hardly surprising when one considers that only a third (34%) of the respondents knew that formal & informal training courses were available, 18% knew that training was provided for newly appointed staff while just 12% realized that fully accredited teaching and learning courses were available. In fact, almost a quarter of the respondents (16-24%) were quite certain that such services were not available.

Indeed, while staff were largely unaware of the existing support mechanisms, many (53%) were highly critical of the level of support personally received; almost half of the series (48%) said they received no support whatsoever. The feelings of anger and frustration engendered by this lack of support were clearly visible in the various free text comments - "frankly none - you just teach as it comes to you" or "between nil and zero". Staff felt they had been forced to "just teach as it comes to you", relying largely on the methods they found effective as students. In fact, only five (6.7%) faculty members felt they had been adequately supported.

Attitudes to Faculty Development:

This survey suggests that there is considerable support for the concept of teacher training courses among Irish dental faculty members as the vast majority (75%) of the respondents said they would be willing to attend such courses. Younger, less experienced staff were particularly interested in such training ($P<0.005$). Conversely, older staff (50+) generally believed they did not need such training ($P<0.05$), expressed less interest in improving the

quality of their work ($P < 0.05$) or, felt faculty development was irrelevant as they were approaching retirement. This is in agreement with international reports which have suggested that older staff members may become disenchanted and reluctant to engage in faculty development due to emotional 'burn-out', with commitment and care becoming somewhat 'frayed at the edges' (Day, 2003; Hargreaves, 1993). Furthermore, Taylor (2001) suggested that senior staff and consultants may have greater "inhibitions and difficulties about undertaking significant new learning...owing to fears of exposure". However, the results of this study do not support this hypothesis as none of the consultants/ senior lecturers agreed that experienced teachers did not need teacher training; two professors supported this viewpoint.

Interestingly, perceived learning needs varied significantly by age, and academic rank ($P < 0.05$). Professorial staff had scant interest in training for PBL, seminar teaching or feedback provision while part-time clinical staff and consultants were more interested in clinical teaching skills than the lecturers and professors. Younger staff were significantly more interested in PBL than those over 50 years of age (70% versus 32%, $P < 0.05$) while interest in clinical teaching skills, evaluating learning and self development decreased with age ($P = 0.006$ and $P < 0.05$, respectively). This suggests that teacher training courses must be pitched at an appropriate level and that the curriculum must be selected to appeal to the specific target group.

This survey also explored motivation for participation in faculty development. Results indicate that the key motivating factors include: (i) self improvement, (ii) a desire to improve the overall student experience and, (iii) to raise educational standards. Many (33%) believed that teacher training would help them to develop professionally, improve their teaching ability and satisfaction, and increase their communication and clinical supervisory skills. Similar motivating factors were reported among different disciplines e.g. among pharmacy faculty members by MacKinnon (2003).

Several international reports have suggested that medical and dental educators are resistant to educational concepts and, that faculty members look upon educational concepts and theories as "edu-babble" and "gobbledegook" (Masella & Thompson, 2004, Abrahamson, 1996). Conversely, this study suggests that Irish Dental faculty are actually more than willing to embrace new ideas, that they appreciate the need to provide students with the best possible education and, accept the need to "learn evidence base for current educational theories". Indeed, they seem to believe this training would help to underpin their teaching, thereby giving them "greater structure and confidence".

However, while one would wish to highlight the positive findings of this study, it would however be invidious to suggest that all faculty members were willing to unreservedly embrace faculty development. Many faculty members expressed guarded enthusiasm, saying that they "would be interested in short, focused sessions with practical content" but had "no further interest in assignments/projects etc". Others admitted that their participation would depend upon the format, quality and perceived relevance/ personal benefit of future development programmes. Many staff felt that the lack of promotional opportunities (44%) and perceived benefits (56%) posed significant barriers to their participation in faculty development programmes. These views were consistently expressed, irrespective of academic rank, clinical/teaching experience, or contractual status. The frustration engendered by the current situation is illustrated by the comments listed below:

"No point in attending such courses as there are no rewards"

"Teaching needs to be recognised as part of the job and not an 'extra'. The most important support is recognition of the importance / role of teaching in the promotions within the college. Currently, research is the only currency".

"Emphasis is not on the quality of teaching – it is regarded as a minor part of what we do. Consider that recognition needs to be given to the value of good teaching".

"It is truly up to oneself and there is no chance of promotion or advancement even in salary for those who work hard at teaching. Often those who do less are promoted".

"Personnel should be trained to do the job they were hired to do. This is the case with almost any job, why not so with 3rd level education? It is assumed you know what to do. Lecturers are experts in their own field but not necessarily at teaching. I think to be fair to students, teacher training should be mandatory".

While staff raised the possibility of compulsory faculty development this concept is still somewhat controversial. Some authors, for example Seidemann & Torres (2002), agree that attendance at educational courses should be mandatory. However, others suggest that a change to higher standards is more likely to come with "persuasion, endurance, and experimentation" than by duress (Falk-Nilsson et al., 2002). The survey indicates that Irish dental faculty members are somewhat divided on this issue as 46% believed that teacher training should be compulsory for all faculty members whereas 66% felt it should only be compulsory for all new faculty. However, the general consensus was that faculty development was worthwhile and should be encouraged and supported.

Conclusions:

This study indicates that there is considerable support for the concept of teacher training among Irish Dental Faculty members, and refutes the hypothesis that dental faculty are resistant to educational concepts. Results indicate that the format and content need to be tailored to the needs of participants and finally, that participation must be encouraged and rewarded.

"We need our best scholars to be our teachers, and we need them to give them the same creative energy to teaching as they do to scholarship. We need to identify, support and reward those who teach superbly"- Frank Rhodes (1998).

References:

- Abrahamson, S. (1996). *Essays on medical education*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, p.112. In: Masella RS, Thompson TJ. (2004). Dental education and evidence-based educational best practices: bridging the great divide. *J Dent Ed*; 68:12: 1266-71.
- CDA. (1998). Commission on Dental Accreditation. *Accreditation standards from dental education programs*. Chicago: American Dental Association.
- Day, C. (2003). *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. Pub. RoutledgeFalmer.

- Falk-Nilsson E, Walmsley D, Brennan M, et al. (2002). *Cognition and learning*. Eur J Dent Ed; 6 (Suppl.3): 27-32.
- Haden NK, Beemsterboer PL, Weaver RG, Valachovic RW. (2000). *Dental school faculty shortages increase: an update on future dental school faculty*. J Dent Ed; 64(9):657-73.
- Hand, JS. (2006). *Identification of Competencies for Effective Dental Faculty*. J Dent Ed; 70: 937-47.
- Hargreaves, A. (1993). *Dissonant voices, dissipated lives: teachers and the multiple realities of restructuring*. In: Day, C. (2003). *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. Pub. RoutledgeFalmer.
- Kennedy JE, Hunt RJ. (1998). *Meeting the demands for future dental faculty. Leadership for the future: the dental school in the university*. Washington, DC: Am Ass Dent Schools.
- Livingston, HM, Dellinger, TM, Hyde, HC, Holder, R. (2004). *Critical Issues in Dental Education: The Aging and Diminishing Dental Faculty*. Journal of Dental Education; March: 345-354.
- MacDougall J, Drummond MJ. (2005). *The development of medical teachers: an enquiry into the learning histories of 10 experienced medical teachers*. Medical Education; 39:1213-20.
- MacKinnon, GE. (2003). *An investigation of pharmacy faculty attitudes towards faculty development*. Am J Pharmaceutical Ed; 67 (1) Article 11.
- Masella RS, Thompson TJ. (2004). *Dental education and evidence-based educational best practices: bridging the great divide*. J Dent Ed; 68:12: 1266-71.
- Nesbitt PE, et al. (2003). *Work environment perceptions of fulltime dental educators: does gender matter?* J Dent Educ; 67(8):916-24.
- Seidemann, M, Torres E. (2002). *Teaching Dentistry: A Fascinating Challenge*. Int Coll Dentists. Pub Yale University School of Medicine.
- Spencer, J. (2003). *ABC of Learning and Teaching in Medicine: Learning and Teaching in the clinical environment*. BMJ; 326: 591-4.
- Taylor D. (2001). *Emotional factors and continuing professional development*. Adv Psychiatric Treatment; 7:9-15.
- Vassilas CA, Brown N, Wall D, Wormersley H. (2003). *Teaching the teachers in psychiatry*. Adv in Psychiatric Treatment; 9:308-315.
- Waldman BH. (1995). *Faculties of dental schools: changes and perceptions*. J Alabama Dent Assoc 1995;79:26-31. In: Livingston, HM, Dellinger, TM, Hyde, HC, Holder, R. (2004). *Critical Issues in Dental Education: The Aging and Diminishing Dental Faculty*. Journal of Dental Education; March: 345-354.
- Wilkerson L, Irby DM. (1998). *Strategies for improving teaching practices: A comprehensive approach to faculty development*. Academic Medicine; 73: 4: 387-96.
- Yip, K.H. (2003). *A Dentist's Professional Development for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: The SEDA Programme*. London Metropolitan University – Deliberations from 10th March 2003. Available from: www.londonmet.ac.uk/deliberations/professional-development/yip.cfm