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Preface to the Second Edition

As nearly all college and university teachers have learned, joining the professoriate means that for as long as they are members of the academy, their professional lives will be segmented into three unequally sized portions: They will teach, perform research, and engage in service activities. And, as they also know, the academy primarily prepares graduate students for careers in research and not so much for teaching or service. Graduate students may receive some preparation for teaching, but essentially none for service.

In the past dozen or so years, the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP; http://www.teachpsych.org) has worked tremendously hard to underscore the need for better preparation of psychology graduate students for academic careers. For example, in 2002, STP founded the Graduate Student Teaching Association (GSTA) to provide a supportive home environment for graduate students within its organization (http://teachpsych.org/gsta/index.php). The GSTA provides teaching resources to its members and sponsors programming at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association. Its members also contribute extensively to ongoing STP projects and initiatives—in fact, two of the chapters in this e-book are authored by members of the GSTA.

This book—the second edition of Preparing the New Psychology Professoriate: Helping Graduate Students Become Competent Teachers—is intended to provide graduate students interested in pursuing an academic career with a detailed introduction to the transition from graduate school to the academy. It is chock full of excellent advice for how graduate students might successfully navigate this transition and thrive in their new work environment.

We have expanded and updated the book with this new edition. Whereas the first edition included 31 chapters divided into five parts, the second edition includes 43 chapters (organized into the same number of sections). We expanded the first part of the book, Introduction, from two to six chapters. These new chapters address valuable resources that graduate students may tap to enhance their preparation for teaching at the college and university level including the role that STP, the GSTA, teaching and learning centers, and teaching conferences can play in contributing to development of one’s teaching prowess.

The second part of the book, Exemplary Models of Preparing Graduate Students for Teaching, provides an overview of 11 graduate programs across the US that feature especially well developed and expertly implemented teacher training components. We included these chapters in this book so that readers, including faculty who supervise graduate training for teaching, may gain some insight into the various platforms that currently exist for training the new psychology professoriate. We expanded this part of the
book by two chapters, although several other chapters are new to the book as replacements for chapters in the first edition.

Part 3, The Successful Job Applicant: What Academic Departments Seek in New Assistant Professors, contains 16 chapters, including three new chapters. The authors of these chapters represent a broad spectrum of different types of colleges and universities (e.g., religious, Historically Black, undergraduate, master’s-level, and research universities). Each of these authors describes what their particular department is looking for in new assistant professors. This section provides readers with compelling accounts of the dispositions and skills sets essential in today’s academic job market.

The chapters in the next part of the book, Part 4, Making the Transition from Graduate Student to Assistant Professor: Nine Exemplars, are authored exclusively by new or nearly new assistant professors. In each case, authors describe their transition to the academy from graduate school. Thus, these chapters offer prospective new faculty members a glimpse into “the good, the bad, and the ugly” of leaving graduate school and entering academia as brand new members of the professoriate. We think many readers will find these chapters extremely useful in thinking about ways that they might prepare for this transition. Each chapter in this section is new to this edition of the book.

The final part of the book, Part 5, Selected Bibliography in College and University Teaching, contains a single chapter authored by members of STP’s GSTA. This chapter is a massive annotated bibliography of resources available to individuals who wish to enhance their teaching skill sets.

As the chapters in this book illustrate, teaching occurs within complicated and constantly changing contexts. For that reason alone, it is probably impossible for any graduate student to fully anticipate and prepare for every aspect of becoming an assistant professor. However, to the extent that graduate students can ready themselves, the second edition of Preparing the NewPsychology Professoriate: Helping Graduate Students Become Competent Teachers can provide insight and direction to them as to how best to go about mastering the transition from graduate students to faculty members.

We thank our authors for their generous and thoughtful contributions to this e-book. It has been our pleasure to work alongside such thoughtful and talented colleagues. Their efforts, like our efforts as editors, are rooted in a love of knowledge and a passion for teaching.

Jessica Busler, Auburn University
Barney Beins, Ithaca College
Bill Buskist, Auburn University
1. Preparing Psychology Graduate Students to Teach: Where Are We and Where Are We Going?

Steven A. Meyers

The initial consideration of whether or how to prepare graduate students for their teaching responsibilities is important because of their number. Recent data from the Survey of Earned Doctorates (National Science Foundation, 2014) indicated that 28,845 out of 45,808 (63%) doctoral students who received their degrees in 2012 reported that a teaching assistantship had been a source of financial support during their education. This percentage was considerably higher among doctoral degree recipients from social science programs. Nearly 75% of those graduates (5,474 out of 7,318) held instructional responsibilities. The proportion of graduate students with teaching duties is increasing over time (i.e., in comparison, approximately 60% of those in the social sciences held teaching assistantships in 1993; Thurgood & Clarke, 1995).

The magnitude of these figures suggests that graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) play an important part in undergraduate education. The extent to which they are prepared, supported, and successful has implications for the learning experience of many college students. Studies have explored how psychology departments across the country have prepared their graduate students to teach, and this research has indicated considerable variability in training. Within psychology, a significant number of GTAs have limited preparation for their first teaching experience (Meyers, 2001; Prieto, 2004; Prieto & Meyers, 2001). A review of national surveys of psychology departments and psychology GTAs (cf. Buskist, Tears, Davis, & Rogrique, 2002; Lowman & Mathie, 1993; Lumsden, Grosslight, Loveland, & Williams, 1988; Meyers & Prieto, 2000; Mueller, Perlman, McCann, & McFadden, 1997) indicates that 15% to 30% of GTAs have not had the benefit of TA training before undertaking their classroom duties.

There are some indications that this trend may be improving more recently (Buskist, 2013; Meyers, Snarski, & Prieto, 2009), but there are considerable costs when departments do not provide GTAs with adequate training. Prieto (2003) listed several potential concerns and consequences. Overlooking training ignores the fact that teaching assistantships are the foundation of future faculty development for the psychology professorate. For example, Meyers and Prieto (2000) reported that over 60% of their psychology GTA sample expressed an interest in an academic career; yet, approximately only 30% had received either no training for or supervision of their teaching duties. The skills and sense of efficacy toward teaching acquired by psychology GTAs during assistantships prepare them for what they will find in the classroom as future faculty. In addition, those GTAs who show great promise as
classroom teachers and who plan to enter academia, but do not receive good training and support, may become demoralized and lose interest without the guidance to help them through the difficulties that classroom teachers inevitably face (Prieto, 1995, 2001). Failing to train psychology GTAs also increases the probability of a less than optimal experience for the undergraduates they teach. It may also mean that those same undergraduates will be less well prepared when they enter advanced courses within the psychology major, and ultimately, graduate training (Prieto, 2003).

What Are The Challenges for Effective Training?
The historic challenge towards GTA training relates to the devaluation of undergraduate teaching within many research-focused universities that offer doctoral programs. Because of institutional mission and emphasis, potential and current faculty members are primarily evaluated on the basis of the quality and productivity of their research programs and grantsmanship for hiring, tenure, and promotion. This value hierarchy similarly permeates graduate training, in which considerably more attention is devoted to the development of doctoral students’ research abilities rather than their teaching skills. Such neglect can be reinforced by attitudes suggesting that great teachers are “born, not made,” which further discourages the development or requirement of rigorous GTA training programs.

Even when universities and psychology departments appreciate the importance of GTA preparation, training graduate students is complicated because of their changing skill levels and evolving ways of thinking about the teaching and learning process. In the Integrated Developmental Model of Supervision for Graduate Teaching Assistants (IDM-GTA), Prieto (2001) proposed that graduate students move through three stages of professional development (i.e., beginning GTAs, advanced GTAs, and junior faculty members). A different level of motivation, point of focus (i.e., students vs. self), and desire for autonomy characterize each stage. The IDM-GTA emphasizes that these dimensions and categorizations vary across seven different teaching domains (i.e., presentation skills, assessment skills, academic ethics, organizational skills, sensitivity to students’ individual differences, interpersonal skills, and networking abilities) as well. A GTA may be adept and autonomous in one area, but be limited and dependent on assistance in another area at the same point in time, which complicates the training process.

A complementary perspective illustrates another challenge for GTA preparation. Graduate students are not only gaining technical competence as they train and teach (i.e., learning new content information as well as pedagogical skills), but they are also developing increasing amounts of confidence in their instructional abilities. These two dimensions produce four combinations that require different responses from those who supervise GTAs: low competence/low confidence (i.e., graduate students who have limited ability to teach and are highly anxious about these limitations); low competence/high confidence (i.e., a graduate students who believe that they are much more capable as instructors than they truly are); high competence/low confidence (i.e., graduate students who are riddled with self-doubt but actually possess the requisite skills); and high competence/high confidence...
(i.e., graduate students who demonstrate emerging mastery and appreciate their abilities and skill levels).

This four-permutation perspective and the IDM-GTA both suggest that preparing doctoral students to teach is more challenging than merely teaching them how to disseminate information. The “dissemination” approach reflects the totality of some training programs that solely provide GTAs with practical information about their job responsibilities. Similarly, didactic programs that address attributes of effective college instruction may also be insufficient if faculty trainers do not remain highly attuned to the varied skill and confidence levels of GTAs, closely monitor changes in each domain across time, and adjust supervision styles as needed. Instead, current training efforts for training graduate students to teach span a continuum that ranges from minimal to sufficient to optimal. These programs vary in terms of their didactic and experiential components, with different levels of intensity or expected involvement.

**What Training is Done and Does It Work?**

Prieto (2004) summarized research on psychology GTA training with respect to common methods used and topics covered. Focusing on five key articles published in the journal *Teaching of Psychology* (Buskist et al., 2002; Lowman & Mathie, 1993; Lumsden et al., 1988; Meyers & Prieto; 2000; Mueller et al., 1997), he distilled the information into the two general categories of (a) training methods employed and (b) topics covered in GTA training. Typical training methods included orientation programs, workshops, a course on teaching, observations of teaching, and microteaching exercises. These methods often use an apprenticeship or modeling approach (e.g., GTAs watch faculty and have faculty watch or supervise them); GTAs actively practice and receive feedback on actual teaching skills (e.g., microteaching); and didactics (graduate students learn about teaching through course work, orientations, workshops, seminars).

Typical topics included developing and presenting syllabi, labs, and lectures; evaluating and promoting student learning; managing problematic student behavior; ethics; and awareness of campus resources. Other topics have been more recently expanded within GTA training programs, addressing diversity or teaching using computer/Internet technologies (Meyers et al., 2009). General themes within topics covered appear to be basic pedagogical issues (e.g., developing syllabi); evaluative issues (e.g., grading); and networking and resource issues (e.g., GTA awareness of campus resources available to both themselves and students).

Early research into the general area of GTA training showed clear evidence that skill training helped to improve classroom performance (see Abbott, Wulff, & Szego, 1989 for a review). Later efforts demonstrated that training enhances GTAs’ sense of self-efficacy toward teaching, which in turn can lead to improved classroom performance (Prieto & Altmair, 1994). Prieto and Meyers (1999), in examining national data from psychology GTAs, found that those graduate students who received training possessed a greater degree of self-efficacy toward teaching than those not trained.
Consistent with self-efficacy theory (cf. Bandura, 1986), psychology GTAs are likely to benefit most from training methods that provide them with actual experience with the skills they will need in teaching. A prime example of this type of training method is microteaching (Allen & Ryan, 1969), especially when coupled with recorded feedback. Maslach, Silver, Pole, and Ozer (2001) discussed the utility of using microteaching to train GTAs in classroom instruction. As typically practiced, GTAs develop a short presentation of class materials, then they teach this material to fellow GTAs, and finally, GTAs receive feedback from their peers, supervisors, often including videotaped feedback of their performance. After assimilating feedback, GTAs then rework both the content and their teaching methods and immediately re-present the material to their peers.

Prentice-Dunn and Pitts (2001), in their review of research examining the use of videotape feedback to train GTAs, found this method to have solid empirical support. These authors use the technique in their own psychology teaching practicum. Their students reported that watching themselves teach on video was an invaluable tool in understanding their teaching styles and to maximize their effectiveness in the classroom.

This emphasis on hands-on training is likely the most effective way to rapidly enhance psychology graduate students’ teaching abilities. In a survey of GTA training in counseling psychology programs, Prieto and Scheel (2008) reported that GTAs were most satisfied with training techniques such as role-playing and receiving feedback on their practice teaching. This approach can be applied in a narrow way or more broadly. Focusing on a very specific teaching behavior to refine, Doe, Gingerich, and Richards (2013) used repeated practice and feedback to successfully increase the accuracy and consistency of GTAs’ grading of writing assignments for an Introductory Psychology class. Using a wider focus, Komarraju (2008) described incorporating mastery and vicarious learning experiences into an intensive 1-week training program for psychology GTAs. These graduate students observed, practiced, and obtained feedback through multiple learning opportunities involving microteaching and practice grading. These GTAs demonstrated a significant increase in their personal efficacy and enjoyment of teaching at the program’s culmination compared to pretest levels.

What’s Next? The Future of GTA Training in Psychology
Although the amount of training that psychology GTAs typically receive is variable, many doctoral programs offer innovative and comprehensive preparation programs that can serve as exemplars (Beers, Hill, & Thompson, 2012). Those departments typically offer a teaching of psychology course taught by faculty members who have considerable expertise in not only college pedagogy, but also who are knowledgeable about the scholarship of teaching and learning (e.g., McElroy & Prentice-Dunn, 2005). Buskist et al. (2002) showed that a great many of the methods and topics typically covered in a component fashion in GTA workshops or orientations can be integrated into these teaching of psychology courses. A course-based vehicle for GTA training provides several benefits, including transcript credits and evidence of training, a longer-term period of training, and a time-efficient and pragmatic centralization of training. Integrating a GTA training course into a curriculum allows departments and students to regard teacher training as a valuable and legitimate part of
educating psychologists. In this comprehensive approach, graduate students complete this
class as a requirement to receive their teaching assignments, and follow-up assistance is
offered following its conclusion. Such continuing support may involve peer networking and
mentoring as well as assistance from faculty (Verges, Spitalnick, & Michels, 2006).

The increasing focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning indicates that academic
psychologists realize that training is necessary to produce effective classroom teachers (cf.
Boyer, 1990; Halpern et al., 1998). This preparation is viewed as one important component
in the creation of model teaching criteria for psychology instructors (Richmond et al., in
press). Nevertheless, determining the specific nuances of GTA training programs ultimately
can be informed at three interlocking levels of analysis: (a) understanding the most effective
components of GTA training as a whole (i.e., determining what particular GTA training
methods and topics are necessary, efficient, or effective in providing state-of-the-art
preparation), (b) understanding whether a particular department’s GTA training program
achieves its desired outcomes, and (c) understanding whether individual GTAs develop
increased competence and confidence in instructing undergraduates. Such an assessment
process involves adopting the mindset of a local clinical scientist (cf., Stricker & Trierweiler,
1995) who conducts outcome assessments for training programs and 360-degree
performance evaluations of individual GTAs. Shore (2012) suggested a range of data sources
to achieve this goal, including course evaluations for the teaching of psychology class in
terms of its quality, impact, and student satisfaction; formative and summative evaluations
from undergraduates regarding GTAs’ teaching; GTAs’ ratings of self-efficacy and their
performance; peer and supervisor ratings of GTAs’ teaching; and the assessment of GTAs’
teaching artifacts (e.g., syllabi, assignments, teaching portfolios, etc.). This rigorous inquiry
can increase the likelihood that graduate students learn the essential skills to become
effective instructors, and advances the discipline’s commitment to preparing graduates who
will be effective researchers, practitioners, and educators.
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Author Note
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2. The Shifting Currents of Scholarship and Teaching in the Ecologies of Academic Careers

Neil Lutsky

How a graduate student navigates the shifting currents of scholarship and teaching represents a significant difficulty of advanced study in psychology. It is hard enough as a graduate student to explore, refine, pursue, and promote a set of research interests, even if it normally represents the primary reason for being in graduate school. It may be even more challenging to be interested in teaching, because teaching is less frequently recognized as a professional aspiration by graduate faculty (although, laudably, this trend is changing). It may be most burdensome of all—although not uncommon—to be unsure about one’s academic motivations and how scholarship or teaching might come together to constitute a personally viable academic role. Nonetheless, the resolve, optimism, ingenuity, and adaptability that navigating the confusions and alienations of graduate school may require, can serve an academic well throughout a career, especially when charting a course for scholarly and teaching activities.

In some hypothetical academic place, scholarship and teaching are both highly valued, supported, and rewarded. Fortunately, time in that mythical place expands endlessly to accommodate the preparation and execution of scholarship and pedagogy. Multiple roles also facilitate each other such that an investment in teaching almost always strengthens research, and research accomplishments enrich and sustain teaching. Finally, in this place, life outside academia is not only possible, but even desirable; all family, community, and personal activities contribute to teaching effectiveness, to research productivity, and to renown, and all professional work strengthens personal life.

Of course, the world of academia, taken as a whole, doesn’t operate this way. We are forced to make choices, set balances, cut corners, accommodate pressing necessities, and then weave the compromised elements of academic life that remain into compelling narratives of purpose, coherence, and growth. Such professional and personal acrobatics are a fundamental fact of contemporary academic life. Nonetheless, we can thrive and enjoy deeply engaging and fulfilling roles in academia. How might it be possible to incorporate both scholarship and teaching in an academic life in psychology? This essay addresses that question.
Where You Are Going? The Ecologies of Academic Careers

A First Big Point

It is vital and, at times, reassuring to recognize that the real world of academia in psychology is far messier—more open, variable, and changing—than the immediate experience of graduate school might indicate. Graduate socialization may promote the prototype of life as a primary researcher, but PhD psychologists list “teaching” and “research and development” with equal frequency when asked to indicate their primary professional activity (Bailey, 2004). This tendency shows, in a gross way, that PhD psychologists forge highly varying balances between scholarship and teaching in their professional lives.

A Second Big Point and a Corollary

Somehow, academic roles accommodate this diversity in balances between scholarship and teaching, which suggests a second big point: There is no one place. Academic environments vary considerably in terms of the balance of scholarship and teaching they expect, support, and reward. What is balanced—what constitutes outstanding scholarship and fine teaching—also varies across academic ecologies and changes historically (e.g., Freeman, 2002; Halpern et al., 1998; Halpern, 2010). Consider, for example, the attention currently being given to the flipped classroom and student-centered learning in contrast or in addition to more traditional stand and deliver approaches to teaching (e.g., Forsyth, 2003). Graduate students need to recognize these forms of variability, explore ranges of personal aspiration within them, and begin to understand the norms of academic environments that might accommodate particular balances and forms of scholarship and teaching.

At the same time, it is important to avoid stereotyping academic environments, which leads to this corollary of the second point: there is no one place at the place you happen to be. Any particular academic environment often accommodates a variety of balances of scholarship and teaching even given that institution’s central tendencies. Undergraduate liberal arts colleges known for teaching often value and nurture faculty whose primary commitment is to scholarship; major research universities often value and nurture faculty whose primary commitment is to teaching. Faculty begin academic careers intent on sustaining particular balances of scholarship and teaching, but those balances shift, sometimes radically, as a function of development, new institutional and disciplinary histories, changes in higher education, and happenstance. The norms of institutional academic ecologies are real, to be sure, but genuine variability can be found in most.

A Third and Reorienting Point

Are “scholarship” and “teaching” two monolithic, independent academic callings that have to be balanced, as suggested above? Without doubt, given the requirements of certain scholarly and teaching activities, there are times when temporary or long-term trade-offs between the two are necessary. However, it is also possible, and at times essential, to intertwine scholarship and teaching. In other words, scholarship is often teaching, and teaching is often scholarship. As the renowned cellist Janos Starker (1993, November 7) once observed, "I personally cannot perform without teaching, and I cannot teach without performing. When you have to explain what you are doing, you discover what you are really..."
Both graduate and undergraduate faculty “teach by means of research activities” (Clark, 1997). Teaching through research is highly characteristic of graduate education and is a common hallmark of outstanding undergraduate curricula in psychology (e.g., Dunn, McCarthy, Baker, & Halonen, 2011; Newman, 1998). In addition, research is not limited to the creation of new knowledge in a standard discipline. New perspectives on scholarship (Boyer, 1990), in conjunction with calls for the evaluation of educational practices, have put a premium on applications of scholarly expertise in teaching (Bernstein et al., 2010; Johnson, 2002). Contemporary teaching is expected to be informed by pedagogical scholarship (e.g., Halpern & Hakel, 2003; National Research Council, 2000), to demonstrate scholarly integrations and applications of knowledge (Halpern et al., 1998), and to be evaluated in a systematic manner (e.g., Dunn, Mehrotra, & Halonen, 2004).

Teaching itself, at its best, is centered on immersing students in the values of discovery. If “the fundamental goal of education in psychology...is to teach students to think as scientists about behavior” (Brewer, 1993, p. 169), then it follows that the teaching of psychology is not primarily about conveying conceptual names and definitions or lists and descriptions of noteworthy studies. It is about training students in the manner of thinking characteristic of psychological science.

In sum, scholarship and teaching can represent overlapping and intertwined domains. A key dimension of variability in ecologically selective pressures for scholarship and teaching is precisely how tightly interrelated an institution may view these two domains. The existence of this variability, in turn, suggests that one goal of a graduate experience should be to explore and to test possible fits to environments that are differentially conducive to traditional scholarship and teaching.

How You Might Get to Where You are Going in Academia

Given the diversity and ongoing evolution of academic environments for scholarship and teaching, how can a graduate student develop the plumage to be attractive to an appropriate ecological mate (i.e., a desired academic position in psychology)? The obvious but not always feasible answer to this question is to develop and demonstrate as a graduate student interests and accomplishments that will match those valued in a range of desired environments. Many of the essays in this volume articulate what accomplishments particular educational environments value and how those might be achieved in graduate study. In addition, there is a relevant research literature worth consulting (Senstrom, Curtis, & Iyer, 2013).

For many students, the ecological pressures of graduate school—specifically those pushing research productivity over teaching—make broad investments difficult. Nonetheless, it is still possible in a domain of specialization to recognize and demonstrate values, characteristics, and interests that potentially generalize to and predict success in other environments. Evidence of curiosity, openness, adaptability, creativity, rigor, an eagerness to test ideas, and
scholarly grounding come to mind in this regard. Although it is attractive to have demonstrated expertise and success in both scholarly and pedagogical domains, what may be more practical is to show appreciations and abilities that potentially transcend a domain and to recognize the import of doing so. As the currents of scholarship and teaching continue to shift in the years ahead, such dexterity will, I believe, serve academic psychologists exceptionally well.
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3. A Wealth of Riches: The Society for the Teaching of Psychology

R. Eric Landrum and Bernard C. Beins

Your chapter authors are completely biased. Both having served as President of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP; Division Two of the American Psychological Association (APA)), we believe that the greatest resource for the development of new and experienced teachers of psychology is the wealth and riches of STP. These resources include not only the extensive material available at www.teachpsych.org, but also the generosity of psychology teachers who are active in STP. Although it is not possible to describe the complexity of this organization in a short chapter, our goal is to provide a brief review of the diversity of resources available. The organization of this chapter follows the current list of topics provided at the top of the STP website, although you may be able to find resources about a particular topic in multiple locations on this website.

Resources

The Office of Teaching Resources in Psychology (OTRP) is a long-standing and venerable component of the resources offered by STP. The brief listing here should whet one’s appetite for a more thorough examination of the riches OTRP provides. The major components of OTRP include

- Teaching Resources (organized by topic/course), documents that inform teaching (other than syllabi);
- Project Syllabus, a roster of complete syllabi that have been peer reviewed and sorted by course/topic, including guidelines for preparing exemplary syllabi along with the Project Syllabus rubric (in case individuals wish to submit their syllabi for peer review);
- Teaching of Psychology Idea Exchange (ToPIX), a resource with timely contributions to aid in helping students make connections between psychology topics and their daily lives, largely organized by varied areas in psychology with classroom resources, audio and video resources, book and film listings, “in the news” updates, pedagogical tips, teaching of psychology blog links, links to podcasts, and assessment ideas;
- Diversity initiatives and resources to stimulate teachers’ thinking about the importance of diversity in the classroom and in interactions with students;
- Links to official APA documents about teaching and teaching competencies;
- Information about the STP Departmental Consulting Service, through which departments seeking external review teams can connect with a resource database of qualified and vetted reviewers;
- Resources specifically dedicated to teaching the capstone course in psychology;
• Information about our Professional Development program tailored toward early-career psychologists, which links volunteer mentors and mentees together for an individualized experience;
• Resources generated from a recent pedagogical innovations task force, including information about online course management, best practices about classroom presentations and multimedia, and more; and
• An annotated listing of other resources for psychology educators, with links provided.

e-Books
STP has published 14 single-volume e-books and two multi-volume e-books comprising 17 individual volumes. These e-books address a wide variety of issues related to the teaching of psychology and are freely available at www.teachpsych.org under the link “e-Books.” Recently published titles include The teaching of psychology in autobiography: Perspectives from exemplary psychology teachers (Vol. 5), Applying science of learning in education: Infusing psychological science into the curriculum, and Introductory psychology teaching primer: A guide for new teachers of Psych 101.

The Journal Teaching of Psychology
One of the premier resources that STP provides to its members is the journal Teaching of Psychology, both in print form and electronic form with direct access—that is, not through a library subscription. Fondly abbreviated ToP, its aim and scope is to be a source of teaching methods and new ideas, with the overarching goal to improve teaching and learning at all levels. Journal articles published in ToP are empirically based, and include studies on student characteristics, content reviews of psychological topics, assessment matters, course design and implementation, curriculum matters, laboratory projects, and a plethora of good ideas in varied forms.

Awards and Grants
STP Excellence in Teaching Awards acknowledge teaching excellence at multiple levels including high school, 2-year college, 4-year college, graduate student, adjunct, and early career (see www.teachpsych.org, then click on the tab “Awards/Grants”). These particular awards are made possible by the Fund for Excellence in the Teaching of Psychology. Other awards include Instructional Research Awards that are designed to stimulate the creation of teaching resources and to encourage instructional research, and the Sage Travel Awards, which help one graduate student and one untenured early-career faculty member attend the APA convention each year.

STP has a robust grants program that provides support to members in many ways, including:

• Early Career Travel Grant, which provides conference travel funding for early career psychologists who are members of STP;
• Partnership Grants, which provide funding to facilitate communication among and collaboration with psychology teachers across different institutions, typically through local and regional conferences or other cross-institutional collaborations;
Psi Chi-STP Assessment Grants, a collaborative grant program between Psi Chi (the international honor society in psychology) and STP that provides grant funding in support of research into the assessment of student skills related to the APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major, Version 2.0 (http://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/about/psymajor-guidelines.pdf);

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Grants (SoTL) Grants that fund research in teaching and learning;

Conference Speaker Grants that provide support to small teaching conferences to fund speakers to attend to give talks related to the teaching of psychology.

Conferences
STP plays a large role in fostering the congregation of psychology educators for conference opportunities, either in person or via virtual means. Hosted exclusively by STP, the Annual Conference on Teaching (ACT, formerly Best Practices) brings psychology educators together for 2 days of collegial events that promote and support the teaching of psychology, including keynote speakers, multiple symposia, and a poster session. Concurrent with ACT, a SoTL writing workshop takes place in which faculty members partner with experienced mentors to work on writing projects with support from statistical and publication experts. Realizing the expense incurred in attending conferences, STP also provides online conference opportunities through an e-conference typically held each January that includes access to a live broadcast and materials archived for later use (see the listing at http://www.teachpsych.org/conferences/eworkshop/index.php -- scroll to the bottom of the page). STP also has a strong conference presence at all seven regional conferences and at national conferences such as the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP), Association for Psychological Science (APS), and the APA annual convention. STP often collaborates with other conferences such as National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology (NITOP) and statewide teaching of psychology meetings in support of improving teaching and learning by providing resources and opportunities to psychology teachers.

Opportunities to Become Involved
STP is a welcoming organization that encourages participation by teachers at all kinds of schools. An obvious way to become an active part of the teaching community is through publication in ToP. But there are other possibilities, too. For instance, as mentioned above, teachers can submit their syllabi for peer review with the possibility that it will become one of the syllabi listed in Project Syllabus, or they can propose to write or edit an e-book to be published by STP. Psychology teachers can also provide links to psychology in the public sphere through ToPIX. With the wealth of activities taking place in STP, they can express their willingness to serve on committees and task forces; they can also volunteer to serve as reviewer for ToP. These kinds of activities are frequently the first step toward becoming an active and recognized member of the teaching community.

However, perhaps the greatest gift that involvement in STP can provide is the potential for establishing personal connections among individuals who are passionate about psychology education. STP provides fertile ground for friendships to grow and collaborations to be born.
Lifelong friendships abound among STP members whose first introduction to one another was through an STP task force, conference presentation, grant application, ToP co-authorship, and so on.

Finding kindred spirits who care deeply about psychology education provides a social support mechanism that allows individuals to flourish, even during those times when local departmental conditions may not be optimal. Remember that to be a member of STP, one does not have to be a member of APA; this notion is commonly misunderstood among our nonmembers. Member benefits abound with regard to the subscription to ToP and grant and award opportunities, but regardless of membership status, if teachers truly care about the teaching of psychology, they should avail themselves of the wealth and riches of resources available through STP outlets, chiefly www.teachpsych.org.
4. The Graduate Student Teaching Association (GSTA): An Oral History Project

Christina Shane-Simpson, Svetlana Jović, Rita Obeid, Theresa Fiani, and Patricia J. Brooks

The Graduate Student Teaching Association (GSTA) is the student affiliate organization of the American Psychological Association’s Division 2: The Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP). The GSTA provides graduate student teachers with teaching resources and support as they develop their pedagogical skills in undergraduate classrooms. It provides an environment for graduate student teachers to share their accomplishments and the challenges they face while teaching. Members also benefit from active involvement with the STP, serving as a path for future contributions to the professorate.

As outlined in the GSTA mission statement, the association embraces the philosophy that strong teachers are courteous, passionate, knowledgeable, and dedicated to their profession (GSTA, 2010). The GSTA position asserts that by embracing these characteristics, educators can exert great influence beyond the traditional classroom environment and can help others change the ways in which they think about psychological issues. The organization also believes that graduate students should employ well-established psychological principles to positively change the lives of those around them, while contributing to the growing body of research on effective pedagogical practices (GSTA, 2010). By viewing the classroom as a research setting, members of the GSTA contribute to the growing body of research on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL).

This chapter provides an oral history of the GSTA collected directly from previous GSTA leaders. Their stories illustrate their passion for teaching and how this passion has led to their professional growth in psychology. The following sections start at the beginning, when the GSTA was only an idea in the minds of a few outstanding teachers of psychology who realized the need for an organization that supported and gave a voice to graduate student teachers nationwide. The oral history illustrates the powerful impact the GSTA has had on previous leaders’ professional trajectories. This chapter allows the previous GSTA leaders the opportunity to tell the story of the GSTA in their own words.

GSTA Host Institutions and Leadership

The GSTA provides psychology graduate student teachers with teaching tools and resources to develop their pedagogical skills within the classroom to enhance the effectiveness of their teaching. The idea for the GSTA came about at an STP meeting where members discussed the importance of getting representation from the future professoriate in the field of
psychology. Graduate students needed a voice and a place where they could discuss their teaching struggles and successes to prepare them for the job market ahead. As described by Loreto Prieto (personal communication, May 7, 2014), the GSTA came about in discussions in the STP Long Range Planning Committee where the members discussed the mission of the GSTA, an initial funding line, voting rights, and other infrastructure for the novice organization.

In 2002, STP members selected the first host site, the Auburn University. Under the faculty leadership of Bill Buskist, Co-Chairs Jason Sikorski and Jared Keeley led the student organization to develop its bylaws and ultimately to gain its presence within the STP community. In 2005, STP selected the second host site, the University of Akron. With their faculty advisor, Loreto Prieto, guiding the organization, the GSTA nominated three chairs over the course of its 3-year term: David Wimer, Sara Rieder Bennett, and Shannon (Schmidt) De Clute. STP chose the University of New Hampshire as the GSTA host site from 2007 to 2010 under the leadership of faculty advisor Victor Benassi and Co-chairs Rachel Rogers, Bethany Fleck, and Jennifer Stiegler-Balfour. At the end of the University of New Hampshire term, the University of Georgia picked up the reins, serving as GSTA host site from 2010 to 2013 under the faculty leadership of Rosemary Phelps, with Florin Selagea as the GSTA chair.

The Graduate Center of the City University of New York is the current GSTA host and will continue to host the organization through 2016, led by faculty advisor Dr. Patricia Brooks. Since arriving at the Graduate Center, the organization’s leadership team has expanded to include new positions within the GSTA, including Chair Svetlana Jović; Associate Chair Christina Shane-Simpson; Co-Treasurers Rita Obeid and Jeremy Sawyer; Co-Secretaries Emily Dow and Danielle DeNigris; Communications Director P. Ozlem Yuksel-Sokmen; and a Social Media Team consisting of Theresa Fiani, Phil Kreniske, Kasey Powers, and Francis Yannaco.

Founding the GSTA
In an effort to connect with the former leaders as the Graduate Center host site made plans for its own term, this new leadership team sought to trace the experiences and histories of individuals who had contributed to the development of the GSTA. The current GSTA leadership team e-mailed questions to past student leaders and faculty advisors, asking how they became involved with the GSTA, what the GSTA looked like at the time of their involvement, and how the GSTA had changed over the course of their leadership. The current GSTA leadership team also asked the previous student leaders how their involvement affected their careers, what they gained from their GSTA participation, and where they were currently employed. Current leaders asked the previous faculty advisors about how the formation of the GSTA affected STP. Their responses illustrate the vital role of the GSTA in shaping the professional development of its leadership.

The first GSTA chair was Jason Sikorski, who worked closely with the founding faculty advisor, Dr. Bill Buskist, and Associate Chair Jared Keeley. GSTA’s founding members
acknowledged that there were few teaching resources oriented toward developing graduate student teachers. As described by Buskist,

I was the founding faculty advisor to the GSTA. I started this group because, as I looked at the structure of STP, I noticed that we did nothing to serve the needs of graduate students who desired to become college teachers. We had representation from all levels of college and universities and the folks that work at them, but nothing for graduate students (personal communication, April 12, 2014).

Although the GSTA had only a few founding members, the members were passionately dedicated to the formation of an organization for graduate students that would shape the future leadership of the STP. As Buskist described the GSTA evolution,

It was small, of course, but Jason Sikorski, our first president, did a super job in trying to get the word out to graduate students in psychology across the USA. Our main job was to figure out an organization and administrative structure and to begin a membership drive. You have to remember that when we created the GSTA, STP was organized differently and the GSTA president was a voting member of the STP Executive Committee. That brought Jason into direct contact with the STP leadership. He attended all of the EC meetings, contributed comments and ideas to it, and voted on all issues that required a vote. He had to step up to the plate and become an active participant at that level. So, I saw Jason develop and mature in his ability to work within STP on equal footing with the faculty members who led the organization (personal communication, April 12, 2014).

In order to attract members, the founding GSTA team at Auburn University established a listserv and invited all graduate student members of STP from doctoral programs across the U.S. to join. In its second year, the organization’s leadership focused on developing services for members of the GSTA. They established a website in conjunction with STP’s site, helped locate scholarships and awards for GSTA members, and published those funding opportunities on the website. They also gathered teaching-related links and resources so that members could easily access them, and developed programming specific to graduate student teaching interests at the APA convention (J. Keeley, personal communication, March 28, 2014). Perhaps most importantly, the Auburn University GSTA team created the leadership structure and wrote the STP bylaws for the GSTA.

“We worked very hard to get the organization on its feet with enough momentum that it could sustain itself when it moved to the University of Akron under Loreto Prieto’s
supervision” (B. Buskist, personal communication, April 12, 2014). The original GSTA bylaws set 3-year term limits for each host site. After 3 years at the University of Akron, the torch moved to the University of New Hampshire. As noted by Dr. Prieto,

Bill B and his crew at Auburn housed the first term of the GSTA and really fleshed out and gave life to what had previously only been on paper. I took the second watch—Bill and I wanted to ensure a smooth and steady take off of the organization and its activities. I believe Victor took over as the third faculty advisor believing we had accomplished that mission (personal communication, May 7, 2014).

How Did the GSTA Leaders Get Involved in the Organization?

Many of the previous student leaders described their involvement as linked to a specific faculty member who was often the individual who agreed to host the GSTA at his campus (S. De Clute, personal communication, May 7, 2014). Other GSTA leaders joined the organization after taking a course with the GSTA faculty advisor or working on research on the SoTL (R. Rogers, personal communication, May 19, 2014).

It was apparent from the previous leaders’ responses that the word of the GSTA often spread from faculty involved in the STP to future graduate student leaders. Their responses also highlight the importance of the GSTA host site in recruiting graduate student members while word of the organization spread to students nationwide. As described by Bethany Fleck,

We were still small. Our major initiatives were to build membership. I created the first Facebook page and we used the listserv then. We also worked hard to make a blog site that was a clearinghouse of teaching resources. We created the logo at that time as well (personal communication, March 31, 2014).

When the University of New Hampshire was the host, the GSTA leadership was focused on increasing awareness about the great resources STP has to offer. They reached out to different graduate programs across the country to encourage graduate students to seek out the STP and get involved in student leadership as regional representatives of the GSTA. They also put together a programming hour at the APA convention with guest speakers and opportunities for graduate students to connect with others (J. Stiegler-Balfour, personal communication, April 8, 2014).

Benefits of GSTA Membership

Previous leaders were eager to share the plethora of ways in which they had benefited from their roles within the GSTA. Many leaders emphasized the importance of the GSTA for networking and connecting with graduate students and faculty, which often led to direct benefits for the graduate students’ professional development as they entered the job
market. GSTA leaders participated in the STP leadership listserv, went to APA conferences, and attended Division 2 planning meetings. Rogers describes this experience,

Witnessing the dedication, passion, and tireless efforts of faculty in Division 2 was very inspiring for me. I saw how seriously faculty across the country approached their teaching and their students’ learning. I saw how the scholarship of teaching and learning was taken seriously and can help to advance learning of psychology and other topics” (personal communication, May 19, 2014).

Many of previous student leaders stressed the importance of networking and identified this opportunity as the largest benefit they received from their GSTA affiliation. They discussed how connections made with academic professionals across various subfields of psychology helped them to find job opportunities, specifically within academia, and described the benefits that come with being an active member of an APA organization (J. Stiegler-Balfour, personal communication, April 8, 2014; S. De Clute, personal communication, May 7, 2014). Student leader Wimer wrote,

It benefited me in many ways. Gave me good experience in a leadership position within an area of psychology that I’m very interested in (Division 2), it allowed me to make some important connections, it helped me to see how governance works within an APA division (the executive committee meeting at the APA convention was particularly educational)” (personal communication, April 3, 2014).

Similarly, Rogers emphasized how the GSTA supported her professional development, “I believe that the peek behind the scenes of a professional organization was the most beneficial for me. I was able to get a more accurate set of expectations of what my career could look like in academia” (personal communication, May 19, 2014).

Being part of the GSTA leadership provided graduate students with mentorship from professionals in their fields and opportunities to publish scientific articles and book chapters related to SoTL. Sikorski wrote,

Getting mentorship from the members of STP was invaluable. I was so far ahead of the game when it came to teaching at the university level. I hit the ground running. I published thanks to them in teaching journals, continue to write book chapters and love to teach (personal communication, March 24, 2014).

Several GSTA leaders developed keen interests in SoTL research as represented by their scholarly works (e.g., Blessing, Blessing, & Fleck, 2012; Buskist, Benson, & Sikorski, 2005;

GSTA leaders also noted that through their involvement in student governance, they acquired leadership skills, developed their organizational skills, and enhanced their commitment to professional service. They were offered myriad opportunities to organize meetings and events, participate in teaching and research conferences, and manage important decisions within the group—all skills that are necessary and relevant in their current faculty positions. “STP also offered many opportunities to apply for travel awards, small grants to organize teaching-related conferences and/or conduct SoTL research, which has allowed me to get even more involved in my professional community” (J. Stiegler-Balfour, personal communication, April 8, 2014).

Many leaders specifically noted how their involvement helped them to find jobs in a difficult job market.

Being a part of the GSTA helped in my job search by documenting a level of professional service that is rare among graduate students. As service would be part of most academic positions, it is valuable to be able to show that you are familiar with that sort of work and invested in furthering the profession. Because of my involvement with the GSTA, I had several academic products that contributed to my portfolio when applying for jobs, and every little bit helps (J. Keeley, personal communication, March 28, 2014).

Benefits of the GSTA to STP
Not only has the GSTA been beneficial to its members, but also to the broader STP community. Buskist wrote,

I think the primary impact that the GSTA has had on STP has been to bring to STP a greater awareness of the need that graduate students have to be trained as teachers and college professors. I think under the old structure of STP that the GSTA was able to have a greater impact than it does now because the GSTA rubbed shoulders directly with all of the other STP leaders. I don’t think that the current structure permits such opportunities. I look forward to the new leadership of the GSTA in making a strong impact along those lines (personal communication, April 12, 2014).

Prieto described the potential of the GSTA to provide future STP leadership:
The GSTA needs to be the ‘seed corn’ of the future of STP. Committed to being good teachers, if not career academicians, the GSTA officers are at the vanguard of the professional practice of teaching in psychology, and need to be the ones with a forward perspective in terms of research and pedagogy in our discipline. Especially now, with standards having emerged for psych teaching at various levels of education, there is no reason why we should not look to the GSTA to help STP scholars develop and implement a sound technology of teaching that can best ensure future psychology students with quality instruction and solid foundational knowledge of the discipline (personal communication, May 7, 2014).

Indeed, the GSTA paved the way for several former GSTA leaders to join the STP Early Career Psychologist Council (now called the Early Career Psychologists Committee http://teachpsych.org/Default.aspx?pageId=1537437). Their involvement with the STP provided opportunities for former GSTA leaders to edit or author books dedicated to helping new professors launch their careers (e.g., Afful, Good, Keeley, Leder, & Stiegler-Balfour, 2013; Keeley, Afful, Stiegler-Balfour, Good, & Leder. 2013; Korn & Sikorski, 2010).

Future Directions of the GSTA

In the fall of 2013, the PhD program in Psychology at The Graduate Center, CUNY became the new host institution of the GSTA in an effort to better support students in their preparation towards becoming future members of the professoriate. This PhD program ranks as one of the largest doctoral programs in the world, with more than 550 doctoral students pursuing scholarship in diverse training areas including Animal Behavior and Comparative Psychology, Basic and Applied Social Psychology, Behavior Analysis, Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience, Clinical Psychology, Cognition, Language & Development, Health Psychology, Human Development, Industrial/Organizational Psychology, and Psychology and Law (http://www.gc.cuny.edu/Page-Elements/Academics-Research-Centers-Initiatives/Doctoral-Programs/Psychology.)

As part of their training, PhD students teach one or more courses as graduate student teaching fellows and adjunct instructors at the 11 senior colleges and seven community colleges of CUNY. They develop pedagogical skills while engaging with an exceptionally diverse student body. The interest in becoming the GSTA host institution came from the CUNY Pedagogy Taskforce in Psychology, a group dedicated to promoting dissemination of best practices in teaching and learning that supports the development of graduate students as instructors. Over the past 5 years, this taskforce organized its own Pedagogy Day Conference held annually at The Graduate Center. This year, in addition to providing graduate students with valuable pedagogy resources for their classrooms, this 1-day conference introduces graduate students to the GSTA.
To increase the visibility of the GSTA, the CUNY team is expanding its digital footprint by further developing the GSTA webpage (http://teachpsych.org/gsta/index.php) and by leveraging social media networks. Previous host sites created a Facebook group page (https://www.facebook.com/groups/33805718623/) that allows members to easily connect and maintain communication online, and the current GSTA recently added a Twitter account (https://twitter.com/gradsteachpsych). To augment these efforts, GSTA leaders created a blog to share teaching tips for the classroom and teaching-related research; graduate students prepare and edit the blog entries, and readers of the blog are encouraged to write blog posts (http://teachpsych.org/Default.aspx?pageId=1784686&mode=PostView&bmi=1504880). Additionally, the current leadership will launch a book club in the fall of 2014 to review recent publications relevant to SoTL and effective pedagogy.

As a continued effort to increase membership in the GSTA, we hope to increase GSTA visibility at regional and national conferences. GSTA members recently organized a teaching-research panel at the Eastern Psychological Association, and will attend the American Psychological Association and the Association for Psychological Science conferences. GSTA leaders are interested in networking to discuss SoTL research topics and to meet students throughout the U.S. with interests in serving as regional GSTA liaisons. Through conference presentations and the expanding online presence, the GSTA seeks a stronger identity within the STP, in order to enrich the lives of graduate student teachers in preparation for future service and leadership.
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5. On The Importance of Attending Teaching Conferences

Natalie K. Lawrence and Janie H. Wilson

We are teaching conference junkies. We got hooked at our first teaching conference, and we continue going back for more. We are also involved in the direction and supervision of several teaching conferences. In this chapter, we hope to convince readers that attending teaching conferences is one of the best activities they can do for their academic career. We will share our experiences as teaching-conference participants and directors. We will also share the testimonials of other teachers who have benefitted from attending teaching conferences.

Teaching conferences can be interdisciplinary or they can focus on teaching within a specific discipline. The interdisciplinary conferences often center on a general teaching topic (such as using technology in teaching) or the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Some of the biggest interdisciplinary conferences in the United States are the Lilly Conferences on College and University Teaching and Learning (http://lillyconferences.com) and the Teaching Professor conferences (http://teachingprofessor.com/conferences). The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Kennesaw State University provides a comprehensive directory of national and international conferences (http://cetl.kennesaw.edu/teaching-conferences-directory). For the remainder of this chapter, we focus on the benefits of attending conferences specifically related to the teaching of psychology.

Professional Development

One of the most important reasons for attending teaching of psychology conferences is the opportunity for professional development. This point is especially true for people who did not receive formal teacher training in graduate school. Most psychology teaching conferences offer invited addresses, concurrent sessions (which include a number of symposia and/or workshops), and poster sessions. Some conferences, such as the National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology (http://nitop.org) offer additional programming such as participant idea exchanges, which are roundtable discussions led by conference participants. Through this variety of programming, teaching conferences allow participants to learn about cutting-edge research in various subfields of psychology, hear about new ideas and research in teaching and learning, and discuss best practices in the teaching of psychology.

Participants often report that they leave conferences with a wealth of information and ideas. Dan Segrist from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville reported that attending teaching conferences “is the best travel money I spend all year. I always come back with teaching ideas and resources, many of which I also share with my colleagues” (personal
communication, May, 29, 2014). The wealth of the ideas teachers acquire from attending teaching conferences generally will be easy to implement—teachers can make changes to their courses as soon as they return to campus.

Some participants learn just as much from casual conversations at teaching conferences as from attending the sessions. Aaron Richmond from the Metropolitan State University of Denver related than he gains the most from:

One-on-one conversations with exemplar teachers at conferences. Whether the discussion is about a new and innovative teaching method or a debate on the efficacy and prevalence of skill learning in the psychology classroom, I am a better teacher for engaging in this practice (personal communication, May 29, 2014).

To facilitate communication among participants, conferences often provide time between sessions, during catered meals, and during a social hour.

The professional development offered by teaching conferences can benefit teachers at all stages of their careers. Teaching conferences can help graduate students and new faculty members expand their repertoire of teaching skills and techniques and develop their teaching philosophy and style. Seasoned teachers can reap benefits as well such as helping them stay “current” by learning about cutting-edge research, innovative pedagogies and ever-changing student perspectives on learning. As Bill McKeachie (2002) wrote after 55 years of teaching, “The great thing about teaching is that there is always more to learn” (p. 332).

Focus on Teaching and Learning
Individuals who attend teaching conferences can expect that most of the other attendees care about teaching. In fact, people’s enthusiasm for teaching is readily apparent in the sessions they attend and the informal conversations they have with other participants. Teachers who are passionate about their craft will have much in common with other conference participants. This commonality creates a sense of community that makes teaching conferences unique from research conferences. Many participants report that they develop and sustain friendships while attending teaching conferences. As Dana Dunn from Moravian College wrote, “the strongest reasons for attending a teaching conference include forming friendships and sometimes scholarly alliances with teachers interested in the same issues you are. The potential to form professional and friendship networks is terrific” (personal communication, May 30, 2014).

Teaching conferences can also help graduate students and new faculty members develop their identity as teachers. Jeremy Houska, an assistant professor of psychology from Centenary College, reported that:

Teaching conferences helped me gain a sense of identity as a graduate student. Coming from a small liberal arts school as an undergrad, ultimately I
knew I wanted to work in that type of setting. But it was difficult as a graduate student when most of my colleagues were R1 or bust. At teaching conferences I was able to find others like me. I was affirmed and energized (personal communication, May 29, 2014).

By attending teaching conferences, new teachers will learn that teaching is valued by many of their colleagues.

Teaching conferences also allow attendees to share their ideas about teaching, whether they report the results of SoTL projects or share an innovative technique or strategy. Attendees may present their work in a variety of formats: symposia, poster sessions, or participant idea exchanges. Presenting one’s work can help refine one’s ideas and open the door to future collaborations. Teaching conferences also help attendees generate new ideas related to teaching and SoTL. When we are not busy running a conference, we often get great research ideas from the sessions we attend.

**Lighting the Fire**

Some of the most frequent comments that we see on conference evaluations are that people are “inspired” and have a “renewed passion for teaching.” In the words of Laura Powell from the University of South Alabama, ”I feel very motivated about my job after I leave a teaching conference. Being with like-minded people is very motivating” (personal communication, May 29, 2014). In a way, attending a conference is like having a personal support group—likeminded people who have experienced and wish to share with others the same challenges and joys.

Jordan Troisi from Widener University sent us a long list of the ways he has benefitted from attending teaching conferences. The primary benefit on his list was being inspired:

I first started attending teaching conferences around 10 years ago, while I was a graduate student in a research-heavy PhD program. Right off the bat I was struck by how passionate the speakers were about teaching, working with students, and crafting an interesting presentation. Hearing about their dedication to the craft literally gave me chills. I now attend at least one teaching conference every year, and each time it reignites a passion and excitement for working with students (personal communication, May 29, 2014).

**Making and Strengthening Connections**

Many people cite networking opportunities as the greatest benefit of attending teaching conferences. New teachers will meet others who are eager to mentor them and help them get connected. “I am certain I would not have become the teacher I am without the benefit of the mentors and collaboration that I’ve experienced through our annual [local] teaching conference,” wrote Amanda Vanderbur, a high school teacher who recently won a national teaching award (personal communication, May 29, 2014).

Similarly, Melissa Beers from The Ohio State University noted that:
One of the main benefits I have received from attending teaching conferences is the collaboration. As opposed to professional conferences focused on research, I find teaching conferences to have a stronger emphasis on collaboration and sharing of resources. I never leave a teaching conference without exchanging contact information with a new colleague (personal communication, May 29, 2014).

We have had a similar experience of being pleasantly surprised by the spirit of freely sharing information at teaching conferences.

Teaching conferences offer many opportunities to get connected. In most cases, the programming does not overlap with meals, which gives you the chance to get to know the people sitting next to you. Many conferences also have social hours designed to promote networking. Socially reserved participants may have to push themselves to meet people, but the opportunities are available to everyone. After you meet people in the teaching of psychology community, teaching conferences will feel like reunions. You get to meet with friends you might only see once or twice a year.

There are a growing number of online conferences and workshops available to teachers of psychology. Because you are not likely to interact with other people during these events, these conferences and workshops do not offer the same benefits as in-person conferences (such as networking). Online conferences are a good opportunity for people who lack the time and/or money to travel to a distant conference, but we recommend attending a live conference if at all possible.

The Bottom Line
Attending teaching conferences will make attendees better teachers and happier that they chose to become teachers of psychology. As a result, everyone wins—teachers, students, colleagues, administrators, institutions, and the profession. Below are some steps to maximize the benefits of attending a teaching conference. First-time attendees should:

- Use the links in this chapter to identify a conference to attend.
- Consider applying for the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Early Career Travel Grant Program (http://teachpsych.org/members/grants/ECPtravel.php). This grant offers funding to graduate students and early-career psychologists who want to attend teaching conferences.
- Attend keynote presentations and symposia and take notes about new ideas.
- Attend poster sessions and talk to presenters about their work.
- Present their own work to create networking opportunities.
- After the conference, e-mail attendees with comments, questions, or just a note to maintain new connections.
Take the advice of a couple of junkies and register for a conference as soon as you get the chance. It will be one of the best decisions of your career.
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6. The Role of University Teaching and Learning Centers in Developing Graduate Student Teaching Competencies

James E. Groccia and Emad A. Ismail

Graduate education in the US is considered the best in the world serving the vital scientific, cultural, educational, and economic needs of the national and global community, yet it is far from perfect. Nyquist and Woodford (2000), in an “environmental scan” of promising practices and concerns about US PhD programs, collected data from more than 375 individual interviews, five focus groups, six sets of e-mail inquiries, one mail survey, and a review of over 400 hundred articles and documents. Among the findings they reported was the graduate student perception of an overemphasis on research, which leads to inadequate preparation for teaching, collegiality, curricular planning, and service. Golde and Dore (2001) found that most of today’s doctoral students are primarily interested in becoming faculty and graduate programs prepare students to be research faculty and do so well. However, graduate programs do not prepare their students for the jobs they actually get as most faculty across the full spectrum of higher education institutions spend the majority of their time on teaching, some on service, and only a little on research.

Benassi and Buskist (2012) proposed the question “Should all graduate students receive preparation for their teaching duties?” and their short answer was “yes” (p. 6). They see it as indefensible to let unprepared graduate teaching assistants teach. It is uncommon in any applied professional field to release unprepared graduates to do the job (or part of the job) they are most likely to do after they graduate. Just as medical schools prepare their students to be professional doctors, graduate programs in all disciplines should prepare those students aspiring to be academics to be able to perform the professional tasks expected of them prior to employment. Graduate programs must recognize that teaching expertise is not gained by on-the-job experience alone, but requires adequate pre-graduation academic training and supervised teaching practice (Seidel, Benassi, Richards, & Lee 2006). Receiving a doctoral degree is not a guarantee that graduate students will be successful teachers in their field: There is more to teaching success than mastery of disciplinary knowledge.

The transition from being a student in front of the lectern to a faculty member behind it is a challenging experience, particularly without proper preparation and training. New faculty members unprepared for teaching during their graduate programs often face the prospect of spending more time on-the-job preparing for teaching responsibilities and may face increased difficulties in classrooms and consequently spend less time on research (Benassi &
Buskist, 2012; Boice, 2000). This situation presents a template for future trouble for aspiring and novice academics: poorer teaching and less research productivity.

A study conducted by the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation in 2005 highlighted the need for an increased focus on teaching and service as evolving aspects of the doctorate. Although graduate education has slowly changed as a result of these studies and others (e.g., Fagen, & Suedkamp Wells, 2003; Lovitts & Nelson, 2000; Murray, 2000; National Research Council, 1996), campus centers for teaching and learning have often been the central source for enhancing the pedagogical skills of graduate students. This chapter details the broad range of graduate student professional development services provided by US teaching and learning centers and provides an in-depth discussion of a few of such services provided by the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning at Auburn University.

History of Graduate Student Development Programs
The GI Bill provided the spark that ignited the development of graduate student development programs (Border & Von Hoene, 2010). Undergraduate and graduate student enrollments exploded as veterans returned from WWII to pursue their education. In order to cope with this increased demand for higher education, universities, especially large research-orientated state universities, channeled resources to employ graduate students as teaching assistants. By the 1970s, some universities introduced support programs to better develop TA teaching skills especially in foreign languages, English, speech and chemistry (Border & Von Hoene, 2010). The decade between 1985 and 1995 saw a series of national conferences supported by the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education and the Pew Charitable Trusts, as well as the creation of the Preparing Future Faculty program (PFF) to engage graduate students in teaching enhancement activities. Numerous national research projects were also initiated during the late 1990s and early 2000s to investigate graduate student perceptions and needs, most of which emphasized a greater need for instruction and support for their teaching functions (Fagen, & Suedkamp Wells, 2003; Lovitts & Nelson, 2000; Murray, 2000; National Research Council, 1996; Nyquist & Woodford, 2000; Smallwood, 2001).

Types of Graduate Student Development Programs
Lambert and Tice (1993) provided a description of about 20 centralized and an equal number of departmental-based programs to support TA development. Marincovich, Prosteko and Stout (1998) broadened this list to include programs that prepared graduate students as the next generation of faculty. Many of these programs still exist today as workshops, seminars, courses, and mentoring platforms on such topics as course and syllabus design, grading and assessment of learning outcomes, use of instructional technology, diversity, learning styles, the American classroom culture, and communication skills for non-native English speakers. Additionally, numerous programs have been developed to enhance graduate student success as future faculty providing support for the job search, academic writing and publishing, research and outreach skills, scholarship of teaching and learning, time and project management, teaching portfolio and philosophy of teaching statement development,
as well as professional development activities to support exploration of non-academic careers.

Programs to support graduate student development and teaching enhancement can be categorized as departmental or discipline based or centralized and campus-wide. Lambert and Tice (1993) described discipline-based TA teaching development programs in biological sciences, chemistry, English and composition, foreign languages; mathematics, psychology, social sciences, and speech communications. Although they differ in scope and focus, the number of disciplines offering such support since 1993 has expanded to include almost every academic department. Some disciplines such as psychology have sustained excellence throughout this period (see Buskist, Beins, & Hevern, 2004). Centralized programs are most often based in graduate schools or in centers for teaching and learning. On many campuses, centralized programs share some responsibility and programming with departmental programs, working cooperatively to prepare TAs for teaching.

History of Teaching and Learning Centers
Teaching and learning centers began to emerge as a result of social, educational, and economic movements in the late 1950s and early 1960s (Bergquist, 1992; Rice, 2007; Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006) and the rise of student protests in the 1960s and 1970s over poor and uninspired teaching, academic disengagement, and dissatisfaction with irrelevant courses (Gaff & Simpson, 1994; Groccia & Hunter, 2012). The first centers for teaching and learning were founded at the University of Michigan and Michigan State University about 1961 (McKeachie, 1991). Since that time, colleges and universities have recognized the need to support faculty and graduate teaching and learning enhancement efforts, and as of 2014, approximately 800 institutions at all levels of higher education in the US have some form of center or program to do so—approximately 35% of all 2-year and 4-year colleges and universities (H. Holmgren, personal communication, June 23, 2014).

Additionally, institutions internationally have gradually but steadily increased their support for teaching and faculty and TA development as witnessed by the creation of the International Consortium for Educational Development (ICED; http://icedonline.net) in 1993, which provides a forum and bi-annual conference for teaching and learning centers within higher education institutions in more than 24 countries. The most recent ICED conference held in Stockholm, Sweden on June 15-18, 2014 was attended by over 600 academic and faculty developers from more than 30 countries.

An Exemplar: Graduate Student Development Programs at Auburn University
Established in 2003, the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning at Auburn University (www.auburn.edu/biggio) provides many services to graduate students to prepare them for future careers in academia. Auburn University, established in 1856, is a public, land grant institution located in East Central Alabama, enrolls approximately 20,000 undergraduate students and 4,000 graduate students in 13 different colleges. Graduate
student development is an integral component of the Biggio Center’s mission and the following are some of the Center’s programs.

**New GTA Orientation**

New Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA) Orientation is the first program that Auburn University invites and encourages its graduate teaching assistants to attend. This 1-day long intensive orientation program is usually held a few days before classes start in both fall and spring semesters and provides GTAs with an overview of basic principles of effective teaching, as well as introduces them to available resources at Auburn. Some of the sessions regularly included in the orientation programs include: GTA 101 (covering important aspects of the GTA role including administration issues, what to do on the first day of class, office hours, classroom management), Effective Lectures and Student Engagement, Trouble in the Classroom, Leading and Encouraging Effective Discussions, and Using Technology in Teaching. Many of the orientation sessions are actually led by GTAs’ who have received training through the Graduate Teaching Assistant Fellows program (see below). On a scale of 1-5, the general average score of these sessions as evaluated by participants in 2013 were 4.0, 4.5, 4.0, 3.3 and 4.0, respectively.

**Graduate Teaching Assistant Fellows Program**

The Graduate Teaching Assistant Fellows Program (GTAP), established in 2011, is a full-year leadership program aimed at enhancing teaching skills by familiarizing GTAs with effective strategies in teaching and preparing them to be able to use active learning and instructional technology. Another goal of GTAP is to develop a network of teaching assistants who will mentor and support other graduate students in their department as well as assist with campus-wide TA development activities such as New TA Orientation. The program is available to all interested doctoral students from any academic discipline.

GTAP fellows meet multiple times throughout the year attending seminars, teaching workshops, and brainstorming sessions in order to hone cross-discipline teaching methods that engage students in the classroom and lab. They are required to attend six teaching seminars during spring and fall semesters; watch on-line archived professional development seminars, and write a reflective blog on a specifically created Web site.

GTAP fellows participate in New TA Orientation by working in small teams with other GTAPs and faculty preparing one or more of the parallel sessions. GTAP fellows host breakout sessions on topics such as how to survive your first week of teaching at Auburn University, how to teach small and large class sections, and how to manage lab sections.

GTAP fellows are also responsible for revising and expanding the wiki-based GTA Survival Guide established by the first GTAP cohort in 2012. The guide includes teaching tips and methods such as active learning strategies, logistical information for future GTAs about Auburn University, and departmental specific teaching-related policies and procedures. Contributions might be tailored specifically to the GTAP’s field of study or generally apply to any discipline and detail teaching projects that enhance undergraduate students’ learning.
Finally, GTAPs have the option to participate in mid-semester small-group instructional feedback (SGIF) activities to evaluate and further improve their teaching, which is followed by a one-on-one consultation with a Biggio Center staff member. Ten graduate students completed the program in the first year and nine completed it in the second year (2013). The majority of respondents to an end-of-program evaluation indicated that they found all parts of the GTAP program valuable and that it prepared them to become effective graduate teaching assistants.

Certificate in College Teaching
The Graduate Certificate in College/University Teaching is awarded to graduate students who successfully complete 12 graduate hours of coursework in various course topics. There are three required courses (Seminar in College Teaching, The Professoriate, and a supervised teaching practicum in the student’s home department) as well as one elective course chosen from a list of approved options. The Certificate is coordinated by the Biggio Center but academic credit is awarded by the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology and certified by the Auburn University Graduate School. Matriculating graduate students as well as non-matriculating students can enroll in the certificate program and upon completion receive a certificate from the Graduate School, which is recorded in the student’s official university transcript. The certificate indicates to future employers that the recipient has the initial working knowledge and skills to successfully teach in a college or university setting. Thirty graduate students have been awarded the certificate during the 5 years since its inception in 2009.

Small-Group Instructional Feedback (SGIF)/Consultation
An SGIF session is a formative assessment of students’ learning, and a way to gather information early in the semester about instructor’s teaching. It usually takes place between the 4th and 7th week of the semester (as a mid-stream evaluation). SGIF channels student perceptions of instructor’s teaching into opportunities for instructional improvement. A consultant from the teaching and learning center gathers anonymous and voluntary students’ comments about the course, instructor’s teaching, and their learning. The feedback is summarized and presented to the instructor during a one-on-one consultation that includes suggestions on how to improve his or her teaching.

The process starts with the instructor scheduling a date for the consultant to conduct the SGIF session. The consultant arrives at the classroom with approximately 30 minutes of the class session remaining. The instructor leaves the room and the consultant conducts the SGIF. Small groups of students engage in discussion for about 10 minutes answering the following questions:

1. What is going well in this class so far? (This item reveals what the instructor should keep doing.)
2. What suggestions do you have for improvement? (This item reveals what the instructor should start doing or possibly change.)
3. What other comments do you have? (This item can relate to aspects of the course not covered by the two previous questions.)

The Biggio Center provides this service to both faculty and GTAs. Some departments require their GTAs to participate in SGIF on annual or semester basis; however, some GTAs request this service on their own initiative to improve their teaching.

**Professional Development Seminars (PDS) series**

Conducted throughout the academic year, the Biggio Center PDS series presents topics ranging from course and syllabus design to conducting a peer review of teaching and are open to all students, staff, and faculty of Auburn University. The Biggio Center videotapes all PDSs and uploads them to the Biggio website ([http://wp.auburn.edu/biggio/events/professional-development-seminars/](http://wp.auburn.edu/biggio/events/professional-development-seminars/)). A sample of PDS topics from the past few years include Classroom Assessment Techniques, Engaging Students in Active Learning, Teaching Large Lecture Classes Effectively, Using Student Ratings to Improve Teaching Effectiveness, An Introduction to Problem-Based Learning; Learning to Do What Excellent Teachers Do, Concept Mapping, Getting Published in Peer Reviewed Journals, Distance Education—How to Put a Class Online, Using Item Response Theory to Improve Assessment, Case Studies and Clickers, Promoting Critical Thinking, Applications for iPad on Teaching and Learning, and Introduction to the Academic Portfolio.

**Preparing Future Faculty Program (PFF)**

Twenty percent of doctoral students who pursue academic careers secure positions at research universities where earning tenure will be based predominantly on research accomplishments; the remaining 75% find employment at other types of institutions where teaching and service exert a greater time commitment and influence on career success and reward (Gaff, Pruitt-Logan, Sims, & Denecke, 2003). Although many graduate students have had teaching assignments (GTAs) during their graduate studies, some may not (e.g., graduate research assistants; post-docs). However, both may end up in a faculty position that has a high teaching requirement. Even students who have been GTAs may not have had much supervised in-class teaching experience because they often serve simply as exam graders, lab assistants, and discussion or review session leaders. The intent of PFF programs, therefore, is to supplement traditional graduate research-focused training to provide additional opportunities for graduate students to experience the full range of faculty roles, of which teaching is often dominant.

Preparing graduate students to become successful teaching faculty was not a priority in higher education until the early 1990s. The understanding that graduate students should be able to excel in teaching as well as in research is widely accepted now, and reinforced by the need to respond to teaching and learning demands dictated by the rapid changes in the undergraduate student population who are tech-savvy and can access information by a tap on their computers, smart phones, or tablets (Benassi & Buskist, 2012).
PFF at Auburn is modeled after the national program and is an interdisciplinary year-long program consisting of two one-credit courses (one each in the fall and spring) for advanced graduate students who wish to pursue a career in academia. The purpose of program is to familiarize prospective faculty with the job skills needed in the professoriate, and to give them an opportunity to experience faculty life and determine whether their career should or should not be in academia (Gaff et al., 2003).

The cohort meets for 2 hours every other week to discuss topics such as Carnegie classifications, learning styles, the academic job application and interviewing process, cultural awareness, academic freedom, publishing and grant writing, the tenure and promotion process, and various other aspects of faculty life. Students develop teaching e-portfolios and prepare and deliver a teaching lesson that is recorded and critiqued by other PFF students and course coordinators. Students are also required to attend professional development seminars and write critical reflections on those events they attend.

PFF courses are team-taught by Biggio Center staff and are highly interactive and often include presentations by guest speakers. During the 2012-2013 academic year 31 doctoral students from 13 academic departments participated in PFF (10 were international graduate students) and 22 successfully completed the program and received certificates. All respondents who took an end of the program evaluation survey thought the PFF program prepared them for teaching responsibilities as faculty members, 93% reported that PFF helped with their job interviews, and 100% agreed that the PFF program supported them well with the preparation of job application packages. During the prior year, 2011-2012, 27 doctoral students from 17 academic departments successfully completed the program and received certificates. Eight of these students were international graduate students.

Summary
Campus cultures in universities that use graduate students as teaching assistants have experienced a gradual change over the past 25-30 years creating a more favorable climate for the preparation of graduate students for teaching. A key element of this change has been the development of centralized centers for teaching and learning that compliment academic department-specific GTA teaching enhancement efforts. Efforts to improve graduate student teaching have had a dual positive impact: better learning for undergraduate students and better preparation for the teaching-intensive academic jobs most GTAs will find as future faculty members.
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7. A Work in Progress, the Teaching of Psychology Course at Appalachian State University

Paul A. Fox, Amy T. Galloway, and Robyn L. Kondrad

Appalachian State University (ASU) is a comprehensive university located in the northwestern mountains of North Carolina. It is part of the 16-member University of North Carolina system and consists of approximately 16,025 undergraduates and 1,813 graduate students. The Department of Psychology has 35 full-time doctoral level faculty and four MA level graduate programs (Clinical, General-Experimental, Industrial-Organizational/Human Resource Management, and School Psychology), which matriculate between 33 and 40 new students each year. The School Psychology program also provides a specialist degree. Students typically complete their MA degrees in 2.5 to 3 years.

Several years ago, as director of our graduate programs in psychology, Paul Fox noticed that our graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) seemed either to teach pretty well or do well in their coursework—but seldom both. Faculty frequently expressed concern about the quality of instruction in our General Psychology course, the gateway course for the infusion of majors into our department. Prior to the inception of our GTA training program, undergraduate respondents to our teacher evaluation instrument often expressed concern with lack of organization, preparation, and confidence on the part of their GTAs.

To address these concerns and to provide GTAs support for their teaching responsibilities, we developed our Teaching of Psychology (TOP) course. This 1-credit course is now required of first-year graduate student trainees before they can apply to teach and then also during their subsequent teaching assignments. Therefore, GTAs have three semesters of training and support. During their first semester students are trained in a formal course. In the second semester they begin teaching and meet regularly as a group for additional teacher training, evaluation, and support. During the third semester, the GTAs attend the teacher training course again, but this time as co-instructors for a new set of trainees. Between 5 to 10 GTAs assume complete responsibility as instructor of record to teach a section of a General Psychology class of 40 to 70 undergraduate students each semester.

The First Semester (Teacher Training)

During the spring semester of their first year, graduate students who would like to teach during the following fall semester enroll in the team-taught TOP course. The class meets for 2 evening hours every other week. Each class session consists of three parts with separate goals for each. First, two or three of the current GTAs attend each class and serve as models, mentors, and resources for the trainees. Each class begins with a presentation by current
GTAs on activities they use to bring to life topics from the textbook being used in General Psychology. GTAs conduct demonstrations (often of their own design) and provide handouts relative to each topic. GTAs describe what works for them and what does not. They model qualities we want to see in our GTAs like enthusiasm for teaching, organization, and confidence.

The second major part of each class meeting aims to shape the confidence of the future GTAs. This segment also provides us, as the TOP instructors, an opportunity to evaluate the teaching potential of each trainee and to provide helpful feedback. Each trainee makes a presentation (usually two students present each evening) over a chapter from major textbooks on the teaching of psychology (e.g., Davis & Buskist, 2002; Svinicki & McKeachie, 2013; Perlman, McCann, & McFadden, 1999). The topics include facilitating discussion, teaching large classes, lecturing, using humor, fostering diversity, handling difficult students, creating written assignments, grading, and developing tests. Following the presentations the TOP instructors and current GTAs contribute insights drawn from their personal experiences to reinforce relevant concepts.

The third portion of each class session is devoted to pedagogical issues not covered by the formal presentations of the trainees. Conversations focus on such issues as test anxiety (sources and reduction strategies), development of teaching goals, organization of lectures, how to foster and assess critical thinking, academic integrity (reducing the likelihood of dishonesty, creative cheating techniques used by undergraduate students, and appropriate ways to expose and prosecute instances of cheating), ethics and legal issues (including relationships with students, access to student records, confidentiality, copyright law, etc.), respect for diversity and exceptionalities, use of technology, and handling of classroom medical emergencies.

One class period includes a guest lecture by an instructional technology faculty member who covers the basics of Moodle programming. During each class session, current GTAs take advantage of the “teachable moment” to discuss issues as they occur in their classes. Together we brainstorm solutions to those specific problems and discuss proactive approaches to avoid them in the future. The current GTAs expound on such issues as the experience of their first day of teaching, pet peeves, student evaluations, and changes they found prudent to make in their syllabi for their second semester of teaching.

To shape further the confidence of the trainees, a gradual, supportive, four-step introduction (which Vygotsky [1997] described as scaffolding) to the teaching experience is offered. In addition to making a presentation to their peers in the TOP class as described above, the trainees observe and complete an evaluation of a current GTA teaching his or her class. Later in the semester, the trainees collaborate with a current GTA and co-teach a brief (approximately 20 minutes) segment of the current GTA’s General Psychology class. Toward the semester’s end, each trainee teaches one complete General Psychology class for a current GTA. The current GTA provides written and oral feedback and undergraduates attending that class complete an assessment of strengths and areas in need of improvement.
The trainee and the TOP instructors meet to discuss the trainee’s teaching strengths and areas in need of attention.

In addition to the observations and presentations, GTAs complete several written assignments. We provide trainees a model for syllabus development and copies of syllabi from previous semesters. Each week the trainees submit a section of their potential General Psychology syllabi and receive feedback about strengths and weaknesses of the developing documents. In addition, after each observation or presentation GTAs submit a reflection paper describing the experience, what they learned from it, and how the experience might influence future goals or behaviors.

**The First Semester of Teaching (Teacher Support)**

During the fall semester, the GTAs meet to discuss additional pedagogical issues and share classroom experiences and tribulations. We assign the GTAs relevant articles to read and discuss. We also instruct them on the preparation of teaching portfolios. In addition, the Graduate School also offers a series of workshops to which it invites all GTAs. A major effort during the first semester of teaching is devoted to the issue of formative evaluation and constructive feedback on the GTAs’ teaching. After 4 weeks of teaching, GTAs ask their students to complete an informal evaluation of their classes. This evaluation usually takes the form of a paragraph indicating what the undergraduates like best about the course and the instructor, and what they would prefer to see changed about either. At midterm, the undergraduate students complete a much more formal and detailed evaluation instrument that contains both Likert-type and open-ended items. The TOP instructors also visit each class midway through the semester. The GTAs then schedule individual sessions with the instructors to review their progress, to set semester goals, and to discuss strategies for improvement. At the semester’s end, all GTAs have their undergraduate students complete the Psychology Department’s evaluation instrument.

A source that we find helpful throughout the course is the PsychTeacher electronic discussion list ([http://teachpsych.org/news/psychteacher.php](http://teachpsych.org/news/psychteacher.php)). We forward (or sometimes save for a teachable moment) portions of strings about such topics as problem students, self-disclosure, demonstrations, plagiarism, attendance policies, student complaints, grading, etc. These communiqués, along with the PsychTeacher series “E-xcellence in Teaching” ([http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/eit.php](http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/eit.php)) provide titillating starting points for classroom discussion.

**Evaluation of the Program**

The efficacy of the TOP course has been addressed through several informal measures. The mean and variability of the GTA scores on the Psychology Department faculty evaluation instrument consistently fall at the mean and within the range of the faculty scores. At the end of the most recent fall and spring semesters, the mean ratings on the 5-point Likert-style items were commensurate with and often exceeded that of the faculty as a whole. At least one, and often two, of the Psychology GTAs frequently win ASU’s GTA award. Several GTAs present posters at the annual meetings of the National Institute on the Teaching of
Psychology and several conduct theses on pedagogical issues. In 2007, we conducted a study that showed that our GTAs scored significantly higher on the Psychology-specific Area Concentration Achievement Test (ACAT) than graduate students who had no teaching assignments. (We do not think there is a selection bias because students who do not teach in our department are just as strong academically as those who do teach. Those students who decline to teach do so because of the heavy academic requirements for one particular MA program or due to a stronger focus on gaining research experience.) Some of our graduate students have reported that having the possibility of teaching influenced their decisions to enroll in our graduate program. Both an internal and external review of the Psychology Department’s graduate programs indicated that the alumni who have served as GTAs rated their teaching experience as one of the highlights of their graduate careers. Many of our graduate students have gone on to pursue doctoral degrees because of the experience and other graduate students teach part-time at community colleges. Finally, in 1987, the North Carolina Bureau for Public Policy Research named our TOP course one of two outstanding programs in the state for the training of GTAs. It became a template for the development of a legislative mandate governing the training of GTAs in the state of North Carolina.

**Evolution of the Program to Include Laboratory Sections of Courses**

Beginning in the fall semester of 2013, the Psychology Department instituted a curriculum change for the purpose of strengthening our undergraduate program by providing students with more experiential training in psychology. The new curriculum requires all of our undergraduates (a) to enroll in a 2-hour lab associated with the Research Methods course, which is a prerequisite for all of our other courses, and (b) to take at least one 2-hour lab associated with our sophomore/junior-level courses (social, cognitive, personality, learning, biological, or perception). A consequence of this change is that our graduate students now teach either the General Psychology course or one of the lab courses. Therefore, instead of having approximately 8 to 10 graduate students teaching General Psychology, now typically five graduate students teach General Psychology and five or six graduate students teach one of the lab courses. Although we wholeheartedly embrace the applied nature of the experiential labs, we are experiencing certain challenges as we attempt to prepare both lab instructors and General Psychology GTAs. The lab instructors for the large sections of the Research Methods course attend the lecture section of their course and observe their faculty mentor teach the first lab of each week. The instructor provides GTAs his or her PowerPoint slides and other materials in order to help support GTAs in teaching the two 2-hour labs themselves. GTAs are not responsible for syllabus development, assignment of grades, or presentation materials. The lab instructors for sophomore/junior-level classes have more responsibilities than those teaching the Research Methods labs and they, like their peers teaching General Psychology, are instructors of record for their lab classes, which means that they create their syllabi and are responsible for assigning final grades. However, like the Research Methods lab instructors, they work closely with a faculty supervisor who teaches the content course yoked to the lab. In essence there are now three types of GTAs whose needs are unique and impact the teaching of the TOP course.
The first time we taught the TOP class with students who could receive either lab or General Psychology assignments we had difficulty determining how to include appropriate content for each group into our TOP class. To make matters more difficult, one of the MA programs began requiring all of their students to take the TOP course regardless of whether they desired to teach in the fall. And finally, some of the faculty who were directing the lab sections selected their GTAs prior to the start of the semester despite the proscribed goal that the decision for assignments should rightly be based upon the evaluation of their performance in the course. Due to these additional changes, we had an unusually large TOP class with three tiers of students—a few who had already been selected for a particular teaching position, many anxious others who were uncertain if they would receive a teaching assignment at all, and a few who had no desire to teach but felt compelled to take the course.

We experienced several temporal issues. There were too many TOP students observing, co-teaching, and solo-teaching GTA classes during the spring semester. We also had to increase the number of TOP students giving presentations in the TOP class and that took time away from the typical presentations and discussions we led. In previous spring semesters we addressed a single syllabus development section each week and assigned TOP students to develop and submit that section prior to the subsequent class meeting. That assignment did not seem as necessary or appropriate for the potential Research Methods lab GTAs, so we asked current lab GTAs to present on issues such as APA writing style, approaches to research design, and basic statistics. Those GTAs gave a related assignment to the TOP students who thought they would have a lab assignment in the fall while the other students completed the syllabus assignments. This approach worked fairly well until it came time for the department chair to make assignments for the fall General Psychology and lab slots. Conflicts with graduate student academic course scheduling and lab availability arose. Some graduate students who thought they would teach a lab did not. Some who hoped to teach General Psychology were given a lab assignment. Several students did not receive an assignment due to scheduling problems or to uncertainty about whether they would be effective in the classroom.

After the semester ended, the TOP faculty and the lab faculty met and worked out many of the issues. The primary changes we made were that the teaching assignments (General Psychology or lab teaching) would be given by the department chair at the end of the spring semester based upon the combined recommendations of the TOP and lab faculty. Rather than trying to prepare students specifically to teach a General Psychology or lab course, we decided that we would teach the TOP course as just that—one to prepare students for teaching at the post-secondary level and not include separate lab-focused assignments. We have justified the emphasis on the General Psychology course (i.e., development of a General Psychology syllabus) because that course covers content from many of the labs and because the goal of the TOP course is to prepare teachers of psychology for coursework beyond General Psychology and specific labs. However, we allowed the graduate students who preferred to teach a lab to complete their observations, co-teaching, and solo-teaching assignments in a lab. We also felt that, depending on which lab course the department
assigned graduate students to teach, some of the General Psychology text material would nevertheless apply. After making these changes, we feel confident that the TOP course now seamlessly prepares students to do any type of teaching in the field of psychology.

Another issue with which we are grappling is whether to require lab GTAs to attend the TOP classes in the fall semester. In the past, these monthly meetings served as a support mechanism for GTAs who were assigned to teach General Psychology. However, because lab GTAs (especially those teaching Research Methods labs) already work closely with and receive support from their supervising faculty members, they were less appreciative of these TOP sessions. If lab GTAs do not participate in the fall TOP course, one concern is that it may lead to a disconnect from the program and impact their contributions the following spring when they are asked to help train the next wave of potential GTAs. We have considered several modifications to the fall course to increase its value for both lab and General Psychology GTAs and thus preserve the continuity of the program. We may incorporate empirical articles related to the common pedagogical challenges that we discuss. For instance, undergraduate motivation is a challenge that nearly all GTAs face, and there is a wealth of psychological research related to motivation and learning that could help GTAs understand why some strategies work better than others in motivating undergraduates to complete assignments, study, and engage in class discussion. We may ask GTAs to provide a product from their course that demonstrates how they have applied ideas generated from these discussions—perhaps an assignment they re-designed to motivate undergraduates using intrinsic rather than extrinsic goals. Finally, we may video GTAs teaching their class as a new method of evaluation and as a source of feedback to the students.

The most difficult aspect of teaching the TOP course is that it is inherently competitive in nature due to the fact that there are often not enough teaching positions for all the graduate students who wish to teach. The tension is especially palpable near the end of the spring semester because students need to know whether they will have a position so they can pursue other funding options if need be. Although we want to be selective and have the best teachers for our undergraduates, we make a concerted effort not to exacerbate the feeling of competitiveness. We try to reduce student concerns by emphasizing the benefits of improving public speaking and preparing them for teaching whenever it happens in the future. We find that students generally appreciate what they gain from taking the course even if they do not have the opportunity to immediately apply their new skills.

References


8. Master’s-Level Psychology Graduate Teaching Assistants: Early Training Program for Future College Teachers

Cathy A. Grover

Founded in 1863, Emporia State University (ESU) is a Midwestern regional state university and currently enrolls approximately 6000 students (undergraduate and graduate students combined; News and Events, 2013). The student-faculty ratio is 16:1 with approximately half of its classes having 20 or fewer students (US News, 2014). ESU is located in Emporia, Kansas (population about 25,000) located on I-35 midway between Wichita and Kansas City. The Department of Psychology, housed in the Teachers College, has eight full time Psychology doctoral-level faculty, 12-14 graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), approximately 200 undergraduate psychology majors and 90 graduate students in Masters (MS)-level Clinical, Experimental, Industrial/Organizational, and MS/Education Specialist School Psychology programs (Emporia State University, 2014).

Training of Master’s-Level GTAs

According to the American Psychological Association’s (APA) Center for Workforce study (Mulvey, Wicherski, & Kohout, 2012), 53% of Master’s-level psychology departments offer first-year graduate students 20 hour/week graduate teaching assistantships (GTA), and 60% of the departments offer GTA positions to graduate students past their first year. Typically, these positions have an annual stipend ($6-$7000/yr) and about half offer full tuition remission. It is less clear how many of those assistantships have teaching training programs and how many of those allow GTAs to have full teaching responsibility for psychology courses, although resources are available that provide guidelines, advice, and strategies for becoming an effective college/university teacher (e.g., Buskist & Benassi, 2012; Buskist & Davis, 2006; Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014) as well as training graduate teaching assistants (e.g., Buskist, Beins, & Hevern, 2004, Prieto & Meyers, 2001).

Davis, Grover, and Burns (2004) previously presented the ESU Psychology Department model for training, supporting, and evaluating master’s-level GTAs who have complete responsibility for teaching beginning level psychology courses. The ESU Psychology Department model includes pre-teaching training (orientation), continuous training with peer and supervisor support (meetings throughout the semesters), and guidance developing documentation of teaching (teaching portfolios) and evaluation of each GTA’s teaching effectiveness (peer, faculty, and student evaluations). This chapter provides an update of this training model.
History of the ESU GTA Training Model

Prior to 1979, one full-time faculty member taught Introductory Psychology by presenting a weekly, 1-hour lecture to all students (250+) enrolled in the course. The GTAs assisted in the course by administering and grading tests, and conducting two weekly, 1-hour small-group discussion sections. Because faculty, students, and administrators were dissatisfied with that approach, the psychology department searched for a better approach. Hindered by a limited number of faculty with full course loads, the department chose to give GTAs full autonomy for assigned sections of the course, which resulted in the development of a well-structured and effective GTA training program. The ESU administration endorsed and has continuously supported the program, which has contributed substantially to the program’s sustained success. The following sections describe the current GTA training program.

Selection of GTAs and Their Responsibilities

Graduate student applicants must have an excellent background in psychology, at least a 3.00 cumulative and 3.25 last 60-hour undergraduate GPA, and must submit a one-page “Teaching Interest” essay in addition to other graduate admissions materials (Guide to Graduate Assistantship Opportunities, n.d.). March 15th is the deadline for psychology GTA applications. The department chair and I rank order the applicants’ qualifications based on our review their coursework in psychology, GPA, desire to teach as reflected in the essay, and letters of recommendation for admissions to the graduate program. I then conduct phone interviews with the top-ranked applicants, during which I describe possible GTA assignments and responsibilities, such as having complete responsibility for two, 3-credit hour sections of Introductory Psychology or Developmental Psychology for non-majors with enrollments of 30-40 students each. Another possible assignment for new GTAs is to teach two sections of a 1-credit hour Introductory Psychology Laboratory, although typically 2nd year GTAs who have already taught Introductory Psychology receive this assignment. GTAs may also teach one of the above courses and spend 10 hours per week assisting a faculty member in a different course, assisting with departmental advising, or assisting with office clerical work. Extra duties may include proctoring departmental make-up sessions, supervising the departmental online research pool, completing ESU van driver training, and attending a teaching conference each year (with departmental funding). Additionally, all GTAs must enroll in a 1-credit hour University Level Teaching course (PY703) each semester they are a GTA. Because it is important that each applicant fully understands the pending possible assignment before making a commitment, I provide applicants with this information via e-mail before the phone interview. Applicants return a signed form, indicating their understanding and acceptance of the GTA position. Approximately half of the department GTAs are new each fall.

GTA Orientation

At the beginning of the summer before the GTA assignment begins, GTAs receive a copy of the PY703 syllabus, name and contact of a returning GTA mentor, a copy of the textbook and instructor materials for their course, and sample course syllabi. The syllabus contains all the PY703 course requirements, fall/spring PY703 course calendar, all required information that must appear in their assigned course syllabi (e.g., course goals and objectives, disability
statement, make-up policy), helpful teaching hints from former GTAs, and copies of evaluation forms. Before the 3-day orientation in August, all GTAs read *Teaching Tips* (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014), prepare a tentative syllabus, and develop lectures and demonstrations. All GTAs participate in a 3-day (8 hours per day) departmental orientation the week before fall semester classes begin. The orientation includes, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Introductions by GTA supervisor, department chair, departmental administrative assistant, and each new GTA.
2. Presentation and discussion of ESU policies, as contained in the *Faculty Handbook*.
3. Presentation and discussion of departmental policies.
4. Tour of Teachers College (e.g., GTA office, departmental student lounge, mailroom, departmental office) and university facilities (e.g., copy center, student union).
5. Presentation and discussion of expectations of GTAs and GTA supervisors (e.g., ethical relationships, responsibilities).
6. Presentation and discussion of syllabus requirements and construction (e.g., a minimum of 5 office hours, grading, extra credit, testing, use of Canvas).
7. Presentation and discussion of resources available (e.g., campus labs, technology, library, guest speakers, campus counseling center).
8. Extensive presentation and discussion of effective teaching opportunities, techniques, policies, and procedures that includes returning GTA presentations of assigned chapters in Svinicki and McKeachie (2014). For example,
   a. Classroom policies and procedures (e.g., what students will call you, cheating and harassment, poor attendance, student problems).
   b. Class delivery (e.g., instructor attire, lecture, discussions, PowerPoint and other media, sensitivity to personal differences/biases, cultures, gender, and controversial topics).
   c. Quizzes, exams, and testing (e.g., how many and when, reviewing, types, test banks, scantrons, item analysis, returning).
9. Presentation of online delivery system (Canvas) by technology and computer personnel.
10. Presentation by each returning GTA of an advantageous classroom activity or demonstration, with a description of when and how to use the demonstration.
11. Presentation of a 30-minute lecture by each new GTA. The topic must be from one of the chapters of the new GTA’s assigned course. They are to teach as though the returning GTAs and the GTA supervisor are students in their assigned class.

**GTA / University Level Teaching Course Semester Meetings**

All GTAs and their supervisor attend biweekly group meetings during the fall and spring semesters. The GTAs give the presentations and the supervisor directs the group 1.5 hour or longer meetings. The meeting activities are as follows:
1. The supervisor collects the GTA Focus/Reflection papers that are due at the beginning of each meeting. These papers are a 1-2 page self-evaluation of each GTA’s teaching focusing on their growth and development as a teacher since their last Focus/Reflection paper. The supervisor does not grade these papers, but may provide individual feedback in a subsequent private meeting.

2. The GTA supervisor makes announcements and reminders. For example, the supervisor may remind GTAs to submit names of students having difficulty or exhibiting poor attendance electronically to the ESU CARE Team that investigates matters of concern related to undergraduates and assists undergraduates in distress through assessment and consultation. The CARE team (Dean of Students, Director of Student Wellness, Director of Disability Services, and Director of Student Life) seeks input from different professionals (e.g., mental health counselors, police, attorneys) to assist students having difficulties. The advising office has commended several GTAs for submitting names of undergraduates for CARE intervention early in the semester so that these students get the needed assistance to successfully complete their course(s).

3. GTAs have an open discussion of the successes and problems they have experienced since the previous meeting. Initially, the supervisor encourages GTAs to contribute suggestions, ideas and comments, and the supervisor provides feedback, if needed. Additional encouragement after the first GTA meeting typically is unnecessary because GTAs become eager to help one another and receive advice from others. GTAs indicate that they benefit from the many diverse suggestions and that they return to their classroom well prepared to try new techniques for preventing or solving problems in the classroom.

4. A GTA leads a discussion over a teaching topic currently of particular interest or concern to himself, herself, or other GTAs (e.g., how to encourage quiet students contributing to discussion, how to curtail the more vocal students’ contributions without embarrassing the students). GTAs comment they benefit from the many diverse suggestions and often return to their classroom well prepared for dealing with difficult/uncomfortable situations.

5. A different GTA presents a 30-40 minute PowerPoint presentation of any teaching topic. The GTAs typically use information from Griggs and Jackson (2011), Korn and Sikorski, (2010), Perlman, McCann and McFadden (2004), Svinicki and McKeachie (2014), the Society for the Teaching of Psychology’s journal *Teaching of Psychology*, and/or online teaching resources (e.g., Society for the Teaching of Psychology, n.d.).

6. GTAs demonstrate and give detailed explanations of a psychology activity/demonstration. GTAs use many different sources including their instructor’s manuals that accompany their textbooks and the numerous sources for teaching psychology (e.g., Afful, Good, Keeley, Leder, & Stiegler-Balfour, 2013; Buskist & Davis, 2009; Miller, Balcetis, Burns, Daniel, Saville, & Woody, 2011).

7. The class discusses professional development activities (e.g., teaching research projects, teaching conferences, teaching workshops, teaching and/or psychology-related speakers at ESU or online).
8. The supervisor closes with final comments for the good of the group that are teaching-related as well as more personal in nature. This is an excellent opportunity to summarize the highlights of the meeting, reiterate important reminders, and plan a GTA social event (e.g., pizza party, movie night, bowling).

**Additional University Level Teaching Course Requirements**

Prior to midterm of the first semester the GTA mentor and the supervisor observe the GTA teaching for a minimum of 50 minutes using the same observation and evaluation form that faculty use to provide written feedback to other faculty on their classroom performance. The form allows the observer to provide detailed comments for both teaching strengths and concerns. The supervisor meets with the GTA after the observation to review the evaluation and make constructive comments. Different GTAs and different faculty (not those from the GTA’s graduate program) observe the GTA after midterm of the first semester, and before and after midterm of subsequent semesters. Having each observer only evaluate the GTA one time provides GTAs with a variety of feedback. GTAs provide the supervisor with a copy of all evaluation forms and place a copy of each form in their teaching portfolio.

The biweekly self-focus/reflection papers (described above) allow each GTA to report on specific aspects of teaching and promote ongoing reflection on teaching practices and abilities. GTAs can use the information in the papers to aid recall of their teaching progress as they complete the required GTA Semester Self-Evaluation form that they submit to their supervisor and place in their portfolios at the end of each semester. Self-Evaluation forms evaluate teaching development and performance as well as personal growth and development that is relevant to teaching.

Additionally, GTAs and the supervisor attend a regional teaching conference (e.g., The Association for Psychological and Educational Research in Kansas (PERK) / Nebraska Psychological Society (NPS) joint teaching workshops, Oklahoma Network for Teaching of Psychology (ONTOP) conference) during the academic year. The department provides funding for registration, hotel, and transportation. The supervisor encourages all GTAs to participate at the conferences by giving a paper, poster, or symposium presentation.

The final requirement of the University Level Teaching Course is the personal teaching portfolio, which documents each GTA’s teaching and teaching effectiveness. The portfolio contains items such as a statement of teaching philosophy with supportive evidence and documentation (e.g., vita, syllabi, PowerPoint slides, exams, assignments, student work, focus/reflection papers, self-evaluations, student course/instructor evaluations and summary data, teaching conference presentations). Each GTA’s teaching portfolio is a work in progress, submitted at the end of each semester during the final evaluation meeting with the supervisor. The portfolio is a source of inspiration for many GTAs because they realize how much they have accomplished as a new teacher.
GTA Program Evaluation
The GTA supervisor maintains an active evaluation file for each GTA, and meets individually with GTAs at the end of each semester to review teaching performance, improvement, and development. This meeting allows each GTA and the supervisor to identify and discuss the GTA’s strengths and weaknesses and methods to improve teaching for the next semester. This meeting also provides an opportunity for the GTA supervisor and the individual GTA to identify strengths and weaknesses of the GTA program. Because the supervisor archives the GTA files, those files can provide specific information regarding the GTA that the supervisor can use when writing letters of recommendation.

Recently, the ESU Teachers College has adopted the use of online IDEA (The IDEA Center, 2014) for student evaluations of courses/instructors. I obtained spring 2014 summary IDEA grand means for each of the 9 GTAs and 10 faculty teaching psychology courses at ESU. The summary IDEA score consists of the class average of the student ratings on a 5-point rating-scale for the combination of progress on relevant objectives (e.g., gaining factual knowledge, learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories, and learning to apply course material), excellent course, and excellent teacher. The faculty and all but one of the GTAs had taught at least two semesters at ESU. An independent samples t test indicated no significant differences, t(20) = -.99, p = .33, between GTAs (M = 4.21, SD = .30) and faculty (M = 4.34, SD = .31) raw summary IDEA scores. As reported earlier (Davis et al., 2004), students evaluate ESU psychology GTAs and faculty as being similar. Unlike the previous report where faculty scores were more variable during some years, a Fmax test revealed comparable variability between GTAs and faculty for the current spring 2014 semester raw summary scores, Fmax(11, 9) = 0.99, p = .48. Additional future years of IDEA data will reveal if the current similarities in variability of the scores are stable. As reported in previous years (Davis et al.), current findings can indicate “… that the GTA training program is successful in producing a uniform, high level of teaching performance” (pp. 47-48).

Conclusion
The ESU Psychology Department GTA training model continues to be an effective and reliable method of preparing graduate students to teach. One former GTA currently in a doctoral program has indicated,

The GTA program provided excellent training in teaching, a collaborative environment, and continued education through workshops and biweekly meetings. These experiences were invaluable when it came to teaching my own (upper-level) classes in the first year of my PhD program. Most importantly, the GTA program at ESU allows students to create relationships and professional networks that extend beyond graduation. Overall, the GTA program positioned me to be successful in teaching, researching, and establishing professional relationships with students, colleagues, and professionals early
in my academic career. (Amanda L. Martens, personal communication, July 11, 2014).

The teaching assignments in the ESU Department of Psychology are consistent with recommendations by Irons and Buskist (2008) who suggested that teaching introductory and developmental psychology courses might give psychology graduate students seeking a professorial position a competitive advantage, as those courses are general psychology courses. After graduating with a MS in psychology from ESU, several of the former departmental GTAs pursue PhDs and acquire a GTA position at those institutions, and ultimately become professors at colleges and universities. As summarized by a focus group of former Master’s graduate students (several in doctoral programs),

Graduate students have a unique opportunity at ESU to teach and develop teaching skills that are not offered at many universities. Upon leaving ESU, many have at least 1-year of experience in college teaching, which gives them an advantage over many other first-year PhD students (Howard, McJunkin, Miller, Peterson, & Russell, 2009).

As suggested initially by Davis et al. (2004), much of the ESU Psychology Department GTA training program can be adapted for college/university-level training at any level. Ideally, development as a college-level teacher should be an ongoing process that begins with sound training at the earliest possible opportunity. Over its many years, the ESU Psychology Department GTA training program has served as the initial training for many successful college teachers. I hope that others training psychology GTAs may glean some useful tidbits from the current program as I have it presented here.
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9. Training our “Trainers”:
Teaching Graduate Students to Teach Psychology

Sharon Bowman

In my 18-plus years as a department chair, I have personally reviewed more than my share of applications from would-be faculty members. In turn, I have also reviewed my share of packets for our own students, soon-to-be academics themselves. Although many years have passed since I was in their position, I still recall my own training and the advice received from my doctoral chair as I prepared for my first job search. Some of those lessons are still quite valid today, and, if followed, would probably facilitate the hire of better-qualified psychologist-teachers.

The training of psychologists who are able to teach requires some care and feeding. Regardless of the particular branch of psychology being studied, we have some commonalities in our training at the doctoral level at Ball State University (BSU). First, we prepare our graduate students to be critical thinkers—they should not blindly accept material presented to them. Instead, they should be able to critique that material and understand the nuances of the message. Second, we train them to understand the foundations of their respective branch of psychology, and the current growing edges. Third, we expect them to add to the scientific knowledge of their field, through research and/or practice. Knowing that many of our graduate students (in the applied fields, at least) do not intend to be active researchers after graduation, we still want them to be able to critique research in anticipation of applying it in their work. Fourth, they should have a breadth of knowledge of the field of psychology; our training does not occur in a silo, and the work of one branch has much to offer other branches. Finally, our graduate students must be able to apply their knowledge in the manner appropriate to their branch of psychology (in particular settings, with clients or other consumers, across disciplines).

What is missing from the above list, simply put, is training graduate students how to teach. We do not regularly, and passionately, and purposely train our doctoral students to impart their knowledge in the classroom. We train them as consultants, as researchers, as workshop or conference presenters, yes, but not as teachers of psychology. Strangely, I am not sure where undergraduates (or even some of my Master’s level students) think psychology professors are birthed. I am bemused by young students who are surprised that I identify as a counseling psychologist first and foremost; my occupation is as professor and department chair, but my vocation is as a counseling psychologist. When even my students are not sure that a psychologist can be a teacher, something is missing in the world. I should note that this “how to teach” dilemma is not unique to psychology; the question arises from
time to time on college campuses for all fields. In short, we offer majors in teaching at the primary level, but most of our fields of study do not provide training on teaching at the college level.

In this chapter, I will discuss the training of psychologist-teachers in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Services at BSU. I can speak of what we do in my department in hope that it will help others in different types of academic environments.

**Commitment to Teaching Instruction**

I am the chair of a primarily graduate department at a mid-size Midwestern state university. Our programs include Master’s degrees in social psychology and counseling, and a PhD in counseling psychology. We also offer an undergraduate minor in interpersonal relations. Our department admits up to 10 doctoral students in each cohort. We require students to complete four training assignments at least once each during their program, whether or not they have accepted an assistantship from the department (some students have other means of paying for their schooling, and thus do not accept the funding). Those training assignments include staffing our counseling practicum clinic, providing clinical supervision to our Master’s counseling students, serving as a research assistant to a faculty member, and teaching a course for our undergraduate minor. We inform potential students during the application/interview process that they will be teaching at least once during their training, and our department is prepared to provide this experience by virtue of having the undergraduate minor available for an immediate teaching opportunity.

**Pre-teaching Training**

Good teachers do not simply grow fully formed. Like training researchers, we have to provide graduate students with the appropriate tools for the task at hand. Having been a student for so many years does not automatically prepare someone to understand how to teach any more than years of riding in a car automatically prepares us to know how to drive one. A little foundational work in the beginning reliably gets novice instructors off on a good direction.

In training our graduate students to teach, we address several areas of knowledge: the specific nuts and bolts of teaching in your university, the rules and regulations of the university, some knowledge of college student development, and methods of engagement that facilitate a good classroom experience for students and instructor alike.

The specific nuts and bolts of teaching include such things as the use of Blackboard or other electronic media to communicate with students and the university. Larger campuses are moving toward communications systems that allow instructors to send e-mail, check enrollments, post slideshows, or embed links to articles, videos, or other materials for student review. Instructors can be quite creative within these platforms, including creating discussion boards or journal assignments as course requirements. Exams may also be administered through these platforms. A benefit for instructors is the option to have writing assignments submitted electronically and be evaluated for the likelihood of plagiarized
material. The opportunity to check for plagiarized work is arguably the most helpful aspect of the platform, as it saves teachers countless hours of manually checking suspicious documents. At some universities, the electronic platform may be the only way to submit final grades, so instructors must have a base familiarity with the product. These platforms also may have the capability to tally the number of times a student assesses the platform and how long he/she remains involved with it, thus allowing instructors to identify a specific student’s engagement with the course.

Other important nuts and bolts issues include information on handling specific types of student concerns, such as student athletes who are in season and might need to miss a class session for a competition. On some campuses, such as ours, freshman grades are closely tracked as part of the university retention plan; instructors must report their mid-semester grades to the university. Another issue that can arise during an academic term is the handling of students who are experiencing personal difficulties. Perhaps this issue is more relevant for those of us in applied branches of the field, but undergraduates may choose to reveal information to an instructor that is better served for a therapist. For example, in a journal or an assignment, perhaps a student reveals struggles with past trauma or abuse, or current issues with depression. A therapist-in-training sees red flags and feels a mandate to respond in a certain way. In contrast, a teacher-in-training has a different set of responsibilities to that student. Our instructors must acknowledge their primary role in each situation, and to guide the student to the appropriate offices on campus to get other needs met. In short, providing early instruction on some of these nuts and bolts issues will help instructors-in-training when faced with one of these atypical situations.

The student code for academic dishonesty identifies the rules and regulations of the university. Plagiarism, whether inadvertent or intentional, frequently occurs in our classes (more so in undergraduate classes, but graduate classes are not immune). Each campus has a definition of academic dishonesty, and rules to follow when it is suspected or proven. New instructors, in my experience, tend to be blindsided by their first experience with academic dishonesty, whether it is cheating on an exam or submitting another author’s work as one’s own original work, and are unsure what steps to take in response. Instructors-in-training must be exposed to the student code, and the necessary steps to follow if the code appears breached. Similar instruction should be provided regarding the parameters of dual relationships with students, working with students with disabilities, and other such issues. Finally, rules and regulations include the expectations for instructors to attend class regularly, grade and return materials in a reasonable time, and be appropriately accessible to their students via office hours or other means of contact.

Knowledge of college student development might seem unnecessary, but it is an important (yet often overlooked) component of teacher training. Psychologists who wish to continue into a professional career as an academic should have a knowledge base about the people they are teaching. Again, to use the analogy of primary education, education majors often take developmental psychology courses as part of their training. Although many of our programs might require a developmental psychology course in the doctoral curriculum, we
seldom focus on the changes experienced by college-age or adult students. Those changes in maturation, and in self-awareness, have an effect on what undergraduates are able to process. This area is much larger than can be covered here, but the *Journal of Higher Education* and the *Journal of College Student Development* would be two immediate resources.

Methods of engagement are the ways in which instructors introduce the course material to a diverse audience. The old standard “lecture, multiple-choice exams, and write a paper” approach may not work across the board. New instructors need to know how to capture the attention of students who have been fully immersed in the digital era. Methods of engagement may include use of electronic discussion boards and video options, as noted earlier. It may include teaching hybrid courses (partly online and part face-to-face instruction), or fully online courses. Although most undergraduate courses in my department are taught face-to-face, we have been creating online versions of most of those same courses, which gives us many more degrees of freedom for working within graduate student instructors’ schedules (after all, they are students, too, with their own class schedules to manage). Experience with such courses can be an asset when applying for teaching positions post-graduation, especially as online college education continues to gain footage across the country.

The other side of creating an environment of engagement includes learning how to present to a group. Instructors need to understand how to give a lecture without simply reading the slides to the class or lecturing straight from the textbook. New instructors also need to learn the basics of managing a class, such as how to create informative but not overly dense PowerPoint slides. Failure to engage undergraduates is probably the number one complaint I read in final course evaluations—the instructor just read the slides and didn’t bring anything new into the class, thus students didn’t really need to come to class.

Graduate students have years of vicarious experience watching other people teach, and these students are able to identify techniques that they enjoyed or disliked. Our job is to help them shape their vicarious experience as a student into their own style of instruction. Thinking outside of the box as an instructor is a skill that requires some nurturing. New instructors experience a twinge of fear when a student asks an off-the-cuff question. Even worse is when a student, or small group of students, chooses to be disrespectful to the instructor. For example, it is not uncommon for one of my instructors-in-training to be challenged by a student who consistently creates disruptions during class. The instructor-in-training in such a situation must make quick judgments about how to finesse the student in question and the rest of the class. As their supervisors, we must help the instructor-in-training learn to trust his or her judgment.

Other necessary information includes instruction on creating appropriate assessments. As with other aspects of teaching, creating a good multiple-choice exam requires some attention and follow-up analysis to assure that the questions are appropriately discriminating. Equally important is learning how to evaluate course presentations and other
projects. Finally, as noted earlier, being able to distinguish plagiarized papers, then knowing what to do about it, is critical to effective instruction.

**How to Provide Training**
In my experience with applicants for academic positions, I’ve learned that most people are thrown into teaching without much training. It is truly a trial-by-fire experience. There are ways to provide new instructors with a foundation before they begin to teach, or at least during their first teaching experience, that will be of benefit to both the new instructors and to their students.

*Pre-teaching workshop*
Some of the nuts and bolts of effective teaching and information about university rules and regulation can be provided in a concentrated afternoon of instruction. We schedule such a training session for our incoming doctoral students in the week before our fall semester begins each year. A subset of our faculty is involved in this training, and they take various sections of the material. We often bring in someone from another office on campus to provide instruction in the use of Blackboard. As BSU continues to upgrade Blackboard with more functionality, we have learned it is better to have someone who understands the system’s functions to provide that instruction.

*Semester-long brown bag instruction*
If the pre-semester workshop is not feasible, or seems too short, a more leisurely approach is to spend a full semester prior to the teaching assignment providing the necessary training. Using this method, we arranged a series of lectures on teaching, with each member of our faculty spending an hour with the first-year doctoral cohort discussing an assigned topic. The advantage to having a semester to get novice instructors prepared for teaching is that they have time to absorb the relevant information prior to beginning to teach. In this case, supplemental materials could also be used, such as Stowell and Landrum’s Video Clips of Master Teaching, available from the Office of Teaching Resources in Psychology via the American Psychological Association’s Division 2, Society of the Teaching of Psychology (STP) ([http://www.teachpsych.org/otrp/resources/index.php](http://www.teachpsych.org/otrp/resources/index.php)).

When they are actually in a teaching semester, our doctoral instructors are supervised by a faculty instructor. The instructor and supervisor meet regularly (or as needed) over the course of the semester. The supervisor visits each novice instructor’s course once during the semester for a face-to-face teaching observation then provides written feedback to the instructor and his/her doctoral chair. For online courses, the faculty supervisor is added to the course as a supplemental instructor for supervising purposes. The faculty supervisor is also the go-to person for any concerns or complaints raised by undergraduates enrolled in the course.

*University-level instruction*
Larger college campuses may offer some additional training options for novice instructors. First, if there is a university office charged with improving teaching effectiveness, graduate students may participate in their workshops or training sessions. Our Office of Teaching
Effectiveness offers a set of foundational workshops for new faculty, which also includes our graduate students. This office also coordinates a 3-week summer workshop on incorporating diversity into one’s courses that our doctoral students often attend. In these workshops, the training is general enough to cover all disciplines, thus giving students exposure to the ideas of instructors from across campus.

The second option for additional training directs interested doctoral students to complete specified coursework in higher education teaching, which may lead to a minor or a certificate in college teaching. For example, BSU’s Department of Educational Studies offers a Certificate in College and University teaching, in which students learn to provide quality undergraduate and graduate instruction. The certificate also focuses on the intersection of teaching, research, and service responsibilities for academics. Courses for this certificate cover teaching and curriculum issues in higher education, teaching strategies for adult learners, international higher education, and a teaching practicum. This option requires much more time on the graduate student’s part, and is beyond the scope of many departments, but imagine being able to hire someone with that sort of background!

**Concluding Remarks**

There is a science and an art to both the practice and the teaching of psychology. Although many instructors are self-taught, it might be more efficient (and ultimately, more productive for both instructor and students) to provide some training for our “trainers.” Although I haven’t tried it yet myself, perhaps funding an initial membership in STP for each of our novice instructors might be in order.
10. Preparing Future Psychology Faculty at the University of New Hampshire

Victor A. Benassi, Robert C. Drugan, Kenneth Fuld, Brett K. Gibson, and Michelle D. Leichtman

The Durham campus of the University of New Hampshire (UNH), located near the Atlantic seacoast, is a residential public university with a total undergraduate and graduate enrollment of about 13,000 and 2,200 students, respectively. The university offers a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs. UNH has a designation as a land-, sea-, and space-grant institution. Its Carnegie Classification is Research University (High Research Activity). UNH—Durham offers doctoral degrees in over 20 major areas of specialization. Undergraduates are predominantly in the 18 to 23 age range and most hail from New England, although a significant number are from other parts of the US and other countries. About 50% of the undergraduates are nonresidents. UNH also has an urban campus in Manchester, NH with an enrollment of about 1,000 students. In 2014, the Franklin Pierce Law Center became part of the university, and is now the UNH School of Law.

The goal of the UNH PhD program in psychology since its inception in the 1960s has been to prepare psychologists to secure faculty positions (Benassi & Fernald, 1993). Its centerpiece has been the background students receive in the area of college teaching and other faculty roles, including research and service (Benassi & Fernald, 1991; 1993; Fernald, 1995; Ferren, Gaff, & Clayton-Pedersen, 2002).

In addition to engaging in coursework and research training, our graduate students participate in experiences designed to prepare them for a full range of faculty roles. These experiences vary depending on their positions in the program. First-year graduate students participate in a proseminar and gain teaching and research assistant experience. They also complete a seminar that covers the specialty areas in our PhD program as well as major topics included in our introductory psychology course. (Graduate students teach the introductory psychology course in their third year.) Second-year graduate students serve as teaching and research assistants, complete coursework, and prepare for teaching in their third year. Third-year graduate students participate in a two-semester Practicum and Seminar in the Teaching of Psychology, while concurrently teaching a course in introductory psychology each semester. They also take the first part of a specialty exam designed to prepare them for teaching a course in their specialty area during their fourth year. Finally, fourth- and fifth-year graduate students teach in their specialty area and prepare for the job search. In their fourth year, graduate students take the second part of a specialty exam designed to prepare them for dissertation work. Graduate students may secure a highly competitive dissertation year fellowship in the fifth year, with about 15 awarded across the
Experiences Related to Teaching, Research, and Service

Teaching
During the spring of their second year and over the summer, graduate students scheduled to teach Introductory Psychology begin to work with the next teacher of the Practicum and Seminar in the Teaching of Psychology. They earn academic credit for completing this important work through a seminar entitled Preparing to Teach a Psychology course. Several important topics and tasks are addressed early in the process of preparing to teach the introductory course: the purpose of the introductory psychology course, principles of test construction and grading practices, classroom teaching methods, selection of textbooks and other materials for the introductory psychology course, preparation of a course syllabus, and preparation of several teaching modules (Benassi, Jordan, & Harrison, 1994). This course was made available in 2002 in an online format to doctoral students from universities other than UNH through support from the American Psychological Association (APA; Murray, 2002). To date, about 450 students from nearly 80 universities across the US and from nearly a dozen universities in other countries have completed this course (http://www.unh.edu/teaching-excellence/GRAD980/Index.htm).

The Department of Psychology offers a Practicum and Seminar in the Teaching of Psychology each fall and spring semester. Four senior professors currently take turns teaching this course. It provides third-year doctoral students with an academic foundation for teaching psychology. Concurrent with taking the practicum and seminar, the doctoral students teach one section of Introductory Psychology during the fall and spring semesters. Coverage includes a broad range of traditional and innovative topics concerning teaching and learning, with special emphasis on the teaching of psychology. For example, topics include scientific findings on best practices in teaching, writing in the curriculum, rich media class projects, academic technology (e.g., Blackboard and clickers), inclusive pedagogy, teaching statistics and methods, and teaching as a performance art. Where appropriate, specialists (including faculty, administrators, etc.) from the university and larger community are often invited to meet with students and share their expertise, and former graduates are invited to discuss their experiences on the job market and beyond. In addition, students receive group and individual supervision of their teaching. In the practicum classroom, students share the joys and challenges they encounter each week in teaching and support each other with advice. On several occasions the practicum/seminar teacher observes doctoral students teaching their course and these students are also videotaped while teaching. The teacher observes the videotape with the graduate students and provides feedback on their performance. Each student also prepares a teaching portfolio over the course of the academic year. Prior to the start of their third year in the graduate program, we provide students with a Society for the Teaching of Psychology (http://teachpsych.org) membership, which includes a subscription to the journal Teaching of Psychology.
During recent years, there has been an increased emphasis on helping graduate student teachers maintain their research activity while they are teaching. The Practicum and Seminar teacher encourages the graduate student teachers to write every day (e.g., research articles, grant applications), following strategies from Murray (2005) and Silvia (2007). Some time may be allocated during weekly class meetings for students to provide updates on their progress with research and writing.

During their fourth year and sometimes during the fifth year, students teach a survey course in their specialty area and often an introductory course in statistics, with guidance from Psychology Department faculty.

**Research and Service**

Doctoral students work on research from the beginning of their studies in a specialty area offered in the department—brain, behavior, and cognition; development; social and personality. The nature of this involvement varies with their prior background, interests, and seniority in the program. Graduate students continue to be productive, as evidenced by presentations at research conferences and by publications and they are also routinely involved in service activities for the department (e.g., hiring committee), graduate school (e.g., Graduate Student Organization), and university (e.g., Women’s Commission). Informal surveys of program graduates have indicated such service activities have served them well both during the job interview process and on the job.

**Faculty as Advisors and Mentors**

**Graduate Proseminar**

First-year doctoral students take a required two-semester proseminar that is taught by a senior faculty member. The proseminar meets biweekly for 2 hours. It focuses on the following areas: forming a professional identity, meeting Psychology Department faculty and learning about their careers, establishing professional relationships with faculty, becoming knowledgeable about ethical issues in research and teaching, and developing a first-year talk. (Doctoral students prepare and deliver an end-of-the-year research presentation.) The proseminar routinely includes presentations by our departmental faculty, staff of the Graduate School, the Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the Psychology Department's administrative coordinator, and advanced graduate students.

**Job Search**

The preliminary stages of the job search process begin during graduate students’ third year of study, when the teacher of the Practicum and Seminar in the Teaching of Psychology assists them in preparing a curriculum vitae and the beginnings of a professional portfolio. During the year that graduate students begin their job search, faculty offer advice and assistance on identifying job openings, preparing cover letters, finalizing the portfolio, and preparing research- and teaching-oriented job talks.

Since the early 1990s, over 75% of the graduates of the program have secured faculty positions at the full range of postsecondary institutions—community colleges (e.g., New
Hampshire Community Technical College, liberal arts colleges (e.g., Lesley College, Siena College, Hobart and William Smith College, Willamette University), comprehensive universities (e.g., Minnesota State University, University of New England, Armstrong Atlantic State University, State University of New York College at Geneseo), research universities (e.g., University of Utah, College of William and Mary, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick Campus). Program graduates occasionally seek career opportunities outside of academe—for example, in business, industry, consulting, or the non-profit sector. An increasing number of the program graduates first complete a post-doctoral fellowship before applying for faculty positions.

Integrating the Department Program with Other UNH Programs

We urge students to take advantage of two faculty development programs available at UNH—the university-wide Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program and the Academic Program in College Teaching (APCT). Through the APCT, most psychology graduate students work toward earning a minor in college teaching, which is granted in conjunction with the conferral of the PhD (Seidel, Benassi, & Richards, 2006). Graduate students earn academic credit by taking courses offered through the UNH Graduate School, either in face-to-face or online formats (http://www.unh.edu/teaching-excellence/resources/Programs.html). Required courses are Preparing to Teach a Psychology Course; Teaching With Writing; Cognition, Teaching, and Learning; and Classroom Research and Assessment Methods. Students also complete two elective courses related to teaching in higher education and prepare a College Teaching Portfolio.

UNH sponsors a university-wide PFF Program (http://www.unh.edu/academic-affairs/preparing-future-faculty). Most psychology graduate students participate in program activities such as the PFF Breakfast/Lunch series during which students from across the university discuss, often with faculty guests from other colleges or universities, a variety of important issues (e.g., academic freedom, the job search, managing an academic career).

Dissemination Activities

The American Psychological Association’s Education Directorate provides national leadership for the Preparing Future Faculty Program in Psychology (Nelson & Morreale, 2002; http://www.apa.org/education/grad/future-faculty.aspx). UNH PFF participants—both faculty and doctoral students—have been involved in a variety of ways to disseminate information about the UNH program to leaders of other psychology doctoral programs. Some examples of dissemination activities include presentations at the annual APA convention (e.g., Benassi, 2013), participation in other national and regional meetings (e.g., Benassi, 2008), and offering workshops to psychology faculty, administrators, and graduate students from other institutions where there is an interest in learning about the PFF initiative and in developing a PFF program.

The Society for the Teaching of Psychology oversees a Graduate Student Teaching Association (http://teachpsych.org/gsta/index.php), which has been functioning since 2002. UNH was the host institution for the GSTA from 2007-2010, with leadership provided by
Rachel Rogers, Bethany Fleck, and Jennifer Stiegler-Balfour. (Auburn University [2002-2004], University of Akron [2004-2007]; University of Georgia at Athens [2010-2012]; City University of New York [2013-present]).

**Conclusion**
The UNH Psychology PFF program has a firm institutional footing and a steady funding stream from permanent UNH funds. Students leave the program with several feathers in their caps related to their teaching, research, and service skills and accomplishments. Graduates have done very well on the job market, with most securing faculty positions. This consistent commitment and support are essential to the program’s success. As the landscape of doctoral education continues to change in significant ways, traditional programs that prepare doctoral students primarily as scholars and researchers, while ignoring other aspects of their professional development, will be viewed increasingly as offering necessary but insufficient preparation for a productive faculty career (Seidel et al., 2006).
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This chapter is an edited and updated version of a chapter prepared for the first edition of this book (Benassi & Fuld, 2004). Much of the material remains the same. We made changes as needed as well as additions/deletions. Peter Fernald, Victor Benassi, and Kenneth Fuld taught the practicum and seminar for decades. They were joined in the early 2000s by Victoria Banyard. Benassi, Fuld, and Fernald no longer teach the practicum and seminar. The newest teachers of the practicum and seminar are Michelle Leichtman, Robert Drugan, and Brett Gibson.
Training Tomorrow's Teachers: Graduate Training in University Instruction in the Department of Psychology at Washington State University

Samantha Swindell, Lee W. Daffin Jr., and Lisa R. Fournier

In the Department of Psychology at Washington State University (WSU), pedagogical instruction and teaching experience are integral parts of graduate training. At the university level, training tomorrow's teachers aligns with the institution's land-grant mission "to extend knowledge through innovative educational programs in which emerging scholars are mentored to realize their highest potential and assume roles of leadership, responsibility, and service to society" (Mission - Washington State University, n.d.). Training graduate students to be highly skilled, ethical, and effective instructors is a core learning objective of the department's doctoral programs, a goal equally important to expertise in research and clinical practice. By learning to teach, graduate students master skills (e.g., successful communication, information literacy, critical and creative thinking) relevant to many career options, academic or otherwise, thus enhancing their marketability in an increasingly competitive job market. The department's investment in pedagogical instruction reflects its commitment to undergraduate education as well. Proper preparation, training, and mentoring of graduate instructors is necessary to maintain the high-quality of instruction valued by WSU faculty and expected by its undergraduates.

Snapshot of the WSU Psychology Program

The WSU Department of Psychology offers a Bachelor of Science (BS) degree in psychology as well as doctoral degrees in experimental and clinical psychology. The BS degree emphasizes both experimental and applied aspects of the discipline and majors have some flexibility in their course selection within the degree's requirements. Students can major in psychology on the main Pullman campus, two urban campuses (i.e., WSU Tri-Cities and WSU Vancouver) and most recently, online through WSU's Global Campus. Online courses are asynchronous and offered entirely within the university's learning management system. Psychology courses, whether face-to-face or online, are available during the spring, summer, and fall semesters. Course enrollments vary from large, lower-division courses (i.e., 100-500 students) to small, upper-division courses (i.e., 30-40 students).

The doctoral programs in experimental and clinical psychology offer a terminal doctoral degree to students seeking advanced training in psychological research, teaching, and
clinical practice. Students pursuing degrees in experimental psychology focus their program of study around one of six areas: cognition, biological, social, industrial/organizational, health, and applied quantitative methods. Those pursuing clinical degrees receive broad training in clinical theory and practice with specialized focuses in neuropsychology, clinical health psychology and psychopathology. Doctoral students in both programs expect to teach undergraduate courses and most will do so beginning in their first year. Entry-level teaching appointments (i.e., first and second semester) include assistantships in which graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) play a secondary, supportive role in faculty-taught classes. Later appointments include those in which GTAs are the primary instructors for the course. These independent teaching appointments begin with teaching Psych 105: Introductory Psychology. GTAs who demonstrate competency in Psych 105 are eligible for appointments teaching additional psychology courses across various topics, levels (100-400 level), enrollments, and modalities (i.e., face-to-face and online).

**Graduate Instruction and Training in Pedagogy**
Maintaining high quality instruction, and insuring the success of graduate instructors, requires proper training and mentoring. A series of graduate courses as well as formal and informal mentoring arrangements between faculty and graduate students serve as the sources of that training and mentoring. The first course in the training series, Psych 505: Teaching Introductory Psychology, provides graduate instructors with pedagogical instruction and hands-on training prior to their first independent teaching appointment. The second, Psych 510: Introduction to Teaching Online, is available to graduate students who are assigned online teaching appointments. This course offers additional instruction on a range of pedagogical issues related to online teaching. Psychology faculty recognized for their expertise in face-to-face and online instruction, respectively, developed both courses. In addition, training and mentoring of graduate instructors extends beyond these courses in the form of on-going classroom observations and annual evaluations, attendance at university teaching workshops, and informal discussions between faculty and graduate instructors on pedagogical research and trends in teaching innovation. In all, the Department of Psychology's training model has become an exemplar at WSU for other units seeking examples of successful training programs for graduate instructors.

**Psych 505: Teaching Introductory Psychology**
Psych 505 is a two-semester, variable-credit course that meets twice a week for 1 hour. The course prepares graduate instructors for their role as independent instructors in Psych 105: Introductory Psychology. Graduate students must take Psych 505 before they are eligible to teach Psych 105, the only exception being a student who enters the program with prior university teaching experience. Given this requirement, most graduate students enroll in Psych 505 during the spring semester of their first year in anticipation of receiving a Psych 105 appointment the following fall semester. Graduate students selected to teach Psych 105 again enroll in Psych 505 during the fall semester for on-going training and supervision. Graduate students not selected for Psych 105 remain eligible for future teaching appointments provided they demonstrated sufficient competency in Psych 505.
The structure of Psych 505 encourages each student to develop a personal teaching philosophy and style as well as the confidence to translate that philosophy into practice while teaching Psych 105. The first semester of Psych 505 focuses on several pedagogical issues relevant to novice instructors. During the first 4 weeks of the course, graduate students read selections from *McKeachie's Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers* (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2013) and *The Wright Teaching Tips: Strategies and Techniques for Beginning College and University Instructors* (Wright, 2011). The developer of the Psych 505 course wrote the latter book. Primary instruction focuses on the following topics: (a) identifying course learning goals and designing curriculum elements to support and evaluate those goals, (b) constructing effective course syllabi, (c) creating positive learning environments, (d) employing interactive teaching technology and innovations to increase active learning, and (e) utilizing aspects of the university's learning management system.

After the foundational aspects of teaching have been addressed, the remainder of the semester is devoted to hands-on training with particular teaching techniques. Specifically, each student prepares and delivers three practice lectures to all members of the 505 class. The first lecture is a short 15-minute "mini-lecture" on a psychological topic assigned by the 505 instructor. Graduate students give their mini-lectures in a small university classroom (i.e., approximately 30 seats). By design, graduate students deliver their mini-lectures "low tech" (i.e., no PowerPoint, videos) and the Psych 505 instructor directs them to focus on using body language (e.g., hand gestures, voice intonation, eye contact, and movement around the room) to project confidence, engagement, and enthusiasm. Although some attention is given to lecture content and structure, the primary goal of the mini-lectures is to ease novice teachers into the instructor role in a low-risk, supportive environment. Immediately following each mini-lecture, the 505 instructor gives verbal feedback on the graduate student's strengths and makes suggestions for areas of improvement. The 505 instructor also encourages other Psych 505 students to contribute their impressions/reactions so that all class members participate in, and benefit from, an exchange of ideas about what constitutes good teaching.

Once all graduate students complete their mini-lectures, each prepares and delivers two 50-minute "full lectures." Full lectures occur in two cycles (i.e., all students give their first full lecture before any gives her/his second full lecture). Graduate students develop full lectures on two different psychological topics, one assigned by the 505 instructor and one selected by the student. Like the mini-lectures, graduate students present their full lectures to all members of the 505 class. Unlike the mini-lectures, graduate instructors deliver their full lectures in a large university classroom similar to one typically assigned to Psych 105 (i.e., 100-150 seats). The Psych 505 instructor encourages the graduate instructors to use a variety of approaches for teaching course material (e.g., text on PowerPoint slides, illustrative animations, videos) and to explore a range of techniques (i.e., classroom demonstrations, individual and group activities, using interactive technology to poll student opinion and/or answer questions). During full lectures, the other Psych 505 graduate students assume the role of Psych 105 undergraduates by asking questions and participating.
in classroom activities and discussions. During the second round of full lectures, the Psych 505 instructor directs these students to engage in specific behaviors (e.g., challenging the instructor's authority, talking to classmates during the lecture, arriving late) and provides guidance to the graduate instructor on how to handle these classroom behaviors. These scenarios give novice instructors the opportunity to prepare for, and practice, how to approach challenging classroom situations.

During full lectures, the Psych 505 instructor takes careful notes on the lecture's organization and content as well as aspects of the instructor's performance, including: (a) ability to employ interesting examples, demonstrations, and class activities, (b) use of body language to convey enthusiasm and confidence, (c) effectiveness in generating student interest and engagement, and (d) management of classroom issues. Each lecture is followed immediately by a discussion period during which the Psych 505 instructor and graduate students share their observations. This collective feedback is specific, constructive, and developmental. The Psych 505 instructor and graduate students cite and reinforce the instructor's strengths. They also discuss how current weaknesses could be improved with possible changes and/or alternative approaches. The Psych 505 instructor provides written summaries of the feedback to graduate instructors after their first full lecture. To increase the salience of this feedback, and better narrow the graduate instructor's focus for improvement, the Psych 505 instructor provides more targeted written guidance approximately 1 week before each instructor's second full lecture. At this time, the Psych 505 instructor identifies three specific aspects of teaching for the graduate instructor to improve in the second full lecture (e.g., incorporate more examples, use creative approaches to complex material, transition from "presenting" to "teaching" material). Overall, practice lectures involve an instructional cycle in which novice instructors: (a) receive guidance on best practices, (b) assume the role of instructor to teach a given topic, (c) obtain constructive feedback on their performance, and (d) practice again. Over time, instructors gradually build on their strengths while effectively working on areas that need improvement.

The second semester of Psych 505 provides support to graduate students during their first semester of independent teaching. The Psych 505 instructor and graduate instructors meet weekly to discuss aspects of teaching not covered during the first semester of Psych 505, including: (a) designing assignments and exams, (b) assessing and evaluating undergraduate work, (c) increasing student motivation, (d) recognizing, and responding to, cultural diversity, (e) handling learning disabilities and accommodations, (f) responding to academic dishonesty, and (g) managing student conduct and disruption. Weekly class time is also devoted to the discussion and problem-solving of teaching issues graduate instructors are encountering in their courses (e.g., low attendance, disruptive students, technology problems). Finally, the Psych 505 instructor conducts at least two classroom observations of all graduate instructors during their first semester of teaching. Each classroom observation is accompanied by detailed verbal and written feedback regarding the following areas: (a) lecture organization and content, (b) the use of audiovisual aids and teaching technology, (c) instructor style and presence, and (d) classroom environment and student engagement. At the end of the semester, undergraduates enrolled in Psych 105 complete course evaluations.
for all graduate instructors which the Psych 505 instructor reviews. These data inform and
guide the ongoing training and mentoring of each Psych 105 graduate instructor during the
following spring semester (i.e., second semester of independent teaching).

**Graduate Training Beyond Psych 505**

Graduate instructors who perform satisfactorily in Psych 105 (i.e., whose teaching
evaluations are at, or above, the department mean for all instructors) qualify for additional
teaching appointments, including both face-to-face and online courses. Graduate instructors
teaching face-to-face courses continue to be mentored by the Psych 505 instructor. They
receive at least one classroom observation each semester as part of their ongoing training.
Evaluation of their teaching is included in their annual review. Instructors teaching online
courses receive additional training in online instruction in Psych 510: Introduction to Online
Instruction. All graduate instructors teaching beyond Psych 105, whether face-to-face or
online, are encouraged by the department to continue their pedagogical training by
attending university workshops and presentations on various pedagogical topics and to
explore innovations in teaching (e.g., interactive technology, "flipped classrooms," team-
based learning) in their courses. To reinforce quality teaching, the department routinely
nominates exceptional graduate instructors for teaching honors. These honors include the
department's Marchionne Teaching Fellowship, awarded annually to a psychology GTA who
has distinguished her/himself in teaching, and the WSU Graduate and Professional Student
Association’s Teaching Assistant Excellence Award, awarded annually to GTAs who excel in
both supportive and independent teaching assistantships.

**Psych 510: Introduction to Teaching Online**

Graduate instructors teaching online do not create their courses. Rather, they inherit
courses designed previously by faculty. For this reason, Psych 510 focuses primarily on
aspects of teaching related to online interaction and engagement. The first week of this
course covers the relative differences and similarities between online and face-to-face
instruction. The second week addresses online tone and communication with special
attention on how to effectively manage challenging interactions. The third week examines
how to effectively facilitate online discussions. Graduate instructors enrolled in this course
complete all of their exercises/discussions within the learning management system used for
all online psychology classes, thus familiarizing those instructors with the general design and
framework of online classes. Graduate instructors develop their online teaching skills by
completing interaction exercises mimicking situations they are likely to encounter while
teaching online (e.g., managing difficult students, directing the development of online
discussions). The Psych 510 instructor provides constructive, timely feedback on each
graduate instructor’s ability to respond to, and effectively resolve, these situations.

The Psych 510 instructor remains the primary teaching mentor throughout the graduate
instructor's online appointment. For example, the Psych 510 instructor meets individually
with each graduate instructor prior to the activation of her/his course to review its content
and structure, answer questions, and provide an overall orientation to the online
environment. The Psych 510 instructor also conducts ongoing course assessments
throughout the semester by routinely accessing the course space to review the graduate instructor's online teaching. The rubric used for these assessments focuses on the graduate instructor's (a) online presence and engagement, (b) responsiveness to student questions and e-mail, (c) professionalism and communication style, (d) ability to facilitate discussions and interaction, and (e) timeliness in feedback and grading. Course assessments occur 2-4 times each semester, depending on the instructor's performance during previous assessments. Typically, the Psych 510 instructor gives feedback from the first assessment in person to the graduate instructor to facilitate communication of teaching strengths and areas for improvement. Finally, the Psych 510 instructor provides ongoing support and guidance (via e-mail, phone, or in person) regarding emerging classroom issues throughout the period of the graduate instructor’s appointment.

Beyond the training provided in Psych 510, WSU’s Global Campus, which oversees all online courses at WSU, offers advanced programming for online course design, instruction, and management. The department encourages graduate instructors seeking additional training in these areas to complete the Global Campus' Teaching Online Certification course. This certification program offers a series of instructional modules that graduate students complete online and at their own pace.

**Closing Comments**
The WSU Department of Psychology is committed to training graduate students to become successful researchers, practitioners, and instructors. The commitment to produce effective, creative, and ethical instructors is reflected in the department's long tradition of pedagogical instruction and hands-on training. Psychology faculty created the original elements of the model described here in the early 1990s. Over time, aspects of this model have evolved in response to emerging departmental needs (e.g., increased course enrollments, development of the online degree), advances in technology (e.g., PowerPoint, interactive technology), and shifting trends in pedagogical practice (e.g., renewed focus on active learning and innovative teaching formats such as "flipped classrooms" and team-based learning). The teacher training model we employ will continue to evolve by adapting to new challenges and incorporating new technology and practices so that we may continue to deliver the best possible training and support to our developing graduate student instructors.
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12. Utah State University’s Approach to Preparing the New Teaching Professoriate

Scott C. Bates

Utah State University (USU) is a large, public, land-grant university that served nearly 29,000 students in the fall of 2013. The system includes four regional campuses and more than 20 distance education centers. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies USU as having a very high undergraduate enrollment profile, and a research university with high research activity. Indeed, USU has been awarded an annual average of $160 million in sponsored research funding over the past 5 years.

The Department of Psychology is housed the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services. In 2013, there were 768 student-majors (580 undergraduates, 206 graduates) and there are 22 full-time tenure or tenure-track faculty in the department. The department has generated $13.2 million in sponsored research over the past 3 years.

The department houses three graduate programs: a Master’s of education (MEd) degree in school counseling, an education specialist (EdS) in school psychology, and a doctoral (PhD) program. The PhD program has two specializations: (a) Experimental and Applied Psychological Science, and (b) a Combined Program in Clinical, Counseling, and School Psychology.

Diversity of Courses
The department offers undergraduate courses in a variety of formats:

- Traditional, face-to-face, courses are offered at the main campus and at regional campuses and distance education sites;
- Concurrent enrollment, also known as dual enrollment, general education courses are offered at Utah high schools, for USU credit;
- Fully online courses are offered. In 2008, the department made a commitment to the creation of a fully online psychology major, which required that all courses were taught in online and on-campus sections;
- Interactive video conferencing courses, which bring together multiple regional campuses/distance education sites in live, interactive broadcasts are offered throughout the year; and
- Blended/hybrid Courses that include both face-to-face interaction and a significant online component are now offered across the system.
We teach face-to-face courses in sections of 20, 60, and 300. In fully online courses, classes have as many as 100 students and interactive broadcast sections have as many as 80 students.

**The Problem and the Solution (Thus Far)**

In the not-so-distant past, the department found itself in a bind: The psychology major was popular and growing, but the grant-funding productivity of the faculty meant that course-buysouts were becoming increasingly common. Whereas many departments around the United States have partially addressed the problem of having enrollment growth while a fixed (or reduced) number of tenure or tenure-track faculty lines by using temporary faculty, USU resisted this trend and opted instead to provide teaching opportunities for its graduate students. The department provides all graduate students opportunities to establish and improve their college-level teaching skills. Many of our graduate students teach at some point during their graduate training. In the fall of 2013, six graduate students taught six on-campus courses, with a total of 519 undergraduate students enrolled.

Five years ago, the department underwent a thorough review of its practices in training graduate students for college-level teaching. Up to this point, little systematic training was provided: A graduate student’s advisor or a course’s instructor of record provided support by making their course-materials accessible and being responsive to questions. There was little systematic training, and the levels of support varied greatly.

We currently take a developmental approach to training of our graduate student teachers. This approach has four components: (a) training and practical experience in a teaching assistantship, (b) a teaching ethics module in the graduate level professional ethics course, (c) a teaching course designed to be taken just prior to first teaching experience, and (d) ongoing support.

*Teaching Assistantship Workshop*

We offer a 12-hour Teaching Assistantship Preparation workshop every fall semester. We require all of our graduate students who are awarded an assistantship (effectively, all students) to complete an assistantship workshop during their first semester on campus. This workshop prepares graduate students to function as teaching assistants and begin their training as future college teachers.

The workshop includes an introduction to USU’s learning management system (LMS), Canvas, via a 2-hour training session that is conducted by USU’s Center for Instructional Design and Instruction (CIDI). The first hour is dedicated to the teaching assistants’ function in their assistantships—grading, managing the grade book, and communicating with undergraduates. The second hour is dedicated to the capabilities of the LMS in the context of teaching (e.g., assessment features, communication capabilities) and provides a foundation for “what is possible” in the LMS for future teachers. It also serves a departmental function: improving the LMS skills of teaching assistants has had an impact on other courses as instructors of record often do not know the full range of capabilities of the
LMS. We have observed that courses taught by faculty have been revised as a result of what the teaching assistants know about the LMS (e.g., “Dr. Bates, did you know that you can record audio-feedback in assignments in Canvas?”).

The workshop also includes a 2-hour sexual harassment prevention training (provided by the Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity office), and a 30-minute session on the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) training (provided by the Registrar’s Office).

The workshop also introduces graduate teaching assistants to the student honor code, along with the processes and consequences of academic misconduct. This training is important because in many cases teaching assistants are grading assignments (and thus potentially detecting plagiarism) and proctoring exams (and thus responsible for good testing practices that prevent cheating).

Training in student diversity is also included in the workshop. USU’s Disability Resource Center provides training for our graduate students on working with students’ disabilities and the nature of accommodations. Interactive class sessions also describe “college students today” and “Utah State’s student body.” This content is also echoed in subsequent teaching-oriented courses.

Finally, given that teaching assistants often lead discussion groups, conduct exam-review sessions, or guest lecture, the workshop also introduces some of the basic principles of teaching in college settings: course planning, leading discussions, lecturing, and successful teaching across formats (e.g., interactive broadcast, fully online, large lecture).

**Ethics Course**

The department also offers a 3-credit Professional Ethics course that is required of all students in the PhD program and all students in the School Psychology (EdS) program. The course is taught by an expert in professional ethics and standards, and has three components: clinical ethics, research ethics, and teaching ethics. The teaching ethics module lasts 2 weeks (6 hours total, although teaching ethics is a consistent conversation throughout the term).

The core purpose of the course is to provide students the skills and ways of thinking necessary to identify ethical dilemmas in research, teaching, and practice, as well as ways in which those dilemmas can be approached productively. The course is a variable credit course (non-clinical students are not required to take the clinical ethics module, although many do).

The teaching component includes 6 hours of course time, supported by assigned readings, across two sessions. The first session, Ethical Behavior in Teaching Psychology, includes content (i.e., readings, writing assignments, class discussion) on ethical teaching of diverse students, ethical grading, and creating and maintaining ethical boundaries with students and mentees. The entire course frames the discussion in the context of professional
responsibilities. The second session, Ethical Issues in Mentoring and Supervision, includes readings related to ethical responsibilities around student mentorship. Students in the course undertake directed readings related to mentorship, write a paper, and discuss ethical mentorship.

**Teaching Course**

Graduate students also enroll in University Teaching Apprenticeship (PSY6930) course, which is designed for first-time instructors to support their success in teaching in undergraduate classrooms. This one-credit course is offered every fall semester. Graduate students may take this course prior to teaching their first independent class or, with permission, during their first semester teaching an undergraduate course. This course covers course planning, pedagogical strategies, effective assessment, and a variety of other topics related to becoming a successful teacher in higher education.

There are a variety of objectives for this course and all course activities help students to meet these objectives:

- Understand the principles of science-based teaching and incorporate them into their classrooms. Specifically,
  - Demonstrate the ability to develop effective learning objectives and course syllabi,
  - Demonstrate the ability to design and deliver an effective lecture and/or class session,
  - Develop assessment strategies that are based on sound pedagogical principles, and
  - Demonstrate the ability to collect and react to feedback related to their teaching.
- Understand the implications that teaching technologies, strategies, and resources can have on student learning.
- Understand the variety of issues (e.g., ethics, student behavior, cheating) that arise during the course of teaching in college classrooms and apply it to their current or future teaching assignments.
- Develop a personal understanding of how the full range of student diversity impacts their teaching.
- Develop a philosophy of teaching and understand how it can be put into practice.

Course time and assignments map directly onto these objectives. Course sessions are reading and discussion-based. There are readings and course sessions devoted to effective course planning, syllabi, and course objectives, effective assessment, developing a statement of philosophy of teaching, effective lecturing, effective class-discussions, the evaluation of teaching, and student course evaluations. It also includes sessions on teaching and learning across pedagogical formats (e.g., learning online) as well as several sessions devoted to scholarship of teaching and learning (e.g. theories of intelligence, learning styles, effective pedagogical strategies). Students read chapters from Benassi, Overson, and Hakala’s (2014)
Several key assignments provide additional opportunities to work on course objectives. Students start with a “preflection” assignment wherein they write a start-of-term reflective essay about their future teaching or their thinking on the topic of teaching (e.g., “I want to do this for the rest of my life,” or “I hope to never teach anybody, anything, ever”). This assignment is followed with an end-of-term reflective essay about their progress on the course goals outlined above.

A key part of the apprenticeship course is the development of each students’ individual statement of philosophy of teaching, which is a “systematic and critical rationale that focuses on the important components defining effective teaching and learning in a particular discipline and/or institutional context” (Schönwetter, Sokal, Friesen, & Taylor, 2002). Writing this statement is one of the cornerstone assignments for the course. Intentionality in teaching is stressed throughout the course, course objectives emanate from a philosophy of teaching, learning objectives, course assignments, reading assignments, assessment, and all other pedagogical decisions emanate.

Students also conduct two observations of an experienced instructor and provide a brief oral summary of the observation. The first set of observations is not directed—students simply, “go and observe an experienced instructor.” The second observation is scaffolded using the Teacher Behavior Checklist (Keeley, Smith, & Buskist, 2006; Keeley, Furr, & Buskist, 2010). Students may observe any instructor teaching an undergraduate course and we encourage students to observe teachers in courses outside of the department in order to help them focus on the act of teaching, rather than content of what is being taught.

Students in PSY6930 also give a guest lecture and lead a discussion in an undergraduate course. Often, these guest-teaching experiences happen in content-relevant courses (e.g., clinicians in training may lecture on mood disorders in the General Psychology course, students who are in the Sociobehavioral Epidemiology concentration may lead a discussion in the Health Psychology course). The process includes three steps: preparation, delivery, and feedback. In the preparation stages, students meet individually with the PSY6930 instructor to discuss a lesson plan, review materials (e.g., readings, slides, demonstrations), and design an assessment to be used to collect feedback directly from students in the class. Once the PSY6930 instructor and the instructor of record in the course sign off, the student delivers the lecture or leads the discussion.

The guest-lecturer gathers feedback from multiple sources. First, at the end of the session, student teachers gather feedback from the students in the course using a brief questionnaire that includes both teaching style questions as well as brief assessment of learning. Second, all students in PSY6930 conduct one peer observation of a fellow student in the course and provide written feedback, which is copied to the PSY6930 instructor. Finally, the PSY6930 instructor often directly observes the session and writes a written report of his or her
observations. Finally, in the feedback stage, students summarize the observations of their students, peers, and instructor, write a self-assessment of the experience, and submit an “after-the-fact” report.

**Ongoing Support**

There is one, final, formalized and systematized support. While each student’s major advisor serves as a key resource for teaching—specially related to content—I provide ongoing teaching support and resources for all graduate students. I invite graduate students to e-mail, call, or set up meetings with me on specific topics (e.g., “I think that I have a cheater, what do I do?”, “There is a student in my class who is running over me, what do I do?”, or “They all failed the first test, what do I do?”). Each term, I reach out to all graduate students who are assigned a course as instructor of record and tell them that departmental supports are ongoing and comprehensive. In some cases, I review syllabi. In other cases, I conduct teaching observations during lectures. I work to offer and provide formal and informal support of college teaching for our newest teachers. In short, a community of excellent in teaching is nourished.

**Conclusion**

The USU Psychology Department is dedicated to offering its graduate students an excellent education in educating undergraduates. As the department continues to evolve, the support of training for teaching of future faculty will also continue to evolve. We see the program as a “win-win-win”: Graduate students win by having access to training, undergraduate students win by being taught by instructors who are supported and trained, and the department wins by making progress on one of its core missions: teaching.
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I open my essay with two stories. The first is about Jen, an excellent undergraduate student who graduated from the University of Delaware (UD) in less than 4 years and then entered a competitive law school. A year or two into her first job as a lawyer, I invited Jen back to UD to participate in the annual career panel we hold for current students. I explained, “We’d like you to discuss some ways that you use what you learned in your psychology major in your job as a lawyer.” Jen’s reply: “Well, I hardly ever work with people with mental illnesses, so I don’t really use my psych degree all that much!”

I slumped dejectedly at my computer. Here was one of our best students; her GPA indicated that she had performed almost everything we had asked of her in the major. And yet only a few years later, this student had reverted back to what the average American thinks psychology is all about. Had we educated Jen at all?

The second story is about Shelly, a third-year PhD student who had been an energetic participant in my previous semester’s Teaching of Psychology class. During that class, Shelly and her classmates examined research on how people learn. She had prepared two engaging teaching samples and developed authentic and creative assessments. A few months later, she asked to meet with me as she prepared to teach her first summer session course: Brain and Behavior. Fifteen students were already signed up for this course! But my posture sank again as she started asking me how to prepare lectures and multiple-choice tests during this 5-week session. Wait….really? What about what we learned a few months ago—active learning and assessments that tap into authentic learning goals? Had I taught Shelly at all?

I’ve been teaching about teaching, in the form of a graduate course called Teaching Practicum for about 8 years now, and I have learned one important thing. Teaching teaching—that is, teaching graduate students about teaching—is not different from teaching any student anything. Graduate students who are learning to teach, just like undergraduates who are taking psychology courses, bring past information with them. Both groups benefit from distributed practice, timely feedback, active learning, and a warm environment. As Jen and Shelly’s stories illustrate, both groups of students forget. They need reinforcement for the good stuff to stick.

Because teaching teaching is so similar to, well….teaching, I think it makes sense to go meta. By “going meta” I mean applying what we know about teaching to teaching about teaching. When graduate students learn to teach, we facilitate that learning by remembering how people learn. In this essay I’ll describe some examples.
Training Graduate Students at the University of Delaware

The context for my essay is our teaching program for psychology graduate students at the University of Delaware, a comprehensive doctoral university. The Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences enrolls about 50 graduate students in four PhD programs: Behavioral Neuroscience, Social Psychology, Cognitive Psychology, and Clinical Science. The goal most faculty advisors hold for their PhD students is for them to land a tenure-track job at a research university. Because research faculty have to teach, and because not all graduate students are competitive for such jobs, we offer a one-semester, elective, three-credit, graded course called Teaching Practicum. The course meets for one, 3-hour session per week, and is offered every fall semester for up to 12 students. Students typically take the course in their 3rd or 4th year, and must take it before teaching an undergraduate course of their own during winter or summer sessions. A syllabus from a former semester is available on the Society for the Teaching of Psychology’s Project Syllabus, and you can read more details about the program in The STP Guide to Graduate Student Training in the Teaching of Psychology (2012).

Graduate students who desire to get more experience in the classroom can follow the Teaching Practicum course with our “Teaching Fellow” experience. One to three graduate students choose to become Teaching Fellows each year. Students must first have completed the Teaching Practicum Course. Students select an undergraduate course that they would like to teach, such as Research Methods, Statistics, or Child Development. Under my supervision during the summer, Teaching Fellows design their course and syllabus, and then during the Fall semester, they teach it to a class of 30 or fewer students. During the semester, the Teaching Fellows meet weekly to discuss progress and challenges in their course. I visit their classrooms at least twice in the first half of the semester. Using writings on peer observation of teaching as a guide (Keeley, Smith, & Buskist, 2006; Buskist, Ismail, & Groccia, 2014), I conduct a detailed observation of their teaching, including a pre- and post-class meeting. During spring semester, the graduate students teach the same course again. Teaching Fellows receive a stipend and tuition remission similar to a regular teaching assistant.

Learning to Teach is Like Learning Anything Else

No matter what the graduate context, learning to teach is like learning to do anything else, because similar learning principles apply. Prior knowledge, good pedagogy, and research all matter, and applying the science of learning can help teachers do a better job.

The Role of Prior Knowledge

Prior knowledge matters for learning (Ambrose, Bridges, DiPietro, Lovett, & Norman, 2010). Students enter almost any course with prior knowledge of the subject matter, which may take the form of general knowledge or previous study in a specific topic area. When a student’s prior knowledge is accurate, appropriate, and activated, it can help learning, but when the knowledge is inaccurate, inappropriate, or inactive, it can impede learning (Ambrose et al., 2010). An example familiar to teachers of introductory psychology is when students mistake “negative reinforcement” for punishment. The issue is that students
misapply previous general knowledge, assuming the term “negative” means “bad,” rather than the “absence of something.” We can go meta here. Prior knowledge affects how undergraduates learn course concepts and material; prior knowledge also influences graduate students as they develop their philosophies of teaching and their teaching skills.

Unless they have taken formal classes in education, graduate students’ prior knowledge about “how to teach” is often based on their experience as students. Graduate students have been in school for more than 16 years and they all have stories of teachers who inspired or deflated them. Many of my graduate students will say they want to emulate the teaching style of their favorite teachers. Therefore, their default mode of teaching, and the standard to which they hold themselves, is to teach as their favorite teachers did.

An important part of the Teaching Practicum course is activating this prior knowledge and examining it in a new context. I have found that it helps to begin the course with a discussion of their favorite (and least favorite) college professors. In group discussion, we then discuss how their prior knowledge of teaching can be both helpful and harmful. Sometimes this prior knowledge is helpful—especially when admired professors have modeled the techniques we know to work (creating a warm learning environment, being clear and engaging in their classroom presentations, asking undergraduates to complete creative assignments). Other times, prior knowledge can backfire. Our high-achieving graduate students typically have longer attention spans and more diligent study skills than the undergraduates they will be teaching. They may fail to consider this contextual factor, however, if they assume that the teachers that they admired most used teaching and learning techniques that work for all levels of student abilities. For example, an admired professor’s dynamic lecturing style might work well for well-prepared students who have long attention spans and the metacognitive skills needed to ask clarification questions, space out their studying, or test their own understanding of material. For students who do not have these skills, lecturing has its downsides. Student attention during lectures is not constant, and lectures may not provide adequate opportunities for reflection, self-testing, and problem-solving (Daniel, 2012; McDaniel & Wooldrige, 2012).

It may help to remind graduate students that their reactions to techniques they learn in the Teaching Practicum course will be filtered through their learning histories. They might initially reject the idea of clicker questions, online bulletin boards, or videos “because my favorite professor never even used a computer.” They might balk at assigning essay questions or in-class writing exercises if they never participated in these sorts of experiences as undergraduates; they may resist assigning group work if they disliked it during their college years. Emerging teachers should be aware of how their past experiences might influence their reactions to new teaching techniques.

Besides raising awareness of prior knowledge through discussion, graduate students can break free of familiar patterns by learning new behavior. In my own class, behavior training takes place in microteaching sessions. Microteaching assignments are a 20- to 30-minute practice teaching session using the other graduate students in class as the audience.
Students must prepare, deliver, and reflect on a small slice of teaching. These episodes can be used to push students to try something risky or new. For example, my graduate students’ first microteaching usually follows a comfortable template, with PowerPoint slides and a small group activity. For the other microteaching sessions, I urge them to leave their comfort zone. They might lead a discussion (if they’re afraid to). They might create a new classroom demonstration. They might try working with social media, video, or with small groups. I have found that one of the best ways to help graduate students shake off old models of teaching is to stop talking and start walking—that is, to try new techniques and receive feedback.

**Scholarly Teaching of Teaching**

Another domain in which to go meta in training graduate students to teach is through scholarly course design and pedagogy. A course on the teaching of psychology should model the best practices for teaching any course. First, a well-designed undergraduate syllabus should clearly lay out the teacher’s learning objectives for the course—clear, attainable, and assessable learning objectives are the core of any syllabus. Therefore, learning objectives should go meta as well. Graduate students should practice writing learning objectives—that is, “to write learning objectives” should be a learning objective for any course on the teaching of psychology. During the semester, my graduate students each design their own courses, and I expect students to carefully develop learning objectives for their courses. Their learning objectives should contain a set of assessable behaviors that undergraduates should be able to perform by the time the course is over (Fink, 2013).

Second, as the teacher of the Teaching Practicum, my syllabus for this course should model the standard I am expecting my graduate students to learn. Therefore, the syllabus in my course is meant to be a meta-model for the syllabi they will be preparing. Learning goals are clearly stated, and the activities in the course are aligned to develop and assess them.

What other activities model and good teaching practices? How about always reviewing what happened last week and previewing what will happen next week? How about active learning? Graduate students, like undergraduates, can do some in-class writing, try think-pair-share (writing their thoughts to a prompt, discussing with a partner, then sharing with the class), and produce lists of ideas in groups. The best teaching workshop leaders demonstrate creative teaching techniques as they deliver their workshop content. I try to emulate their techniques and illustrate as many engaging activities as possible.

Microteaching provides my graduate students some of the richest learning experiences of the semester, and can be used to develop a variety of scholarly teaching skills. The presenting graduate students benefit in numerous ways. For example, they go into their first course with at least two class presentations prepared, and they get to work out some teaching jitters before a friendly audience. By having a reflective discussion after each microteaching session, the graduate students can celebrate what worked and revise what did not. In other words, they begin the habit of reflecting on their teaching. The graduate students in the audience benefit, too. They can experience what it is like to be in a lecture that is too fast, too dull, or just right. They might also be inspired by what their fellow
graduate students have presented. Because good teaching activities are not proprietary, they can “borrow” examples and demonstrations from their peers. Finally, during the microteaching discussions, all participants benefit by being actively engaged in discussions of teaching—something they are unlikely to experience outside of our classrooms, at least not in a PhD program that emphasizes research over other scholarly activities. The behavioral practice of microteaching provides students much of what they need to learn how to teach.

**Basing Content on Research**

As psychologists, we want both undergraduates and graduate students to base decisions on empirical evidence, rather than experience, intuition, or appeals to authority. Undergraduate and graduate courses alike teach not “what psychologists know,” but “how psychologists know what they know.” Teaching of psychology courses should be no exception. In my research-intensive department, faculty train their PhD students to examine research evidence behind any claim, so I am careful to assign graduate students in the Teaching Practicum course lots of empirically-based readings. Ambrose et al.’s (2010) book is an excellent source of accessible, research-based information on how students learn. Other empirical articles also reinforce the argument that active learning is more effective in helping undergraduates learn than lectures (Freeman et al., 2014), that timely accumulated practice matters (Healy, Clawson, & McNamara, 1993; Martin, Klein, & Sullivan, 2007; McDaniel & Wooldrige, 2012), and that frequent testing helps students learn (Roediger & Karpicke, 2006). For example, Freeman et al.’s (2014) recent meta-analysis on the efficacy of active learning in STEM classrooms demonstrated that student engagement in the material is superior to lecture-only, especially for students in the bottom half of the grade distribution. In their report, Hedge’s g for 14 studies conducted in psychology classes was over 0.5.

Although they are dedicated to research, graduate students have to be reminded to actually use it. Graduate students are just as susceptible to basing their teaching beliefs on anecdote and experience as anybody else. For example, our graduate students may still fall back on lecturing, even after reading Freeman et al.’s (2014) meta-analysis, because as undergraduates they learned just fine with lectures. It is a challenge to get any student—graduate or undergraduate—to trust data more than experience. In this case, however, research could convince our students to rely less on their own experience. As high achievers, our graduate students learned well from lecture, but the research shows that active learning provides the strongest gains in learning for underrepresented students and students in the C, D, and F range—that is, the students they will eventually be teaching (Freeman et al., 2014; Saville, Pope, Truelove, & Williams, 2012). I go meta in my teaching about teaching on this point: I use this research to get my students to use the research to develop their teaching skills.

**Performing, Learning, and Forgetting**

One final way that teaching teaching is like teaching anything involves the difference between performing and learning. According to Bjork (1999), *performance* is the behavior we observe in students during a training period—can they do what we are asking them to do at that time? But *learning* is different from performance; it is an internal, permanent change
in understanding, skill, or competence. Just because students perform well during training doesn’t mean they will show the long-term retention of learning or the ability to apply that learning down the road. When it comes to graduate students in the Teaching Practicum course, I need to remember that students can perform good teaching techniques while they participate in a teaching seminar, but their later behavior may not show the long-term changes in skill that would indicate true learning (Bjork, 1999). Fourteen class sessions on the best practices of teaching are unlikely to fully dislodge assumptions based on 16 years of experience as a student. My graduate student, Shelly, exemplified the difference between performance during training and long-term learning. Even after practicing better ways to reach students in the semester-long course, Shelly failed to retrieve those skills when she planned her own course—especially in the anxiety of the moment, when class started in 2 weeks.

We know that forgetting happens. For Jen, my undergraduate, it took only a few years of law school to forget that psychologists do more than treat mental illnesses. My research methods students take the whole semester to acquire the difference between random assignment and random sampling, and even then, some of them forget. In an ideal world, I would require all graduate students not only to take a course on teaching, but also to find a way to refresh what they performed in that course, before they actually teach a course of their own. I would like to find a way to require a content boost to graduate students before they begin teaching in the classroom. One robust finding from learning and memory science is that spaced practice (spreading out learning sessions over time) is superior to blocked practice (learning everything in one session). Although a semester-long course provides spaced practice, it makes sense that a booster session, repeating the key lessons 1 or 2 years later, would improve the ability of new teachers to apply what they learned in the course (Bjork, 1999).

**Conclusion**

As we do with our undergraduates and with our teaching, we should take a long-term perspective. Nobody expects undergraduates to be transformed in a single semester—each course takes them just a tiny step forward. As teachers, we have the opportunity to develop our craft every time we teach a course, and thus our teaching may improve over a lifetime of practice.

Similarly, our graduate student teachers are just starting out on a decades-long career in teaching. Although they will forget some of the “solid foundation” we’ve laid for them, they will not forget all of it. With practice, consistent and effective feedback, and a memory boost after an adequate spacing delay, we can improve the amount of learning that happens as graduate students learn to teach.
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The Teaching Program for Psychology GTAs at Auburn University

Jessica N. Busler

Auburn University (AU), a land, sea, and space grant university, has more than 140 degree options in 13 schools and colleges. Having a total enrollment of 24,864 (19,799 undergraduate students, 3,993 graduate students, and 1,072 professional school students) makes Auburn University one of the largest universities in Alabama (Auburn University, 2012). Auburn is home to 1,192 faculty members, 23 of whom are members of the Psychology Department. Within the department, prospective graduate students have the opportunity to choose from three PhD programs: Clinical Psychology, Cognitive and Behavioral Sciences, and Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Regardless of the program of study, most of our graduate students will hold teaching assistantships (typically as graders) and will be required to take courses in the teaching of psychology as part of their core curriculum requirement. The teaching of psychology courses serve as a training program for graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) and provide a basis for advanced seminars in teaching of psychology as well as preparation for participation in the department’s Teaching Fellows program. Below I describe the GTA training program, the Teaching Fellows Program and other university-wide GTA training opportunities.

PSYC 7120: The Teaching of Psychology Fall Semester

All first-year psychology graduate students take Teaching of Psychology (PSYC 7120) during their first and second semesters at AU. The Teaching of Psychology course is a two-part course with the first part occurring in the fall semester and the second part occurring in the spring semester. The course has four main objectives: to (a) help students learn the basic principles of good teaching (i.e., proper organization, adequate preparation, effective use of class time, clear communication) as those principles relate to their graduate teaching assistantship responsibilities, (b) build a base for graduate students who wish to become a part of the Teaching Fellows program as well as Teacher of Record for an undergraduate course, (c) aid graduate students in the development of basic skills necessary to become effective communicators, and (d) explore issues related to professional development.

Course Text and Other Resources

One of the primary texts that has been used in the PSYC 7120 course is McKeachie’s Teaching Tips (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2014). This book covers a plethora of ideas, issues, and teaching techniques related to college and university teaching. In addition, because the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP) provides many resources that GTAs might find valuable for their teaching assistantships and future courses they may teach, faculty who teach PSYC 7120 acquaint GTAs with the STP web site (www.teachpsych.org). Faculty who teach PSYC 7120 also make GTAs aware of the listserv hosted by STP.
so that they can be involved in a professional discussion list for the teaching of psychology if they desire.

Course Activities
This course has two types of assignments, written and oral, neither of which are graded. The atmosphere of the class is low stakes to allay any anxiety students may have while they are trying to hone their public speaking and writing skills. Although there are no graded assignments in the course, faculty teaching the course provide ample feedback on both types of assignments.

Written assignments are brief (1-2 pages) and include learning incident reflections and teaching observation summaries. Throughout the semester students create two 1-page learning incident reflection papers. The goal of these brief essays is to foster a thoughtful approach to public speaking that will continue throughout graduate students’ journey of becoming teachers. In these essays, graduate students ponder factors that may have hindered or enhanced their learning as undergraduates or experiences they may have had thus far in graduate school that one way or another affected their perspective on teaching and learning.

In addition to the reflection essays, GTAs complete summary reports of two observations of either Teachers of Record (faculty or graduate student) or fellow GTAs. This assignment also prompts a thoughtful disposition because watching others teach is an excellent way of learning how to become a better teacher—it allows one to focus on the teaching style of the instructor and the students’ responses to that style. Participating in this exercise provides opportunities for GTAs and future Teachers of Record to ask themselves “What did I learn about teaching by watching the instructor teach this class?”

Graduate students also complete oral assignments such as leading seminar discussions and giving practice lectures. Each graduate student leads the class in a discussion based on chapters in Svinicki and McKeachie’s (2014) book. Each graduate student is responsible for noting key aspects of a chapter as well as fostering discussion among the other graduate students with thoughtful questions or examples regarding the topic being covered.

Graduate students also select a topic of their choosing from an undergraduate course and give a practice lecture or class presentation over the topic. These lectures last for 50 minutes, roughly the same amount of time they would need to teach an undergraduate introductory psychology lesson. Giving a practice lecture provides graduate students with valuable teaching experience in a low-stakes environment and a more intimate setting as opposed to a room of 300 undergraduates. This format permits our graduate students with an opportunity to hone their teaching skills before becoming Teachers of Record. Each GTA also gives one full-length lecture or class presentation in the class they are assigned to for their teaching assistantship—this class may be an introductory class or an upper division course. The Teacher of Record serves as a mentor for the lecture, observes the graduate student teach, and provides oral feedback afterwards.
**PSYC 7120: The Teaching of Psychology Spring Semester**

The second semester of the course serves two main functions: (a) to help GTAs continue learning the principles of good teaching, and (b) to have GTAs continue to explore and consider issues related to their professional development.

**Course Text**

The primary text for this portion of the course recently has been *Effective College and University Teaching: Strategies and Tactics for the New Professoriate* (Buskist & Benassi, 2012). This text is an additional teaching resource for students to work through to further explore their teaching interests and needs.

**Course Activities**

Similar to the first semester of PSYC 7120, the second semester of the course has two types of assignments, written and oral. For the written assignment, GTAs complete a professional development portfolio containing the following sections: (a) table of contents, (b) vita, (c) statement of education and career goals, (d) statement of research interests, (e) statement of teaching philosophy, (f) statement of service and outreach interests, (g) sample syllabus, and (h) teaching evaluations. The goal of this assignment is to prepare GTAs more broadly for becoming a professional psychologist by drafting some of the most commonly requested materials in job advertisements.

The oral assignment portion of the course consists of a 20-minute professional presentation over a topic of the GTA’s choosing so long as it is part of the graduate student’s research, clinical training, or teaching area of interest. The presentation must include a handout that the GTA incorporates into the presentation, and GTAs should be dressed in professional attire as though they were speaking at a professional conference. In addition to the professional presentation, the graduate students take turns presenting a chapter of the Buskist and Benassi (2012) book to the class to further develop their skills in leading discussions.

**PSYC 6960: Advanced Teaching of Psychology**

Graduate students who desire additional training in the teaching of psychology have the opportunity to take an advanced teaching course in which the objective is to prepare graduate students to teach undergraduate courses as a Teacher of Record. For this course, the graduate students work through Buskist’s and Groccia’s *Evidence-Based Teaching* (2012).

As in the PSYC 7120 course, the PSYC 6960 course has both written and oral assignments.

The oral assignments include one seminar discussion, one sample lecture, and one sample conference or job talk. For the seminar discussion assignment, students choose a chapter from the Buskist and Groccia book (2012) and lead the class in a discussion over it. Along with the discussion lesson, the presenting graduate student also creates five multiple-choice quiz questions to be distributed following the lesson. For the sample lecture, the graduate students prepare one 30-minute lecture from either introductory psychology or an upper division psychology course of their choosing. The lecture cannot be a straight lecture—it must have an active learning component. In conjunction with the lecture, students create
two short-answer essay questions and distribute the questions immediately following the lecture. The presenting student collects responses, grades them, and returns them to the students with a grade and feedback. In order to facilitate effective grading of the short-answer essay responses, the presenting student also develops a rubric for grading the essays and shares the rubric with the class. For the sample conference or job talk, each graduate student delivers a 40-minute presentation in the form of a straight lecture regarding some aspect of their research area. This lecture generally involves the presentation of data or a proposal for research that the graduate student plans to conduct.

The written assignment for this course is the creation of two sample syllabi. For the sample syllabi assignment, students create one syllabus for an introductory level course and the other syllabus must be for an upper division course. One syllabus must be for a traditional classroom course that does not involve any supplemental internet-based components and the other syllabus must be for a blended or hybrid course that incorporates both classroom and online components. The purpose of the sample syllabus assignment is to prepare GTAs to teach their own course by learning about course design as reflected in their course syllabi. The syllabus must contain thorough descriptions of the following: (a) instructor information, (b) text, (c) course objectives, (d) teaching philosophy for the course, (e) grading scale, (f) attendance policy, (g) academic honesty policy, (h) accommodations policy, (j) make-up policy, (k) tests or assignments, (l) any other graded activities, and (m) course calendar. The course instructor evaluates the syllabi according to the thoroughness of the descriptions for each component, neatness and formatting, and spelling, grammar, and word usage.

Graduate students in the PSYC 6960 course also practice observing and critiquing each other’s class presentations: Each student provides an oral critique of all presenters commenting on both strengths and areas in need of improvement. The course instructor provides a critique of the graduate students’ critiques so that they can receive feedback on whether they are identifying the most important aspects of the other students’ public speaking skills (both strengths and areas in need of improvement).

**Teaching Fellows Program**
Students who successfully complete PSYC 7120, PSYC 6960, and hold a Master’s degree become eligible to enter the Teaching Fellows (TF) program. The purpose of the TF program is to strengthen the teaching skills and credentials of graduate students by providing opportunities for further training and experience in college and university teaching as Teachers of Record. Participating students have the opportunity to teach one or more undergraduate psychology courses. A faculty member assists each TF in syllabus creation and textbook selection and provides supervision, including a classroom observation with written and oral feedback, throughout the academic term. Once graduate students complete the TF program, the Psychology Department recognizes each TF at the department’s annual Research and Teaching Festival.
Preparing Future Faculty Program (PFF)
Outside of the Psychology Department, graduate students have the opportunity to participate in the Preparing Future Faculty Program (PFF) coordinated by the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning. PFF Fellows enroll in courses that address a wide array of topics such as preparing teaching statements, obtaining funding for research projects, tenure and promotion, publishing, work-life balance, and microteaching. PFF Fellows attend at least eight Biggio Center seminars and workshops related to teaching and learning in higher education throughout the academic year.

GTA Fellows Program
In addition to the PFF Program, the Biggio Center also sponsors the GTA Fellows Program in which a small group of doctoral and Masters students from various departments undergo training to become instructors. GTA Fellows meet multiple times throughout the semester at professional seminars, teaching workshops, and brainstorming sessions to explore state of the art cross-discipline teaching methods for the classroom and lab. The Fellows also maintain a GTA Survival Guide Wiki as a resource for all AU GTAs. The Wiki includes topics such as teaching tips and methodologies (i.e., active learning strategies). Another responsibility of the GTA Fellows is to lead breakout sessions for the fall and spring GTA orientations.

Graduate Certificate in College and University Teaching
Along with the PFF Program and GTA Fellows Program, all AU graduate students have the opportunity to obtain a graduate certificate in college and university teaching by completing a minimum of 12 hours of coursework selected from a predetermined list of AU courses related to topics such as professional development, curriculum theory, cultural foundations of education, and learning theory. Participating students must also undergo a faculty supervised teaching practicum in the graduate student’s home department. The teaching practicum includes a minimum of 15 hours of face-to-face instruction and at least three class sessions in which the supervisor observes the student teaching. Based on the observations the supervisor provides written and verbal feedback to the practicum student on the following: (a) mastery of course content, (b) communication skills, (c) enthusiasm, (d) clarity of instruction, (e) organization, (f) selection of course and lesson content, (g) appropriateness of course objectives, (h) appropriateness of instructional materials, (i) commitment to teaching and concern for student learning, and (j) student achievement based on performance on exams and projects. Following the observation and feedback sessions, the practicum student writes reflection papers to be included in a practicum portfolio. In addition to the reflection papers, the practicum portfolio documents successful completion of the teaching practicum by including components such as (a) an overall description of the teaching practicum, (b) a philosophy of teaching statement, (c) a copy of the syllabus, (d) a sample lesson plan, (e) examples of student work, (f) evaluations by students of the practicum’s student teaching, and (g) observation reports.
Conclusion
Auburn University provides several beneficial opportunities for GTAs to participate in training for teaching in higher education. Specifically, the Psychology Department offers graduate students the chance to participate in a rigorous training program for the teaching of psychology. When selecting graduate schools for psychology, students often choose AU specifically for the GTA training program as I did. The Psychology Department’s emphasis on teaching and dedication to providing students valuable GTA training through the PSYC 7120 course, PSYC 6960 course, and Teaching Fellows Program continues to make AU a treasured place for budding future academics.
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The Psychology Department, located in the USF College of Arts and Sciences, has 39 faculty, each of whom teach both undergraduate and graduate psychology courses. The undergraduate program awards the BA in psychology and has about 1,700 undergraduate majors enrolled at any given time. The graduate program offers the PhD in the areas of Clinical Psychology, Industrial/Organizational Psychology, and Cognition, Neuroscience, and Social Psychology. Of the 112 graduate students currently enrolled, about 57 of them are supported through teaching assistantships. Teaching experience is not a departmental requirement; however many of our graduate students prepare for academic careers and most get extensive teaching experience while at USF.

Development of GTA Training
After earning my MEd from Mercer University, I earned my PhD in psychology from USF. During my first semester in the graduate program, I was funded through a teaching assistantship. As was common at that time, around 1990, training for teaching assistants was nonexistent. I, along with my classmates, was handed a class roster by the department and told where to meet with my class. There was no training. We did our best to stay one chapter ahead of the students we were supposed to be teaching. Around the mid-1990s, students in the Industrial/Organizational (I/O) graduate program made a class project out of designing a training program for graduate teaching assistants (GTA). The original GTA training program was an intensive assessment of skills followed by various teaching modules, culminating in “microteaching breakout sessions.” In 2002, when I accepted the newly created position of Director of Introductory Psychology and Coordinator of Undergraduate Affairs, I was put in charge of the GTA training. At that time, the first component of the GTA
training schedule was an assessment of each student’s knowledge of research methods, design, and statistics. That is, the first thing each new graduate student did upon arrival was to take a test. Needless to say, this caused much anxiety for new graduate students, and the results were not always good predictors of how well graduate students would do in their roles as teaching assistants. One of the first things I did was drop the first-day test component. The rest of the training program was well designed and received good reviews from participants. The GTA training that we currently use for preparing incoming graduate students generally remains faithful to the original design set up by the I/O graduate students.

USF enrolls about 18-20 new graduate students each fall, of which about 15 are supported on teaching assistantships. The remaining students are funded on research grants and fellowships. The department requires all incoming graduate students, including those on research assistantships, to participate in the GTA training program because they likely will be supported on teaching assistantships in future semesters. The GTA training also provides an environment that allows first-year graduate students to become familiar with each other and form a healthy support system for themselves.

First-year graduate students supported on teaching assistantships serve as lab instructors for our undergraduate Research Methods course. Each Research Methods lab consists of 20-24 undergraduate students, mostly psychology majors. A veteran graduate student facilitates the 3-day GTA training session and serves as a guide for new graduate students as they acclimate to graduate school. For this position, we select a graduate student who possesses the desirable qualities that would most likely facilitate a good experience for the incoming students (e.g., outgoing, conscientious, excellent teaching and presenting skills).

A Modular Approach to GTA Training
GTA training begins with a series of 1-hour modules. Each module is presented by seasoned graduate students, selected specifically for that particular module based on their skills.

Module 1 introduces the Research Methods course to the graduate students, the instructors for the course who will supervise the graduate assistants in their teaching of the labs, and to our expectations of the assignment of Research Methods GTA.

Module 2 focuses on necessary information for teaching the Research Methods labs such as the mechanics of the course, assignments and activities that will constitute the lab activities, and training on how to use the course management system (previously Blackboard, now Canvas).

Module 3 guides the graduate students through identifying good qualities in a teacher and focuses on best practices for teaching Research Methods labs and teaching in general. During this module, the graduate students make their first attempt at writing a statement of their philosophy of teaching.
Module 4 presents “life in the classroom” in which the graduate students discuss how to build a healthy classroom culture, establish their role as instructor, build classroom management skills, and develop strategies to engage students in the lab activities.

Module 5 teaches the necessary information and skills for assigning and grading undergraduate papers in Research Methods. The graduate students receive grading rubrics and are provided sample student papers to practice grading. This grading assignment serves as “homework” for the graduate students to complete overnight between the first and second day of GTA Training.

Module 6 focuses on the presentation skills including preparing presentations, verbal and non-verbal communication skills, and effective use of presentation technology and software. This module has become a traditional highlight of GTA training. Many graduate students compete to present this module because the presenter demonstrates all the wrong things to do in a presentation without alerting the audience to that fact. It has become a comedy routine as the GTAs in training begin to realize that the presenter is demonstrating a painfully dull presentation, with all the wrong behaviors, rather than an appropriate way to present material.

Module 7 covers the mechanics of teaching at USF. Important information such as how to get copies made for class, using classroom tools, meeting the needs of students with disabilities, library and research facilities, and holding office hours.

Module 8 focuses on professional conduct and ethical behavior for both instructors and graduate students. In this module, I present USF’s and the Psychology Department’s expectations of graduate students as employees of the university and department. At the end of this module, I challenge the graduate students with situations that test their judgment of ethical behavior, which makes for some interesting discussion topics (e.g., gifts from undergraduates, dual relationships, posting on social media, responding to students in distress).

Module 9 consists of a team of veteran graduate students presenting a panel discussion, without faculty present, to better inform incoming new graduate students about life in the Psychology Department at USF. Although this session is off limits to faculty, the impression is that the tone is positive, and sprinkled with tidbits of advice. This module also helps to integrate new graduate students into the student body of the psychology graduate program.

**Microteaching Breakout Sessions**

As homework the night before the last day of GTA Training, each new graduate student prepares a 15 to 20-minute presentation on a topic within Research Methods (e.g., correlational vs. experimental studies, statistical procedures such as t-test, ANOVA, correlation, regression). On the morning of the last day of their training, graduate students form groups of 3 to 4 with 2 to 3 seasoned GTAs in separate classrooms. Each first-year
student then presents a prepared topic and receives feedback and suggestions from the seasoned graduate students.

A luncheon celebration with all GTA participants and presenters follows the microteaching breakout sessions, and each student is awarded a certificate of completion of GTA Training. The GTA training culminates in a social gathering that evening organized and hosted by the advanced graduate students.

**Advanced Training in Teaching**

During their first year as a GTA, each student is supervised by the instructor of the Research Methods section to which they are assigned. After the first year, graduate students can be assigned to teach other labs (e.g. Psychological Statistics, Tests and Measures, Experimental Design and Analysis). Once graduate students have earned their MA, they become eligible to apply to be the Instructor of Record of an undergraduate course. To prepare for this advanced assignment, most graduate students apply to be “course assistants,” which is a GTA appointment in which they assist the instructor of one of the large enrollment undergraduate courses. As a course assistant, the graduate student helps with the mechanics of the course, holds office hours, may present review sessions, gives guest lectures, and engages in other tasks that helps prepare the graduate student for teaching his or her own course.

During the first semester in which graduate students serve as the Instructor of Record, they enroll in Graduate Instructional Methods, a 1-credit hour course designed to support them in their first semester of teaching their own course. There are usually between 3 and 8 graduate students each semester in this course. The first meeting occurs 3 weeks before the beginning of the semester and provides needed information and reviews skills for designing and preparing the course. We discuss the importance of writing good learning objectives and outcomes and using them throughout the course as guidance in assessments. We review good course design and the components of a useful syllabus. We also review university and departmental policies and procedures.

Throughout the semester, the Graduate Instructional Methods course meets weekly. During the sessions, we present and discuss course-related skills as well as any issues from the students’ teaching experience that week. Topics that are covered in the course are

- classroom management styles and strategies,
- effective use of technology in the classroom,
- effective use of Web-based learning,
- various techniques for engaging students in active learning,
- different types of assessment of learning,
- relationships between learning theory and teaching style,
- building a teaching portfolio, and
- making use of resources outside the Psychology Department.
About 4 weeks into the semester, graduate student instructors solicit anonymous informal feedback from their students and review that feedback with the Graduate Instructional Methods course instructor. This process usually entails a sheet of paper on which students are asked to list one thing they feel is going well in the course at the top and one thing they’d like to change in the course at the bottom. This first feedback session provides the new graduate student instructor with an indication of any problem areas. The graduate students also receive official mid-semester and end of semester course evaluations that the Psychology Department requires for all graduate student instructors, including both first-time and experienced graduate student instructors. The Graduate Instructional Methods course instructor reviews the student course evaluations and then provides feedback to the graduate student instructors.

In addition, an important component of Graduate Instructional Methods course is an observation of teaching. Soon after the midterm, the Graduate Instructional Methods course instructor observes each first-time graduate student instructor teaching a class and meets with them individually to provide feedback and discuss their skills and goals. If any type of corrective action is prescribed, the Graduate Instructional Methods instructor arranges further observations to ensure effective corrective action. Although follow-up corrective action has been required in only rare instances, when it has been implemented it appears to greatly improve teaching; those graduate students often develop outstanding teaching skills.

Sometime during that last 3 weeks of the semester, Graduate Instructional Methods students observe a seasoned faculty member teaching a course similar to theirs and discuss their observation with the Graduate Instructional Methods instructor. The Graduate Instructional Methods instructor encourages GTAs to make use of other teaching resources and training, those available online (e.g., Society for the Teaching of Psychology website, teaching conferences) and within the university. The USF Academy for Teaching and Learning Excellence (ATLE) provides workshops and training programs, including an 8-week course entitled “Preparing for College Teaching.” Other resources include teaching conferences. The USF Psychology Department co-sponsors the National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology (NITOP) meeting each January. USF graduate students serve as volunteers at the conference, providing support services to conference staff and presenters. Working at NITOP enables GTAs to attend the excellent presentations by nationally recognized psychology teachers and researchers.

USF recognizes excellence in teaching by GTAs. Each year the University awards several outstanding GTAs with the USF Provost’s Award for Outstanding Teaching by a Graduate Student. Psychology GTAs have historically done well in this competition. The Psychology Department also awards the Eve Levine Graduate Teaching Award to one outstanding GTA each year. The USF psychology faculty prides itself in their graduates being not only great researchers, but also scholarly and knowledgeable teachers.
16. Teaching of Psychology Course at California State University San Marcos

Marie D. Thomas and Elisa Grant-Vallone

“Good teaching is the creating of those circumstances that lead to significant learning in others” (Finkel, 2000, p. 8).

“Despite the challenges of teaching, it’s hard not to like a job where you can start over every September, shredding the previous year’s failures and tossing them out the window like so much confetti” (Parini, 2005, p. 6).

California State University San Marcos (CSUSM), a Carnegie-designated community engaged university and a federally designated Hispanic, Asian American, Native American, and Pacific Islander-Serving institution, is committed to serving students and communities in the local area. CSUSM faculty view teaching as an integral aspect of their role—we see the dramatic change that a college education makes in the lives of our students and their families, especially because close to 50% of our students are the first in their families to earn a college degree.

Psychology is one of the most popular undergraduate majors. CSUSM psychology department faculty are proud of our scientifically-focused and rigorous bachelor’s and master’s degree programs. The MA program prepares students for continued study at the doctoral level (about one-third of the MA students apply to PhD programs, and of those students over 90% are accepted), a variety of positions in business industry and the public sector, and academic careers at the 2-year college level. The graduate program is research-based and built around a strong mentorship model requiring each graduate student to have an advisor throughout the program. We have fewer than 15 faculty, and each is committed to helping our graduate students complete their degrees in a timely fashion. Therefore, we encourage faculty to limit the number of graduate students they advise in order for all graduate students to receive the attention they need. Consequently, incoming class sizes tend to be small; for the past 5 years we have enrolled an average of 11 graduate students a year.

Graduate students complete four proseminars that cover major areas of psychology (e.g., social, developmental, cognitive, biopsychology). In addition to the proseminars, graduate students take five required courses: Graduate Statistics, Advanced Research Methods, Contemporary Issues in Psychology, Graduate Thesis, and Teaching of Psychology (PSYC 680). Graduate students take PSYC 680 in the fall semester of the second year and the course is graded as Credit/No Credit. This course provides an introduction to pedagogical theories, styles, and strategies and their application to college teaching of psychology. In the
course, students have the opportunity to learn the role of a college instructor by presenting
course material, constructing assessment tools, and grading. Additionally, each graduate
student prepares, organizes, and leads a Friday 50-minute breakout section of 25 to 30
students from our large lecture format (240 students) Introduction to Psychology course
(PSYC 100).

PSYC 680 has been a part of our MA program from the program’s onset. The faculty who
developed the original curriculum valued the inclusion of such a course in the graduate
curriculum and viewed it as a way to distinguish the CSUSM program from other California
State University psychology MA programs. PSYC 680 is a course that provides students with
the skills, knowledge, and abilities to teach their own class. Leading the PSYC 100 breakout
sections provides our graduate students the opportunity to practice what they are learning
in PSYC 680. Below is the class structure for our PSYC 680 course in detail; the course
syllabus is available through Project Syllabus

**PSYC 680 Seminar**

Students meet with the PSYC 680 course instructor (for the past 10 years Marie Thomas and
Elisa Grant-Vallone have alternated teaching the class) for a 2-hour seminar, usually on
Wednesday. To facilitate preparation for the breakout sessions, graduate students also
meet with the PSYC 100 instructor each week for about an hour.

**Course Content**

PSYC 680 covers a variety of topics such as developing and writing a syllabus, choosing a
textbook, designing a first day icebreaker activity, crafting a teaching persona, creating an
active learning environment, using classroom assessment techniques, lecturing, leading
discussions, grading, writing, coping with academic dishonesty, and promoting student
motivation. Some of the key readings include *McKeachie’s Teaching Tips* (Svinicki &
McKeachie, 2014), *The Joy of Teaching* (Filene, 2005), and *Teaching Psychology: A Step by
Step Guide* (Lucas & Bernstein, 2005).

**Class Session Structure**

Each Psych 680 class session includes a discussion of a teaching technique or issue as well as
a student-led discussion about that week’s teaching technique or a controversial topic, and a
presentation or discussion of an active learning technique that will be implemented in the
following week’s Friday breakout section. In the past when we covered teaching techniques
such as lecture and discussion, we typically modeled the topic we were discussing. For
example, when we discussed lecturing we used a lecture format. At this point we are moving
past the need to demonstrate the various pedagogical techniques. Instead, we assume that
our graduate students, through their own educational experiences, have been exposed to
numerous examples of teaching strategies that varied in quality. We encourage graduate
students to analyze critically what has worked well (and what has not worked well) for them
as learners, and to tie their experiences to the literature on pedagogy. This process helps the
graduate students craft their own teaching persona and also allows for a Socratic discussion
of these topics, rather than implying that a particular pedagogical method is optimal. For
example, graduate students often begin the PSYC 680 course convinced that lecturing is the most appropriate and efficient way to teach all courses. Many of them believe they best learned through lecture. Although we agree that lecture can be a useful tool in some situations and, in fact, the PSYC 100 students have 2 hours of large-class lecture each week, we challenge our graduate students to think about what conditions must be met for lecture to be a good teaching strategy. The graduate students soon come to realize that for lecture to “work,” a learner must have an intrinsic interest in the subject or have read about the subject ahead of time, be a good note taker, be able to pay attention for long periods of time without drifting off, and be willing to go over class notes soon after the lecture. For many of these very good graduate students, such conditions were met at least part of the time in some of their undergraduate classes. However, after seeing the glazed-over looks when they begin lecturing in their breakout sessions, they quickly realize that almost none of their PSYC 100 students possess these attributes. In essence, even the staunchest defenders of lecturing quickly understand the importance of using active learning strategies in becoming an effective teacher.

In addition to discussing a teaching technique or teaching issue, graduate students lead discussions on the readings assigned for that particular class or readings they chose about a controversial teaching topic (e.g., MOOCs/online learning, is it the faculty’s responsibility to prepare students for a career?). At the beginning of the semester graduate students sign up for the discussion topic they will lead and send class members a set of discussion questions ahead of time. Our students typically lead at least one class in each proseminar and have no difficulty creating thought-provoking questions. However, these discussions are sometimes flat and rarely "catch fire," prompting consideration of techniques that might enliven those discussions.

Finally, part of the PSYC 680 session is devoted to teaching graduate students active learning strategies that will be used in the following week's breakout session. At the beginning of the course, the PSYC 100 instructor provides scripted activities for the students. Starting with the fifth week of the semester (after the first PSYC 100 exam), graduate students develop their own activities without input from the PSYC 100 instructor (we encourage them not to reinvent the wheel, and suggest they consult the numerous resources for psychology activities that we have accumulated in the department). Each graduate student signs up to create one activity; if the class is large, students form pairs. They first present the activity to their peers in PSYC 680. They run the activity as they would in the breakout section, and they must include a classroom assessment technique that will help them determine how well the activity worked. After we try the activity, we work to improve it. All graduate students will use the same activity in their Friday class; the following week we discuss what worked and did not work along with how the activity might be improved for future use.

**Other Course Requirements**

In addition to leading a discussion and creating a Friday activity, the PSYC 680 students keep a journal, develop multiple-choice items, and write a statement of their teaching philosophy. The graduate students also write weekly journal entries. The initial journal entry has two
parts. First, graduate students write a critique of the initial class session of an undergraduate course (any discipline) that they attend. They comment on such topics as what is covered in the first class, the professor's behavior and attitudes toward students, the students' behavior and attitudes toward the professor and class, the nature of the classroom environment, and so on. The graduate students report the discipline and whether it is a lower- or upper-division class, but not the instructor's name.

Second, students comment on their first Friday breakout session, answering questions such as, “How did you feel before, during, and after class?” “What initial impressions did you have about your students?” “What went well and what could be improved?” For the rest of the weekly journal entries, we ask students to reflect less on what they did in their breakout session (although early in the semester we ask for a very specific outline of activities) and more on their evaluation of what went well and what could be improved, as well as how they linked what they learned in the PSYC 680 readings to particular aspects of the break-out session (e.g., motivation or teaching diverse students). We encourage students to write about issues they have faced, to seek out advice on how to best handle student problems, to tell funny stories about their teaching experiences, and even to brag about the success of their teaching techniques. In the final journal entry students describe their growth over the course of the semester, answering such questions as, “What have you learned in 680 and through teaching your breakout section?” “How will you continue to develop as an instructor?” “What improvements would you still like to make?”

These journal entries help us, as the PSYC 680 instructors, to assess how much the students are learning about teaching psychology. The entries are a way of developing individual dialogues with each graduate student, encouraging their successes, and identifying any specific problems that may have arisen over the course of the academic term.

Our graduate students also learn how to develop reliable and valid tests. Before the second exam in PSYC 100, the graduate students develop five multiple-choice items, and they present their best two items in PSYC 680 to be critiqued by the class. Based on the feedback they receive, they edit all of their items and submit them to the PSYC 100 instructor, who includes at least one item on the exam from each of the students. After the test is graded, graduate students examine the psychometric properties of their items to determine their effectiveness. They often discover that the item they thought was very easy actually proved to be difficult for the PSYC 100 students. We then discuss what characteristics of the item made it particularly difficult.

Finally, at the end of the semester, we require the PSYC 680 students to write a statement of their teaching philosophy. This activity allows graduate students to bring together all the material they have learned throughout the year and define who they aspire to become as college instructors. We have found this activity to be a rewarding final activity for the graduate students and is especially valuable for those who plan to seek teaching positions after they graduate.
Typical (ideal) Breakout Session

One of the greatest challenges we have had with the PSYC 680 graduate students is helping them create a structure for their Friday sections that provides more than merely a review of material that was covered earlier in the week in the regular meetings of the course. We challenge our graduate students to engage their students in thinking more deeply about the subject matter and to apply the theories and concepts presented in lecture earlier in the week. To help with this process, we encourage PSYC 100 students to read the textbook as preparation for taking a quiz (prepared by the PSYC 100 instructor) at the beginning of the breakout session. After a quick review of the quiz, the graduate instructor may provide a brief overview of topics covered that week in the 2 hours of PSYC 100 lecture, which is sometimes done at the request of the PSYC 100 instructor for particularly difficult topics. Otherwise, we encourage the graduate students not to review unless one of their students asks them to go over specific concept or topic.

During the first third of the semester, the remainder of the class time during the discussion section is spent using a technique that graduate instructors learned in PSYC 680 (e.g., leading a discussion or giving a lecture) and utilizing an active learning technique. For the rest of the semester, the majority of class time is spent engaging undergraduates in the active learning exercises that graduate instructors have created to apply the material their students are learning. For example, students may work on a debate on parenting styles or analyze case studies of psychological disorders. A key aspect of the active learning exercises is that they are followed by a classroom assessment technique (Angelo & Cross, 1993). Therefore, graduate instructors get immediate feedback at the end of class to see how much students learned from the active learning exercise.

The three issues graduate students most struggle with when leading a class (even after numerous discussions) are setting the stage for active learning, wrapping up an activity at the end of class, and general time management. In our class observations we have noted that many graduate students jump right into to an exercise (“Okay, let’s get into groups!”) without providing a context as to how it links to earlier classes or the topics being covered. At the end of class we find a similar problem in that graduate instructors may have groups “share out” what was discussed in the activity but then do not bring it all together again and clearly summarize the purpose of the activity. Finally, graduate students quickly discover that 50 minutes go by very quickly, and they often find that they have not left time to implement the classroom assessment technique (especially on days when a test or homework assignment is returned). One of our tasks as PSYC 680 instructors is to convince the graduate students that working to improve in these three areas will result in a better learning experience for their Introduction to Psychology students.

Role of the PSYC 680 Instructor

Splitting the role of the Teaching of Psychology professor from that of the Introduction to Psychology professor by having different instructors for the two courses has been a very effective way for graduate students to have the opportunity to work with two different faculty members throughout the semester. It also allows us to separate issues that are
specific to PSYC 100 (e.g., what to do when students do not understand a lecture on neurotransmitters) from larger issues related to teaching in general (e.g., how do we increase undergraduate engagement in a 100 level class?). (However, Elisa has taught both PSYC 100 and PSYC 680 in the same semester. Although having the same instructor teach both courses eliminates problems of coordination between two instructors, which may be the only downside of our model, she found that the PSYC 680 sessions became more focused on teaching the introductory course rather than on general pedagogical issues.) We set the stage for the separation between PSYC 100 and PSYC 680 the week before the semester begins by having graduate students attend a retreat with the two course instructors. We discuss key issues with them during this first encounter such as the importance of taking their instructor role seriously (e.g., not calling in sick unless they are really sick), over-preparing for the breakout sections, and keeping accurate records of all grades and assignments. When we explain to them that they are responsible for one-third of the PSYC 100 course the importance of their role becomes apparent to them.

Perhaps our most important and valuable role is to provide the graduate students the “wisdom” we have accumulated over our many years of experience as college professors. For example, we often must remind them that one must be flexible when teaching. Graduate students sometimes begin teaching with very black and white ideas (“I will never accept a late paper!”), and we spend much time discussing particular teaching situations that demand flexibility (e.g., undergraduates have parents, siblings, and friends who die; they do really get sick and have cars break down), which often makes it necessary for teachers to change their plans at the last minute. For example, graduate students become frustrated when the PSYC 100 instructor does not cover all material as expected because it means that they may need to add that content to their Friday session. Over the years, we have become better at predicting how much material will be covered each week but we also have made it clear to graduate students that sometimes they will find out just 2 days before their Friday session that they need to change something in their instruction—short-notice changes are part of real life for a college professor! We also model these behaviors for our graduate students. For instance, we are always well prepared and plan PSYC 680 activities in advance, but sometimes we need to change an activity at the last minute, and we try to do so with grace and with as little fuss as possible.

A final aspect of our role as teachers of PSYC 680 is that we observe each graduate instructor once during the semester. This observation is a purely formative evaluation. Although we take notes and debrief the graduate students verbally, we do not write up an official evaluation (we keep our notes, though which come in handy for letters of recommendation later on). Our graduate students generally come to class with relatively well-developed presentation skills and a good understanding of the material, and almost all are enthusiastic and engaged in learning about teaching. The purpose of the classroom visit is to observe and discuss their strengths and any areas for improvement, (e.g., any “annoying” behaviors, such as vocal tics or only facing one side of the classroom, of which they may be unaware). One area that we often address, especially for observations early in the semester, is a lack of
confidence in the classroom. Specifically, many graduate students appear hesitant and lack assertiveness about class rules, guidelines, and expectations.

**Conclusion**

Although at the start of the semester many of our graduate students are anxious, apprehensive, and are unsure that they will enjoy teaching, by the end of the semester they have more fully developed their teaching styles and comfort level with different teaching techniques. Some graduate students end up being strict but others laid back; some are funny and some are more professional, but virtually every student finds his or her groove as an instructor during the semester. Over the many years we have taught this course, we have had students who were more or less engaged, but only once did we have a situation in which we had to intervene. We have found that the majority of our graduate students love the teaching experience and build tremendous confidence throughout it. Some of our graduate students opt to gain more teaching experience by continuing to serve as breakout session instructors during the spring semester.

Of our approximately 190 MA graduates, we know of at least six who have become full-time instructors at community colleges and many more of our graduates teach part time. Over 25 percent of CSUSM psychology lecturers (6 out of 23) are our former students. Notably, two have of our former students have won the outstanding lecturer award at Palomar College, and one of our graduates is the 2014 Wayne Weiten Teaching Excellence Award (2-year college) recipient by Division 2 of the American Psychological Association.

We have seen successful results from our MA program, and we believe that PSYC 680 is one of the jewels responsible for this result. Our graduate students leave CSUSM with solid teaching experience, a sense of who they want to become as instructors, and a strong grasp of their teaching philosophies. Teaching this course is also extremely rewarding for us because we are able to pass on our knowledge and experience, our interest in innovative pedagogies, and our love of teaching to new generations of psychology graduate students.
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17. Principles and Practices of Graduate TA Training at The Ohio State University

Melissa Beers, Jennifer Belding, and Maggie Mehling

Ohio State University (OSU) is one of the largest universities in the country and is a diverse, research-intensive institution that is ranked among the Top 20 American public institutions for higher education. OSU’s department of psychology currently represents 76 faculty on 5 campuses (54 at Columbus campus), 177 graduate students (115 with teaching appointments), and 1,800 undergraduate majors on the Columbus campus. Psychology is one of the largest OSU departments and provides extensive course offerings and research opportunities in eight graduate programs: behavioral neuroscience, clinical psychology, cognitive psychology, decision psychology, developmental psychology, intellectual and developmental disabilities, quantitative psychology, and social psychology.

Background and History

OSU’s Introduction to Psychology (Psychology 1100) course has long been among the university’s largest courses, with enrollments currently as high as 2,400 students per semester. On the Columbus campus, graduate instructors play an essential role in the delivery of the course, typically serving as instructors of record in independent sections of approximately 60-80 students. In order to maintain consistency across more than 50 sections of Introduction to Psychology each academic year, the program has several standardized elements including a general syllabus, common textbook, common exams, and standard course policies. The course is managed by a program director, who provides general oversight, and two senior graduate student coordinators, who regulate the many details related to course administration and serve as teaching mentors to new instructors. This model was established in OSU Introduction to Psychology course by 1960 under the supervision of professor Delos Wickens, and continued under the guidance of David Hothersall, then Alexis Collier, and now Melissa Beers.

The department adopted a similar model for Introduction to Social Psychology. This 2000-level course fulfills not only a requirement for the major but also serves as a General Education (GE) writing component for OSU. Thus, this high-enrollment course (up to 400 students per semester) usually draws both majors and non-majors. As a GE writing course, graduate students who independently teach these sections are responsible for grading up to five two-page papers for each of the 28 students in their section. The course was originally supervised by Jon Krosnick and later by Robert Arkin. Lisa Libby currently serves as faculty coordinator.
These two large courses represent the majority of graduate student teaching appointments in the psychology department. Both courses utilize coordinated models and thus afford graduate students the opportunity to gain valuable teaching experience in a structured and supervised context. Shared resources and responsibilities for course management alleviate many teaching-related demands on graduate teaching assistants’ (GTAs) time so they are better able to balance their teaching, coursework, and research responsibilities.

Even considering the benefits of a coordinated course model, teaching places significant demands on graduate instructors. Until recently at OSU, TA training primarily took place “on the job” with only a limited amount of preparation prior to the start of the semester (typically a 1-day teaching orientation meeting). Such a training model has long been common practice, particularly among large institutions (see Buskist, 2013). However, in 1999, the department’s two largest courses partnered with our University Center for the Advancement of Teaching to enhance our GTA training practices. Since then our department has steadily increased its support of graduate student instructors. This chapter provides an overview of key elements within our GTA training program, organized around four central, guiding principles:

1. Providing GTAs time, resources, and support as they build teaching skills
2. Balancing practical and pedagogical considerations
3. Encouraging reflection, collaboration, and continuous development
4. Rewarding teaching excellence

**Time, Resources, and Support**

A critical consideration at OSU is that graduate students need time to adjust to graduate school before they assume responsibility for teaching, which gives new graduate students the opportunity to build a knowledge base in their program area and establish foundational research experience before they accommodate the demands of undergraduate teaching. First-year graduate students are typically funded through fellowships or research assistantships. In the rare situation in which a first-year graduate student is funded through a teaching assistantship, such an appointment would involve assisting with the teaching of a course and not independent teaching. Graduate students are only considered for appointments that involve classroom instruction after successfully completing a minimum of 1 full year in the graduate program and remaining in good standing. OSU’s Introduction to Social Psychology course, in fact, requires that graduate students have completed (at minimum) 2 years in the graduate program and have gone through the formative experience of writing and defending their master’s thesis before they are eligible to teach this writing-intensive course.

We give GTAs as much time to prepare for their teaching assignments as possible. Graduate students may request various teaching positions within the department with almost 9 months lead time, and appointments are determined by a faculty committee representing all
graduate programs approximately 4-6 months prior to the start of the next academic year. Thus, before the end of an academic year, both the graduate student and the department have committed to a specific graduate student teaching position for the following year. This strategy affords new instructors the opportunity to plan and prepare for teaching a course over the summer as well as to collaborate and share resources with other instructors, a practice that the department encourages and supports. Advanced notice is arguably most important for new instructors, who must fulfill our departmental training requirements before they are permitted to teach.

The core of our GTA training program is the Teaching of Psychology course, a 5-credit hour seminar/practicum offered each summer to first-time GTAs. Over 12 weeks, new instructors become familiar with the specific course they will be teaching as well as the GE or major requirement(s) that the course fulfills for undergraduates. GTAs learn about resources for teaching in the department and university, build skills necessary for effective teaching, and gain familiarity with research and theory in pedagogy and the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Although many OSU graduate programs offer teaching courses, the psychology department’s model is unique in that it is notably more time-intensive (5 semester credit hours as opposed to 1-3 in most other departments), and is offered in the summer, separate from the rest of the academic year, so as to promote balance between the students’ program area requirements and preparation for teaching. GTAs must successfully complete the summer teaching course before being permitted to teach a section of any course in the department. Ultimately, we want to ensure that these early teaching experiences are effective and positive because, as Boice (2000, p. 11) noted, “poor starts as teachers are difficult to undo; they predict career-long ambivalence and avoidance” where teaching is concerned.

Another distinctive characteristic of our approach to GTA development is the role of experienced GTAs in our training program. We select two highly effective senior GTAs each year to serve as GTA coordinators for Introduction to Psychology and one senior GTA to coordinate Introduction to Social Psychology. These GTA coordinators are engaged in all aspects of course management and work closely with the course supervisor(s), taking an active role in setting course policy, selecting textbooks, and developing tools and teaching resources. Not only do GTA coordinators model effective teaching, but they also plan, organize, and deliver teaching-focused workshops to their peers. The coordinators also serve as consultants to help new instructors generate ideas or solutions to problems that may arise in their courses, and their feedback is often received more readily than the same feedback delivered by a faculty member or course supervisor.

Balancing the Practical and the Pedagogical
Our training program is also firmly grounded in the belief that training for new instructors must balance both practical, “hands-on” training with sound pedagogy. The prospect of teaching an undergraduate course for the first time can be daunting, and new GTAs often feel overwhelmed when they begin preparing for their first teaching assignment. Because new GTAs are often unsure how to best cover required content, how to plan and organize
the course, and how to develop effective tests and quizzes, the majority of new instructors approach their first teaching assignment in “survival mode.” Many new instructors tend to focus their efforts primarily on how to present course content and think about teaching primarily from their own experiences as students. For instructors at this early point in their teaching careers, we have found that training should balance the theoretical with the practical, providing both a conceptual framework for thinking about student learning while still providing new instructors with all the details and practical guidance they find useful. Thus, our Teaching of Psychology course is structured in an integrated seminar and practicum format.

The seminar component of the course is designed to address primarily pedagogical aspects of the teaching of psychology. The program director, who provides oversight for both the Introduction to Psychology and the Introduction to Social Psychology courses through the academic year, supervises the entire summer teaching course and leads this component of the Teaching of Psychology course. In the seminar, all instructors meet as a group to discuss general issues relevant to teaching. Readings that emphasize practical implementation (e.g., Davis, 2009; Forsyth, 2004; Goss-Lucas & Bernstein, 2005) are intentionally included along with recent publications that emphasize evidence-based approaches to teaching and learning (e.g., Ambrose, Bridges, DiPietro, Lovett, & Norman, 2010; Benassi, Overson, & Hakala, 2014). We structure assignments around the course elements that new instructors will need when they begin teaching (e.g., a syllabus, tools to assess student learning), as well as a preliminary statement of teaching philosophy to encourage new instructors to think about their values related to teaching and how these values take shape in the way GTAs implement their course. In the seminar, we discuss such topics as how students learn, the importance of helping students develop metacognitive skills, the value of active learning, how to assess student learning and one’s own effectiveness as an instructor, and how to create an inclusive classroom. We encourage new instructors to think both about the course they are currently preparing to teach, as well as other courses they are likely to teach in the future.

Immediately following each seminar meeting, the new instructors meet in practicum groups led by the senior GTA coordinators to discuss practical aspects of course planning. These practicum sections are specific for each undergraduate course so new instructors preparing the same course have the opportunity to talk about how the abstract ideas introduced in that day’s seminar can be applied within their specific teaching context. The practicum is geared toward guiding new instructors as they create their course materials. These sessions focus on the common content instructors cover when lecturing on course-specific topics, discussion of specific active learning demonstrations and activities, and discussion of how to integrate evidence-based teaching practices when preparing one’s materials. For example, after discussing how one’s syllabus sets the tone for a course in the seminar (cf., Harnish et. al, 2011), we then focus on the specific details that should be included in individual syllabi for the specific undergraduate course that the new instructors will soon be teaching. Additionally, as part of their coursework, new instructors prepare lecture materials (typically PowerPoint slides and accompanying notes) on seven topics and receive feedback from the
senior GTAs. Whenever possible, the senior GTAs invite other experienced instructors to join discussions in the practicum and share their personal strategies for teaching a particular topic, which encourages our new instructors to collaborate with all of our more senior instructors and witness a wide variety of teaching strategies rather than merely mimicking the techniques of the senior GTA leading the practicum.

Because of its practical and pedagogical value, microteaching has a prominent role within the teaching course. We require our new instructors to give three presentations during the summer course, starting with a 5-minute talk on the second day of class—GTAs can choose any subject for this talk so long as it is on a topic other than psychology. Our rationale is to encourage GTAs to select a topic in which they are interested and to encourage them to think about how to explain that topic concisely to others who are unlikely to know much, if anything, about it. Midway through the term, all GTAs give a 10-minute presentation on an assigned topic from a course they will be preparing, and at the end of the 12-week course the GTAs give a final 15-minute presentation on a psychology topic of their choosing in the course they are preparing to teach. The latter two presentations are held in various locations around campus to give GTAs direct experience in a classroom in which they may eventually teach. Presenters receive both written and oral feedback from the course instructors and their peers. We often invite “guest experts” (e.g., faculty members who regularly teach a particular course, other experienced GTAs) to attend these presentations. The final presentation is videotaped and reviewed individually with the program director at the end of the term, and we discuss the new instructors’ reaction to their teaching video and set goals for the upcoming semester.

Although the process can be anxiety-provoking for the new instructors, they reliably identify microteaching as among their most important formative teaching experiences. They often comment that such practice makes the first day of class far less stressful than it might otherwise be.

Because new instructors’ nervousness tends to peak just before the start of the term, we also hold a Fall Kick-Off meeting before the start of classes for both courses. The Kick-Off frequently includes a guest speaker to offer new instructors advice and inspiration. A few recent guest speakers have included authors and scholars in the teaching of psychology such as Doug Bernstein, Jeff Nevid, Scott Lilienfeld, Bill Buskist, and Stephen Chew, who have been both encouraging and inspirational to new instructors. The Kick-Off also provides a forum for GTA coordinators to provide important, time-sensitive information needed in the first few days of class. The new instructors can then ask the coordinators or their peers any last-minute questions they have before classes begin. Instructors who will be serving together on various committees (exam development committees, textbook review committees, and so on) have the opportunity to meet and start coordinating their schedules, and the entire team can socialize over lunch or refreshments, which helps to create a sense of community and celebration.
Encouraging Reflection, Collaboration, and Continuous Development

Throughout our training program we emphasize that even with significant preparation to teach, all new instructors will experience some missteps or mistakes. Thus, we stress that the ability to gather and use feedback to improve over time is far more important than trying to be a “perfect” teacher. Encouraging new instructors to use feedback for self-reflection and improvement is a third guiding principle of our program. Nyquist and Sprague (1998) contended that instructors must learn how to engage in self-reflection to improve their teaching, and this task is not necessarily something all instructors will do spontaneously or easily. Like Nyquist and Sprague, we see reflection as critical to GTA development and we encourage GTAs to regularly seek and use feedback to improve their teaching. In order to facilitate reflection, we utilize classroom observations (both by a supervisor and one’s peers) and encourage our GTAs to take advantage of several other enrichment opportunities, which we describe below.

Classroom observation plays a central role in providing GTAs support and feedback during the academic year. All GTAs are regularly observed by the program director or a faculty member and receive written and oral feedback on their teaching. At the end of their first term of teaching, the program director meets with each new instructor to review feedback from the observation as well as the feedback received from students in order to identify the new instructor’s strengths and successes as well as opportunities for growth in the next term. Throughout the academic year, the program director and faculty are readily available to consult with GTAs on issues relating to teaching and to provide guidance on departmental and university policies.

We also encourage peer observation, which is required as part of the department’s Teaching Certificate program. To earn the certificate, new instructors must complete the Teaching of Psychology course, teach two semesters as an instructor of record, be observed twice by their course supervisor or a faculty mentor, participate in a teaching-focused professional development workshop or event, and participate in formative observations of two peers and one faculty member. Obtaining the teaching certificate is optional and may be completed by any graduate student, as long as he or she has taught at least 1 full year as an instructor of record. The certificate is formal acknowledgement that a graduate student has participated in our training program, has taught independently, and has gained additional formative feedback in the form of peer and faculty observation. Peer observation is included as an assignment in the Teaching of Psychology course to help graduate students understand how to approach this task and to help them see the value of peer observation for their ongoing development as instructors. We advise GTAs that the primary goal of a peer observation should be to improve their own teaching by gaining experience and perspective. Peer observation encourages a positive learning community and encourages the exchange of teaching-related ideas and resources among the new instructors.

Beyond the department’s training opportunities and Teaching Certificate program, graduate students interested in gaining broader teaching experience and contributing to the ongoing development of our training program can participate in a Graduate Teaching Fellow (GTF)
program, co-sponsored by the Ohio State University Center for the Advancement of Teaching and the Graduate School. Teaching Fellows complete a multidisciplinary course on college teaching and participate in a year-long learning community with participants from many other departments across the university, each working on developing teaching-focused programs and resources. For example, one GTA coordinator for the Introduction to Social Psychology course conducted a project to enhance instructors’ resources for the teaching of writing and developed a sustainable plan for course-wide assessment of learning outcomes that could be shared with various university committees upon request.

Similarly, we encourage GTAs interested in learning more about academic positions at liberal-arts institutions to participate in the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program. Sponsored and coordinated by the Graduate School, PFF offers graduate students an opportunity to learn about faculty life at liberal arts colleges and smaller universities, addressing teaching, research, and service. The PFF program’s premier feature is a one-to-one mentorship between each PFF fellow and a faculty member at one of the PFF program’s partner institutions (one of the many liberal arts institutions in Ohio). The PFF program also includes a series of on-campus activities and workshops. Together, these components of the program expose graduate students to the wide range of teaching and professional expectations associated with faculty life at liberal arts colleges and smaller universities.

**Rewarding Teaching Excellence**

A final guiding principle in our training program is the importance of recognizing and rewarding GTAs for their accomplishments and contributions. The Introduction to Psychology course sponsors program awards and recognizes GTAs at the end of each year (on the basis of peer nomination) for distinguished service, leadership, and meritorious teaching in the program. At the department level, faculty nominate outstanding GTAs for recognition with the Teaching Excellence Award for Graduate Students (TEAGS). A committee comprised of members of the undergraduate and graduate studies committees reviews the nominees, and the winner receives $400 and a certificate of achievement.

At the university level, OSU offers a Graduate Associate Teaching Award (GATA), which is the university’s highest recognition of the exceptional teaching provided by graduate students at OSU. Award winners receive $1,500 and are recognized at the annual Graduate School awards reception. Nominations are solicited from students, peers, faculty, and staff. Eligible GTAs must apply by submitting an extensive teaching portfolio for review by the GATA selection committee. From more than 2,000 GTAs in the university, 10 exceptional GTAs are recognized with this award each year. We are proud of the fact that our department is often represented in this selection of outstanding instructors.

The importance of the role of graduate student instructors in our department cannot be understated, and the benefits are profound, both to the graduate student and to the undergraduates they teach. GTAs often provide the very first experiences (if not the only experiences) our undergraduates have with psychological science, and continue to work with and mentor these students over the course of their undergraduate careers. We strongly
believe that investing in our graduate students’ preparation for teaching creates a positive
formative experience both for our graduate instructors as well as for our undergraduates.
The investment in graduate student teaching also means that our graduate students can be
more effective as new faculty members, in that they will require less “start-up” time for
teaching as they adapt to the many demands of the faculty role. Recent research shows that
training for teaching positively teaching impacts the quality of graduate student research
(Feldon et al., 2011), so it would be a disservice to graduate students to consider teaching
and research to be disconnected activities or competing priorities. Ultimately, by supporting
GTAs’ preparation for teaching, we hope to prepare these talented young professionals for
their future academic lives and reinforce the value and importance of undergraduate
teaching in the academy.
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When a full-time position in psychology opens at our institution, we use several important criteria to identify the most competitive candidates. This chapter describes and explains these criteria from my perspective as the psychology department’s senior member. I have served on numerous hiring committees for a variety of academic disciplines. Most recently I participated on the hiring committee for a tenure track physiological psychologist at Irvine Valley College, the college at which I have done the majority of my 35 years of teaching.

Irvine Valley is a public community college founded in 1985 and serving nearly 15,000 students. The median student age is 24. Fifty-three percent of the students are from minority populations (mostly Asian and Hispanic). The college employs 129 full-time and 371 part-time instructors.

We use eight criteria to evaluate psychology applicants seeking a full-time, tenure track position at Irvine Valley. These criteria begin with the candidates’ academic preparation. Those seeking an adjunct position usually must meet only the first criterion, but meeting some or all of the remaining seven criteria would certainly improve an applicant’s chances of landing a part-time teaching position.

**Academic Preparation**
No doubt, the candidate’s academic preparation is the most fundamental requirement. Nearly every state, including California, requires an MA in psychology or a closely related field (e.g., counseling or educational psychology) as the minimum academic background. Although the application process allows candidates not meeting this criterion to argue for their "equivalency" by describing a combination of coursework and experience thought to constitute an equivalent background, most hiring committees would not seriously consider interviewing such a candidate. A growing number of applicants hold a PhD in psychology, but the minimum academic preparation continues to be the master’s degree.

**Successful Teaching Experience**
The qualified candidate must provide evidence of teaching experience, especially successful teaching experience at the post-secondary level. The hiring committee will examine the breadth of courses taught, the number of years the candidate has been teaching, and the type of institution at which the candidate has taught. Some colleges will be looking for generalists capable of teaching any of the courses offered by the department, whereas...
larger departments may be looking for specialists in statistics and research methods, biopsychology, or some other area of psychology. It seems likely that when an opening occurs, smaller departments would seek those who can teach almost any course the department offers. Applicants with limited formal teaching experience may be able to strengthen their application by summarizing their experiences working with students (e.g., graduate student teaching, guest speaking presentations, or service as a teaching assistant).

How does a candidate provide evidence of "successful" teaching? Do not rely on a lengthy cover letter. Members of the screening committee are pressed for time and may not read it. A current curriculum vitae (CV) will effectively and efficiently communicate your qualifications to the hiring committee. The vitae should emphasize “instruction...one’s accomplishments as an educator, teacher, and disseminator of knowledge” (Forsyth, 2004, p. 290). Landrum and Davis (2010) provide clear examples of curriculum vitae.

Besides presenting a CV, I recommend preparation of a professional development portfolio. Include in the portfolio documentation of teaching evaluations performed by department chairs, deans, peers, or students. Individuals who currently teach at a college that doesn’t often evaluate instructors should request such an evaluation. Another strategy is to create and regularly administer one’s own student feedback form. However, do not load the portfolio with reams of raw data; instead provide statistical summaries and representative comments about teaching gathered from former students and administrators.

**Philosophy of Teaching**

Somewhere within the application and interview process, candidates will be asked to reveal their philosophy of teaching. Good candidates will provide examples of teaching methods sensitive to the diverse learning needs among students, use of instructional designs that emphasize active rather than passive learning, the preference for learner-centered over teacher-centered instructional strategies, and the application of instructional principles derived from the science of learning (Benassi, Overson, & Hakala, 2014; Halpern & Hakel, 2002, 2003). Applicants who are invited to give a teaching demonstration should present one that reflects their philosophy of teaching-centered instructional strategies, and the application of instructional principles derived from the science of learning. Applicants who are invited to give a teaching demonstration should present one that reflects their philosophy of teaching. The demonstration is an opportunity to reveal the candidate’s ability to incorporate technology, encourage active learning, and connect well with students.

Regional accreditation agencies now expect disciplinary faculty to work together to identify learning outcomes encompassing essential knowledge and skills that students should gain from their courses and programs. Moreover, faculty must develop and implement ways to assess student learning, review data generated from the assessments, and document how such data have been used to improve teaching and learning. Because of their academic background and training, all psychologists are well prepared for this type of work. In addition, the candidate should be fully committed to helping colleagues develop and assess course and departmental-level learning outcomes. In this regard, the informed candidate
should be well aware of the learning outcomes for the undergraduate degree in psychology, a comprehensive set of outcomes recently updated by the American Psychological Association (2013). The APA Guidelines, version 2.0, presents foundational indicators that specify learning outcomes appropriate for psychology majors who are transitioning from lower to upper division coursework.

A Personal Commitment to Ongoing Professional Development
Exceptional candidates can readily list strategies that they employ to stay current not just on recent developments in psychology but also on effective teaching strategies. Candidates should provide, in chronological order, an annotated listing of workshops, conferences, and presentations they have attended. Another section of the professional portfolio should provide examples of relevant books and journals that the candidate reads to stay current in psychology and the teaching of psychology. Superior candidates can list professional organizations in which they are members (e.g., TOPSS, Psi Beta, Psi Chi, PT@CC, and any county, state, regional, national, or international organizations in psychology such as the American Psychological Association and the Association for Psychological Science). Candidates should take time to describe all instances of active participation in such organizations and describe personal links and connections within psychology's network of professional organizations. The point here is to convince the hiring committee that as a future colleague, you will take primary responsibility for your professional development as both a psychologist and a teacher. Individuals serving on a hiring committee never want to be accused of having had a hand in hiring an instructor who subsequently earns a reputation of being "dead wood."

Show Knowledge of and Appreciation for Community Colleges' Unique Role in Higher Education
The unique charge of the community college is to maintain academic standards equivalent to those in place at 4-year colleges and universities, while serving a highly diverse group of students, many of whom are literally learning to be students. Community colleges embrace the ideal of open access to students. Effective instructors acknowledge and accept the responsibilities associated with serving the highly diverse student body derived from an open access policy. Faculty need to embrace this challenge by focusing on student potential. Besides teaching course content, they must recognize the importance of helping students become competent learners. Psychologists are uniquely prepared to help students develop effective learning skills, a fact candidates should express during the hiring process. (Some of my colleagues resent the developmental nature of some community college students; these instructors tend to blame the students for what is generally, in fact, ineffective teaching.)

Be Eager to Mentor Students
Expect the interview committee to include questions that prompt candidates to describe ways in which they mentor students, whether it’s helping students become more competent learners, or encouraging students to participate in undergraduate research, service-learning, and clubs and organizations. Effective community college teachers accept responsibility for helping students become more effective learners. Mentoring students involves formalizing a
commitment to student development. Many psychology students thrive on co-curricular activities designed to enrich their knowledge of and involvement in psychology.

Many community colleges have established Psi Beta chapters. Psi Beta is a national honor society in psychology for students attending a 2-year college. Psi Beta, which grew out of Psi Chi, provides students with many benefits: a forum to meet and develop friendships with others who share their interests in psychology, a place to learn leadership skills by serving as chapter officers, and the opportunity to hear speakers on a variety of topics in psychology. Many Psi Beta chapters provide students with the opportunity to present their research at poster sessions during regional and national psychology conferences. Besides advising a Psi Beta chapter, mentors may arrange service-learning opportunities in the community so students can apply what they are learning in class, or arranging field trips to the local university's "Psychology Day" program.

The hiring committee will look for clues of the candidate's potential for becoming a strong student mentor. Did the candidate participate in Psi Beta or Psi Chi as an undergraduate? Has the applicant been involved with any type of mentoring activities initiated during former or present teaching employment? Does this applicant have knowledge of the mentoring activities the department already has in place? Would this candidate become an active participant in our co-curricular activities or avoid them? Worse yet, would this person refuse or neglect requests to announce Psi Beta and other enrichment opportunities to students? These are critically important questions for the hiring committee.

Show Promise of Being Good "Campus Citizen"
Most community colleges require full-time instructors to serve on at least one standing committee. Instructors must provide reliable service on their committees by arriving for the meeting on time and prepared to engage in the committee's business. Good colleagues also accept their portions of shared-governance work on temporary committees such as task forces, ad hoc committees, and hiring committees. The good applicant will show a willingness to fulfill the obligation and responsibility for committee work. Hiring committees will examine the applicant's history of committee work for supportive evidence.

Related to fulfilling committee work, it is necessary that teachers enjoy positive, respectful interactions with teaching colleagues, including of course, adjunct faculty, both within and outside their teaching discipline. The expectation for positive working relationships extends to interactions with all support staff. Members of the support staff provide essential services for developing and maintaining a positive learning environment; these individuals must be treated with the respect and appreciation they deserve. Often it is difficult for the hiring committee to evaluate candidates’ tendencies in this area, but the candidate sometimes provides clues by the way he or she interacts with the staff who arranged for the interview. Post-interview reference checks may also provide some insight in this area.
Information and Technological Literacy
The candidate should meet the APA guidelines for information and technological literacy desired for the BA in psychology and should demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for teaching purposes. For example, applicants can list software programs for which they have reached mastery, such as spreadsheet generation for maintaining grades or presentation software for class use. This criterion also includes the ethical and responsible use of information in academic work.

Closing Tips
Community colleges are primarily teaching institutions; conducting and publishing research is not part of the community college mission. Doing research is not usually supported or even acknowledged by the college. However, psychologists at 2-year colleges are not discouraged from conducting and publishing their research; some community college faculty conduct research because they enjoy active involvement in psychology’s scientific community.

College teaching positions are highly competitive, even positions that open at 2-year colleges. Be prepared. Expect a very thorough hiring procedure. A committee will meet to review the criteria for screening the applications and will develop a set of questions to ask those invited for interviews. Take care in preparing the application form. Candidates get off to a poor start when they submit a sloppy application form (e.g., handwritten responses); a copy of the completed application is the first thing members of the hiring committee will examine. Second, if the interview requires a teaching demonstration, take time to prepare a good demonstration; the demonstration carries a good deal of weight. Finally, don't lose heart. Hiring committees don't always make the correct decision. Be aware that being invited to an interview indicates that you definitely have job-landing potential in this highly competitive market. Learn from interview experience. After the interview, candidates should write down as many questions as they can recall. They should then think about how they could have given better answers, and how they could have made an even better presentation of what they can offer the college.

It is typical for the interview process, as conducted by a group, to identify several candidates whose names are then forwarded to the college president for final interviews. Some presidents require a minimum number (e.g., three) of names be forwarded for consideration to be invited to this interview. The president, perhaps with the help of another administrator and the committee chair, then makes the final determination about whom, from those names forwarded, to offer the position. The final interviews are usually less structured, and more casual than the group interviews. Don’t allow this moment to become little more than a pleasant chat. Candidates should come to the meeting prepared to tactfully promote their qualifications. They should prepare for the final interview by having a list, in their minds, of the unique strengths they will bring to the department and the college. The list should describe how they meet the important criteria set forth in this chapter.
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19. Characteristics of Successful Community College Academicians

Ann T. Ewing

Training for a career in academia is often focused primarily on attainment of academic credentials but entails little instruction regarding acquisition of a teaching position or, subsequently, how to become a successful faculty member. In this chapter, I will draw from my 30-plus years of teaching experience and service on hiring committees at Mesa Community College to unveil the qualities that characterize those individuals who are likely to be hired and to become successful academicians in the 2-year college setting.

Mesa Community College (MCC) is the largest of 10 colleges in the Maricopa Community College District. Mesa College is located in Mesa, Arizona, and has a student body of approximately 24,000 students with a median age of 26. Mesa College is a publicly funded 2-year commuter institution, located approximately 15 minutes from Arizona State University. Many MCC students transfer to Arizona State University after 2 years and many are also simultaneously enrolled in both institutions, so called “swirlers.” The MCC student body is quite diverse in regard to ethnicity, age, and academic preparation. The Department of Psychological Science consists of 10 full time PhD faculty members, four men and six women, and about 35 adjunct faculty. Each semester, approximately 3,500 students enroll in the 25 different courses offered by the department.

Academic Preparation for Teaching
The minimum requirement for someone to teach in the Maricopa Community College District is a master’s degree in their teaching field or a master’s degree in a related field and at least 18 hours of graduate work in the specific subject area. Often there are many more than 100 qualified applicants for a full-time teaching position in psychology, so candidates must have much more than the minimum to even merit an interview when a position becomes available. Although not technically required, a PhD from a reputable program and significant teaching experience are realistic prerequisites for final selection.

When an interview committee reviews the curriculum vitae (CV) of prospective candidates, it may be looking for expertise in a particular specialty or for breadth of background. Regardless of the specifics of a given hiring situation, a solid background in statistics and research, both academic and experiential, is often highly valued. This strong research background often correlates with an emphasis on the scientific approach to the study of psychology, a perspective that the MCC Department of Psychological Science heartily embraces.
Teaching Experience Desired

During the educational process, the primary focus is on the acquisition of knowledge. When one prepares to teach, the focus shifts to an emphasis on one’s ability to effectively transmit that information and related thought processes to others. A hiring committee will be much more impressed with a candidate who can formulate an effective analogy to explain a concept than with a candidate who can explain the concept to the “nth degree.” Thus, prospective candidates who have recently graduated must learn to shift from an attempt to demonstrate how much they know to an attempt to demonstrate how well they can communicate that information to students. Teaching should be an interactive conversation that prompts students to think actively about the concepts under discussion. Because teaching experience is highly valued, prospective candidates should build a CV with documented teaching assistantships and adjunct teaching experience. It is more advantageous to acquire experience as the primary instructor in an adjunct teaching setting than as a teaching assistant. Experience teaching multiple different courses is also valued by search committees. Solid academic credentials and teaching expertise are the primary hiring considerations.

Teaching experience in statistics and research methods is particularly desirable. Many people shy away from teaching these subjects, so those who are willing and have shown competence in this area are often prized candidates. Because approximately eight sections of Statistics and four sections of Research Methods are taught at MCC each semester, search committees seek demonstrated competence to teach these subjects.

Many successful candidates get their “foot in the door” by teaching as adjunct faculty at the prospective employment site, which provides them with an opportunity to gain needed experience as well as to become familiar with the faculty, the student population, the institutional mission, and the goals of the department. It also affords the department the opportunity to observe the candidate’s ability to relate to students and manage the various tasks associated with serving as an effective faculty member. Candidates are well advised to take advantage of opportunities for adjunct teaching at a local community college while they are completing their graduate work.

Technical expertise is another valued characteristic of potential faculty members. The department expects its faculty members to utilize current technology in their course management, presentation of course material, both online and in class, and as part of the curriculum, such as teaching students how to use SPSS. Although this factor alone will not get one hired, it is a valued asset and a necessary component of effective teaching. Many students today are part of the Net Generation (individuals born after 1983) and this cohort expects faculty to be sophisticated in the use of the Web. In addition, a command of the technological tools available today may signal that a candidate is progressive and likely to prefer to be leading rather than following the pack throughout their career.

At MCC, a “micro-teach” presentation, with hiring committee members acting as students, is included as part of the interview process. This opportunity allows candidates to demonstrate
effective use of technology in their mini-lecture as well as to demonstrate active learning techniques and creative classroom presentation skills. The micro-teach session is a crucial part of the selection process because it provides the committee with a good sample of the candidate’s teaching style. The micro-teach session enables the successful candidate to demonstrate an understanding of the multiple learning styles that characterize the diverse cohorts that they will encounter in the community college classroom. Millenials, the Net Generation, constitute the largest portion of students in our classroom today and are the most technologically sophisticated group ever to enroll in college. They expect to find lecture notes available on Web sites; submit papers and communicate with their professors on line, instantly, and at all hours of the day and night. They are accustomed to multi-tasking, enjoy group work, and expect a supportive environment that sometimes feels like hand-holding to the faculty. In contrast, Generation X and Baby Boomers may sit in the same classroom and may not be as technologically sophisticated or as comfortable using the Web. They typically don’t like group projects and show much more individual initiative and responsibility for their own learning (Junco & Mastrodicasa, 2007). A successful candidate should demonstrate awareness of this type of generational diversity and address it with a variety of appropriate teaching techniques.

The micro-teach session also allows the applicant an opportunity to demonstrate effective teaching techniques. A successful candidate should demonstrate a knack for explaining concepts and ideas in simple ways, using effective analogies and real life examples. The student-professor interaction should feel more like a conversation that draws students in and involves them, rather than like a lecture. Effective teachers will frequently check for comprehension and read student’s body language for understanding, pausing often to encourage questions (Bain, 2004). The micro-teach session provides the opportunity for a demonstration of effective student engagement and active learning.

A successful candidate should be very meticulous in the completion of the formal application and thoughtful in their preparation for the interview. The candidate should anticipate what questions are likely to be asked and formulate possible responses to those questions. Following the interview, it might be helpful to write down the questions that were asked and think more about possible responses because those same questions may arise in a subsequent interview for finalists. Interviewees should look for opportunities to highlight their personal strengths and ways that they might possibly contribute to the department and college should they be hired.

**Professional Experience and Affiliation**

Practical experience in the psychology lab, the clinical world, or the industrial/organizational world is also a valued asset. Candidates who can draw from previous applied experience often bring new perspectives, applications, connections, and great practical examples to their classrooms. Candidates should emphasize their practical experiences, including research, on their CV and other application materials. If discussed during an interview, these experiences may set one candidate apart from the rest.
Another valued entry on a CV is active membership in professional organizations such as the American Psychological Association, Association for Psychological Science, Society for Teaching of Psychology, Psychology Teachers at Community Colleges, college honor societies such as Psi Chi and Psi Beta, or other regional professional groups. These affiliations demonstrate strong identification with the field and a commitment to continued professional growth, as well as interest in organizations that facilitate excellent teaching and leadership growth opportunities. A potential candidate should strive to form such connections and take advantage of the opportunities that they offer. Ideally, candidates will be interested in the scholarship of teaching and learning and strive to become scientist-educators who are knowledgeable about and engage in the science of learning. Reference to the APA Principles for Quality Undergraduate Education in Psychology (APA, 2011) would be very impressive to a selection committee.

Tacit Characteristics of Successful Academicians
So far, I have focused on some of the tangible characteristics of faculty who are likely to be hired at an institution such as MCC. Equally important, but less obvious, are the tacit characteristics that selection committees seek in a candidate. A love for teaching is a primary characteristic of a highly desirable candidate. This quality is difficult to measure but is often evidenced by an emphasis on the process of teaching. Sometimes during an interview, a good teacher will refer to the joy that is generated when a student suddenly seems to “get it” or the satisfaction that comes when a student asks a good question. Such an interest in the individual experience of each student in the classroom is often indicative of a potentially good faculty member. Candidates may benefit from including student and colleague evaluations in their initial application materials as evidence of passion and talent for teaching.

Another highly sought after characteristic of a good candidate is a willingness to go beyond the specific teaching situation in the performance of the job. This quality may be manifest in various ways but the dedicated teacher is often interested in creating many opportunities for interaction with students outside the classroom. A desirable candidate could mention eagerness to advise a psychology club or honor society or get involved with students who want to do service-learning or independent research. Dedicated teachers are passionate about their teaching, and as with any love affair, they show a constant desire to do more and to do it better. They are creative and venturesome, always searching for better ways to teach and interact with students and not afraid of trying something new that could possibly fail.

In an interview, successful candidates should be able to readily describe an example of a classroom situation that provided them with an emotional high. Typically, these candidates have a high level of energy and enthusiasm for teaching. They are also avid lifelong learners with a hunger for new information and a passion for sharing what they have discovered with others. These characteristics should surface in candidates’ written applications and teaching philosophies. Successful candidates should include letters of recommendation and contact information for individuals who can give concrete examples of their instructional creativity.
and passion for teaching. Graduate students might also look for ways to document their interest in teaching through attendance at teaching workshops as well as their publications or conference presentations related to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Finally, collegiality is a characteristic that also is hard to document but highly desirable in faculty members. This quality may be one of the most important determinants of a candidate’s eventual success and satisfaction in academia. Because teamwork is essential to optimal functioning of an academic department, a candidate who is willing to support departmental goals and to encourage colleagues becomes a potentially invaluable resource to the department. (A faculty member who fails in this regard may become a liability and may handicap the effectiveness and functionality of the entire department.) Successful candidates should carefully review the job description and the missions and goals of the department and institution prior to applying for a position to ensure that the position is a good fit for them. Although faculty are essentially autonomous in their individual classrooms, effective faculty are collegial and hold the welfare of their students and their departments in the highest regard.

For individuals who are passionate about teaching and about psychology, enjoy interacting with undergraduates, and are innovative and enthusiastic about teaching, the community college may be the ideal setting for a very rewarding academic career. In order to be successful, a candidate should carefully prepare the application, statement of philosophy of teaching, letters of recommendation, and CV to reflect strong academic preparation in psychology, practical experience, teaching expertise, and evidence of passion for both teaching and students.
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For over 50 years, Highline College has been serving the residents of South King County, Washington, near Seattle. We are a community college deeply rooted and strongly connected to our neighbors, schools, businesses, civil services, and government representatives. Our student body reflects the diversity of our community in nearly every way. Most obviously, 68% of our 17,000 students are non-white, which includes over 700 international students, numerous students from refugee and immigrant populations who come from all corners of the globe, and 1,200 high school students enrolled through Running Start, a dual enrollment program with our local high schools. In 2014, Highline College was rewarded with the Advancing Diversity Award of Excellence by the American Association of Community Colleges. Our reputation is nationally renowned. To say that diversity is at the core of our identity is an understatement.

Highline College offers a variety of educational opportunities to our community. For the 2012-2013 academic year, 25% of students were enrolled in professional-technical programs, working toward an Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree, and 36% of students were enrolled in transfer courses, working toward an Associate of Arts (AA) degree. We have strong associations with Washington State’s 4-year universities, most notably with the University of Washington and Central Washington University—nearly 90% of our transferring students will attend one of these two schools. In an effort to best serve our students, the Highline College Psychology Department maintains a close working relationship with the psychology departments at each of these institutions.

Based on employee satisfaction surveys, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* named Highline College one of America’s “Great Colleges to Work For.” We in the Psychology Department agree. Highline College provides its faculty members with a tremendous amount of professional freedom and support. On a macro (college) and micro (departmental) level, faculty may implement new initiatives without fear of being punished if such risk-taking does not pan out. For example, our department recently offered a course in collaboration with the English Department in order to better serve psychology students who speak English as a second language. The administration’s support was swift, and the class was described in the catalogue the following quarter. This example is the norm, not the exception. Additionally, Highline College invites and encourages its faculty to participate in all aspects of campus governance.
Our department maintains a supportive work environment. We have long found weekly department meetings (yes, you read that right!) to be profitable in terms of cohesion and camaraderie. As we are fond of saying, “We meet because we like each other.” This 2-hour lunch meeting, divided roughly equally among items on the agenda and social support, allows us to consult about teaching and student-issues, departmental initiatives (e.g., assessment), campus-wide involvements, and has proven to be a successful environment for supporting and mentoring new professors. Although we have a departmental coordinator, members of our faculty often take on specific roles such as managing our budget or managing our Web page. We collaboratively make decisions that affect the department, and although we may not always agree with each other, we always work toward consensus.

Highline College is first and foremost a teaching institution, which means that we are closely connected with students in every step of their academic journey. Daily classroom time (three classes per quarter, three quarters per year with optional summer teaching) and office hours, small class sizes [38 students maximum], academic advising, and personal communication all afford faculty the opportunity to provide direct educational support to our students. Sure, this deep involvement in teaching gets complicated, and at times, we must wear many different hats, but it reminds us that student learning is more than just textbooks and exams—it is also student growth and development.

**Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities**

For psychology faculty applicants, knowledge of psychology is generally demonstrated by their degree. Whereas some community colleges have a preference for people who hold a PhD, we do not. We are fine with people who have an MA or MS. What is most important is that the applicant has a solid understanding of research methods and the science of psychology.

When looking for full-time faculty, we give priority to teaching skills and abilities. The more first- and second-year courses that a candidate has taught, the greater confidence we have in knowing that candidates are interested in teaching those courses for a career. Introduction to Psychology is our workhorse course. Because of its breadth, however, it is one of the most difficult courses to teach. We prefer our job candidates to be familiar with the foundational indicators given in the American Psychological Association’s (APA’s) *Guidelines for the Major 2.0* and the recommendations regarding the content to be covered in Introduction to Psychology by APA’s Board of Educational Affairs (both of these documents can be found at [http://apa.org/ed/precollege/](http://apa.org/ed/precollege/)). Knowledge of these documents will demonstrate an understanding of the role that Introduction to Psychology plays in the psychology major for our students who choose to attend a 4-year college following their graduation from Highline College. More importantly, that knowledge will demonstrate an understanding of the role that the introductory psychology course plays in helping the educated public see the vital role the science of psychology has in people’s lives.
Teaching at a community college means being flexible. Highline College psychology courses are taught between 7am and 9:30pm. Psychology courses can be taken face-to-face, hybrid, or online. Not only does the delivery format differ but the students who take the courses also differ. Evening students, for example, tend to be older and have more family and job commitments than do daytime students. Being older, they bring with them a lifetime of experiences, but often much fear and trepidation because they have been out of school for so long. They wonder, “Will I be the oldest person in the room?” “Will I do well on the tests?” “Will I be able to write well enough?” At the other end of the age spectrum, the state of Washington, like many states, has a dual enrollment program where high school students can take college classes for both high school and college credit. It is not unusual for us to have 15- to 17-year old students in our classes. Our department tries hard to ensure that no one is teaching at a time or in a modality that does not work for them, but an applicant who has more experience with teaching at different times or through different modalities will be looked at more favorably. Perhaps a candidate has taught online before, and decided it was not for her—that is okay. We are more comfortable hiring faculty who know what works for them and what does not than faculty who have never had the experience.

Because teaching is the primary mission of community colleges, we are looking for applicants who understand what skills are needed to be a solid instructor in a culturally-diverse classroom, have evaluated their own teaching skills to identify strengths and weaknesses, and have formulated a plan for improvement. Applicants who have used a variety of teaching techniques and assessed their effectiveness demonstrate a commitment to the profession. During our interview process, applicants give a 15-minute teaching demonstration, which is aimed partly at determining the candidate’s knowledge of psychology and partly at revealing teaching technique.

We expect full-time faculty to participate in division and college governance (There are five divisions at Highline College, organized roughly around academic disciplines. The Psychology Department is within the Social Sciences Division (along with Sociology, Anthropology, History, Political Science, Geography, Economics, and Human Services)). We view applicants who express interest in or who have experience with working with committees, task forces, or work groups outside of the department more favorably than candidates who have neither an interest nor the experience. Participation in professional organizations dedicated to the teaching of psychology, such as the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (teachpsych.org), demonstrates not only a willingness to work toward becoming a master teacher, but also a willingness to give back to the profession.

Highline College has an advising office where all students can meet with an academic advisor. We encourage students to start there for general academic guidance, but then move on to a faculty advisor, especially as they become clearer on their career goals. We prefer applicants who have experience with student advising or, at minimum, understand the importance of high quality student advising.
The Hiring Process

Once the department has been given the go-ahead to recruit for a tenure-track position, a committee comprised of at least one member of the department (usually the departmental coordinator), the chair of the division, one member from the division, one member outside of the division, and one administrator will meet to create the job advertisement. This committee decides on the required as well as desired qualifications for the position. Although the members of the department are a minority on the committee, the other members of the committee generally heed the advice of the departmental members. We expect our applicants to address in their cover letter and/or CV how their experience meshes with the required and desired qualifications described in the position announcement. We also expect to receive contact information for three references who can speak to the candidate’s teaching skills. Our Human Resources department places the job ad in local and national publications and Web sites. Once the closing date passes, Human Resources forwards the completed applications to the hiring committee.

The hiring committee transforms the job qualifications into a rubric. Each committee member reviews the application packets according to the rubric and the committee meets and scores the applicants using the rubric. If there are discrepancies among committee members, a discussion ensues to address them. The committee generally invites the top candidates to campus for an in-person interview.

In addition to the actual interview and teaching demonstration, the campus visit also includes a campus tour and a visit with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs or the Dean. The interview with the hiring committee will begin with a 15-minute teaching demonstration, with the committee members playing the role of students. We ask applicants to cover classical or operant conditioning, whichever they prefer. For applicants who do not have a strong grasp of these concepts, the weaknesses will show.

Following the teaching demonstration, the hiring committee will ask 10 or so interview questions that it has created. The questions often address issues about student diversity (e.g., age, ethnicity, academic preparedness), why the candidates wish to teach at a community college, how they structure their courses, what teaching techniques they use and why, and how they envision themselves contributing to the college environment beyond the classroom. Candidates are sometimes given a classroom situation and asked to describe how they would address it. We give the questions, or most of them, to the candidates 24 hours in advance of the interview. It is important that candidates carefully consider their responses. The hiring committee will conclude the interview by asking if the candidates have any questions for the committee about the college, the department, or the students. We expect our applications to arrive for the campus visit having done some research on the college and the department, and prepared to ask at least three questions. The interview process is about the committee deciding who they want to hire, but it is also about the candidates getting a sense as to whether Highline College is a place they want to work.
The candidate’s visit with the committee is generally about an hour long. After the interview, the candidate meets with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs if he is available. Our candidates should be prepared to ask questions of him as well. Following this meeting, candidates will often meet informally with other members of the department. This meeting offers candidates a peek at who their future colleagues may be.

Some days after the interview, the committee may ask the candidate to submit a teaching portfolio. The committee will specify what should be in the portfolio. Often it includes student evaluations, sample assignments, syllabi, and a statement of teaching philosophy. Within the Psychology Department, we are not especially interested in the statement of teaching philosophy—seeing what a candidate has done is more important to us that reading about why he does what he does, especially because this information will likely be covered in the interview—but we may be outvoted by the other members of the committee.

After interviewing the candidates and reviewing the teaching portfolio, the hiring committee will usually rank order the interviewees and send the list to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, who will make the final decision. Although it is technically completely up to the Vice-President, the position typically will be offered according to the rankings of the committee.

The Tenure Process
One way to find out about job expectations at a community college (or other academic job) is to examine the criteria for tenure at that college. Every college will have a different procedure, but the procedures generally speak to the hope for what full-time faculty will continue to bring to the college. We have a tenure process at Highline College that is unique, and clearly in line with our goals for the institution.

The tenure process at Highline College is only 7 quarters long. (There are 3 quarters per school year—summer quarter is not included—so the process is really 2 years and 1 quarter long). For each of the 7 quarters, Highline College evaluates the faculty on four basic criteria: teaching effectiveness, professional growth (remaining current in the discipline and with teaching strategies), professional conduct, and service (to students, the campus, the community, and the profession).

Each new full-time, tenure-track faculty is assigned a unique “Tenure Working Committee” (TWC), composed of both faculty representatives and an administrator. There are always four members of this committee. If possible, one member of the committee comes from the new faculty member’s department, one comes from the new faculty member’s division (but not the department), one comes from outside the division, and one is appointed by the administration. The faculty members of the committee are elected by vote, but in reality the new faculty has influence on who those members can be. If pre-tenure faculty have taught at the college before, for example, as a part-time instructor, they may have preferences for certain members, but if they have not, other members of their department may suggest members for them. The TWC really has a dual role. They are responsible for evaluating the
new faculty member, but they also are responsible for mentoring and assisting the faculty in improving their professional performance.

TWC members meet with the new faculty each quarter of their “probationary” period. All TWC members also visit at least one class of the new faculty member each quarter, and describe their visit both in writing and verbally at these meetings. The TWC collects student evaluations from each class and discusses those evaluations thoroughly at these meetings. If there are any problems that arise with teaching (that the new faculty member brings up, appear in the observations of classes, or appear in student evaluations), the committee proactively addresses them by brainstorming possible solutions. We expect that different faculty will come with different experiences, so that all new faculty members are expected to grow throughout the process from wherever they started in the process. After the first year (or sooner, if the new faculty member is experienced in teaching), the committee broadens its scope and looks at what new faculty members are doing in the broader campus community (e.g., committees and activities in which they are involved, student advising). What each TWC is really looking for are new faculty members to bring their passions to the college in a way that suits them (and the college, of course) best.

The tenure process at Highline College also includes another committee for oversight: the Tenure Review Committee (TRC); this committee is primarily responsible for upholding standards for tenure. The new faculty member and his or her TWC chair meets with this committee twice a year. This committee is composed of one member from each division on campus, as well as one administrator and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs (non-voting). All observations from class visits, student evaluations, and minutes from TWC meetings, as well as a letter from the divisional chair describing how the new member is fitting into the division and contributing to it, are sent to the TRC by the TWC. However, they too, have both an evaluative charge and a mentoring charge. The TRC strives to identify any problems with the new faculty member’s professional performance early. If the TRC uncovers any problems, it ensures that the TWC is working on them so there are no surprises later in the tenure process for the new faculty member. Once a year the TRC votes to continue the tenure process (or not), and once a year the meeting checks on the new faculty member’s progress. At the end of the seventh quarter, the TRC votes one last time on whether to recommend tenure. The final tenure decision is made by the college’s Board of Trustees.

Highline College is looking for faculty who are passionate about teaching and show that passion both in the classroom and to the wider college community. This process for tenure is unlike the tenure process typical of many research or 4-year institutions primarily because there is no emphasis on research at Highline College (although Highline College very much appreciates research that faculty choose to do).
Is a Community College Career the Right Career Choice?
Community college teaching is not for everybody, but it is for faculty who love teaching, and it is one of the most rewarding experiences we can imagine. Watching students of all ages, cultures, and personal histories interact with each other in the classroom and collectively having an “Aha!” moment when the meaning of a psychological concept becomes clear to them is incredibly powerful. With a focus on the science and art of teaching, community college faculty work continuously to hone their craft.
21. New Faculty as Colleagues and Change Agents

Karen Brakke

Higher education is experiencing a dynamic phase shift brought about by new technologies, changing student demographics, greater emphasis on accountability for student learning, economic challenges, and global opportunities. College and university departments are doing their best to navigate this period of instability, and faculty play a central role in moving academic programs forward in alignment with the emerging educational landscape.

A Note on Perspective
When discussing issues of faculty community such as the introduction of new colleagues, it is important to recognize the institutional context of the author’s perspective. Although in this chapter I discuss faculty hiring in a broad framework, it is natural that my own institution provides my primary point of reference and serves as a source of examples. Spelman College (SC) is a Historically Black, residential liberal arts college for women located near downtown Atlanta. SC currently serves approximately 2,000 undergraduate students, with just over 20% of those pursuing a psychology major. Our majors have a wide range of interests and career goals; about 30% attend graduate or professional school within 2 years of graduation. Our 12 full-time and several part-time faculty continuously demonstrate commitment to student learning while engaging in teaching, scholarship, and service activities. We have a strong, collegial department that we (of course) consider to be one of SC’s best.

At our institution and others, finding the right colleagues to join the department is a major concern, and we devote much effort to the process. When faculty lines come open, our priority is in hiring new faculty who are not only well versed in the discipline but who also have the interests and competencies to help colleagues ride the wave of academic progress. Fit is, as always, that sought-for match among a candidate, the department’s needs and personalities, and the college’s mission.

Fit with the Position
The necessity of a candidate’s fit with the advertised position should be apparent, but typically a search results in several applications from marginally or non-qualified candidates. Therefore, it is important to understand why a scattered buckshot approach is not an effective approach to applying for advertised positions, especially those on the tenure track. When we develop an advertisement for a new position, we put a great deal of thought into the areas of expertise that we believe are most needed to complement our collective knowledge as well as to teach the courses that we must need covered. Once the advertisement appears, it guides our search and hiring decisions. We also are always mindful that faculty qualifications are subject to review by our regional accreditation body so
we must make sure that all faculty members have training that supports their teaching assignments. Thus, our initial review of applications serves to identify those candidates who meet the qualifications for the position. So, although it is understandably tempting for someone who is on the market to apply to a wide range of positions or just to their dream school regardless of scholarly area, it is important to understand that if the job description calls for expertise or activity with which the candidate is not familiar, then the application will probably not pass the first round of review. The first year as a full-time faculty member is challenging enough for someone who is ready to hit the ground running. An individual who must start from scratch to teach a class or initiate a research agenda will not be in a position to thrive.

It is also important to know the balance of teaching, research, and service that we expect for the position. The advertisement typically conveys this information as well. The balance would likely lean heavily toward research at a large university, whereas at a 2-year college it might lean heavily toward teaching, with up to five course assignments per term. At a liberal arts college, however, there is often greater equity among the three areas of faculty life. At our institution, for example, junior faculty typically teach three courses per semester (unless they have a course release), maintain active research labs with undergraduate research assistants, and engage in departmental and at least some college service. Because teaching undergraduates is at the heart of everything we do, we seek colleagues who share our enthusiasm for the craft of teaching, have evidenced their commitment through prior teaching activity, and have thought about how to effectively teach our students in ways that will engage them in the material and will support deep learning. We understand that individuals coming directly from graduate school or a postdoctoral fellowship may have had limited opportunities to teach their own courses, but taking advantage of opportunities to serve as a lab or adjunct instructor not only demonstrates initiative and interest in teaching, it also indicates that one knows something of what one is getting into.

Along with teaching, scholarship is an essential element of faculty life, even at many liberal arts colleges. One’s area of scholarly expertise must be compatible with the description of the position and complement the expertise represented by the current faculty. At the same time, however, faculty at many institutions must be comfortable working outside their specific areas of interest. Strong familiarity with research design and method, knowing how to read literature in different fields, and comfort in extending one’s scholarly boundaries are all essential skills. For example, we expect all faculty at our institution to support, and perhaps broaden, student research interests as well as advise students on research projects of different types. We engage students in our ongoing projects, but we also help them pursue their own interests. For these reasons, in psychology we typically prefer candidates who have earned a PhD, as this degree provides evidence of rigorous scientific training. Applicants with degrees other than a PhD may have to more explicitly address their readiness to engage in scholarly activity in their application packages. Search committees, particularly those for tenure-track positions, want to feel confident that new colleagues will support student research efforts as well as be prepared for reviews leading to tenure decisions.
Additionally, although different colleges, and even departments within a college, differ in their expected rates of productivity when making tenure and promotion decisions, many expect tenure-track faculty to publish peer-reviewed manuscripts and seek grant funding. Such expectations may tie in with the physical, personnel, and financial resources that the institution has available to support faculty research activity. For this reason, it is important to consider the fit of the institution with the candidate’s research program. A small school with few resources, for example, may be a better fit with someone who can conduct online surveys than with an applicant who requires large and expensive neuroimaging facilities.

Although applicants for faculty positions often put much thought into their scholarship and teaching priorities, the third pillar of faculty life, service, typically gets less consideration. Faculty who share in service to the department and college are essential to any institution’s success. Almost by definition, service provides greater direct benefit to the campus community than to the individual’s career progress, so some individuals may view it as a necessary burden. However, to the extent that faculty hopes that the institution will make a long-term investment in them, it is to the individual’s advantage to return that investment in service. Such activity may not weigh as heavily in tenure decisions as do scholarship or teaching, but it demonstrates good faith in the community that it supports. More immediately, though, candidates who express interest in service are attractive to faculty search committees because the service roles they take on may well lighten the overall workload of those very people who serve on the search committee. A good program will limit pre-tenure service requests of its junior faculty to manageable levels, but it is not something to be avoided entirely. Junior faculty who identify and pursue a few service areas in which they are particularly interested, and know how to diplomatically say “no” to other requests, will often be viewed as valued—and wise—colleagues.

**Fit with the Program/Department**

When new faculty are hired, they are joining a community of peers who work together to facilitate student learning, support the organizational needs of the department and institution, and represent one or more fields of study. A department whose faculty members function well together can stay focused on its mission and get the necessary work of constantly reviewing and updating itself done with minimal drama. It can also provide a very pleasant, fulfilling context for work.

In addition to collegiality, faculty are interested in working with someone who can bring new ideas and skills to the department. We need to keep changing and adapting to new technologies, new ideas, and new pedagogies. Faculty who join a department have often been trained in areas that didn’t exist when senior faculty were in graduate school. In psychology, for example, statistical modeling has gotten more complex and sophisticated in recent years as computing power has grown. We often look to junior faculty to be conversant in the latest techniques and theories so that they can help us prepare the next generation of psychology graduate students.
Furthermore, recent years have witnessed marked changes in the ways that college classrooms function; indeed the very structure of a “classroom” has been challenged through increased emphasis on community-based and global learning, research and professional internships, as well as through widespread availability of online learning environments. An applicant who demonstrates awareness of the current climate in higher education has a distinct advantage over others. Candidates who are aware of—and who express interest in participating in—trends in matters such as program assessment, inquiry-based learning, and integrative learning them are very attractive to many hiring departments.

In short, what one brings to table in terms of assessment, student mentoring, innovative and effective pedagogy, and departmental service, can be an important hiring consideration. This point is especially true when departments have to make a decision between multiple well-qualified candidates. Making the effort to consider these issues and becoming familiar with relevant resources could set an applicant apart from others who have been focusing solely on their research training and the narrow context of their teaching.

**Fit with the Institution**

One aspect of fit that is often overlooked is an applicant’s fit within the institutional culture and mission. Each college or university serves a different group of students. Different institutions may have religious affiliations, long-standing traditions, guiding philosophies or missions that give each a unique character. Some institutions serve special populations. Each institution has its own identity and its personnel collectively believe that it is special in some way. As faculty at a particular institution, we want those who join us to be excited about and committed to what we do and whom we teach.

At SC, for example, our students are almost all women of African ancestry. Social justice, leadership, and the concerns of communities of color are woven throughout our curriculum and our interactions with students. Similarly to other colleges and universities, we take pride in our institution and our students, and we expect that anyone who joins us will do the same. We don’t want to be just another job opening for someone who is applying for dozens of positions; we want to know why each applicant hopes to work specifically at Spelman, and we want to know that whoever joins us will appreciate the experiences and perspectives of our students. A candidate who is able to demonstrate commitment to SC in this regard will likely be viewed favorably. Such commitment lends support to the candidate’s fit with the institution, which in turn suggests long-term investment in our community and positive outcomes for both the department and the prospective faculty member.

In addition to understanding the institution’s identity and mission, it is important to understand faculty life and culture at each institution. This catch-all phrase includes things such as the extent to which faculty socialize with each other, administrative support in different areas, faculty governance, and the service load a faculty member might expect. Although some of these aspects of faculty life can only be learned through experience after
hiring, getting a sense of how faculty view their roles and interactions can go far in evaluating one’s fit with the institution. Again, current faculty and administrators seek candidates who are interested in forwarding the work and community of SC outside of the classroom as well as within it.

As this chapter and others in this volume suggest, faculty life is multifaceted and often hectic. It is also intensely rewarding and never dull. Finding new colleagues who share the collective vision of the institution, who can help move the academic program forward through changing times and technologies, and who will become respected and supportive peers over the years is one of the most important things we do. The more a candidate understands about an institutional community and the qualities it values in new hires, the more successful that candidate will be in finding a professional home that provides outstanding fit.
22. Preparing for a Faculty Position at Alabama State University

Tina Vazin

Alabama State University (ASU), a public Historically Black University (HBCU) located in Montgomery, Alabama, was established in 1867 as a teaching college for freed slaves. Since its initial enrollment of 113 students, it has grown to enroll approximately 6,000 students. ASU offers 32 undergraduate programs, 11 Masters programs, 3 doctoral programs, and 2 Education Specialist programs. The ASU Psychology Department has five full-time faculty with approximately 300 majors.

Graduate students preparing for academic careers at small and mid-size colleges/universities should go beyond acquiring expertise in their specialty area and perfecting their research skills. Search committees generally give preference to candidates who have demonstrated their commitment to undergraduate education by acquiring (a) outstanding pedagogical skills; (b) excellent educational technology skills such as using synchronous online technology, social media in the classroom, learning management systems, podcasts, interactive smart boards, etc.; and (c) experience with related non-instructional duties such as advising. In addition, applicants who can think creatively and innovatively about program development and show evidence of their commitment to scholarship will have an edge.

Commitment to Undergraduate Education

Pedagogical Skills
Many students who choose to attend ASU are first-generation college students seeking a supportive, nurturing academic environment, and the psychology program is committed to providing classroom experiences that meet this expectation. We expect our faculty to challenge students with high academic standards and design learning experiences that provide pathways to success. We desire faculty who continuously strive to improve teaching through self-reflection, exhibit a willingness to learn and incorporate new teaching strategies and technologies, keep up with the new developments in the field, and model the professional attributes of respect for the opinions of others, open-mindedness, and lifelong learning. Faculty should teach the value of collaboration and diversity of opinion, challenge students to think critically, cultivate the desire to continuously pursue knowledge beyond the classroom, and when possible, involve students in service-learning activities that allow them to apply their knowledge and skills in real-life settings. Achieving exceptionality in the classroom is a process that should begin in graduate school and continue throughout one’s career.
**Educational Technology**
Technology is constantly changing best-practices in education, and effective educators must keep up with emerging educational technology. Graduate teaching assistants should take the initiative to explore innovative ways to use technology to achieve their teaching goals, enhance student engagement, and create stimulating classroom environments. ASU supports the use of technology in the classroom by providing smart classrooms and professional development workshops on incorporating technology in teaching. For example, a new psychology class, Preparation for Graduate School in Psychology, provides an example of using technology to provide a personal learning environment for students. The course helps students to prepare for the Graduate Record Exam, and the learning management system we use is a Web-based program that includes diagnostics on students’ verbal and quantitative skills, self-paced learning modules that remediate specific content-area weaknesses such as analytical writing or linear equations, and post-tests to assess skill mastery. This technology assists our faculty in accomplishing the goal of effectively preparing students for graduate studies.

**Related Non-Instructional Duties**
In addition to teaching, faculty members at ASU carry a student advisement load of approximately 50 students and serve as an advisor to student organizations such as the psychology club and Psi Chi. Although these skills are usually developed through on-the-job training, a candidate for a faculty position who has experience in these non-instructional duties is highly desirable. It takes a lot of time and experience to develop the skills of an effective faculty advisor and spending years on the receiving end of advisement does not prepare one for the task—just as sitting in the passenger’s seat does not teach one how to drive.

Graduate students who plan to pursue a career in academia should take the opportunity while in graduate school to volunteer to assist willing professors with their advisement duties. Ideally, graduate students should assist several faculty advisors so they can contrast different styles and approaches to advising. Our new faculty must learn the procedural requirements of advising such as how to complete curriculum sheets; write a plan of study; transfer credit; and substitute classes. In addition, faculty assist students in reviewing career options, preparing for graduate school, and completing graduate school applications.

Most undergraduate psychology programs have psychology clubs and/or Psi Chi chapters, but rarely do graduate students take the opportunity to learn how to serve as an advisor to these programs. Prospective faculty members should take the initiative to serve as an assistant advisor and learn how to develop agendas for meetings, form collaborations with other student organizations, become familiar with student organizations’ bylaws, and learn their university’s policies on student organizations such as fundraising and financial management. Having experience in handling the logistical requirements of an undergraduate organization while teaching students leadership skills, the importance of community service, and teamwork will earn job applicants a gold star.
Innovation in Education
New faculty members at ASU will need to be familiar with developing and teaching online courses, teaching diverse groups of students, and have an open-mind to alternative course scheduling. For example, in an effort to attract more students, the ASU Psychology program formed partnerships with community colleges to recruit from the pool of over 86,000 students enrolled each year in Alabama’s 22 community colleges. Focus group and survey data from our needs assessment at local community colleges have shown that many students who graduate with associate degrees are nontraditional students who are not willing to leave their communities to continue their education. In addition, many of these students seek compressed programs that offer accelerated degree completion options. In response to this market, our program, in partnership with three community colleges, piloted an accelerated curriculum that offered 60 hours of psychology courses in 12 months leading to a Bachelor’s of Science degree. Beginning fall 2012, students enrolled in two courses for each of 10 consecutive 4-week mini-terms. Full-time faculty taught the majority of courses online, although adjunct faculty taught some of these courses onsite at various community colleges. This program required psychology faculty to (a) become adept at teaching online courses with synchronous and asynchronous formats, (b) adjust their teaching style to accommodate the learning styles of adult learners, and (c) learn to teach compressed courses.

We expect new faculty to be creative in program development and make valuable contributions to our undergraduate program with ideas that are responsive to students’ needs. Alumni surveys have indicated that approximately 56% of ASU psychology graduates pursued graduate degrees within 10 years of graduation. The majority of students who did not continue their education were unemployed or working in low-paying jobs. Thus, in an effort to better prepare all psychology graduates for career opportunities, we are developing certificate programs in related fields that complement the psychology degree and provide students with the knowledge and skills required to gain post-graduate employment. The certificate programs will require 18 hours of coursework and 300 hours of internship and will provide students with the necessary job skills and work experience for employment.

Another example of innovative programming is the current effort to develop a Master’s of Science degree program in psychology. The proposed program plans to offer specialty areas that will meet the demands of a global market place. Specialty areas will focus on global issues such as the environment and problems faced by disadvantaged populations (e.g., poverty and violence) in an effort to attract international as well as local students. These programs will provide unique educational experiences for students who are committed to solving problems faced by people around the world.

Commitment to Scholarship
The goal of our psychology program is to provide students with the knowledge and skills necessary for pursuing graduate studies in psychology and related areas. Thus, we expect our faculty members to establish a program of research and provide students with opportunities to assist with research projects. Optimally, faculty should include students in
presentations at professional conferences and in scholarly publications. During graduate school, academia-bound graduate students should gain experience supervising undergraduates in research, including conducting literature reviews and collecting and analyzing data. This experience provides opportunities for graduate students to gain important leadership and supervisory skills, while providing undergraduates with valuable research experience.

Some graduate programs have begun offering grant-writing courses, but many do not. Effective grant writing has become an increasingly important skill for new faculty members across many types of academic institutions. Graduate students should work with professors who have been successful in securing external funding and offer to assist them with the literature review or learn how to evaluate a proposal based on the specified criteria before submission. Gaining such experience is useful in learning how to review grant applications, a valuable skill that is likely to come in handy over the course of one’s career. Graduate students should become familiar with all of the acronyms in the world of grant writing and learn how to search for funding, read a call for proposals, write a narrative and budget, complete standard forms for different agencies, and how the review process works. Being able to consistently write fundable grant proposals takes a long time, and the first rejection letters often leave faculty redirecting their efforts to other endeavors less damaging to their egos. Academia-bound graduate students should not to wait until their first academic job to write their first grant proposal. Grant-writing is time consuming, and adds significantly to the workloads of new faculty, many of whom are already inundated with teaching and advising duties and committee obligations.

**Conclusion**
Preparing for a psychology faculty position at an institution such as ASU includes more than acquiring content knowledge and research skills. Tight budgets have resulted in fewer faculty positions, which places heavier workloads on existing faculty members. State-supported universities in Alabama have seen a 37.5% reduction in funding amounting to only $4,413 per student. These cuts have resulted in universities funding fewer faculty positions and cutting academic programs. When a new faculty position becomes open, the department will be attracted to applicants who, in addition to demonstrating exceptional scholarship, can “hit the ground running” and make immediate contributions in meeting the day-to-day demands of the department.
23. Seeking a Teacher-Scholar in the School of Psychological Sciences at the University of Northern Colorado

William Douglas Woody and Mark B. Alcorn

The University of Northern Colorado (UNC) is a community of approximately 12,000 students (approximately 9700 undergraduate students and 2300 graduate students; UNC, 2014) in northeastern Colorado, a 1-hour drive from Denver. UNC is a Carnegie Research Intensive Institution, offering a variety of masters and doctoral programs that attract students from around the country and across the globe. Our undergraduate population is predominantly from Colorado with approximately 36% of the student body being the first in their family to attend college. In this article, we briefly review the history of the University of Northern Colorado and in particular, the history of psychology at UNC. We then review teaching, scholarship, and service expectations for successful applicants for a tenure-track assistant professor position.

History of Psychology at the University of Northern Colorado

From its inception in 1889 as a State Normal School with emphasis on educating teachers, psychology has had a prominent role at UNC. A central aspect of education for teachers included “A knowledge of the mind as a whole, its nature, its powers, their functions and the laws which regulate mental growth, discipline and culture” (UNC, 1891-1892, p. 21). The Psychology Department at UNC initially centered the study of children (1904-1905) and then educational psychology (1905-1906) with emphasis on applications for teachers, and a separate clinic for children started in 1908 (Bessent, Hays, Shapiro & Woody, 2005). In 1915, a psychology major for a masters’ degree started, and the doctoral program in educational psychology began in 1929 (Bessent et al., 2005).

In these early years, with a national reputation for teaching psychology as well as for clean air, UNC served as a popular summer teaching destination for many scholars, including several prominent psychologists. Among others, G. Stanley Hall spent 10 consecutive summers teaching at UNC. Other prominent psychologists who taught summer classes at UNC include Lightner Whitmer, Edward L. Thorndike, Lewis M. Terman, and Anna Freud (Bessent et al., 2005).

In the 1960s, the Department of Professional Guidance and Counseling was located in the College of Education. A researcher-practitioner split slowly emerged in the department (J. B. Cooney, personal communication with B. J. Bessent, March, 22, 2005) that resulted in divisions among psychology programs and a proliferation of masters’ degrees. A psychology department, administering the undergraduate major and MA in experimental psychology,
eventually split off and relocated in the College of Arts and Sciences in 1983. In 2004, the Psychology Department migrated back to the College of Education and, shortly thereafter, merged with the Department of Educational Psychology, forming the School of Psychological Sciences in the renamed College of Education and Behavioral Sciences. The College of Education and Behavioral Sciences houses separate Departments of School Psychology, Counseling Psychology, and Counselor Education and Supervision, all of which now operate independently but collaboratively with the School of Teacher Education, the School of Special Education, and departments of Applied Statistics and Research Methods; Leadership, Policy, and Development; and Educational Technology.

Currently, the School of Psychological Sciences serves approximately 700 undergraduate majors and 300 minors and our MA and PhD programs in educational psychology enroll nearly 80 graduate students. We provide psychology content to thousands of students every year at our central and satellite campuses and online to learners across the country. We provide numerous service courses to students in other disciplines and are heavily invested in the University’s Liberal Arts Core (the general-education component of the BA degree). Our 17 full-time faculty include research psychologists in a variety of areas as well as a strong cohort of educational psychologists who are heavily invested in the masters’ and doctoral programs and who provide foundational coursework to undergraduates in the teacher education program. Below we review our expectations for a successful job applicant.

The Successful Job Applicant
The successful applicant for a faculty position in the School of Psychological Sciences must substantiate his or her fit to our position description. We want to see firm evidence or clear potential for strong teaching and programmatic research as well as a student-centered orientation that agrees with our own and is important for successful advising and mentoring. Indications of successful professional service and a willingness to participate in school governance are beneficial. During the interview process, the successful applicant will demonstrate ability, readiness, and enthusiasm to integrate into a community of teacher-scholars.

Teaching
Teaching forms 60% of our typical workload, and the importance of excellent teaching reflects our history in the School of Psychological Sciences and the larger history of UNC as well as the present and our hopes for the future. We cannot overstate the importance of high-quality instruction and mentoring. Our faculty evaluation system emphasizes effective teaching, and considerable attention is given to instructional design and student outcomes. For promotion to the highest rank, it is not sufficient to demonstrate sustained success as a researcher; one must also excel as an instructor.

Our faculty enjoy teaching. Most of us teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and develop a core of 4-6 courses that we will cycle through over a 3-4 semester period. We typically teach three classes per semester, but new faculty are granted reassignment from two classes in their first 2 years to mitigate the demands of developing classes and initiating
a research program. Beyond the first 2 years, there are other ways to alter the normal 60% teaching assignment, most typically through internal or external funding or by reassignment to service or administrative activities.

Our courses serve several goals. Some meet basic requirements for several departments (e.g., Abnormal Psychology), others provide foundations for psychology and related majors (e.g., Social Psychology), and we have a wide array of upper-division topical classes. Additionally, we have several advanced seminar classes (e.g., Introduction to Counseling Theories, Advanced Research Methods, Behavioral Genetics), and we provide opportunities for faculty to create special topics courses in their own research areas. In recent years, faculty have developed courses on diverse topics such as autism, obesity, executive function, and interrogation and confession.

We expect strong classroom instruction, but we also recognize that new faculty are typically emerging teachers and that learning to teach well is a life-long endeavor. Therefore, we match each new hire with an experienced faculty mentor who serves as a resource for new faculty in many ways, including by observing and providing feedback and guidance about teaching. This formal mentoring in instruction at the school level fits nicely among multiple university and college resources designed to facilitate professional development of our faculty. We also encourage our junior colleagues to seek informal mentoring in their areas of teaching and research—the school will actually reimburse them for taking senior colleagues out to lunch for this purpose! Finally, in each of the first 3 years, formal feedback regarding job performance is provided by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and school director with faculty permitted to elect biennial reviews thereafter. (Five-year comprehensive reviews are required when faculty seek promotion and tenure.) Although especially important for new hires, all faculty members are invited to informal individual meetings with the school director every fall. These meetings provide an opportunity for junior faculty to discuss their experiences and for the director to provide guidance for the near future and long term.

With our emphasis on instruction, we also encourage teaching through faculty-student research collaboration. We have a strong honors program and a very active Ronald E. McNair Scholars program, both of which provide resources for students and faculty advisors to assist undergraduates to build high-quality individual research projects. Beyond these formal programs, many faculty incorporate undergraduate research assistants into their research activities, sometime in collaboration with our MA and PhD students. These faculty-student interactions provide beneficial opportunities for students as well as faculty, particularly because our undergraduates gain research and presentation opportunities. Some UNC faculty take student assistants or collaborators to attend or present at international conferences where few undergraduates typically attend, including those for the American Psychology-Law Society, the Society for Neuroscience, and the American Educational Research Association, as well as to student-oriented regional conferences such as the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association convention. The School provides some funding to support undergraduate and graduate student travel for conference presentations.
Although we expect educational psychologists joining our school to participate in the advising and supervising of graduate students, new faculty in other areas of specialization may choose to do so as well when areas of interest and expertise intersect. Even faculty without formal assignment as graduate advisors may support our graduate programs by guiding a graduate teaching assistant, employing a graduate research assistant, and serving on thesis or dissertation committees. Additionally, our faculty frequently find rewarding opportunities to work with graduate students from other areas as diverse as school psychology, nursing, science education, and sport and exercise science.

**Scholarship**
Our faculty publish in top-tier journals, present at international conferences, write textbooks, and win grants. Although scholarship forms only 20% of our official workload, it is central to our collective identity as a school and to our individual identities as teacher-scholars. Therefore, promotion and tenure rest substantially on peer-reviewed publication as well as invited scholarship, presentations, grant application and procurement, and other scholarly activities. Along with our emphasis on programmatic research, we recognize that we comprise a diverse school with scholars and practitioners in a range of specialties including neurophysiology, social psychology, cognitive psychology, counseling, and educational psychology. We therefore support and positively evaluate faculty who incorporate a wide range of research topics and methods, including both basic and applied scholarship and both quantitative and qualitative methods. Our faculty also take advantage of opportunities for collaboration with scholars across campus such as in the applied psychology programs, the Math and Science Teaching Institute, Applied Statistics and Research Methods, and Gerontology. Collaboration with peers at other institutions, both domestic and international, is also common.

**Service**
Service comprises 20% of our formal workload, and as is typical for universities, we seek service commitments from faculty. We recognize, however, that starting in a new faculty role at a new university provides substantial challenges, and we therefore expect service to be commensurate with academic rank. Accordingly, we expect newly hired faculty to engage in limited service, but we then expect to see service commitments grow in amount and importance as faculty move through academic ranks to full professor, by which point most faculty will have assumed a leadership role in a service endeavor at the school, college, university, or discipline level. We strongly encourage new faculty to work with their formal and other mentors to choose service opportunities that are adaptive and limited. Generally, beginning by his or her second semester a new professor will engage in student advising. All of our faculty members advise undergraduates and many will work with graduate students as well. It is critical that our new hires have the desire to work with students in this capacity and are comfortable being highly available to advisees.

**The Interview**
Before invitations to interview are extended, the applications of candidates are subjected to a rigorous review by a faculty search committee that typically also includes one doctoral student representative. Cover letters, vita, letters of recommendation, and ancillary
materials such as reprints and teaching evaluations are scrutinized to identify finalists with the best fit to the position described in our vacancy announcement. Typically, there is an additional brief screening by phone before three candidates are invited to campus to interview.

Our interview process reflects our goals. We expect successful teacher-scholars to demonstrate their abilities in several settings during the interview, usually over 2 days. We schedule a realistic undergraduate teaching opportunity to observe teaching by prospective hires, and we require a research talk to which our faculty and graduate students are invited. At both events, feedback for the search committee is collected from the audience. Additionally, applicants interview separately with the search committee (which generally includes a student representative), school director, and college dean. There is ample opportunity at meals and between events for our interviewees to visit informally with faculty and students.

Conclusion
We hope this short chapter provides an overview of the hiring goals and procedures of the School of Psychological Sciences at the University of Northern Colorado. We expect strong teacher-scholars to engage students in many ways and to conduct programmatic research while maintaining rank-appropriate service commitments, and we provide resources to support faculty development and success in these areas. Beyond all of the ideas described previously, we also seek to hire warm, engaging, collegial individuals who can motivate students and inspire colleagues in ways that go beyond formal evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service.
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One hundred and thirty years ago, the vast majority of postsecondary schools in the United States, about 80%, were tied to religious organizations (Noseworthy, 2003). These days the percentage is much smaller. In 2012, 746 institutions (or 19.6%) described themselves as religiously-affiliated (RA) among the 3800 degree-granting, 2- and 4-year private non-profit colleges and universities in the United States (IPEDS, 2014). These data point to a significant decrease in the overall proportion of RA institutions in the U.S. compared to a decade earlier. In 2001 about 980 RA schools comprised 20% of all public and private colleges (including for-profit schools; Knapp, Kelly, Whitemore, Wu, & Gallego, 2003) whereas in 2012 RA institutions represented only 15.9% of such schools (Snyder & Dillow, 2013). Nonetheless, although RA institutions may no longer dominate college teaching as they once did and their overall numbers may be slipping, they still represent a notable segment of the American educational enterprise. Many future psychology faculty will consider applying to teach at one or more RA schools. What might or should such applicants consider in doing so?

Every department filling a tenure-track position ultimately asks itself how well a candidate would fit into its overall mission and culture over the long term. Similarly, candidates must ask themselves frankly whether for (potentially) an entire career they could entertain working within that institutional mission and specific departmental culture.

RA schools differ considerably in their mission and cultural identity. Consider the differences across what I will broadly term religiously-confessing, guided, and historical institutions. (I will omit discussion of religiously-missionary or proselytizing schools like Bible colleges or seminaries that primarily seek to train their students for ministry within a specific denomination.) Confessing schools adhere to an explicit faith tradition that informs both academic and nonacademic activities of the institution in a more or less pervasive fashion. Religiously-guided schools identify themselves with a specific faith tradition, which in turn, affects selective aspects of the institution's work. These aspects might include core courses in religious studies, campus ministry outreach to the school as a whole or to resident dormitories, regular spiritual retreat weekends, volunteer service programs, and observance of religious holidays such as Yom Kippur or Good Friday. Religiously-guided schools are generally welcoming of students and faculty of other traditions or even no faith. Finally, schools may have an historical bond to a specific religious tradition that continues to affect campus life and practices in mostly a residual fashion. My own setting, Le Moyne College, is a Carnegie Masters II, private, Catholic school with approximately 2600 FTE undergraduates.
and 400 FTE graduate students. Founded by the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) in 1946, Le Moyne would likely fit under the religiously-guided label.

Applicants to an RA school should identify the type of RA school to which they are applying. They should research the school's (a) overall mission statement, (b) history, and (c) any formal presentations outlining the goals and expectations for members of the college's community. School websites, particularly sub-pages connected to the president's office, usually provide such data. Virtually all institutions have their latest catalog posted online and applicants should read it. If the religious tradition of a school is foreign to applicants, they ought to address that lack of knowledge or understanding directly. Minimally, a candidate should research the explicit values and historical character of the founders or continuing religious sponsors of a school. Applicants at a Catholic college in the Benedictine tradition would not strengthen their employment chances with an interview comment such as "I figure that Benedictines are just like Jesuits or Franciscans." Job candidates can usually expect to be asked explicitly by deans, chairs, or their equivalent about the institution's mission statement and how they see themselves fostering or supporting the goals expressed in that statement. Other interviewers may pose similar questions. A candidate ought not only to know a school's goals, but be able to hold an informed conversation about them.

Other components of the culture of a RA school include other faculty members, the student body, behavioral and dress standards, the use of religious iconography in its décor, and the curriculum. Applicants need to get a sense of the composition and culture of both the departmental and school faculty. An obvious question directed by candidates to interviewers might be, "Would you tell me something about how the faith tradition of this college affects the life and teaching of its faculty members?" In many religiously-guided or historical schools, the impact might be quite indirect, but in confessing schools, the effect is usually much broader. Thus, although no explicit test of faith may be used in hiring, adherents to the school's faith tradition often form a significant minority or even majority across the teaching staff even in religiously-guided institutions. In many confessing institutions connected with a specific church or denomination, instructors may need to be “truly willing to affirm its doctrines and have those doctrines inform their faculty work” (Mock, 2013; para. 15). In doing so, applicants may be asked to sign a specific credal statement of belief. Nonetheless, there is tremendous variability across religious schools about how broadly or loosely the religious tenets of an institution extend into the lives of its faculty. Thus, applicants need actively to ascertain the specific expectations schools have for their faculty on matters of religious belief and practice. They should closely examine a school's policy on non-discrimination or affirmative action (or note the absence of such a policy). It is beyond the scope of this essay to survey the legal rights of both institutions and individual instructors under American constitutional, federal, or state law regarding employment standards in RA schools. But, in general the federal courts including the Supreme Court have given religiously-confessing and religiously-guided institutions significant leeway in establishing broad standards to which academic instructors are bound to adhere as a condition of their employment (Robinson, 2014). Finally, the student body itself may contain a sizeable proportion of followers of the school's religious tradition, for example, at Le Moyne, about
65% of our students identify themselves as Roman Catholic. Potential faculty might be asked by interviewers how their teaching would respect the cultural roots and religious outlook of such students.

There are relatively few explicit behavioral or, even, dress standards at religiously-guided or historical schools though confessing colleges often expect their faculty to act or dress in specific ways. Le Moyne mandates no religiously-sanctioned behaviors or dress standards beyond general academic professionalism. Yet, parallel to their requirements for doctrinal fidelity, confessing schools might forbid male beards, drinking alcohol, cohabitation by unmarried faculty, or non-heterosexual marriage even in states with more inclusive marriage laws. As Mock (2013) described, “a former faculty member at George Fox [the author’s institution] terminated an on-campus interview at a famous East Coast evangelical college when the department chair demanded she return to her hotel room and change from slacks to a dress, the appropriate apparel for any female faculty member at the institution” (para. 15). Applicants ought to inquire discretely about such issues with the department chair or other interviewers. Note, too, that the architecture and decorative motifs of a school may reflect its religious tradition. For example, most classrooms at Le Moyne have crucifixes attached to the wall above the white boards at the front of the class. Their presence is considered to be an expression of the school's mission and potential faculty might not always grasp the affective importance of such religious iconography. Thus, I would caution job applicants in making negative or disparaging comments about religious aspects of a school's use of religious symbols in its décor.

Pedagogical, curricular, and research activities are central to the professional identity of teachers. In religiously-guided and historical institutions psychology faculty are usually completely free to teach what and how they choose and to carry out scholarly work in whatever direction their investigations take them. But it is noteworthy that 40.5% of the censures on academic freedom issued by the American Association of University Professors between 1990 and 2013 were to RA institutions (15 of 37 censures including four Baptist, four Catholic, two Presbyterian, two Methodist and one each to Mormon, Seventh Day Adventist and “non-denominational Judeo-Christian” schools; "Academic freedom censure list, 1930-2013," 2014). Applicants should weigh their own scholarly agenda and pedagogical expectations in light of the mission and cultural standards of an RA school, particularly confessing colleges, to which they might apply. Usually these will not conflict. However, if there were any suspicion that such a conflict might arise, it would be prudent to air these with interviewers in a measured but explicit way.

I have served on a half-dozen psychology hiring committees at Le Moyne and know generally what I hope to find in a potential colleague: enthusiasm for students and for teaching, a willingness to serve the department's needs collaboratively and energetically, the potential for reasonable scholarly productivity, and a general openness to and respect for the values of our college's mission, which is rooted in the Catholic and Jesuit tradition. I don't know in any formal sense the explicit faith commitment of many of my colleagues on the faculty, but,
I do have an experience of mutual respect on matters of faith and the Catholic and Jesuit
tradition at Le Moyne. I would judge that we have hired very well, indeed.
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25. Prospects for the New Professoriate at Brigham Young University

Harold L. Miller, Jr., Diego Flores, and Veronika Tait

Brigham Young University (BYU) annually matriculates approximately 45,000 undergraduate students at its three campuses (in Laie, HI, Provo, UT, and Rexburg, ID) and approximately 3,000 graduate (master’s and PhD) students at its Provo campus. The latter is listed in the basic Carnegie classification of RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity; Carnegie Foundation for the Improvement of Teaching, 2010). Its graduate school is Carnegie-classified as Doc/Prof (doctoral, professional dominant). It is unique within these classifications because of its exclusive ownership by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (hereafter, LDS Church). The question we take up here is whether the fact of that ownership has unique implications for those in the new professoriate who aspire to join the BYU psychology faculty in a tenure-track position at its Provo campus. In other words, are there unique qualifications of acceptable applicants that are distinct from the qualifications sought by psychology departments at other institutions in the United States that are owned by, sponsored by, or otherwise affiliated with formal religious organizations?

The short answer is yes. To be an acceptable applicant—at least at present and in the foreseeable future—one is preferably a member in good standing of the LDS Church. Although other institutions may have a similar insistence where their own religious adherents are concerned, it may be worth inquiring whether BYU’s psychology department is otherwise unique in its practice of faculty hiring. This question prompts a longer answer.

The university’s mission is succinct: “to assist individuals in their quest for perfection and eternal life” (Brigham Young University Graduate Catalog, 2013-2014, 2013, p. 5). It seeks “the balanced development of the total person” in an “environment enlightened by living prophets and sustained by those moral virtues which characterize the life and teachings of the Son of God” (p. 5). The success of the mission rides on four goals: That every student is “taught the truths of the gospel of Jesus Christ,” that students “receive a broad education,” that students also “receive instruction in the special fields of their choice,” and that “scholarly endeavor among both faculty and students” be both essential and encouraged (p. 5).

As a complement to the mission statement, the university administration articulated four aims of a BYU education. The first is that it be “spiritually strengthening.” Specifically, each faculty member should “keep his subject matter bathed in the light and color of the restored gospel” (Brigham Young University Graduate Catalog, 2013-2014, 2013, p. 6). Doing so is consistent with the “common purpose of all education at BYU—to build testimonies of the restored gospel of Jesus Christ.” All at the university are “brothers and sisters, seeking
together to master the academic disciplines while remaining mastered by the higher claims of discipleship to the Savior” (p. 6).

The second aim is an “intellectually enlightening” education. Specifically, “members of the BYU community rigorously study academic subjects in the light of divine truth” (Brigham Young University Graduate Catalog, 2013-2014, 2013, p. 7). Third among the aims is an education that is “character building”: “This process begins with understanding humankind’s eternal nature and ends with the blessing of eternal life, when human character reflects in fully flowered form the attributes of godliness” (p. 9). Ultimately, students’ “character begins to resemble [Christ’s], not just because they think it should but because that is the way they are” (p. 9). The final aim is “lifelong learning and service.” The university’s success in meeting all four aims means that “the lives of its students will confirm Brigham Young’s [the university’s founder’s] confidence that education is indeed ‘a good thing,’ blessing all those who humbly and faithfully use it to bless others” (p. 10).

The psychology department embraces the university’s mission and aims and additionally asserts that: “The mission of the Psychology Department is to discover, disseminate, and apply principles of psychology within a scholarly framework that is compatible with the values and purposes of Brigham Young University and its sponsor” (Brigham Young University Graduate Catalog, 2013-2014, 2013, p. 176). By itself, mere membership in the LDS Church is insufficient as a desideratum for faculty hiring. Integral to the successful applicant’s qualifications are familiarity with the church’s doctrine and policy and a demonstrably orthodox adherence to them. The latter is documented formally by the applicant’s direct ecclesiastical officer. The applicant should not only know the restored gospel and exemplify its precepts but should also espouse its truth and the divinity of its origin. Doing so presumably would qualify the applicant spiritually for the important roles of nurturing students’ testimonies while concurrently contributing to both the breadth and the specialization of their BYU education. On this view, BYU is a faithful community that also is scholarly rather than the obverse.

The psychology department recruits applicants for full-time faculty positions through advertisement in employment listings published by the Association for Psychological Science and the American Psychological Association. In addition to providing the ecclesiastical endorsement described above, applicants supply curriculum vitae, personal statements of interest, and letters of recommendations. A faculty committee appointed by the department chair maintains a roster of applicants and, in a faculty meeting held during the fall semester, shares its ranking of applicants and the accompanying rationale with the faculty. It is not unusual for one or more faculty members to be familiar with those the committee recommends, as many of them are BYU alumni/ae. Following conversation, a faculty vote determines those who will be invited to campus during the early months of the new year. The chair then forwards the list to the dean and academic vice president for their approval (or veto). Once on campus, the applicant has a 2-day agenda consisting of private and small-group conversations with faculty members; a classroom presentation in an undergraduate course of the applicant’s choosing; a public lecture featuring the applicant’s
research; separate interviews with the chair, dean, and associate academic vice president; and a culminating interview with a general authority of the LDS Church. Within a week following the applicant’s visit, the faculty meets to assess the applicant’s merits vis-à-vis the department’s needs and expectations. By vote, the faculty determines whether to recommend that a contract be offered the applicant. The dean, academic vice president, or university president may elect to veto the faculty’s recommendation.

Once hired, the university administration expects new faculty members to participate in a series of employment-related seminars conducted by the central administration and also by colleges during the initial year of employment. Of particular importance are the criteria for successful performance in the interim third-year review of candidacy for “continuing status” (which is akin to academic tenure) and the final seventh-year review. The two reviews may be considered formative and summative, respectively. Candidates for continuing status who are rejected at either review may receive an additional year’s contract in order to find employment elsewhere.

The review process at both junctures originates with the faculty candidate, who drafts an extensive self-report according to a detailed template. This process may occur in consultation with a faculty mentor appointed by the department chair early in the new faculty member’s first year. The full report subsequently is considered within the department, where the faculty members already granted continuing status vote to advance the candidacy or not. A faculty rank-and-status committee and the department chair provide official recommendations to the college dean and college committee. This quartet of recommendations is received by a university-wide committee and by the academic vice president, whose recommendations inform the final decision rendered by the university president. The annual review of faculty contracts follows a similar, if less arduous, protocol.

Our review of the documents that detail the criteria for rank-and-status decisions at the respective levels of review affirmed consistent priorities. Foremost is a record of scholarly productivity, with publications in peer-reviewed outlets being paramount. The psychology department employs its own, revisable, rating system for estimating the scholarly status of publications. Book chapters, book reviews, grant applications, and presentations at professional meetings are evaluated less stringently and carry notably lower weight in the decision.

Of lesser consequence for the rank-and-status decisions are the candidate’s teaching performance and professional contributions otherwise as a departmental “citizen.” The evaluation of teaching relies heavily on university-administered student evaluations and less so on the report of a departmental committee of peers. Mean ratings and students’ written comments are influential factors in the decision making. New faculty members typically have a light teaching load (e.g., one course per semester as opposed to two or more) during their first year so as to be able to ease into the teaching role and routine while simultaneously establishing their research operations. The criteria applied in evaluating departmental citizenship are loosely defined in contrast to those for scholarship and
teaching. Typically, they refer to faculty-committee membership, mentorship of students, and professional contributions on a volunteer basis within the local community as well as within the profession regionally and nationally.

Recently the department faculty voted to furlough the master’s degree program and to concentrate graduate education in two PhD programs—clinical and general (consisting of specialties in behavioral neuroscience, development, and applied social psychology). Though the longer-term consequences of this decision are unknown, it may well accentuate the requirements of scholarly productivity in the continuing-status criteria. At the same time, it may loosen the longstanding primacy of undergraduate education as the department’s forte in favor of the markedly more resource-intensive education of doctoral students and training of postdoctoral fellows.
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26. The Successful Job Applicant at Kennesaw State University

Amy M. Buddie

Kennesaw State University (KSU), located about 25 miles northwest of Atlanta, is the third-largest state university in Georgia with nearly 25,000 total students, mostly (92%) at the undergraduate level. There are 97 undergraduate and graduate degree programs. The university has experienced enormous growth in the last decade in student population, faculty hiring, and physical facilities. Our student-faculty ratio is currently 21-1. Our Carnegie classification is Master’s L: Master’s Colleges and Universities (larger programs).

The Psychology Department at KSU

The Department of Psychology is housed in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at KSU. It is the largest college on campus and consists of nine departments. The department contains 26 full-time and 20 part-time faculty members. We currently have approximately 1,350 majors; this number has more than doubled over the last 10 years, making us one of the largest majors in the university. We offer a Bachelor of Science in Psychology; we do not currently offer a graduate program. We have recently restructured our major to align with the APA guidelines for the undergraduate major (APA, 2012).

The Importance of Teaching

Our department places a great deal of emphasis on excellence in teaching. We have award-winning teachers who are well versed in the literature on good teaching and whose scholarship revolves around teaching and learning issues. Members of our department coordinate the Southeastern Conference on the Teaching of Psychology (SETOP), the Georgia Undergraduate Research in Psychology (GURP) conference, participate as readers for the Advanced Placement (AP) exams every year, have served as officers in Division 2 (Society for the Teaching of Psychology) of the American Psychological Association, and serve as editors and reviewers for the journal *Teaching of Psychology*.

Therefore, we take candidates’ teaching experiences and teaching philosophy very seriously. During the on-campus interview, candidates give a job talk for an audience of both faculty and students. We place a great deal of weight on our student evaluations of the candidate’s presentation, so candidates should target their presentation to an undergraduate level and treat it as a teaching talk. We look favorably on candidates who know and use research-based, effective teaching strategies (e.g., being interactive with the audience, using diverse instructional strategies, generating enthusiasm for the topic). The candidates should also appear comfortable speaking in front of the group (we understand that being a little nervous is normal) and especially importantly from the student perspective, friendly and helpful, the kind of person from whom they would want to take a class in the future.
In our department, we usually indicate that we are looking for a candidate with a particular teaching emphasis (e.g., diversity, developmental, research methods/statistics). In their applications, candidates should make it clear that they have these teaching experiences and that they've taught these courses well (e.g., providing student evaluations of teaching or classroom observation feedback). Candidates who have not taught the courses listed in the advertisement should be prepared to strongly make the case regarding why they could do so (e.g., research interests in those areas, coursework).

Our department is understaffed and thus, we need faculty members who can ideally teach core courses in the curriculum. When possible, graduate students should gain teaching experiences in common core courses rather than specialty courses. In particular at KSU, we place a heavy emphasis on our research sequence, so candidates who have a desire to teach research methods and experimental psychology will be particularly impressive.

KSU is increasingly offering courses in online and hybrid formats, both in response to student (and faculty) demand as well as due to space limitations on campus. We have a rigorous process for certifying online courses through Quality Matters (https://www.qualitymatters.org/), and there is a great deal of training available on campus for faculty who wish to teach online and hybrid courses. Candidates who have experience teaching online or hybrid courses (or a willingness to do so) should highlight their background in their application materials and during their interview.

**Mentoring Students**
Our department has a strong history of student mentoring, both for Undergraduate Teaching Assistants (UTAs) and research assistants. In both cases, students work closely with their faculty mentor and engage in substantive academic work; they do not simply do clerical jobs or engage in rote research tasks. For example, both UTAs and research assistants earn academic credit and the department provides them with syllabi containing learning objectives and assignments. UTAs sign confidentiality agreements and engage in such tasks as grading, creating assignments and lesson plans, holding office hours, coordinating tutoring sessions, and even teaching class sessions, all under the supervision of their faculty mentor. UTAs learn about research on teaching and even occasionally carry out scholarship of teaching and learning projects. Research assistants typically engage in all aspects of the research process, including research design, data collection, data analysis, and presentation/publication. Most research assistants present their work at undergraduate, local, regional, national, or, sometimes, international conferences.

Candidates for positions in our department would do well to include details in their application materials regarding their experiences mentoring and supervising undergraduates, either as research or teaching assistants. It is especially important to include information about the ways in which students have meaningfully engaged in research or teaching experiences; it should be clear that the experiences were high impact for the students (Kuh, 2008). Candidates who have not yet involved undergraduates in their
research should include details in their application materials about how they will in the future include such mentoring and supervision in their scholarship.

Research
KSU has historically been considered a teaching-focused institution; however, the criteria for tenure and promotion have shifted recently. As is true with many other institutions and departments (Green, 2008; Youn & Price, 2009), scholarly productivity, especially peer-reviewed publications, has become increasingly important. The current teaching load is relatively high—21 hours over the course of an academic year, not including summers, or approximately 7 courses—so research productivity is not expected to be as high as it is at research-intensive universities. However, a publication record will be necessary in order to be successful in our department. The bad news is that resources are somewhat scarce; there is very little lab space available, and what is available will likely be shared with other colleagues. There is some internal funding for resources, but these are competitive grants. The good news is that many faculty in our department collaborate with each other on research, so there is a built-in on whom community of scholars to rely. In addition, we have a well-run subject pool and talented undergraduates with whom to work. The majority of the faculty in our department engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning, which is not only valued by the department and university for tenure and promotion purposes, but also has the added benefit of helping our faculty stay current in the literature on good teaching while simultaneously being relatively inexpensive to conduct.

Given these realities, our department will want to see evidence that a candidate’s research can be realistically conducted at our institution. If the research necessitates a great deal of space, it might be necessary to collaborate with faculty at larger institutions. There should be a plan in place for purchasing any equipment the candidate might need for his/her research. It is absolutely essential that candidates mention how they will meaningfully involve undergraduates in their research program. We also look favorably on the scholarship of teaching and learning, so candidates who have these sorts of interests, even as a secondary research interest, should mention so in their application materials.

Service
Faculty members in our department are very active in service and are often leaders on campus in various service initiatives. Our department values service at all levels—department, college, university, discipline, and community. Our institution as a whole has placed emphasis in particular on community engagement, so candidates who can add to this initiative will be highly valued. However, it is important to note that service activities are not typically rated as highly as teaching and research when making hiring decisions.

Departmental “Fit”
In all faculty searches at all institutions, search committees are looking for candidates who will fit well with their department. Our department values excellence in teaching, mentoring students, a solid publication record, research that involves undergraduates, and a willingness to pitch in and be a good departmental citizen. We are also committed to diversity, multiculturalism, and social justice issues, which is reflected in the research and teaching
interests of many of our faculty. When we hire someone, we are looking for an individual whom we think will share those values.

In addition, hiring committees, whether explicitly or implicitly, often ask themselves the following questions: Will this person be a good colleague? Someone with whom we will like spending time over the next 5, 10, 15, 20+ years? Does this person really want to be at KSU, or does he/she wish to be at a different kind of institution, and KSU is a fallback position? Does this person want to be at KSU for the right reasons (e.g., because his/her values align with ours) or the wrong reasons (e.g., because Atlanta’s weather is mild in the winter)? Are we confident that this person will achieve tenure and promotion when the time comes? Concerns in any of these areas can consciously or unconsciously affect hiring decisions.

Finally, it is important to remember that the interview is as much about the candidate interviewing us as it is about us interviewing the candidate. Candidates should ask lots of questions during the interview and make sure that a KSU position is the kind of job they want and the kind of place they want to work. No one wins when candidates accept positions where they know they won’t be happy.

**Thriving in the First Year and Beyond**

Although our expectations for new faculty are high, the department, college, and university provide many useful resources to help our faculty succeed. For example, new faculty members usually receive a favorable teaching load (e.g., several sections of the same course) in order to help with the transition. There are several internal grants that faculty can apply for to help them jump-start their research agendas. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) at KSU hosts a well-reviewed New Faculty Orientation at the beginning of the semester as well as workshops, book clubs, and retreats focused on teaching, mentoring students, and the scholarship of teaching and learning that can help new faculty get up to speed. The Distance Learning Center (DLC) is available to help faculty who wish to teach online or hybrid courses. There are many other campus resources available, and the existing faculty in our department are genuinely eager to help new faculty succeed.

**Conclusion**

In sum, candidates who apply for a position in the Psychology Department at Kennesaw State University should be able to demonstrate that they (a) are excellent teachers who care about teaching and take a scholarly approach to their teaching, (b) have a promising record of scholarly publications and can involve undergraduates in their research, (c) have a record of and willingness to engage in important service activities, and (d) are willing to work hard and be good departmental citizens.

**References**


27. Four Desirable Qualities for Teaching at a Small Liberal Arts College

Ruth L. Ault

Davidson College is a private, liberal arts, baccalaureate college, located in Davidson, NC (just north of Charlotte). The 1950 degree-seeking students, virtually all of traditional college age, hail from 46 states and 39 countries (4.7% are international). Half are men, 20.5% are students of color, 42% are on need-based financial aid. Davidson is a “highly selective” institution, consistently ranked by US News and World Report in the top 20 for national liberal arts colleges. The student/faculty ratio is 10:1. Of the 170 full-time faculty, 93% have tenure or are on tenure-track; 96% have earned the highest degree in their field.

Recognizing that it is difficult to distill a long list of potentially desirable qualities, I have chosen to focus on four that I look for when selecting applicants to interview and subsequently hire as a new assistant professor.

Love Teaching – It’s not an Afterthought, It’s a Requirement

Although you can assert your love of teaching in cover letters and statements of teaching philosophy, there is no substitute for actual experience. Full responsibility for teaching a course is better than being a teaching assistant, which is better than nothing. It is unlikely that you will have taught at a school comparable to Davidson (such schools do not tend to hire pre-PhD adjuncts or lecturers), but the closer you can come to that situation, the better. For example, if you can teach a section of a survey course (developmental, social, abnormal, etc.) at your PhD-granting university, even if your enrollment is 100 rather than our size of 30, that will make you more desirable than teaching a 500-person section of Introduction to Psychology (our size is 40) or teaching 30 students at a local community college (students are too different).

Be realistic about what courses you are prepared to teach. Unlike a department of just two or three people, one of our size (9-10 FTE) allows each person to specialize, so we expect you to have extensive background for teaching your course list. Taking one graduate-level course in a topic is not sufficient. When candidates boast that they can teach anything in the discipline, our suspicions are aroused that the person does not understand the rigor of our courses or the caliber of our students.

Be truly interested in and capable of teaching at all undergraduate levels. Most members of the department teach Introduction to Psychology, a sophomore-level survey course, a junior-level research-intensive course, and a senior-level seminar. These call for different teaching styles and steadily increasing expectations about what students are capable of doing. Although new PhDs are unlikely to have had this breadth of experience, your
A liberal arts focus means, among other things, that students have a range of academic interests. To the extent that faculty share that breadth of focus, there is a desirable compatibility. Faculty office hours and open-door policies invite interaction with students outside of class. If your research focus is so heavy that you do not have time to meet with students, your goals are incompatible with our interests.

Have a realistic idea of what the teaching load entails. Without graduate students, you are unlikely to have a teaching assistant, although you might have an undergraduate assistant if you teach statistics, and work-study(secretarial) assistance will be available for some simple course-preparation chores. Schools of our caliber vary widely in the number of courses and different course preparations faculty will have per year. Being unfamiliar with a college’s teaching expectations will make you seem at best, naïve, and at worst, unacceptable. Therefore, talk to faculty at undergraduate colleges before you hit the job market.

**Have a Research Program Compatible with an Undergraduate Environment**

Bright undergraduates will want to work on research projects, not merely as data collectors but as thoughtful, if inexperienced, collaborators. If your research is so highly specialized that only trained post-docs can be helpful or if it is done in settings that undergraduates have no access to, then we would not be interested in your candidacy.

Be interested in a broader range of research questions than you probably trained for in graduate school. Some students will approach you to supervise their senior thesis or other independent research on a topic they are interested in, as well as to work with an on-going project you have. Although you would not be expected to accommodate all inquiries, you would be expected to supervise some.

Schools differ considerably in the space they can provide you and the research support they can offer. My school happens to be fairly generous on both counts. However, we do not
pretend to compete with major research universities. If you need highly specialized and expensive equipment for your research, you had better be able to collaborate with others who have that equipment or be able and willing to write grants to acquire it.

Scholarship is expected. It would be a mistake to assume that liberal arts colleges are interested only in classroom teaching. Successful candidates have several journal publications or have even co-authored book chapters before obtaining their PhD, especially if they have lingered for a while in graduate school. Many colleges like mine would rank teaching and scholarship/research of equal importance, and the latter matters for promotion, tenure, and keeping yourself marketable in case the unthinkable happens. When we solicit outside reviews of an assistant professor’s scholarship for tenure and promotion consideration, we say (and mean) “quality is more important than quantity.” We judge favorably publications of textbooks or pedagogical aids, research on the pedagogy of teaching, as well as more traditional top-tier research journal articles. If you dislike research and think of teaching as a way to avoid doing any more, then you are not going to be happy or successful at a school like Davidson.

Have the Right Attitude
We value collegiality, collaboration, cooperation, and good departmental and college citizenship. To prepare yourself, you can gain experience by being on research or teaching teams, and you can serve on a graduate school committee. You could also be involved in professional associations’ graduate student groups (e.g., APAGS or STP’s Graduate Student Teaching Association) or help a professor put on a conference. Such activities can not only teach you more about the profession but also demonstrate your interest in committee or service work. To get past the paper application stage and be invited for an interview, you need to make sure these personal qualities are highlighted, most likely by those who write letters of recommendation for you.

Communicate Well
To be able to communicate effectively is important in every area of academic life, but at a college that emphasizes teaching in particular, you will probably be involved in some writing-across-the-curriculum initiative. Your own writing skills will be critically appraised, from your cover letter (which you have, of course, proofread) to your sample syllabi to your professional publications. If you are not currently a strong writer, get help until you are. The payoff for this hard work will be improvement in your ability to teach students to communicate better, both in writing and orally, as both modalities require the same organizational skills and precision in thinking.
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To the harried graduate student who is too busy training or preparing job applications to read further, we offer this general advice: *Train for the job you really want, or at least apply for the job you have demonstrated that you can do.* There is no single prescription for success on the academic job market or afterward. This statement is true because different kinds of institutions have different expectations for their faculty members, and every institution has unformalized traditions that may differentiate it from similar institutions. To help illustrate this point, we comment on some generic factors that influence faculty hiring and new-faculty success at a mid-level public institution like Illinois State University (ISU), while also noting relevant factors that may be peculiar to ISU.

Historically, academic positions have been advertised and thought of in terms of a specific area of scholarly expertise, but as we illustrate, this notion is only one of many variables that identify a candidate as promising at our institution. Our take-home suggestion is every academic position is a fuzzy concept with a unique constellation of desired applicant characteristics that is heavily affected by quirks of the host institution. No single candidate may have all of these characteristics, but it would be a mistake for any applicant to undervalue the multi-faceted nature of new faculty screening and development. This key point may be especially true at an institution like ISU, which has features in common with both teaching-intensive liberal arts colleges and research-focused universities.

**The Context: Our Institution and Department**

ISU is a public Research-Intensive University that formerly was a teacher-preparatory college. We serve over 20,000 undergraduates (most from Illinois) in a wide variety of academic programs and about 1,500 graduate students in 86 masters and 14 doctoral and specialist programs. In recruiting, ISU competes with other state universities for undergraduates who are not going to private universities or the state flagship university. The average ACT score of admitted undergraduates is approximately 24, with nearly 1 in 5 students coming from an underrepresented group.

ISU’s psychology department is one of the largest on campus, with 36 full-time faculty and about 600 undergraduate majors and about 250 minors. We provide thousands of general education seats in introductory-level courses, and thousands of seats in Educational Psychology and Adolescent Development to the large teacher-education programs on campus. The department serves about 150 graduate students, with the majority in MA
curricula (Clinical-Counseling, Cognitive and Behavioral Sciences, Developmental, Industrial/Organizational-Social, and Quantitative Psychology) and the remainder in specialist and PhD programs in school psychology.

Most of the faculty have a nominal teaching load of three courses per semester but because high-enrollment courses count double, faculty are responsible for only two preparations: one large lecture course and one smaller course with at most 40 advanced undergraduates or 20 graduate students. Given the size of our faculty, most members need to prepare only a few courses, with most of these related to their central areas of competence. Due to our heavy service-teaching responsibilities, however, many faculty members also will exercise generalist muscles by occasionally teaching an introductory-level course.

A critical component of the teaching mission at ISU involves supervising undergraduate research. A large proportion of our majors seek independent study experiences in research, and a sizeable minority elect to complete a senior thesis or other research-related capstone experience. Most of our MA students complete a thesis and all doctoral students complete a dissertation. Thus, we mentor many student researchers at many levels of expertise, something that is possible in part because our faculty are surprisingly productive in research for an undergraduate-intensive institution.

**Hiring**

Our screening of applicants for faculty positions follows a familiar three-stage process: inspecting application portfolios, interviewing a short list of applicants by telephone, and inviting a few applicants for a campus interview. Below are some comments on what we look for in this process.

*Subject-Matter Expertise*

Competence in the advertised subject matter area is a must. However, because the department has many teaching needs and many collaborative opportunities, we value candidates whose interests may cut across multiple subject areas or who demonstrate a generalist streak. From the department's perspective, a colleague who can do many things is more valuable than one who can do only a few things.

*Communication Style*

In recruiting new faculty, the department places a lot of attention on quality of communication. The department’s teaching mission, a diverse faculty, and a campus culture of inter-area collaboration all place a premium on clarity of spoken expression and astute audience sensitivity. We need faculty who can talk about areas of specialization incisively, who can explain how their areas of specialization relate to other areas, and who have the theory-of-mind skills to explain specialized knowledge to non-specialists. Most generally, we prefer applicants who show signs of enjoying and seeking out these interactions with diverse audiences because such people fit well into the department's collaborative culture.
Understanding of the Institution

A purpose of job candidate interviews is to assess not only the characteristics of an applicant but also the quality of fit between that person and the local context and, perhaps, the extent to which an applicant is interested in fitting in. Quality of fit refers to whether an applicant has both the subject matter expertise that we seek and more general characteristics that are compatible with the local culture’s emphasis on collegiality, collaboration, and balance between teaching and research. We respond well to applicants who have gone to the trouble to learn about us and can speak intelligently about the type of departmental culture they seek and about the features of ISU that make it a potentially good home for them. An additional plus is if an applicant has thought about which of our current faculty might make good collaborators.

Teaching

In hiring we favor applicants who have taught previously—the more often and the more independently the better, for two reasons. First, although we recognize that teaching repertoires develop over time, we are pleased when our own students can be spared at least some of a new instructor’s learning curve. Second, only individuals who have taught fully understand the rigors of teaching and the complexities of integrating one’s teaching into a broader curriculum. We are happiest when new faculty members are spared unpleasant surprises in this regard.

We also favor applicants who have demonstrated teaching initiative by seeking out teaching experiences beyond what the local context minimally requires. Because of the prominent role of undergraduate teaching in our department, undergraduate teaching experience usually impresses our faculty more than graduate teaching experience. Interest in and experience with mentoring undergraduate student research also counts, a point on which we will elaborate shortly.

Like many departments, we ask applicants to discuss their philosophies of teaching, but we are rarely impressed with purely philosophical statements. Rather, we look for practical grounding of an applicant’s teaching in two regards. First, we want colleagues who are attuned to fundamental research on learning principles and empirically-supported instructional processes. An essential component of any teaching philosophy, therefore, is to embrace what works. Second, we need colleagues who can diagnose institutional constraints (e.g., the kinds of students who cycle through a given course, the prior experiences those students likely will have had, and the local resources available to support a given instructional effort) and find creative ways to rise above them. Every teaching philosophy should emphasize doing what is maximally possible with what is available.

Research

Historically, ISU expected its faculty mainly to teach, but the past 25 years have seen a transition to a more balanced model in which most faculty members in most departments also are productive scholars. Thus, research accomplishments and potential for high quality scholarly contributions to the field are a must.
Although we like the kind of intellectual atmosphere that emerges among skilled researchers and the prestige that research accomplishments bring to our graduate programs, we never simply hire a vita. Research acumen must be supplemented by factors such as collegiality and fit, and at times we may prefer a more well-rounded, junior applicant over a more-frequently published applicant on the basis of these factors. Although every position that we advertise is associated with a broad area of scholarly expertise, typically we seek the best overall candidate rather than a specific research focus.

Balancing teaching and research is no mean task, so we like applicants who have begun and completed multiple research projects because the resulting fluency with the research process frees up effort and attention for other things, such as teaching. Because research resources are in modest supply at ISU, we also favor applicants with promising skills in laboratory instrumentation, participant recruitment, obtaining resources, arranging collaborations, and the like. These are people who can get a lot done with a little and who can be trusted to create research infrastructure in which students can thrive.

Because a prominent portion of any position at ISU is supervising student research efforts, we look for applicants who have functioned in this capacity previously. Even newly-minted PhDs may have trained student assistants or helped to direct a portion of a laboratory’s agenda. We seek people who speak cogently about this process and who regard it as not just a means to a research end but rather as an important instructional process.

During an on-campus interview, the research colloquium is the most important basis of how we evaluate our job applicants. We look for depth of knowledge and broad research interest. We evaluate the presentation for communication effectiveness, such as how interesting it is, and how well it gauges and adjusts to the audience’s level of knowledge. Our faculty thrives on collaborative research with each other so we evaluate the candidates promise in this area, too.

Synthesis
Quite obviously, in faculty hiring we prefer to have it all, a perspective about which we offer two realistic observations. First, applicants must understand that recent supply-demand patterns in the marketplace reward departments who are picky. We have often been able to identify candidates with more expertise than one might expect in a newly-minted PhD. Competition for academic positions is fierce and graduate school is a time to develop a broad range of competencies. Second, we understand that no new faculty member arrives fully prepared to assume all duties involved in academic employment. As we will discuss in the next section, after selecting new faculty members our department is concerned with their growth and development.

Survival After the Hire
Hiring and training are expensive and time-consuming activities that should be repeated no more than is necessary. It is therefore logical to help new faculty members succeed in ways
that will improve their odds of securing promotion and tenure and of wishing to remain part of our institution. By tradition, our department offers several general forms of support to new faculty as they begin their careers at ISU. First, early-career teaching assignments tend to match faculty expertise and topical enthusiasm, and when possible allow for courses to be taught repeatedly in the first few years, thereby lessening the challenge of course preparation and giving new instructors the opportunity to respond quickly to student feedback. Second, although all faculty contribute to shared governance, new faculty are protected from burdensome service obligations. Third, it is common for veteran faculty to explore collaborations with new faculty that may allow research programs to get off the ground more quickly than would otherwise be possible.

**Teaching**

At ISU, teaching counts equally with research in annual performance evaluations and in decisions about promotion and tenure. As a result, mediocre teachers render themselves less competitive in our merit pay evaluations. We set a high bar for teaching quality. Although scholarly productivity has assumed greater importance in the institutional mission, ISU has retained its traditional focus on quality teaching. Faculty members who have taught at other institutions may find that efforts that qualified them as among their previous department’s top teachers garner only average responses here.

New instructors benefit from a strong departmental tradition of collegial interactions around teaching through which experienced instructors provide guidance to them. A campus center on teaching and learning also can provide assistance, particularly with issues concerning the intersection of teaching and technology and the development of projects focusing on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).

Formal feedback about teaching comes from the mechanisms for annual faculty evaluation and promotion and tenure. The chair and members of the departmental governance committee inspect quantitative student ratings and student open-ended comments along with any supplemental assessment or evaluation materials that an instructor may submit. Our most successful teachers engage in regular self-assessment of teaching outcomes and adapt flexibly based on the feedback that assessment produces. Many of our faculty link this process of self-assessment to SoTL projects, and many such efforts, especially those that appear in peer-reviewed journals, count toward teaching productivity.

**Research**

Research productivity also is a prerequisite to promotion and tenure. Some institutionalized mechanisms of research support exist (e.g., laboratory start-up funds, seed grants, and modest travel funds), but research resources are scarcer at ISU than at doctoral institutions. Our most productive faculty members find creative ways to conduct research economically or expand the resource pool through extramural funding. In the latter case, ISU rewards attempts to seek research funding but in contrast to many doctoral institutions has not treated extramural dollars as a prerequisite to promotion and tenure.
Because of our teaching load, time for conducting research is scarcer than at many doctoral institutions. This limited time availability is partly offset by a rich supply of student help, although most laboratory teams consist mainly of undergraduates and MA students, who may be novices at the research process, rather than sophisticated PhD students. The supervisory costs of doing research thus also are higher than at some other institutions. Faculty members who succeed at research usually are good at multi-tasking and at organizing, training, and empowering novice assistants. There are some unexpected benefits to this arrangement, not the least of which is that undergraduate assistants often are more numerous, eager to please, grateful for research opportunities, and receptive to constructive feedback than are some graduate students.

From a student development perspective, an institution like ISU generates more research opportunities than might be available at the typical small, teaching-focused school, and students get more direct contact with faculty mentors than might occur at institutions where doctoral students are the functional lab managers. The latter yields a side benefit of providing student researchers with regular incidental contact with faculty by which faculty may share general wisdom about academia and scholarly pursuits, which may partly explain why many of our undergraduates report that work in faculty laboratories was a highlight of the undergraduate experience.

**Service**

We have said little about faculty clinical and community-service efforts. The department encourages faculty members with the right expertise to develop clinics that meet community needs and provide specialized clinical experiences for our students. For example, one of our faculty created an autism service that addresses a local shortage of clinicians and each year trains about 100 undergraduate and graduate students from across several departments. The department values such efforts, but in terms of early-career survival the stakes are different than for research efforts. In the evaluation of faculty productivity, service carries half the weight of teaching and research, so it is impossible to advance strictly on the basis of superior service. In this respect, a new faculty member might be counseled to defer heavy service commitments until after momentum has been built in teaching and research.

**Summary**

Ours is a hybrid department, neither as research intensive as most doctoral institutions nor as teaching-heavy as most liberal arts institutions. The typical ISU faculty member is at least competent in teaching and research (most are surprisingly accomplished in both) and engages in regular service to the department or broader university. This balanced profile makes our preferred job candidate different from what other kinds of institutions might seek. To return to a point suggested earlier, we work hard to identify candidates who want an institution like ours, and by extension to avoid candidates who might regard working at ISU as compromising on personal goals, especially with respect to research. Therefore, the most important advice we can offer to an academic job candidate is to "know thyself." For both the hiring institution and candidate, fit is everything. What counts as adequate
preparation for academic work, an impressive application portfolio, or a persuasive interview performance, depends heavily on an institution's traditions, including but not limited to the relative roles of teaching, research, and service in daily academic life.

Author Note
We acknowledge the contributions of David Barone and Dan Graybill, who co-authored the version of this chapter that appeared in the first edition of this volume.
Ten Suggestions for Securing a Faculty Position at a Selective Liberal Arts School

Jordan D. Troisi, Andrew N. Christopher, and W. Robert Batsell, Jr.

There are more than 3000 colleges and universities in the United States. A small minority of these institutions are research-intensive. Although many new college teachers receive their training at these types of schools, there are many more job opportunities at nonresearch-intensive schools. Thus, there is the potential for would-be college professors to have a biased view of the academic landscape with respect to the types of jobs that are available (see Irons & Buskist, 2009 for an overview of the different types of academic jobs).

In this chapter, we offer 10 suggestions for securing a position in the psychology department at liberal arts (LA) colleges. We teach at small, private, selective liberal arts colleges of fewer than 2,000 students each. Two of these schools (Kalamazoo College and Albion College) are sister colleges in the Great Lakes Colleges Association, and the third (Sewanee: The University of the South) is a member of the Associated Colleges of the South. We provide perspectives from various viewpoints regarding the hiring of new faculty members; some of us have been teaching full-time for as many as 24 years and have served on numerous faculty searches, and one of us has been teaching full-time for 3 years and has applied, interviewed, and been selected for positions twice in 4 years.

The 10 Suggestions Liberal Arts and Research 1 Institutions Differ in Identifying the “Best Applicant”

Although LA schools strive to recruit the best teacher-scholars possible, teaching has greater priority than research. Thus, selection committees at LA schools are suspicious of candidates who overwhelmingly tout their research credentials relative to their teaching prowess or appear to truly want a job at a Research 1 (R1) institution, viewing a job at an LA institution as a “safety” or “backup” school. Although LA schools are usually smaller in size and less widely known than R1 institutions, competition for tenure-track jobs at these institutions is still quite fierce. Recent social psychology openings at Albion College and Kalamazoo College each generated more than 125 applicants. Job applicants should remember that most of the faculty members at LA schools are there by choice, not as recipients of a consolation prize.

The Cover Letter and Curriculum Vitae are the Most Important

Application Materials

The cover letter and the curriculum vitae (CV) have the highest impact in determining whether a candidate receives further consideration. Afterward, the other application
materials influence rank in the applicant pool. Although these supplementary materials can influence decisions, they alone cannot salvage an application with a poor cover letter or CV.

The applicant’s cover letter is often the first contact search committees have with applicants, and a wealth of social psychology literature confirms the enduring influence of a positive first impression and the difficulty in changing a bad one. Therefore, with the possible exception of the CV, we recommend the most attention be paid to the cover letter. In today’s competitive job market, it is imperative applicants create a cover letter specifically tailored to how they will fit the position and succeed at achieving the goals of the department and institution. Candidates can glean this information from the internet, institutional websites, the job ad and should do so carefully. A generic cover letter is easily detected and gives the impression that the applicant is not truly interested in a job at the institution. Personally, we have elevated candidates to the top of the applicant pool after simply reading their cover letter because it is clear they “get it” and want to join the department. If the cover letter does not convey this impression, the search committee is unlikely to review the remaining materials carefully, if they are read at all.

So, what do search committees look for when reading cover letters? At the very least, the applicant must address the content of the job ad. Departments pay for the number of words in those ads, so they tend not to contain any superfluous text. In addition, successful applicants typically do much more. For instance, many LA colleges need faculty to teach first-year seminar classes. These may not be psychology-specific courses, but rather “orientation to college” courses, and often focus on developing students’ skills in writing, reading textbooks efficiently, and improving public speaking. Likewise, LA schools often need faculty to teach college-wide honors seminars that are highly interdisciplinary in nature and, similar to first-year seminars, these courses are not aimed specifically at psychology majors. Certainly, a cover letter does not need to detail candidates’ experiences with courses such as these, but if it acknowledges them as welcomed teaching assignments, even if not specifically requested in the job ad, the application will score some serious points with the search committee.

We also think it is important applicants provide some information about the resources they will require to conduct their research and the general costs of maintaining their research program. It is no surprise that the research budgets of most LA schools are far below those at R1 institutions. As a result, many popular, current research models, such as fMRI, may not be possible despite the value of such work.

Furthermore, at LA schools such as ours, involving undergraduates in research is of paramount importance. Although we certainly welcome publications in top tier journals, the reality is that they are not valued all that much more than publications with undergraduates in mid-tier journals. At R1 schools, the research is the final product of business, and working with graduate students and developing future researchers is key. At LA schools such as ours, the final products are college graduates moving on to graduate school or first jobs; and
helping them develop the knowledge, skills, and other characteristics to achieve these goals is of paramount importance.

Do Not Exaggerate
An applicant’s CV represents his or her professional history. We do not expect that every item on the CV is directly relevant to obtaining a position in a LA school’s psychology department, but there should be enough documented experience to demonstrate that the applicant is qualified for the job. In that regard, one thing that can hurt applicants is if they exaggerate certain accomplishments to create the illusion that they have more professional experience than they actually do. The two most obvious cases of this exaggeration relate to teaching and publications.

The most common over-inflation error we observe is that applicants exaggerate their teaching experience by listing every teaching-related activity in which they have ever engaged, no matter how trivial. We recognize that applicants who are currently graduate students will probably have limited teaching experience. However, it is not necessarily the applicant who has taught the most classes who receives the job offer. We are looking for a strong fit: that a LA environment is indeed what candidates want for their career. We respect candidates who are honest about their teaching experiences (e.g., guest lectures, teaching lab sections), and do not portray such experiences as more than they are.

Even though the length of one’s publication record may not be as important for an LA job as it is for an R1 job, the quality of one’s publications is important. In most cases, we are seeking individuals who can conduct quality research with undergraduates and can train these students in best research practices, which includes submitting work to high-quality peer-reviewed journals. We have concerns when applicants do not distinguish among different types of publications (e.g., including non-peer reviewed conference abstracts alongside peer-reviewed publications). Similarly, it has become more common to list “ongoing projects” on a CV, yet until these manuscripts are accepted for publication, they have no real value in the application process, and in fact, they may undermine one’s application if they appear too numerous relative to finished products. As a bottom line for us, though, applicants with 3 or 4 peer-reviewed publications in mid-tier outlets, especially as first or second author, demonstrate to search committees sufficient enough accomplishments to warrant further consideration.

Your Statement of Teaching Philosophy Should Be Substantive
More graduate programs than ever before have been aiding their students in preparation for a career as a faculty member, including some instruction in teaching and preparing teaching-related job application materials (Boysen, 2011). Unfortunately, we have not found that the teaching philosophy statement identifies the most effective teachers very well. Instead, the majority of these statements are filled with the latest teaching buzzwords, but with very few specifics. Although applicants should indicate that they use active learning techniques, they should also provide specific examples of how they have applied those techniques in the classroom.
Applicants should reserve the use of terms such as “innovative teaching technique” for activities that are more unique than incorporating discussion into a class or the use of a commercially available computer program. We recommend providing more depth and detail on fewer ideas, while being careful to avoid meaningless jargon. Selection committees want to envision what a potential colleague will do in his or her classroom—the teaching philosophy should help paint this picture.

Evidence of good practices should appear in the statement, such as reading and implementing ideas from sources such as *Teaching of Psychology*. However, successful applicants go beyond what other applicants have done. For instance, if there is an activity an applicant has used from *Teaching of Psychology*, how was it amended to make it more effective for a specific course? How does the applicant know it was effective? If it was not effective the first time it was used, how did the applicant tweak it to make it more effective when it was used again? These sorts of insights will make applicants seem sincere in their desire to be at a LA school.

**Focus on Future Programmatic Research and Working with Students**

Although it is common for most research statements to read like a series of short abstracts about the candidate’s previous work, much of this information is often redundant with letters of recommendation. Thus, applicants should view the research statement as an opportunity to provide new information about their scholarly work. We recommend the candidate include some of the following information in their research statement to advance their application.

First, describe the resources needed to maintain an active research program. These costs will include the expenses for equipment and lab space (although such space may often be shared with others) and may also include the number of participants required for completion of a single study. We will not hire a faculty member unless we can provide all of the resources he or she needs to succeed in both research and teaching.

Second, we recommend applicants speak to their ability to incorporate student collaborators into their research program. Working alongside students in research settings is prized at most selective LA schools, particularly ones that dedicate funds, fellowships, or credit hours toward student research efforts. Sometimes schools will want a candidate who will start a research lab, which may be a smaller facsimile of labs from PhD granting institutions (although typically only staffed by undergraduates). Sometimes a less formal structure will suffice, such as working with one or a handful of undergraduates on various projects. Thus, candidates should address some important issues related to student research, which may include students at all levels of their college career. Have applicants mentored former undergraduates in the lab? If so, applicants should provide details on how they have done so and what they are doing now. Applicants should give us compelling evidence that they care about working with undergraduates.
Third, candidates should speak to their ability to hit the ground running and to conduct independent research. Because departments tend to be small at most LA schools, an entire research domain may be represented by only one individual (e.g., one developmental psychologist). LA schools have a wealth of master teachers who can help novice teachers grow into their craft, but are much more limited in the ability to cultivate expert scholars. Many selective LA schools may prefer a candidate who has established programmatic research rather than a handful of disparate publications, suggesting that there is a line of continuous work in progress, guiding the candidate from project to project and providing a sense of continuity for students interested in getting involved. Such programs also suggest there will be fewer starts and stops in research, which are more of a hindrance at smaller institutions.

However, we offer the following caveat. Because LA schools typically only have one faculty member per area of specialization in psychology, the successful candidate should be prepared to be the go-to person for that field, and indeed, have a desire to play such a role in the department. For example, even though the cognitive psychologist may specialize in linguistic processes, he or she may be asked to collaborate on student research involving memory. Applicants who clearly communicate that they understand this characteristic of LA schools will definitely make a positive impression during the interview.

Letters of Recommendation Should Address Both Research and Teaching
Coming out of graduate school, most applicants will have invested much of their time and energy in research. Letter writers for individuals applying to R1 schools, of course, focus on the candidates’ accomplishments and potential as researchers. However, LA schools look highly on letters that demonstrate the writer has actually observed the applicant teach a class or viewed a videotaped teaching presentation. If letter writers also worked with the applicant in other phases of a teaching a course (e.g., syllabi development, assessment techniques), all the better. Even if only one letter writer can provide such commentary, the application’s value will increase significantly.

Successful Candidates Innovate, Not Reinvent
Some LA departments—although not all—may view a new hire as someone who can infuse the department with new ideas, which might involve slight changes or additions to the curriculum, suggestions for new methods or software for conducting research, or other new opportunities for students. Existing faculty members may be excited about the infusion of new ideas but may be skeptical about a complete upheaval of the status quo. Successful candidates should be prepared to offer new ideas and opportunities for the department and be ready, willing, and able to integrate them with existing expectations and plans. For example, a small school may be interested in new techniques designed to increase student engagement, such as starting a living-learning community. However, such an undertaking should take into account demands on members of the department and the institution more broadly.
Be a Team Player

One challenge of working in a small department is that the work of the department is only as strong as its weakest member. If a faculty member behaves selfishly and fails to complete his or her share of the work, then other faculty members must pick up the slack. Thus, being a team player is often an unspoken criterion of most LA job searches, and committees look for individuals willing to assume departmental leadership roles or non-preferred class offerings.

There are various ways that successful candidates convey such strengths. One common example is related to the choice of course selection. Every psychology department must offer a range of service courses such as general psychology and research methods every semester. These courses tend to be larger, more work intensive, and less popular with students. We recommend that candidates clearly indicate their willingness to share the task of teaching such service courses throughout their application materials and that they emphasize this willingness more so than their desire to teach upper-level courses in their area of specialty.

Faculty members at LA colleges also share more of the load when it comes to shaping the academic community and engaging in service functions at the school. In fact, on a recent interview for one of the authors, many faculty members referred to service as “community service,” suggesting that the definition may have been broader than what many candidates often view as service (e.g., being on a campus-wide committee). Community service does mean serving on committees within the college, but depending on the college, it may also mean helping with student move-in day, assisting with the recruitment of new students, and other activities that may not fit under the traditional definition of service.

Convey Your Excitement for the LA Institution

LA schools wish not only to recruit excellent faculty, but also to keep those faculty. Consequently, selection committees will want to get the sense that candidates enjoy the environment offered on campus (e.g., location in the country, rural/suburban/urban setting, opportunities for recreational activities). For example, one of the authors was recently offered a position at a small, rural LA college, and during the interview he was clear that his alma mater was also a small, rural LA college. The selection committee seemed to appreciate that the candidate understood what such an environment offers.

Although such information can be conveyed throughout one’s application, during the campus interview, candidates should make it clear that they are committed to the LA model of higher education. Certainly, if the candidate attended a LA college, that is a plus in this regard. One interview question often put to applicants repeatedly throughout the interview process is how they conceptualize a “liberal arts education” and why it is the best way to educate undergraduate students. Indeed, during a campus interview, candidates will meet with faculty outside of the psychology department, and commitment to the liberal arts is likely the biggest or the only criterion on which such faculty will judge the candidate.
**Be Prepared to Give a Research Talk and to Teach a Class During the Interview**

During many LA college interviews, there will actually be two job talks. Be aware that, particularly for the research talk, there may be faculty from other departments present, as these events are often announced to the faculty across campus. Because successful candidates will be working with faculty and staff across departments, everyone on campus has a vested interest in each new hire. In addition, expect psychology majors to attend the research talk as well and be aware that their feedback is extremely important in the hiring decision. Upper-level majors in particular will have a perspective that faculty will not have, and selection committees value that point of view.

As a general rule, we urge candidates to pitch this talk at upper-level psychology majors who have completed the research methods and statistics sequence, but not necessarily advanced courses in these areas. As such, if discussion of advanced techniques is vital to one’s talk, one must invest the time to explain the logic of them to the audience.

In addition to a research talk, the department may also ask candidates to give a “teaching” talk (i.e., requiring the candidate to walk into an existing course and teach for all or part of a class period). This talk requires coordinating with the person teaching the course, and the ability to do so successfully is an important determinant of whether candidates can “work and play well” with their potential new colleagues. Alternatively, the teaching talk may be a staged class, with students attending and candidates teaching a topic that is either assigned or of their own choosing. Certainly, giving a presentation on a favorite topic sounds heavenly! But realize one must make sure to teach something relevant to the position requirements noted in the job ad.

For one of the authors, the job ad specified teaching industrial/organizational psychology as the area of expertise, but the ad also requested teaching introduction to psychology and research design and analysis, so an activity on measurement reliability and validity seemed like the best way to touch on all three types of courses (see Griggs, 2000). It is also more important for the candidate’s teaching demonstration to engage students and make the material accessible than it is to make oneself appear brilliant. Students who attend the teaching talk will evaluate the candidate’s performance, and failing to engage students can be the downfall of an otherwise qualified applicant.

**Final Thoughts**

Applying to and working at a LA college is indeed different from applying to and working at a research-intensive university (e.g., Dunn & Zaremba, 1997; Nalbone, 2011). In this chapter, we have provided counsel that will help applicants understand some of these differences. Landing a position at a LA college should not be viewed as a professional consolation prize. If that is the mentality with which one applies to such schools, one should be aware that LA faculty will easily detect such condescension, if not in the application materials, then in a phone or campus interview. As with most job openings, we look for a strong fit between what is needed from someone in the position within the department and the larger institution within which the department operates (Landrum & Clump, 2004).
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Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) is the largest of four universities that comprise the Connecticut State University System. Located almost exactly in the middle of two of the richest hubs for intellectual and cultural expression in the US, Boston and New York City, CCSU serves approximately 10,000 undergraduate and 2,500 graduate students. The Department of Psychological Science at CCSU is housed in the Ammon School of Arts and Sciences. Psychological Science is historically one of the largest majors on campus, and the largest minor. The department houses three Master’s level psychology graduate programs and multiple interdisciplinary programs, including a minor in Gerontology.

The faculty in the Department of Psychological Science possess a range of research interests and professional degree types. Industrial/Organizational psychologists, clinical psychologists, experimental psychologists, developmental psychologists, health psychologists and community psychologists are all represented among our diverse faculty. The mission of the department is to actively mentor and engage undergraduate students in the science of psychology. Independent studies that culminate in professional presentations at national and regional psychology conferences, and even publications in refereed journals, are not uncommon for undergraduate and graduate students in our program. In addition, a central tenet of the program, as is the case with most psychology departments nationally, is an emphasis on experiencing and embracing cultural diversity as a way to live a more interesting life, regardless of one’s chosen profession. We hope that exposing students to people with diverse traditions, thoughts, and behaviors leads them to emerge energized by the possibilities associated with living in a changing and diverse world, as opposed to paralyzed by unfounded stereotypes that serve to generate fear and uncertainty.

The purpose of the present chapter is to outline factors emphasized by hiring committees in our department to select future psychology professors. Of course, each job position and advertisement varies based on the needs of our department at the time, yet there are three general areas of professional development that are universally emphasized in every job search we conduct. The purpose of this chapter is not to outline ways to document and present professional development progress within the application packet, as these issues are covered thoroughly in other chapters within this volume and other notable empirical works (see Korn, Stephen, & Sikorski, 2010). Rather, this chapter describes the constructs we examine to assess job applicants for fit at our institution and outlines a rationale for why we scrutinize these constructs so closely.
Demonstrated Effectiveness as a Teacher of Psychology

When pursuing a job at a state university where the teaching load is large (e.g., 12 credit hours per semester), the ability to influence students to develop mindsets and behaviors consistent with an emphasis on lifelong learning is imperative (Sikorski & Keeley, 2003). Although effective teaching is difficult to define universally, some guidelines can be used to define it.

First, experience matters. Being able to document one’s ability to teach multiple classes, at multiple universities, in multiple areas of the country or world would be ideal. In short, being in “the trenches” a time or two allows teachers the opportunity to use hypothetico-deductive reasoning to chart pedagogical plans for student success, and perhaps more importantly, learn from the inevitable errors made in the classroom. Developing classroom presence (Halonen, 2002), engaging students through lecture and discussion (Benjamin, 2002; Sikorski, 2011) and developing critical thinking and meta-cognitive potential (Dunn, Halonen, & Smith, 2008) is difficult work. Experience alone is not enough to improve one’s teaching effectiveness (Marsh, 2007); however, careful self-reflection regarding classroom successes and failures (Korn, 2002) and seeking peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness (Perlman & McCann, 2002) can certainly document one’s willingness to change and learn.

Although many teachers today report being reluctant to utilize student evaluations as evidence for teaching effectiveness (Dunn, McCarthy, Baker, Halonen, & Boyer, 2011), professors who evaluate job applicants in our department consider student evaluations to represent important factors used to assess teaching and mentoring effectiveness. Although the validity of student-based evaluations of teaching effectiveness have frequently been called into question based on numerous extraneous influences inherent in virtually any self-report assessment (Blackhart, Peruche, DeWall, & Joiner, 2006), it may be the stability of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness that matter most when assessing job applicants at CCSU. After all, just as converging evidence increases the confidence that scientists place in empirical propositions, consistency in student evaluations of teacher successes and failures in the classroom is unlikely to represent a mere aberration. As time goes on, and technologies for gathering student impressions of teacher effectiveness multiply (Silva et al., 2008), it is likely that student evaluations of teaching effectiveness will be viewed as even more central in evaluating job applicants. As such, gathering student impressions multiple times, through both qualitative and quantitative means, seems likely to portray the job applicant as accountable for success in the classroom. Even when a teacher has a “bad class” or “bad semester,” charting student impressions allows the informed educator to provide evidence of a willingness to make adjustments to facilitate students’ satisfaction and growth.

Demonstrated Research Productivity and a Detailed Productivity Plan for the Future

At our institution, research matters. Despite being identified as a “teaching institution,” faculty who teach psychology at CCSU recognize that scholarship and teaching are intertwined (Gurung, Ansburg, Alexander, Lawrence, & Johnson, 2008). Because psychology has been plagued historically by a reliance on anecdotal information and shoddy science
(Lilienfeld, 2010), a commitment to the scientific method of gathering information through personal research productivity is evaluated carefully when search committee members examine the application packets of candidates. Our undergraduates will emerge with their degrees and work in a field where scientific accountability will be stressed in a manner unlike any other period in the history of our field (O’Donohue, Lilienfeld & Fowler, 2007). Perhaps, that is just one of many reasons why our department elected to change its name from the Department of Psychology to the Department of Psychological Science. We expect our undergraduates to learn the process of science and conduct their own empirical research as a means of developing a philosophy of science through active learning. As a result, faculty members model scientific accountability by contributing to the empirical literature in their areas of expertise and involve students in their research programs. Not surprisingly then, search committee members look for applicants who have demonstrated an ability to involve students in their research at multiple levels that might include: data collection, data coding, co-writing and delivering professional poster and paper presentations. In fact, some professors in our department even require student research mentees to deliver symposiums on controversial topics related to their research focus of interest that students attend in exchange for extra credit in their psychology classes.

We assess our job applicants on their past research productivity based on the number of peer-reviewed publications and not necessarily the impact factor of particular periodicals (Sonuga-Barke, 2012). The successful job application also provides a tenable and thoughtful research plan for the future.

**Demonstrated Experience Working with Diverse Populations**

Saying that one has an enduring respect for diverse people is advisable, yet pales in comparison to outlining specific instances, across multiple contexts, where the applicant has served many different types of people well. In short, while writing about ones respect for cultural diversity helps search committees visualize an applicant’s plan for the future, seeing tangible evidence of past success in this regard helps to alleviate committee member concerns that applicants may be merely paying lip service to cultural diversity. After all, on our campus, a respect for cultural diversity in our faculty is not an option, but an important requirement of the leaders and mentors working with students in our campus community.

There are multiple ways to define experience working with diverse populations. People are diverse in regard to age, ethnicity, geographic background, language(s) spoken, physical appearance, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, physical ability, political affiliation, gender orientation, cognitive style, and education (Asimeng-Boahene & Klein, 2004; Bireda & Chait, 2011). Some aspects of cultural diversity are visible, like ethnicity and biological sex, yet other ways in which people can “be diverse” are less visible or invisible (e.g., sexual orientation, religious or spiritual background; Price, et al., 2005). Emphasizing diversity in the work we do as academic psychologists, recognizing both visible and invisible facets of cultural diversity in people, is imperative given the changing society in which we live and work.
The population of the United States is becoming increasingly diverse. Students of color are the majority in 25 of the nation’s biggest school systems (Asimeng-Boahene & Klein, 2004). Furthermore, 21% of United States citizens over the age of five years speak a language other than English in their home (United States Census Bureau, 2013). Of course, although more difficult to measure and summarize, less visible aspects of cultural diversity vary extensively amongst the citizenry of the United States.

In tandem with the burgeoning of multi-faceted diversity in the United States population, the student body at colleges and universities in the United States is becoming much more diverse. According to the U.S. Department of Education, between 2007 and 2018, enrollment in degree-granting institutions is projected to increase 4% for White students, yet 26% for Black students, 38% for Hispanic students, 29% for Asian or Pacific Islander students and 32% for American Indian and Alaska Native students (Hussar & Bailey, 2009). In summary, if the population is becoming more diverse, in both visible and invisible ways, then it seems essential to members of our departmental search committees that we aim to hire faculty members skilled in meeting the needs of a changing student body.

The constructs of active listening (Yalom, 2002) and emotional intelligence (Goleman, 2005) are inherently linked to an appreciation for cultural diversity in ourselves and others. Working with diverse populations, with varying experiences and skills, documents the educator’s willingness and ability to meet the student or colleague where they exist, on their own terms. After all, strategies used by students to succeed in college are rooted in their own cultural history. In recognizing and appreciating differences amongst learners, and adjusting the support and curriculum provided to students accordingly, more lasting and comprehensive learning valuable to each student is achievable (Asimeng-Boahene & Klein, 2004).

Given that professors who emphasize cultural diversity in the college courses they teach facilitate the development of more lasting learning, it is not at all surprising that many learning institutions search for applicants that “walk the walk” when it comes to emphasizing and appreciating cultural diversity in their daily professional lives. A national longitudinal study of 25,000 undergraduates at 217 four-year colleges and universities showed that institutional policies promoting the diversity of the campus culture had positive effects on students’ meta-cognitive development, satisfaction with the college experience and leadership potential (Astin, 1993). Policies that encourage faculty to incorporate themes relating to diversity in their research and teaching, and provide students with opportunities to challenge stereotypes in the classroom, on internship and in their extracurricular interactions, promote learning and thinking. As a result, emphasizing the importance of cultural diversity as a central tenet of campus life and performance evaluations at day one is suggested.

Job applicants that successfully document experience working with diverse people, not surprisingly, do so in a number of different ways. For instance, some of our exceptional job applicants have worked to develop and maintain scholarship programs for ethnic minorities...
and individuals with differing sexual orientations. Other applicants include exercises to promote meta-cognitive awareness regarding cultural diversity in their classes. Requiring students to write reflection papers outlining their evolving views on diverse people is excellent, but regularly facilitating discussions and experiential exercises where students develop first-hand knowledge regarding the moderating influence of cultural diversity on treatment outcomes and interpersonal communications is even better. In short, those applicants that interweave cultural diversity into their pedagogy and teaching are preferred in our department.

**Conclusion**

The Department of Psychological Science at CCSU seeks professors who are experienced in providing high quality instruction to a diverse array of students. Given that the field of psychology has evolved as a true science, we highly value faculty capable of modeling scientific principles and actively engaging students in research.
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In this chapter, we describe what the Fort Lewis College Psychology Department expects in our job applicants and what we seek in our new hires at the assistant professor level. Fort Lewis College (FLC), located in southwest Colorado, holds a liberal arts perspective as an undergraduate institution that is part of the state system. We enroll approximately 4000 students from 50 states, 145 American Indian tribes and Native Alaskan villages, and 17 countries. Our student population is highly multicultural (40%) with one of the highest percentages (20%) of Native American students in the country. Average class sizes are small (23) and our 229 faculty members have strong mentoring relationships with students with a student-to-faculty ratio of 19:1.

We expect a new faculty member in our department to contribute to our program in three principal areas: teaching, scholarship, and service to the department, campus, and community. The role of a faculty member also requires diligent advising of our majors, involving students in research or community service work, and serving as a mentor to students engaged in independent study and thesis projects. A new faculty member in our department must love teaching and mentoring, have a feasible program of research, and be a productive and collegial departmental “citizen.” Below we present the categories of skills most desired in a new faculty member along with a final section on “common mistakes” that we have observed in the context of interviews with job candidates.

What Our Department Seeks in New Faculty
Prior to our recent hiring of a new faculty member, the seven departmental faculty members most involved in the search performed a rank-ordering of the most important features of the candidates in our pool. As Table 1 shows, our top two priorities guiding our hiring decision were the specifics of what courses the candidates could teach and their ability to involve undergraduate students in research. In addition, we placed considerable emphasis on the candidate’s ability to fill a gap in our current faculty profiles and interest areas, rather than overlap too heavily with them. We did not place great importance on candidates’ ability to specifically teach our key departmental learning outcomes—critical thinking and research methods. We also did not highly rank the candidates’ publication and grant history as the highest priority. We were all over the map in terms of how much we wanted candidates to be able to provide service learning opportunities for our students, which is likely due to administrative changes over the past few years. Whereas our previous president had a fervent interest in service learning, the current administration has removed it from our institutional strategic plan. In summary, a glance at our stated departmental search priorities indicates that we value teaching, scholarship, and service in that order. Nonetheless, these
priorities vary considerably among individuals in the department and reflect historical trends, which means that prospective job candidates would do well to learn the priorities of the current college administration (e.g., strategic plan) and what the current holes are in the department areas and offerings. One of the most vital pieces of advice for new faculty that emerges from these varying priorities is to respect institutional culture (Burke, 2004), and that starts even before one is hired by any particular institution.

Table 1. Fort Lewis College Psychology Department – 2013-2014 Position Search Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE EVALUATION ITEM</th>
<th>Number of Faculty Ranking Item in Each Ordinal Position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught or able to teach (i.e., course staffing issues)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to involve students in research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental fit (i.e., not overlapping current faculty’s classes or research areas)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do service learning in community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear research program with history of publications and grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to infuse any course taught with our departmental goals (i.e., critical thinking and research methods)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates’ Teaching Ability
In terms of candidates’ academic preparation, our department typically seeks candidates with a PhD, although several members of our department have stated that they would accept other doctoral-level candidates with the right kinds of focus and experience (i.e., a PsyD or EdD with the requisite teaching and research). Successful teaching experience is highly important for getting hired at a small, teaching-heavy liberal arts school such as ours. We look for evidence of success early on in the candidate’s career (i.e., graduate school). Can the candidate teach courses that we already offer, and moreover, can they add something new to our curriculum? In her article on preparing the new professoriate, Ault (this volume) explained that candidates must be realistic about what they can teach. In a department such as ours, with only nine full-time faculty members, we expect new hires to be in one sense a generalist (able and willing to teach our Introductory psychology, Statistics, and Research Methods courses), but also a specialist in the area for which we have advertised. Our highest agreed-upon priority on our recent job search (see Table 1) was our
desire for a new faculty member who had already taught or was prepared to teach courses that we needed covered either due to their area of specialization or to fill existing gaps.

A candidate’s philosophy of teaching is similarly important to us. Consistent with Rudmann’s concerns (this volume), we look for evidence of an emphasis on active learning and student involvement over a traditional (strictly) lecture format. With increasing pressures from the Higher Learning Commission to measure student learning outcomes, we seek evidence of this focus in our candidates’ teaching philosophy as well as evidence of their ability to promote our department learning goals (e.g., critical thinking, communication skills, and technological skills). Sending us an electronic or online teaching portfolio link is a way for candidates to illustrate their strengths in ways that might possibly stand out from other candidates.

Teaching Beyond the Classroom
It is clear therefore that teaching is of the highest importance at our undergraduate-only institution. However, we also evaluate candidates not only on their ability to actively deliver course content within the traditional classroom setting, but we also look for evidence that candidates can teach beyond the classroom—advising, building relationships, and guiding students toward high-impact learning. We want faculty members to take a fervent interest in our students, and one concrete way of doing so is to get involved in advising and mentoring our undergraduates.

How can candidates show that they can successfully perform advising and mentoring if they are applying for a faculty position straight out of graduate school? First, candidates must carefully research each school to which they are applying, and examine its mission, strategic plan, and student body characteristics. Less than 2% of our recent faculty candidates mentioned their desire to work with Native American students, yet our student population is comprised of about 20% Native American students due to our unique historical mission—and this fact is readily accessible via two clicks on our college Web site under “mission, vision, and core values.” Second, candidates should highlight their previous interactions with undergraduate students during their own graduate studies. Third, candidates can explain how and why they desire to engage with students outside of class. If candidates have developed a specific advising philosophy, they can share it alongside or as part of their teaching philosophy.

Going hand-in-hand with faculty interest in mentoring or advising students is their ability to connect with students and build productive educational relationships. In this vein, candidates can emphasize their technological literacy and how they keep up with popular trends and interests of college students. At FLC, we often assign newly hired faculty to be the official advisor of our Psychology Club in order to capitalize on their youthful energy and facilitate their connections with our students. If candidates have any of their own ideas for how they like to build relationships with students, ranging from planning occasional department social outings to guiding them through volunteer experiences, they should be sure to mention these in their application materials.
Finally, due to their positive associations with student learning and retention, certain undergraduate opportunities are designated "high-impact." High-Impact Practices (HIPs) share several traits: They demand considerable time and effort, facilitate learning outside of the classroom, require meaningful interactions with faculty and students, encourage collaboration with diverse others, and provide frequent and substantive feedback. As a result, participation in these practices can be life-changing (Kuh, 2008). The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) founding director George Kuh has recommended that institutions should aspire for all students to participate in at least two HIPs over the course of their undergraduate experience—one during the first year and one in the context of their major (NSSE, 2007). The NSSE lists six specific types of HIPs:

- Learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together
- Courses that include a community-based project (service-learning)
- Work with a faculty member on a research project
- Internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement
- Study abroad
- Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)

Our department strives to guide students through several of these HIPs, including a summer internship at a clinical psychology field school (working at a state Psychiatric Hospital) taking students to travel courses (though our own internal program or through other organizations like the University Studies Abroad Consortium); guiding students through service-learning projects such as working at our on-campus child development center or volunteering in the local community; and taking several students each year to present at regional research conferences, typically the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association convention, as a senior capstone experience. Whereas we do not expect incoming hires to have previous experience in any of these activities, we desire that our faculty foster high-impact practices in educating our students. Therefore, we are looking for evidence in candidates’ applications that they understand what these experiences are and that they are interested in facilitating one or more of these HIPs for their future students.

**Candidates’ Research Abilities**

At our small undergraduate institution, one HIP that we want all of our incoming faculty to be capable of performing is actively involving students in their program of research. As Table 1 indicates, this value was our department’s consensus second pick—after teaching—for what we seek in job candidates. Instead of attempting to hire famous or even highly prolific researchers who bring in grant money, we are looking for faculty who view research as a high-impact form of teaching, which means that their research generally meets two salient criteria. First, a candidate’s interest area complements our existing research domains without being too similar—in other words, hiring this person would increase available research options for our students. Second, a candidate’s research questions and process can
meaningfully involve undergraduate students using existing college resources. We have had candidates eloquently explain their fMRI research in applications only to be tossed quickly into the “do not hire” pile because we do not have regular access to an MRI scanner in our small town, nor do we have any undergraduate students capable of assisting in this level of research. Such candidates obviously failed to do their homework, which became especially clear when they waxed poetic about their excitement in working with graduate students (we are an undergraduate-only school). Ideally, candidates will want to apply for jobs at institutions where their own values and priorities will be a fit; if research is their number one goal above teaching, our college would not be it.

Candidates’ Service Abilities
Given a match between the candidate’s values and priorities and our undergraduate institution, we take seriously and evaluate highly a job applicant’s promise of being a good departmental and campus citizen. Citizenship entails a mix of collegiality, professionalism, willingness to engage in service commitments, and the intangible “dog energy” we have seen in aspiring new faculty members. In our most recent job search (Spring 2014), the search committee chair directed the seven faculty members voting on candidates to physically move to one of four corners of the meeting room based on which aspect of the candidates’ skills and abilities was most essential for them. The corners were labeled: teaching, service, research, and collegiality. It was interesting to see this behavioral demonstration of each of our priorities for whom to hire: Three faculty stood in the teaching corner, no one occupied the research corner, and four people stood either in service or halfway between service and collegiality. The current department chair and the previous chair were firmly in favor of service, which was surprising because our college places so much emphasis on teaching.

In the discussion that followed, however, it became clear that all of the candidates we invited to campus for interviews could effectively teach the appropriate courses based on their prior experience (including student evaluations and peer testimonials). The promise of collegiality, department service, and other aspects of productive citizenship in departmental business emerged as a key “X factor” in deciding whom to hire from that smaller pool. In short, we want to hire people who will be service-oriented, productive, and enjoyable (or at least not annoying) to work alongside. As Keith (this volume) argued, being a “team player” requires interpersonal skills and perceptiveness beyond one’s teaching ability or area of research specialization. Constructive communication dynamics and willingness to share responsibility for myriad departmental projects is highly valued. It can be challenging for candidates to show how they can indicate their interests in service on their job application, especially because most new professors have never done any service work before, although their collegiality or lack thereof will likely emerge in the interview phase of the hiring process.

Common Candidate Interviewing Errors
In an effort to aid prospective job candidates, we mention typical mistakes encountered during the recent search interviews we have conducted. Complaining extensively about
one’s previous or current job situation sends a message about a candidate’s interpersonal style that raises questions about their fitting in at our college (or possibly anywhere). As mentioned above, it is catastrophic for a candidate not to know the specifics of the institution at which they are interviewing. In our case, candidates have referred to FLC as a “university” when we are an undergraduate liberal arts college, and we have interviewed candidates who evidently did little or no research at all in knowing about our distinct Native American and multicultural student population. Another mistake we have experienced is that of an interested candidate attempting to conduct various “negotiations” prior to being offered a position: Asking for course releases, special research funding, or reduced workloads in advance of a job offer comes across as both naïve and presumptuous. These negotiations should take place in the context of accepting or considering accepting a position offer, but not before, although clarifying one’s future teaching load and other responsibilities is certainly permissible.

Our Dean of Arts and Sciences added another perspective on mistakes to avoid. She interviews all of the job candidates across many diverse academic departments, so she has a wider scope of experience than do members of our department. The dean’s suggestions are as follows: Be authentic. If candidates successfully “sells themselves” to an employer as individuals they are not, neither they nor their new colleagues will be satisfied. Candidates should listen carefully to interview questions and respond thoughtfully with enough specificity and detail that the interviewer learns something important about their potential fit for the position. Finally, at the point where the candidate has been offered a position and it is appropriate to negotiate, it is best for him or her to pose all of the negotiating points at once rather than spreading them over several days. Search committees are working under time constraints with other candidates, and will not appreciate what appears to be extra demands or desires after they believe an agreement has been reached.

In conclusion, we advise job candidates to think carefully about the specific academic job they desire and then apply for advertised positions that are a good fit in terms of what they can (and want to) teach, their research interests, and the type of institutional atmosphere they are seeking. If candidates tailor each application they submit to the specific parameters of the job ad, they will increase the probability of receiving an interview and, ultimately, a new job.
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32. Won’t You Be My Neighbor? 
Making Yourself an Excellent Faculty Candidate

Kenneth D. Keith and Jennifer Zwolinski

Together, the two of us have more than a quarter century of experience in the Department of Psychological Sciences at the University of San Diego (USD), a private Catholic-affiliated Doctoral/Research University (DRU). The institution includes seven academic divisions: the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Law, the School of Leadership and Education Sciences, the Hahn School of Nursing and Health Science, the School of Business Administration, the Shiley-Marcos School of Engineering, and the Joan B. Kroc School of Peace Studies. USD enrolls approximately 8,300 students, more than 4,000 of whom are in the College of Arts and Sciences. In the most recently reported year, almost half of nearly 15,000 applicants were accepted, with about 1,200 eventually gaining places in the first-year class. Fall-to-spring first-year retention is about 97 percent, and first-year to second-year retention is slightly more than 90 percent. The student/faculty ratio is 15 to 1.

Although USD is a national doctoral institution, the Department of Psychological Sciences is an undergraduate program housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, the heart and soul of the University, having more in common with liberal arts colleges than with research universities. We are a teaching-oriented program, but we have growing expectations for faculty scholarship, especially as embodied in research involving students.

Looking for a Faculty Job?
The search for an academic position, at USD and elsewhere, can be a daunting task, particularly for a full-time teaching job. Although the number of full-time faculty in American universities increased by 41% between 1990 and 2012, the increase in part-time faculty for the same period was more than 120% (Desrochers & Kirshstein, 2014). Another measure of the shifting make-up of the American professoriate is seen in the changing proportion of tenured or tenure-track faculty: more than three quarters in 1969, but only about one third by 2009 (Kezar & Maxey, 2013; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). In 2009, of the 66.5% of non-tenure track faculty, 18.8% were full time faculty without the tenure option and 47.7% were part time faculty (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). Thus, competition is stiff for tenure-track academic jobs, and it is increasingly essential that one is an attractive candidate.

As one completes graduate studies and looks ahead to an academic career, the first encounter with prospective employers is likely to come via advertisements describing position openings. Although these ads provide some description of the hiring institutions
and departments, they are typically brief. For example, we recently examined a small sample of typical ads posted by the American Psychological Association and the Association for Psychological Science and found an average length of about 260 words, with some ads shorter than 150 words. This brief introduction may whet the appetite but is not likely to provide enough information to reveal much about the college or university and the likelihood that this job is a suitable one. It is essential to gain more knowledge from such additional sources as university Web sites, any available print materials, and personal contact with individuals familiar with the institution or the department.

Know Thyself
The injunction to know thyself is as important today as it was to the sages of ancient Greece. Teaching, to many outsiders, appears easy; after all, they may reason, it involves little more than appearing two or three times each week to entertain a group of young people. However, as anyone who has done it is well aware, good teaching is hard work—and, as Brewer (1996) argued, it is perhaps more appropriately seen as a calling than a profession. There are some questions that job applicants can ask themselves as they attempt to determine whether they have been “called.”

Am I a Hard Worker?
Thomas Edison is supposed to have said that genius is 99 percent perspiration, and Woody Allen suggested that 80 percent of life is showing up; we believe both of these maxims apply to teaching. Yes, one must have knowledge and the ability to convey it, but one also must prepare, show up, and do the job, day (and night) in and day (and night) out. Nearly anyone with appropriate education would have the technical content knowledge and skills to do what teachers do; it is the other traits—characteristics like work ethic, integrity, and reliability—that will set one apart as an outstanding candidate. To the extent one can do it, getting the experience, particularly in teaching, will allow one to demonstrate these strengths will prove indispensable in pursuing a position at institutions like USD.

Am I a Team Player?
Good departments depend on constructive interpersonal dynamics and shared responsibility for getting work done. Liberal arts institutions frequently feature such expectations as team teaching (Keith, 2006) or interdisciplinary pedagogical research (e.g., Bossio, Loch, Schier, & Mazzolini, 2014). Schools such as USD that value teaching call upon their faculty in myriad ways that go beyond academic or scientific specialties. One is likely to serve on committees; provide consultation to students and faculty alike on issues related to one’s area of specialization, and play an integral role in such processes as program assessment, academic advising, and curriculum development. Successful applicants may also need to be flexible enough to prepare and teach courses essential to their department, even when those courses are not in their preferred area. These activities and many others require the cooperative attitude and effective interpersonal skills that characterize good teamwork.

Do I Have Patience and Love for People?
Nothing is more fundamentally important in teaching than the recognition that, although one may have taught a particular concept a hundred times, the beginning student is
encountering it for the first time, today in class, research lab, or other applied setting. One must therefore teach the material with the enthusiasm the student deserves, not with the weary demeanor of someone who is tired of hearing (or saying) it. When students submit papers devoid of any semblance of APA style, remember that although teachers have seen these same errors more times than they can count, this may be the first time they have completed this type of assignment; all teachers should also remember that they, too, were once beginning students who had never seen the APA *Publication Manual*. A little kindness and patience may improve not only one’s teaching, but the experience of beginning students, as well.

As Marrs, Barb, and Ruggiero (2007) found, the primary reason psychology students choose their major is a positive experience in their Introduction to Psychology course. Students of professors who care about students, and who encourage their hopes and dreams, have an enhanced likelihood of experiencing greater well-being and becoming fully engaged in their future work (Gallup, 2014). An applicant who can take pleasure in activities reflecting engagement with students, and doing those activities year after year in an environment in which students routinely expect personal attention and time from faculty, may be the teacher we seek. On the other hand, the person who finds the campus more pleasant when the students are away, or who always knows how many days remain until the next vacation, is probably not our candidate.

**Do I Know What I Want to Do?**

Prospective faculty will be better prepared to make good decisions about their careers and future if they have found (or created) opportunities to sample key aspects of academic life: teaching, research, committee service, and community work. Teaching and research are likely to be necessary, but not sufficient, requirements, and one’s résumé will be strengthened by committee service or administrative work (University of Oxford, 2014). It is one thing to tell a search committee that one expects to enjoy campus service or to be a good research mentor for undergraduates; it is quite another thing to be able to demonstrate it, based on experience in graduate school. Such experiential learning is important to professional development (McGovern & Tinsley, 1976), and job applicants may wish they had published more, had more opportunities for skills training, or sought more career advice (University of Oxford, 2014). Fewer than half (48.7%) of new assistant professors report that their graduate school training prepared them for their faculty positions (Hurtado, Eagan, Pryor, Whang, & Tran, 2012), so prospective faculty may have to work hard in graduate school to find ways to gain opportunities to teach and to show their interest in all aspects of faculty life at a liberal arts college. Despite the fact that many graduate programs offer limited or poorly supervised teaching opportunities (Buskist & Irons, 2006), for liberal arts institutions like USD, teaching experience is paramount. For students whose graduate program does not offer a teacher training program, Ritzel (2012) offered several recommendations to gain teaching expertise: join APA Division 2 (Society for the Teaching of Psychology, use on-campus resources (e.g., many teaching excellence centers offer programs on teaching), attend teaching conferences (e.g., the National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology or the Society for the Teaching of Psychology annual
teaching conferences), and/or form a campus organization like the Psychology Education Development Program (PEDA), which is a group of graduate students and faculty interested in topics related to the teaching of psychology and related disciplines.

In addition to these avenues for enhancing experience and knowledge that will increase the chances of getting an academic job, prospective faculty should know their own biases (University of Washington Career Center, 2014): For example, do they look down on institutions that are not major research centers? Are there geographic areas where they cannot see themselves living (although some writers—e.g., Ball, 2013—have suggested one should not limit oneself in this way)? Does teaching seem to them less prestigious than working in research or industry? Would they rather work with graduate students than undergraduates? Such attitudes may not serve prospective faculty well in their search for an academic position in a teaching-focused liberal arts department and may further limit their options for available tenure track jobs.

Know the Institution

Colleges and universities are not all created equal. As Freeman (2002) explained in his discussion of research universities and liberal arts colleges, there are important differences among institutions, in teaching, research, advising, diversity, and sense of community, for both students and faculty. Understanding the nature of these differences is fundamental to making good choices and to finding an academic home. When USD and similar institutions recruit faculty, they look for people with a passion for undergraduate teaching and with programs of research that are likely to engage undergraduates in meaningful ways as collaborators.

Occasionally over the years, we have received letters of application that name one or more distinguished researchers with whom the applicants looked forward to working in our department. This tactic can be very useful when the researchers are actually members of our faculty; unfortunately, however, sometimes they have been professors at a well-known research center at a nearby university with a similar name. Candidates who have not done their homework have mistaken our university for a different campus across town, and as a result have applied to the wrong department, one in some ways quite different from the one they intended. Blunders of this sort do not, of course, serve applicants well, and they prompt us to offer some suggestions.

Read the Job Announcement

Is this position in the candidate’s area of specialization? Are the job requirements consistent with the applicant’s interests and abilities? Search committees routinely receive applications from individuals whose credentials clearly indicate their failure to understand (or respect) the position description and their lack of background in the area required. Showing such a lack of interest or attention is not a good way to impress potential colleagues.
Do Some Homework

Every college or university makes a wealth of information available via Web sites and print material. Take advantage of these resources during the job search process. Different types of institutions really do emphasize different aspects of applicant experience and interest in their recruitment of faculty (Landrum & Clump, 2004). Applicants should thus customize their letters of application to fit the particular situation; this step will set them apart from the many candidates who are inadequately prepared for the application and interview process (Morgan & Landrum, 2012). Customizing the application will work to one’s advantage by showing awareness of key characteristics of the department and institution to which one is applying.

In addition, applicants should know about the faculty and their interests, the nature of the student body, any special marks of distinction that characterize the school, and something about the local community. Knowledge of this sort will be helpful in deciding whether one would be well suited to the institution, and using it in the application and interview process will demonstrate to the search committee that the applicant cared enough to invest time and effort in finding a good fit in the search for an academic home.

After learning about the institution, spend time tailoring the career portfolio to the institution and to seeking thoughtful feedback from mentors and colleagues about how to best make an effective presentation of personal skills. If applying to teaching oriented departments, create a teaching portfolio that includes teaching evaluations along with a teaching interests statement, syllabi, and assignment handouts or samples. For programs that focus on a teacher-scholar model, in addition to the teaching portfolio, the candidate should create a research portfolio with copies of representative publications and a research interests statement that shows how past experience and future plans will best serve the students and the institution to which one is applying to work.

Assess the Organizational Climate

Matsumoto and Juang (2013) distinguished between organizational culture and organizational climate. Applicants may learn a lot about an institution’s organizational culture (mission, beliefs, values, procedures, accreditation, and the like) from readily available sources, whether electronic or print. Organizational climate, however, has more to do with the “feel” of the campus, and may be more readily assessed during the campus interview. How do the faculty relate to one another? What do they say about each other? What do students say about life in the department and on the campus? Does the atmosphere of the department feel comfortable?

Although some writers (e.g., Huang-Pollock & Mikami, 2007) have suggested applying for any job in which one might be interested, even if one believes the fit is less than good, research has suggested that perception of fit may be an important factor in the quality of employment (e.g., Saks & Ashforth, 2002). Perhaps Sternberg (2002), in recognizing the importance of person-institution fit, provided the best advice: Find an institution that will value the individual, and that the individual can value.
The Office Next Door

In recent years, as we have read applicant files and interviewed prospective colleagues, we have often thought of the office next door. We are of course interested in the education and the experience of the candidates, including their letters of recommendation, curriculum vitae, and teaching and research portfolios. However, as we have surveyed these credentials, considered teaching and research experience, and listened to what applicants say, we have also reminded ourselves that the person we hire is likely to live in the office next door well beyond our own retirement. We are not only selecting a teacher-scholar, but a colleague, a neighbor, a team member, and, we hope, a friend. We have set aside many applications from individuals with prestigious educational pedigrees when, in the final analysis, we simply did not believe the individual would be a good fit.

If an individual applies for a position in our department, and reads the ad carefully enough to know he or she is qualified, the task then becomes to convince us that he or she will be an outstanding colleague. The applicant will be competing with many others who are highly intelligent, well-educated, experienced, and perhaps well-published. To stand out from the crowd, one must show passion, a willingness to respect methodological and theoretical differences (see, for example, Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011), the capacity for hard work, a love of students, and potential to thrive in our particular kind of environment. In short, we must have a reason to believe that our campus will be a better place if this candidate lives in the office next door; to the applicant who can do that, then, we will ask, in the immortal words of Fred Rogers (1967), “Please won’t you be my neighbor?”
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33. What Comprehensive Primarily Undergraduate Institutions Look for When Hiring New Faculty

Richard L. Miller

My teaching career has been exclusively at primarily undergraduate institutions (PUIs). I began at Georgetown University, taught overseas at the University of Cologne, did a visiting year at the University of Arkansas—Monticello (UAM), and have now accepted a position as Chair of the Department of Psychology and Sociology at Texas A&M University-Kingsville (TAMU-K). For 20 years, I chaired the Department of Psychology at the University of Nebraska at Kearney (UNK), a Carnegie Masters I Comprehensive public institution comprising 6,800 undergraduate and 1,400 graduate students. This chapter will principally focus on my UNK experience, although I have found significant commonality among all of the PUIs at which I have worked. Most UNK students, like those at UAM and TAMU-K are state residents, first-generation college students, graduates in the top half of their high school class, and at least part-time workers. UNK has a 16 to 1 student-to-faculty ratio with 320 full-time and 86 part-time faculty. Faculty teach a 12-hour load but 3 hours can be reassigned for research. A notable feature of UNK is its commitment to undergraduate research, and as a result, UNK consistently sends one of the largest contingents of students to the National Conference on Undergraduate Research.

The UNK department has 10 full-time faculty, 200 majors, and offers only bachelor’s degrees. The curriculum has a series of core courses that include laboratory experiences in statistics and experimental psychology for sophomores plus two additional lab courses for juniors/seniors in cognate areas (e.g., biopsychology, social psychology, developmental psychology). Students choose the two cognate areas for which they include a lab experience and only students in the lecture portion of the cognate area class can sign up for the lab. As a result, 67% of UNK graduates have made research presentations at state, regional, or national conferences. The department has hosted a number of undergraduate research conferences over the years and has a strong commitment to undergraduate research as did UAM and Georgetown during my time at those institutions.

Teaching

Teaching is preeminent at most PUIs and UNK is no exception. At UNK, teaching is not limited to the classroom; also includes mentoring students in research and service learning experiences or both. During my time at UNK, we believed that students learn best through experience, and as a result we emphasized experiential learning as a way of teaching them the science of psychology. The values that we looked for in a new faculty member included not only having a passion for one’s discipline, but a desire to share that passion with
students in ways that go beyond the traditional lecture format. As is true at many comprehensive PUIs, UNK faculty needed a good, broad-based command of their specialty area because they were often the only representative of that area in the department. However, we also preferred a generalist’s perspective and a willingness to expand one’s horizons to be essential values, because UNK, like most departments, did not have enough faculty members to represent every subdiscipline of psychology. The department usually asked new faculty to teach subjects for which they had received relatively little training in graduate school.

The teaching skills we expected included a command of the discipline, a good presence in the classroom, and an ability to work with and supervise students. In general, we did not engage students in assisting with our research. Instead, we tried to develop students’ abilities to pursue questions that interested them, within the context of the courses we were teaching. Therefore, we expected new faculty to be able to take a student’s idea and facilitate development of that idea into a researchable question. We looked for mentoring skills in our new faculty that helped guide a student to form a hypothesis, develop the design, analyze the data, complete a manuscript, and present the finished product. Over the years, we found that much of our best teaching occurred after the class was over when we would work with students to prepare their paper for presentation or publication. In hiring new faculty, we sought evidence of eclectic research interests, statistical skills, computer literacy, and the ability to use technology to enhance teaching and learning. Finally, because collaborative work was common at UNK, as it was at Georgetown and UAM, we believed that good teamwork skills were especially valuable.

To be successful in obtaining a job at UNK, the job applicant needed to demonstrate passion for teaching that could be documented by prior teaching experiences, especially those that included full responsibility for both introductory and upper level courses. We considered essential the applicant’s demonstrated ability to teach within one’s specialty area, and evidence of a willingness to teach outside of one’s specialty area a clear asset. Familiarity with teaching techniques other than the lecture approach was also important. Mentoring experience, especially as a graduate student mentoring undergraduates, was desirable. In addition, we looked for professional activity in scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), which could include attending teaching conferences, scholarly work in the teaching of psychology, and so on. Finally, during the interview process, we asked candidates about their philosophy of teaching. A successful candidate would have given serious thought to how to achieve specific learning outcomes, using a variety of instructional methods, addressing the needs of a diverse student body, and using techniques that emphasized active rather than passive learning. The teaching demonstration that candidates gave during their campus interviews needed to demonstrate how they converted their teaching philosophy into practice.

Scholarship
UNK, like all of the other PUIs at which I have taught, expects faculty to engage in scholarly activities that lead to the advancement of knowledge. We looked for job applicants who not
only had a research program but who also had a desire and commitment to find answers wherever questions and controversy existed. Collaborative research was the norm at UNK as it was at Georgetown, especially SoTL, which provided an arena that all members of the faculty found interesting. It was also important that the new faculty member's scholarly interests not only connected with students’ interests but also with colleagues in other subdisciplines, especially at UAM and TAMU-K because they were and still are multi-disciplinary departments.

Although programmatic research could be pursued, the new faculty member's research interests needed to transcend a particular area and be adapted to the process of providing a quality education for students. A new faculty member's willingness to pursue a student proposal, even on a topic outside of one's area of expertise, is an asset within the experiential learning model that we adopted at UNK.

Scholarship at UNK requires a variety of skills. New faculty members must have the ability to design research projects that can be completed with students and within the framework of the academic semester or year. They must have the ability to write and edit the documents required for successful research, including IRB protocols, grant applications, conference presentations, and journal articles. They must be able to keep abreast of the latest developments in their area of expertise on their own, using the resources provided by e-mail contacts and an occasional specialized convention. They must be able to represent their specialty when working with other specialists, possibly from other departments. Finally, they must have the ability to create student interest in research, and to mentor students in all aspects of the research process, from data collection to publication.

Some of the experiences that we thought were predictors of future scholarly success at UNK included collaboration with peers and with undergraduate students, work that addressed a diverse range of questions rather than questions concerning a single topic and from a single perspective, presentations and publications outside of the thesis and dissertation, completion of research without using sophisticated equipment, and involvement at the “hands-on” level, such as writing grant applications and coding data.

Service
At UNK, service is viewed as a set of activities that go well beyond committee work. Service is a way of connecting across the academy, a commitment to educating students not only within our discipline, but also through general education, service learning, and research mentoring. We valued service to the profession, especially activities that provided opportunities for our students. We valued active academic citizenship at UNK and believed that it can enhance the education of students via policy and curriculum development, as well as encouragement and support of the scientific enterprise. We encouraged faculty to become involved in service activities to ensure that sound educational principles were used to inform academic decision-making. Ultimately, service becomes leadership, an essential element for innovation and growth.
As much as scholarship involves the sharing of ideas within a community of scholars, service that supports scholarly communication provides a valuable lesson for students. From simply organizing travel to a convention, to reviewing papers for publication, to organizing a large conference, service provides opportunities for students and faculty to enhance teaching and scholarship. Some of the experiences that could help prospective faculty members develop service skills include volunteer activities at their graduate institution and in their community as well as service on academic committees and task groups.

Some Additional Insights
Skills and experiences in teaching, scholarship, and service can certainly be assessed in application materials. However, the personal and professional values of candidates are more difficult to assess. Some evidence of an applicant’s professional values can be gathered from the application letter, teaching portfolio, and letters of recommendation. More important to us were the questions that candidates asked during the interview process and how well they listened and responded to our answers. These interactions helped us judge the extent that they would be able to incorporate UNK’s mission and values into their professional plans for teaching. From this information, we tried to judge how well they matched the organizational climate of the department and to predict the likelihood of their becoming a respected colleague.

It also was our expectation at UNK that collegiality extended beyond the faculty and included the support staff. As a part of the interview process, candidates would spend time with our departmental secretary and other key support staff. In the ensuing search committee meeting to evaluate a candidate, their input was always appreciated and taken seriously. Finally, because advising at UNK is a faculty responsibility, candidates needed to be able to explain how they would get to know students outside of class, meet their individual needs, support their academic and non-academic life outside of the department, take an interest in their future, and make a difference in who they become.
34. Transitioning into the Role of Assistant Professor

Jessica J. Good

Davidson College is a small, private, liberal arts institution located in Davidson, NC (near Charlotte). The 1,850 undergraduate students represent 46 states and 39 countries. The student body is split evenly between men and women, with approximately 20% students of color and 5% international students. The vast majority of students (92%) live on campus. The 170 full-time faculty (96% with highest degree in their field) create a 10:1 student/faculty ratio. Davidson consistently ranks in the top 20 liberal arts colleges by US News & World Report, and is one of the first liberal arts colleges to replace loans with grants in financial aid packages (in addition to need-blind admission). Davidson students compete in NCAA Division I sports (Davidson College, 2014). Although the primary emphasis is on teaching, the college expects faculty to demonstrate excellent scholarship, as well as commitment to college and national service.

In Spring 2014 I completed my third year as a tenure-track assistant professor at Davidson. I graduated with my PhD in social psychology from Rutgers University in spring 2011 and began my career at Davidson the following fall. Throughout my graduate career I always knew that I wanted to teach at a liberal arts college. When I interviewed at Davidson, I knew it was the right place for me.

Teaching

Prior to beginning at Davidson, I had considerable graduate school teaching experience at a large research university (Rutgers) and a semester of experience at a liberal arts college (Drew University). Of the four courses I taught my first year on the job, two were completely new preparations, and two were classes I had previously taught. I was confident in my teaching skills and excited to prep my two new upper level courses (a seminar and a research methods course). Even with two courses under my belt, I spent the great majority of time in my first year preparing for class. I worked hard to live up to my ideals for the kind of teacher I wanted to be, and it paid off with happy students and colleagues. Now after year three, I would like to revamp those courses with which I arrived, although the thought of starting over and prepping a course from scratch is daunting. I have really enjoyed my time spent teaching, particularly as I see students progress through my courses and the major as a whole. It is incredibly rewarding to hear from former students that they found my class particularly useful in the real world post-graduation, or that my course influenced their thinking in another class. I still keep in touch with my undergraduate advisor and in the past I sometimes felt like I was bugging her; now that I am in her position I see how heartwarming it is to hear that former students are thriving.
Research
I had considerable research experience prior to arriving at Davidson, thus my concern was with maintaining research productivity alongside a heavy emphasis on teaching. I was also nervous about striking out on my own, so to speak, without the safety net of graduate school mentors and colleagues. I appreciated having a few projects already in the pipeline at the beginning of the semester, so that I didn’t feel guilty primarily focusing on teaching at first. My goal was to keep at least one project in all stages of publication (data collection, analysis and writing, submitted, under review, or ideally, in press). The summer following my first year at Davidson, I advised four undergraduate research students in my lab, on three different projects. It was the busiest summer I have had to date, but also one of the most rewarding. I found that I loved mentoring students through the research process.

I am still working on becoming the kind of research mentor I ideally want to be; I strive to balance productivity and rigor with student autonomy and experiential learning. I love that I am at a school that values research with students and does not mandate the grind of constantly publishing. It has taken me a while to relax my timelines and realize that research takes longer when one is fully incorporating undergraduates into the experience. However, for me, the benefits of mentoring outweigh the slower pace of publishing. I am also fortunate that Davidson provides excellent resources for research in the form of lab space, equipment, and internal funding. Although I will certainly apply for grants in the future, I had enough start-up funding to get my research program off the ground initially, without needing to apply for extramural funding.

Service
Initially, departmental and college service scared me because the system seemed so complicated. Divisional and editorial service scared me because I did not want to overcommit and fail to spend enough time on my teaching and research. Luckily, my department eased me into service gradually (no committee service my first year, then shared tasks with colleagues, then primary responsibility for tasks), and senior colleagues mentored me on what types of service might be most rewarding and valued by Davidson and the broader psychological community. Within my department, I now coordinate the research participant pool and audit the senior majors regarding their progress toward graduation. Institutionally, I serve on the IRB and the Library Committee. I actually enjoy all of these tasks (particularly the IRB and the participant pool administration) and I find that I learn more about the department and institutional history through my participation in service activities. As I have taken on more service and networked within the broader college community however, I certainly have become more aware of campus politics, which has been difficult to navigate. I generally try to listen to my senior colleagues and mentors and avoid forming strong opinions on matters on which I do not have enough information or history with to take an informed stance. In instances in which it is necessary for me to voice an opinion that may be controversial, I generally try to seek out as much information as I can prior to forming my opinion, and remind senior colleagues that my opinion is less informed by institutional history than theirs might be. I think it is very important for a junior faculty
member to maintain strong, collegial relationships within one’s department as well as across the campus as a whole.

When I first started my position, I was prepared to advise psychology majors, but I was unprepared for the flood of potential majors who would come through my door wanting to discuss the major and ask me to be their advisor. I still have difficulty saying no to some students even though my advisee count is on the higher side within my department. In addition to major advisees, faculty at Davidson have pre-major advisees. These students are first- and second-year students who need advice on class registration prior to declaring a major. Faculty are exempted from pre-major advising during their first year because they are still learning the broader curriculum. Even in my second year however, I found pre-major advising to be particularly challenging because I did not have a firm grasp on the entire college curriculum, nor did I feel prepared to answer questions such as which math class would best prepare students for a physics degree, when to take the LSAT, how to proceed through the pre-med requirements, and so on. I definitely prefer psychology major advising over pre-major advising.

Along with class, graduate school, and career questions, advising at a liberal arts college also includes dealing with a whole host of personal and professional issues. I have had to deal with a student who was harassed by another professor, a student who was sexually assaulted, a student who felt her professor was racially biased, multiple students with sports-related concussions that interfere with their classwork, a student with an eating disorder, and multiple students with mental health issues. I mention these student issues to emphasize that at times my role as advisor includes way more than that for which I was trained (I am not a clinician!). It took a while for me to feel competent at figuring out how best to help my students, whether it was taking them to meet with the dean, referring them to counseling, or simply listening to their experience.

In addition to recognized service, I also routinely talk with students about their graduate school and career plans, and write recommendation letters—tons and tons of recommendation letters. I often write four or five different letters for the same student as he or she applies for fellowships, internships, study abroad, post-graduation jobs, graduate school, etc. I also routinely write for students a year or two after graduation after they have taken time off between college and graduate school; I may or may not have a strong memory of that student’s work. Writing recommendation letters is time consuming and a little bit thankless. When I am frustrated by the task, I think back to all the recommendation letters my undergraduate and graduate professors wrote for me, and realize that I am now repaying that debt.

Finally, with regard to wider service, I have taken on a consulting editorship that I think will prepare me to take on greater editorial tasks in the future. I am also co-editing a special issue of a journal, which has enabled me to experience the entire, complex editorial process. Additionally, I served on the Early Career Psychologist (ECP) Council for the Society for the Teaching of Psychology. That committee was incredibly beneficial, allowing me to work with
other ECPs and learn from their experiences, as well as to network within the Society at large. Our council was extremely productive as well, adding conference presentations and publications to my CV at a time when I particularly needed to demonstrate my ability to publish. Although I was hesitant to commit so much time to that committee, in retrospect it was a stellar service experience.

**Challenges and Lessons Learned**

Although I have learned quite a bit over the last 3 years, I will focus on two main challenges and what I have learned from them. First, it was challenging to learn to work efficiently. In graduate school I could spend an entire day or even week on one project. Now, I have so many competing demands for my time during the day that, at the end of the day, I sometimes have no idea where the time went. Instead of working with prolonged focus, I needed to learn to work on a manuscript or data analysis when I only had 30 minutes here or an hour there, with a high likelihood of being interrupted by a student in need. When I first started at Davidson, my goal was to be the best teacher, researcher, and department member I could be. That meant I worked a lot of hours, usually 7:30am–7:00pm on weekdays, plus 8-16 hours on weekends, and constant e-mail availability for students and colleagues. My work was my life. That was okay for a while, but at the end of my first year I realized that I was too caught up in the day-to-day task of being a new faculty member, with little planning for my long-term career and personal goals. In my second year I started to pull back, using my time more efficiently so that I did not have to work so many hours. I adjusted my syllabi, created rubrics to grade more effectively in less time, blocked off time on my calendar for research and writing, and tried to take one full day off each weekend. I also began saying no sometimes, and not wasting time feeling guilty about saying no. In my third year, I had a baby; that experience has led me to honestly reflect upon and reappraise my career goals. I certainly still strive to be the best professor I can be, but realize that some weeks I will be an excellent teacher and not as great of a researcher, and at other times the balance will tip in the other direction. Although it may be taboo to say within the world of academia, sometimes I will have a week where I need to focus on my family at the expense of my career (just as at other times sadly the reverse will be true).

Working efficiently is a challenge for me. I have struggled to develop my identity as a professor. Initially this identity crisis was because I moved straight from graduate school into a faculty position, and I was only 5 or 6 years older than some of my senior students. Who was I to be giving them advice? Gradually my attitudes shifted in line with the social role I was playing, and I began to feel like a legitimate professor. In the past year or so however, instead of fulfilling some preset role, I have started to reflect on my identity as a professor and what I communicate to students in that role. Certainly I spend a lot of time teaching my students about psychology, but I have been reflecting on what else I want to teach them besides simply course content. I want to teach them to respect themselves and others; behave professionally; ask for help when it is needed (e.g., by seeking out the writing center, a statistics tutor, psychological counseling); develop a relationship with their faculty (e.g., by attending office hours, having informal conversations); find healthy ways to manage their stress; and value their family, personal life, and leisure activities in addition to their
classwork. I am better able to model some of these actions than others. As I develop my faculty identity however, I am conscious of what I am currently modeling for my students, and the role that I want to model in the future.

**Conclusion**

It may seem that I am waxing sentimental, but writing this chapter has given me the opportunity to reflect on the past 3 years as an assistant professor. All in all, I really like my life right now. Although I work a lot, I enjoy 90% of my workday tasks. I feel that I make a difference in my students’ lives, and they make a difference in mine. I wish I could go back to my 2nd or 3rd year graduate school self and say, “Keep going—it’s worth it!” In my first year at Davidson, I was very nervous about doing well and earning tenure. Of course I am still focused on tenure, but the prospect of not earning tenure is not so scary any more. I know that regardless of what happens I will have spent 6 years doing a job that I love, working with supportive and interesting colleagues, which makes me very fortunate. Overall, I would sum up my transition from graduate school to assistant professor as being a lot of work, life-changing, and extremely enjoyable.

**Reference**

Davidson College (2014, June 13). [www.davidson.edu](http://www.davidson.edu)
35. Transitioning from Graduate School to the Academy: Redefining our Roles as Researcher and Teacher

Stephanie E. Afful and Karen Wilson

Any change can be difficult, and transitioning from a graduate student to a full-time faculty member was no exception for us. We both earned our PhDs in social psychology from Saint Louis University in an experimental program that also gave ample opportunity to focus on teaching. We are now both assistant professors at small, private, liberal arts universities. In this chapter, we hope to share some of our successes and challenges in this transition from graduate students to the academy.

As we think of the three components of teaching, research, and service, the biggest change in this transition is that, as graduate students, the majority of our time focused on research, whereas in our current position, it is on teaching. We both have a four-course load per semester. In fact, if we were to rank order our professional duties and expectations, teaching is the first priority, followed by service, and last by research. The following sections will elaborate on these components.

Teaching
We both taught adjunct courses at various institutions before teaching full time. One of the significant changes in the transition to the role of assistant professor was the simplicity of one office, with one set of textbooks, and course expectations at our respective institutions. As an adjunct, I (Stephanie) taught research methods at different institutions from different textbooks in the same semester. The parsimony of adopting one organizational framework for each of my courses was timely and efficient. Having a workspace in which I feel organized and productive can help establish balance in other areas as well (e.g., service, scholarship).

Additionally, as we now teach at only one institution, we were able to develop a greater attachment and identity with our respective institutions. Along with this new institutional identity has come the opportunity to develop closer ties with students and colleagues. As an adjunct, I (Karen) often felt like an outsider or visitor where I was teaching. I often did not have the opportunity to attend events or get to know the faculty and staff at the school because I was shuffling from one school to another. A lack of a home base helped contribute to this situation as well. Because I did not have an office (or shared one with 20 or so other adjuncts) I would often come to school, teach, and engage in class prep and grading at home. Now that I am a full-time faculty member, I feel more like I am a part of the college community. I have more time to meet with students and collaborate with fellow faculty.
Although there are many advantages of being a full-time versus part-time teacher, such as the obvious increase in pay, we faced some challenges in crossing over to full-time status. There is an increase in departmental expectations regarding activities outside of teaching, such as advising, service and research, all of which take up a significant amount of time, as we noted before. While I (Karen) taught the same number of classes as an adjunct as I do as a full-time professor I found myself spending more time on class prep than I had before. I think with the switch to full-time status I placed greater pressure on myself to be the best teacher possible.

Because teaching remains our number one priority, as early assistant professors, we also held higher expectations of our courses than we did as adjuncts or teaching assistants. As an assistant professor, I (Stephanie) had more time to experiment with new teaching strategies and technology than as an adjunct or graduate student. As we continue to teach the same course over and over, the emphasis is not so much on preparing the lecture but on seeking new and innovative ways to make the content meaningful and memorable for the students, which included not just new classroom activities or demonstrations, but also re-thinking my perspective on the class and my role as the teacher. Through learner-centered teaching and flipped classrooms, I was able to challenge myself and the students.

Service
Service can be at the departmental level as well as institutional and national level. One of the biggest service challenges in our first year in the academy was advising—we had no previous experience with advising as an adjunct professor or graduate student. Learning a new general education curriculum and its exceptions and idiosyncrasies had a steep acquisition curve. In addition, as an advisor, I (Stephanie) was not only assisting students with their course schedules but also preparing them for the graduate school application process. I was not prepared to have hard conversations with students who, based on their GRE scores and GPA, would not be competitive in the schools or programs to which they wanted to apply. It is still something I struggle with as to how best to steer students for life after college. That being said, despite the initial challenge of advising, it has also been one of the greatest joys of this job. Connecting with students and witnessing their success in graduate school has reinforced the responsibility and contributions we have as advisors and mentors.

Service can also be taxing at the institutional level if colleagues continually ask you to serve on new committees and task forces. During my (Stephanie) first 2 years teaching full-time, I said yes to every request of me and overextended myself. Institutional committees can be a good option for getting to know your colleagues across campus, which serves well for tenure. However, colleagues should also respect new professors in their effort to set limits in order to maintain balance in all their professional duties. One strategy we have used is to explicitly set limits before the semester starts. For example, we decide how many manuscripts and books we will review, how many new courses we will prepare, and how many graduate student committees we will sit on given our current workloads. When choosing university-level committees on which to serve, choose the most visible
committees. It is important to know one’s limits and practice saying “no” when possible. If one is unsure of what is necessary versus voluntary, ask a faculty mentor or department chair about the campus culture and expectations of service.

As new professors, we were also more conscious and intentional of service to the discipline. My department chair at the time encouraged me (Stephanie) to serve within the Society for Teaching Psychology (STP). My experience serving on the STP Early Career Psychologist Council has been one of the most rewarding in my career. Serving STP or one’s disciplinary organizations (e.g., Society for Personality and Social Psychology) forces new faculty to network. As I became familiar with other colleagues in my stage of career, I also gained a broader understanding of policies and procedures at other institutions which put my own university policies and standards in perspective (e.g., tenure procedures, professional development funds, institutional service). For service opportunities within STP, see the Get Involved link on the web (http://www.teachpsych.org). It would also be wise to ask one’s chair or mentor how service outside of the institution is valued by the department and university. Some universities do not regard national service highly in tenure and promotion decisions.

Research
Given a heavy teaching load, we found it more difficult to make time for research, especially in our first year working on new course preparations and learning the campus culture. We found strategies such as collaboration (mostly with our former graduate student colleagues) and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) research to be effective in managing this balance between research and teaching.

Collaboration is effective for anyone in our profession, but it is particularly necessary for those of us who work at institutions where teaching is the main focus. I (Karen) work at a very small school, and I primarily collect data from college students, so collaboration is especially important because I do not have access to very large subject pool. For assistant professors in small universities with limited time and resources, collaboration at regional and national conferences and professional organizations can be fruitful. Ashdown and Brown (2013) provided a number of helpful tips in how to collaborate successfully.

Our research has also evolved. Because we both work at teaching institutions, our research is oriented toward evidence-based teaching. Conducting research in the classroom has provided us an efficient way to develop professionally. Teaching-centered research allows faculty to enjoy their cake and the icing, too! SoTL research improves our pedagogy as we strive to investigate the best strategies in our role as professors. Because we teach multiple sections of the same course, it allows us to use these settings for quasi-experimental designs. Presenting at teaching conferences is also beneficial in many ways—for teaching, service, and research. We also have found that teaching conferences are typically smaller than other national conferences and can thus be less intimidating for new professors.
Thinking about scholarship on whole, in graduate school our job was a perpetual literature review. There is less time as a full-time professor to read at the same level or stay current in the research. Attending conferences is a helpful refresher for new ideas within our disciplines. Although the journals in my mail box often went unopened (and some still do), one strategy I (Stephanie) practiced was to read biographies (e.g., Aronson’s (2012) *Not By Chance Alone*) and other popular mainstream books (e.g., Chabris & Simons’ (2010) *Invisible Gorilla*). These books provided enough historical context and science that aided in my pursuit to stay fresh in the classroom.

**Work-life Balance**
Achieving a work-life balance is important regardless of the type of career one has. Such balance can be particularly difficult for college and university faculty who do not have typical 9 to 5 jobs. We often have to take our work home with us. Having children or other dependents can be difficult to juggle with the work demands we face, especially for those of us who have not yet achieved tenure. Both of us had the experience of having children early in our careers. I (Karen) had my first child while still an adjunct professor, and in the spring of my first year on tenure track, I found myself pregnant with twins. Needless to say this situation was (and is) stressful. Juggling the care of three young children and the demands of my job has been difficult. One issue I faced during my second pregnancy was whether to stop the tenure clock. After consulting with other faculty at my institution, I decided to stop it. Time will tell whether it was a good decision. I just completed my second year of tenure track so I feel I have enough time left to accomplish what I need to in order to achieve tenure. Although there are benefits of stopping the clock in terms of earning tenure, recent research shows that it can also have negative consequences. In an article published on *Inside Higher Ed* Jaschik (2012) cited a conference presentation by Manchester, Leslie, and Kramer which found that stopping the clock led to a salary reduction even among faculty who had similar productivity levels as their colleagues who did not stop the clock.

Our collective experience at teaching institutions does not necessarily apply to research intensive universities. Wolf-Wendel & Ward (2006) compared family policies at different institutional levels and found that liberal arts colleges were the most progressive, offering a variety of family-friendly policies (e.g., Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), maternity course releases, paid maternity leave, stopping tenure clock), followed by research institutions (i.e., majority offered FMLA and stopping tenure clock polices), whereas community colleges were the most limited (i.e., only offered FMLA). With respect to institutional expectations, women at research schools commonly reported they felt they would be viewed weakly if they took advantage of FMLA policies while female faculty at liberal arts colleges reported they were expected to have the baby in May and they would only have one pregnancy before going up for tenure (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). Research schools often have an ombudsperson whose role is to offer confidential advice on such matters. If an institution does not have an ombudsperson, new faculty could seek advice from a faculty mentor or departmental chair regarding tenure and family policies.
Other tips that allow us to manage our time more effectively include teaching multiple sections of the same course thus reducing course preparation time and stacking classes or teaching evening/online classes to allow more flexibility in scheduling. As we mature in our career, we also become more adept at time management and efficiency, which may be due in part to practice but also to understanding more fully the campus culture and family-friendly policies. We have learned a lot from other faculty, both within and outside our respective institutions, about how they maintain balance. We were also assigned mentors within the university. I (Stephanie) have found the mentoring relationships to be very valuable in terms of rethinking my professional duties and how those balance with home life. Mentors might provide insight regarding on which committees to serve, whether one should stop the tenure clock, or innovative avenues for data collection. Outside of one’s institution, there are many resources from the collective wisdom on work-life balance (see Afful, 2013; Prentice-Dunn, 2012). Individuals seeking a mentoring relationship outside of their institution should also consult the STP professional development program for early career faculty (http://www.teachpsych.org).

Professional identity

Another factor that we did not anticipate before becoming full-time professors was the change in our professional identity. Defining ourselves as a graduate student and finding support among our cohort is a framework still in place. As we invest in a new campus and rebrand ourselves, our professional identity has shifted from graduate student to assistant professor. Our new cohort of other early career faculty now serve as our support network. In addition, our identities shifted from primarily being researcher to teacher. The connection with undergraduates and our priority on our pedagogy reinforces this salient distinction. As we mature in our careers, the distinction becomes less so, and our confidence increases in our ability to be both a teacher and a researcher, specifically a teacher who focuses on pedagogical research.

Conclusion

The transition from a graduate student to an assistant professor has been overwhelming at times. Looking back, if we could give ourselves advice in that first year as an assistant professor, I (Stephanie) would have told myself to put myself out there and be active. My motto is “you don’t know until you try,” so whether it be in the classroom or in service, give it a shot. We should not avoid new challenges but also not be too disappointed should we fail (e.g., if not elected to a committee, a classroom demonstration tanks). I (Karen) would have encouraged myself not to get overextended. It is certainly important to be productive; however, you do not have to achieve tenure in 1 year! The most important thing I would recommend is that new faculty try to not put too much pressure on themselves, especially when it comes to things like course preparation. Sure we all want to do the best we can but we do not have to be perfect. Our students most likely will never know that we spent 10 hours perfecting our PowerPoint slides for a 50-minute lecture. Finally, new assistant professors should make sure they are leaving time for themselves and their families—achieving the work-life balance is essential!
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Turning Your Foundation into a Launching Pad

Jennifer J. Stiegler-Balfour

When I began my journey from graduate student to faculty member at the University of New England (UNE) in 2010, I felt confident—or at the very least prepared—for what would be expected of me on a daily basis. But the realities of faculty duties were sometimes quite different from what I had anticipated. UNE is located on the southern coast of Maine and is considered a medium-sized, independent, non-profit, coeducational university with campuses in Biddeford and Portland, Maine. UNE also has a campus in Tangier, Morocco.

For the 2012-2013 academic year, UNE had an enrollment of 5,834 undergraduate students, 2,751 graduate students, and 1,067 professional students in Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine, Doctor of Pharmacy, and Doctor of Physical Therapy programs. The Psychology Department, which is located on the Biddeford campus houses three undergraduate majors: Psychology, Neuroscience, and Animal Behavior. In total, the department has approximately 270 students and 11 full-time faculty members. Before accepting this position, I obtained a doctoral degree in cognitive psychology as well as a Master of Science for Teachers (MST) in College Teaching from the University of New Hampshire (UNH).

For a bit of context, the Psychology Department expects me to teach three courses each semester, develop a program of research involving undergraduates, and become an active member of the university through service. Additionally, I serve as an advisor for roughly 25 students each semester. The university’s faculty handbook states that faculty should excel in teaching, research, and service and that each department determines which types of accomplishments count as progress towards tenure. In my department, for example, I have to demonstrate excellence in teaching by providing evidence of being an organized teacher who presents the material clearly, has effective rapport and comportment in the classroom, demonstrates content competence, and provides evidence of measurable student learning outcomes. Regarding research, I need to provide evidence for ongoing research productivity that involves students and to publish at least three peer-reviewed articles or book chapters (two of which have to be first-authored and/or in nationally or internationally recognized journals or venues). Last, I must engage in meaningful service at the departmental, college, and university levels. Although the requirements for tenure are fairly clearly defined, UNE encourages faculty to push themselves to surpass those requirements, as achieving the bare minimum is no guarantee of being awarded tenure. As a new faculty member, particularly in a tenure-track position, it’s important to quickly gain a thorough understanding of expectations and the criteria from which one’s performance will be evaluated. Some of the best advice I received was to request to view the portfolio of someone who has successfully undergone the tenure review. Hopefully seeing one—or perhaps several—examples will
provide the clarification new faculty often seek regarding accomplishments during the pre-tenure period.

Teaching
I was fortunate that I received training on teaching while in graduate school, which prepared me well for teaching at UNE. While earning my doctoral degree at UNH, I was simultaneously enrolled in a MST program through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, taking several classes and workshops on pedagogy, and being supervised by several teaching mentors. Having taught three separate classes during my third and fourth years of graduate school was invaluable in helping me hit the ground running at UNE. Not only had I already taught some of the classes I was expected to teach upon arrival at UNE (such as statistics and cognitive psychology), but my teaching experience at UNH had provided the necessary foundation to begin to develop new courses (for a review on preparing graduate students to teach, see Benassi & Buskist, 2012).

Workload is one of the first hurdles any new faculty member has to overcome. Even though I felt comfortable instructing in the classroom, having to teach three classes each semester was a challenge for me. I was fortunate to receive a course release during my first year, but teaching (and grading student work in) three classes a semester is a significant portion of my daily work routine. New teaching preps and adapting existing courses to provide an enhanced learning experience keeps all new teachers up on their toes. Because I am in the classroom almost every day, it seems like the work related to teaching is the most pressing and most rewarding because I get to implement changes and see students’ reactions right away. However, focusing all my time on teaching could be detrimental to accomplishing my research goals, and over time I have realized the value in balancing my teaching and research efforts.

As part of my teaching obligations, I also have about 25 advisees. I typically meet with students at least twice a year to discuss their academic progress as well as career planning. Many of my advisees will meet me regularly throughout the semester outside of advising season. Yes, it’s a sizable commitment, but being an active participant in a student’s educational journey has its own rewards—plus it offers another lens into the student experience that I can then use to improve the classroom environment.

Research
Another part of my daily routine—quite large actually—is devoted to research and mentoring undergraduate students in my laboratory. I was fortunate to receive a start-up package and lab space when I arrived at UNE. I initially encountered a few hurdles when the lab space was not ready when I first arrived on campus and the existing subject pool was relatively small. However, with the help of my colleagues, I was able to overcome these challenges. Having the necessary resources from UNE enabled me to build a program of research that is growing and branching out in several directions, although it all ties back to the central theme of reading comprehension. Four years in, I have reached a point where I believe that my lab has its own rhythm. Building a research lab from the ground up was a lot
different than integrating into an established lab, which is what I did while at UNH. Getting my lab at UNE up and running required many hours, including weekends, setting up computers and other equipment, programming studies, and working on developing experimental stimuli.

A key to building a good, productive lab at UNE has been the involvement of undergraduate students. Before coming to UNE, I had limited exposure to working so closely in a lab setting with undergraduates. Although the students who have worked—and are working today—in my lab, are highly motivated and eager to learn about research, one must be prepared to put in the hours training the students. Students play a key role in gathering data and in developing new research ideas and, as a result, are a vital resource for me. The bonus is that I inevitably have some students who work in my lab for several years, thus keeping me from overseeing an endless training loop. Although learning to work with undergraduates in the lab was one of my biggest challenges, I also feel it is the most rewarding aspect of my research program at UNE because it is wonderful to see them develop into researchers. I have been fortunate enough to have many students who have excelled in my lab, presenting at conferences and becoming co-authors on papers I have published.

So, what are some of the important lessons I’ve learned along the way since my arrival at UNE 4 years ago? First, almost everything takes longer than I think it will. This insight is true for both teaching and research (and everything in between). Implementing changes in a class is often trial and error and improving a class is unlikely to happen overnight. Feedback from students (formal and informal evaluations) and faculty members (peer observations) is critical for improvement and success (Stiegler-Balfour, 2013). Second, I have to remind myself that working on a research project for a long period of time without immediate rewards is worthwhile and will pay off in the end. The feeling of having a manuscript accepted is priceless but getting there usually involves a long road with at least some hurdles and roadblocks.

Service

Service is another core component of my responsibilities at UNE. Initially, I focused on departmental service activities such as becoming the Psi Chi faculty advisor, running the subject pool, and participating in events related to student recruitment and retention. Gradually over time, I became more involved in college- as well as university-wide service activities such as participating in faculty development initiatives, serving on university task forces, and participating in activities related to the development of a Center for Enrichment of Teaching and Learning. Although UNE clearly outlines that no amount of professional service to the academic community can make up for service commitments at UNE, I have always been very involved in professional service (even when I was in graduate school). My involvement with the American Psychological Association and the Society for the Teaching of Psychology has been invaluable in shaping my academic career.

To optimize my use of time, I have made a conscious effort to fuse some of my duties. For example, my specialty area is cognitive psychology, and therefore my research interests
naturally tie in with my passion to improve the learning experience of students in the classroom. Several of my research ideas for my lab originated from teaching, and likewise, I have been able to apply some of what I have learned about memory in the lab to the classroom. I have even been able to select service commitments that fit my research and teaching interests. Specifically, I’ve organized events related to faculty development, and I am also an active participant in the formation of a new Center for the Enrichment of Teaching and Learning at UNE. The take-home message here is that I have chosen things that I enjoy and that will help me to have the biggest impact on my community.

Finally, socializing with my colleagues is worth noting. Unlike in graduate school where almost all socialization happened outside of work, having psychology faculty in one central location of a building has really helped me to get to know the other faculty members better and lean on them for support. Several of my colleagues started at around the same time as I did so we have all been navigating the transition into the academy together. Although I find it invaluable to rely on some of my colleagues for guidance and feedback, it is important to mention that it is the faculty member’s job to take the initiative and reach out to others. I’ve found that many academics are self-reliant and do not want to ask for help. At first, I was hesitant, but every time I reached out it was worthwhile to gain another person’s perspective. A network of folks from whom one can ask for help at one’s institution and elsewhere can be a very powerful resource (Sternberg, 2008; Troisi, Leder-Elder, Stiegler-Balfour, Fleck, & Good, under review). I also think that showing evidence that one has sought feedback and guidance from colleagues and other peers is crucial for a successful tenure and promotion review. Showing that one has diligently worked to incorporate feedback and suggestions from colleagues and peers provides the review committee with evidence that one can take constructive criticism and use it become a stronger teacher, researcher, and participant of the community.

Mentors
I was fortunate that UNE assigned an experienced faculty member in the department to be my mentor. My mentor has been tremendous, helping me navigate the academic landscape as a new faculty member. Over the last couple of years I have also made a conscious effort to reach out to other faculty members in my department and at the university, as I mentioned above. I think it is very important not to isolate oneself within one’s department but to also seek out other faculty members to get different perspectives. I have mentors from graduate school as well as individuals whom I have met through my involvement in professional service who have provided me with helpful advice throughout my career so far.

It does not really matter who the person is, but the mentor needs to be able to understand what the mentee’s goals are in order to help, and they both need to be able to have honest and open conversations with each other (Lucas & Murry, 2002). It is important to seek out the help of individuals whom one respects and someone who will provide honest feedback that will propel one’s career forward.
Balancing Work and Family
There is always more to do in an academic career—a new class that can be prepared, or an article that needs to be written. Because our to-do-lists never end, some people delay aspects of their lives for a very long time. As an undergraduate I worked hard to get into graduate school. As a graduate student I worked hard to secure a faculty position. And now I am embarking on a journey toward tenure and promotion. Something I learned about work-life balance is that there is never likely to be a perfect time to have a family or to go on that big vacation. Regardless of how much faculty love their job, they have to understand that it’s okay to devote time to other pursuits.

Although having a child has been the best decision I have ever made, balancing work and a family is very hard. No matter how organized a person may have been pre-baby, once a child arrives, parents need to learn to expect the unexpected. Despite the challenges that go along with being a working mom, nothing is as rewarding and recharges my batteries as spending time with my family (for a more thorough review of work-life balance, see Afful, 2013).

My “Write it on a Sticky” Message
Wherever new faculty members are when they step onto campus the first time, it’s a pretty safe bet to assume the road will be long, sometimes uphill, and contain a few potholes. But rest assured there will also be beautiful stretches in which everything comes together and the journey becomes a wonderful ride. And the more new faculty tap into colleagues, mentors, and even family, the easier and more fulfilling the journey becomes.
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My Love Affair with Teaching

Sadie Leder Elder

Given that I study romantic relationships, it seems fitting that I liken my passion for teaching to a love affair. Starting out as a simple flirtation, it has indeed grown into a lifetime commitment and proven to be one of my most cherished and enduring partnerships. Much like any great love story, this relationship has had its ups and downs, as well as conflicts and triumphs. In hopes of providing support and encouragement for others considering a teaching path, I will share my experiences and a few lessons I have learned along the way.

The Courtship

My path towards becoming a teaching-focused professor was not straightforward. I entered graduate school with the belief that “real” professors should concentrate on research. In fact, my teaching career began not out of desire, but rather in fulfillment of a requirement for a graduate school stipend. As a laboratory instructor for psychological statistics, I was leading students who were only a year or so younger than me. To be honest, I found the experience terrifying. Thankfully, it did not take long to embrace this new role. My secret to succeeding as a teacher was finding a way to make the material relatable so that students could connect to it, and by extension, to me. By the end of my first semester I knew that I enjoyed teaching, but I had no idea that it would blossom into one of the great loves of my life.

To my surprise, my desire to teach grew with each year I was in graduate school. I transitioned from a teaching assistant to the instructor of record, as well as branched out to teach new classes. I found myself spending what little free time I had developing new teaching examples and working to connect course material to life outside of the classroom. I focused my energies on trying new techniques and technologies and even began developing classes related to my research focus. After several years in graduate school, I realized that my aspirations had changed and I was ready to embark on my teaching career. Fate had different plans. Upon entering my PhD program, I had signed on to help supervise a longitudinal research project. To my advisor’s delight, the funding was extended beyond the initial deadline and I had to continue in my role as a graduate student research assistant. I saw the finish line that I so desperately craved move farther into the distance. At that time, the most positive emotion I could muster was ambivalence. Looking back with the clarity that only hindsight can provide, I have come to embrace this turn of events as quite fortunate. It afforded me the opportunity to gain invaluable teaching experiences that made me more competitive for the job market and better prepared for my first few years as a professor. To those who realize that their hearts lie in teaching while their current reality resides firmly on a research track, there is light at the end of the tunnel. Use this time to prepare for the future.
The Commitment
After completing graduate school, I was delighted to accept a tenure-track position as an assistant professor of psychology at High Point University (HPU). HPU is a private liberal arts institution with approximately 4,000 students. The Psychology Department has nine faculty members and roughly 300 undergraduate psychology majors. With our small class sizes, I get to know my students by their first names and often teach students in our major several times before they graduate. In a typical semester, faculty teach three courses, supervise between 20-40 advisees, mentor undergraduate research assistants, and serve on several committees. Although HPU expects its tenure-track faculty to conduct research and publish, the university’s primary emphasis is on teaching. At long last, I find myself working with others who share my passion. I feel fortunate to be in a supportive environment that allows me to focus my energy on what I love to do, teach.

Of course, like all relationships, there is a great deal of hard work involved. Life as an early career psychologist (ECP) can be challenging even when one’s job is a good fit. During these pivotal years, new faculty often struggle to meet the competing demands of their teaching, research, and service obligations, as well as to strike a balance between work and family. ECPs also have the unique task of fulfilling tenure requirements coupled with the ever present need to successfully navigate departmental and university politics (Good, Keeley, Leder, Afful, & Stiegler-Balfour, 2013). My experience has been no exception. I am often busier than I thought possible and occasionally frustrated or confused. However, the freedom inherent in this new role is liberating, and that alone seems to make the obstacles posed by faculty life pale in comparison to those of graduate school. Much like finding the right relationship partner, there are good days and bad, but also an overarching sense of gratitude, appreciation, and good fortune to have found the right match.

I am proud that my hard work and passion for teaching have been successful and well-received. It has been an honor for my efforts to earn the praise of my students and university through Faculty Excellence Awards. It has also been my great privilege to be named the national recipient of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology’s Wilbert J. McKeachie Teaching Excellence Award for graduate students in 2010 and the Jane S. Halonen Teaching Excellence Award for early career psychologists in 2014.

Relationship Advice
I consider the invitation to write this chapter an honor. Many of the authors in the previous edition, as well as those included in this e-book, are my professional role models. I looked to them for guidance on successfully making my own transition from graduate student to professor. Now, I am delighted to add the following five tips to their collective of knowledge.

Do Not be Afraid to be Creative
In graduate school, my teaching of psychology course focused on the dos and don’ts of successful teaching. Although many of those rules have helped to inform and shape my approach, the prescription for the “right” way to deliver material felt limiting. Since then, I
have become more creative. I use quiz bowls, give out prizes, play music, incorporate charitable activities, play “Sadie Says” (akin to Simon Says, but with psychology), and in the appropriate classes even ask students to visit online dating web sites. Between class times that range from 60-180 minutes and the lure of technology, student engagement can be difficult to achieve. I encourage new teachers do whatever is necessary to make the material relevant and relatable. Interestingly, it is often the “I can’t believe I’m trying this” activities that my students remember, appreciate, and rate most positively on course evaluations.

**Try Not to Dwell on the Negative**

Around the second year of my PhD program I expressed my growing affinity for teaching to my research advisor. She promptly replied, “Of course you love it. It provides instant gratification.” She went on her way without knowing the impact of her words, while I sat dumbfounded contemplating what she had said. Was it possible that I loved teaching because it was “easy?” This question hung over me for quite some time. Now, many years later, after classes and students have tested my resolve, I can say assuredly that I have a heart-felt desire and a steadfast commitment to teaching. Students routinely challenge faculty, both explicitly and covertly. Furthermore, assigned courses, room locations, technology, and even class times can test a faculty member’s resolve. To the extent possible, try not to dwell on these negative occurrences. I think faculty are lucky to live within the bounds of a 15-week semester, which means that at any given time we are only a short distance away from a fresh set of courses, textbooks, times, rooms, and even students. I believe it would be a disservice to allow a difficult course preparation or problematic individual to monopolize precious time and energy.

**Continue to Develop as a Teacher**

Teaching is a dynamic process and as technology, content, and students change, we must continue to develop and adjust our methods. As teachers, we can refine and expand our pedagogical skills by attending teaching conferences, reading teaching books/journals, and studying student evaluations to understand both our strengths and weaknesses. Another important influence in my development as a teacher has been the role of the teaching and learning center (TLC). In graduate school, I had few teaching mentors. I received much needed support and guidance from the dedicated and knowledgeable TLC staff. New faculty may find such assistance vital to honing their skills. More recently, I have begun to conduct Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) research on my teaching techniques. This endeavor has proven to be an exciting way to merge my research training with my teaching passion. New faculty may find SoTL a helpful tool in further understanding and developing their own abilities.

Another way that I expand my teaching repertoire is by taking on new types of courses. In addition to teaching classes that are traditionally a part of HPU’s psychology curriculum, I teach online courses, first-year seminars, practica, and service-learning courses. Although such classes rely on the same teaching prowess as more traditional ones, each requires that I tackle novel challenges and acquire new abilities. Of course, some classes feel more
comfortable than others, but as a result of each one I became a better professor with a more extensive understanding of my craft.

*Plan Ahead and be Prepared*
Life is full of the unexpected, and teaching is no exception. However, the professorial life has many predictable aspects that can be made manageable with proper forethought. Practical challenges are inherent in an academic position, such as how will faculty stretch their professional development funds to cover the conferences they need to attend, and when they will have time to eat lunch (or even go to the bathroom) if they stack their afternoon classes. New faculty must also negotiate more abstract considerations such as whether they are making the appropriate strides towards tenure. All of these matters are more surmountable with a plan in place. I am embarrassed to admit that I have worked into the early hours of the morning as a result of procrastination or an overly optimistic idea about how long it would take to prepare a lecture or grade a set of exams. One will get better at estimating how long it takes for such assignments, which should help shape time allocations in future semesters (For advice on planning for early career years, see Keeley, Afful, Stiegler-Balfour, Good, & Leder, 2013). However, I have found that the better I become at balancing my duties, the more responsibilities others seem to put on my plate. By being reliable, faculty often make themselves excellent candidates for more departmental, service, or extracurricular work. My advice would be to guard personal time and not be afraid to fend off additional tasks that may disrupt the current balance.

*Get By with a Little Help from Friends*
This last piece of advice is going to sound more like a testimonial than a tip, but that only serves to underscore its importance. Faculty should not hesitate to rely on family, friends, and colleagues to help them succeed. Although family and friends are invaluable resources that provide more support than can be enumerated in this paragraph, I want to focus specifically on the important role colleagues play in making the sometimes autonomous process of teaching feel more connected. Given that I began on a research rather than teaching path, I had few personal role models in the teaching world. A saving grace for me was the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP). By happenstance, I attended STP’s teaching pre-conference session at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) and immediately felt at home. Through face-to-face interactions with STP leaders as well as by taking advantage of the resources generated and shared by STP members, I found support and encouragement for my teaching. I urge new faculty to take advantage of the cornucopia of resources available to STP members. A sampling of these include the *Teaching of Psychology (ToP)* journal, free e-books, Project Syllabus, mentoring, and a number of funding and award opportunities. The job of early career faculty becomes exponentially easier by drawing from the experiences of exceptional teachers that have come before us.

Just after my first year as an assistant professor, I wanted to express my gratitude by giving something back to STP. I applied and was selected to become one of the inaugural members of STP’s Early Career Psychologist Council. From 2011-2014, I served on this committee,
helping to generate and disseminate teaching-related resources for early career faculty. My involvement with the ECP Council has led to the generation of journal articles, e-books, and presentations, but more importantly, it expanded my teaching abilities and made me a more thoughtful and capable educator. Although I did not anticipate it at the onset, my efforts have been repaid many times over through the connections that I have made with other teaching-focused faculty. Regardless of what stage one is at in their teaching career, there are likeminded others who are ready, willing, and able to offer assistance, camaraderie, and support. Whether it is within one’s department, university, or through STP, all they need to do is ask.

**Conclusion**

Although it has been quite a journey already, my love affair with teaching is still in its early stages. As my relationship with teaching progresses, I look forward to the new challenges and rewards that will present themselves. Although Confucius once said, “Choose a job you love, and you will never have to work a day in your life” (Confucius & Waley, 1938), I endorse a more pragmatic outlook on love and work. For me, the benefits of teaching have far outweighed their costs, and although this relationship requires a great deal of hard work, the fulfillment it provides is paramount. As this love story continues to unfold, I will remain inspired by my mentors, challenged by my peers, and dedicated to ensuring that my students receive the support and enthusiasm necessary for them to develop a passionate connection to and critical understanding of psychology.
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38. Transitioning from Graduate School to the Professoriate

Christopher R. Howard

Husson University (HU) is a small, private college in Bangor, Maine with approximately 2,600 undergraduate and 500 graduate students. HU began in 1898 as a professional business school and has since added numerous professional degree programs (e.g., occupational therapy, physical therapy, pharmacy), as well as degrees in science and humanities (e.g., psychology, English, healthcare studies). The HU psychology program consists of four full-time faculty members (including myself) and houses three degree programs. In addition to a traditional bachelor’s of science degree, we also offer a combined dual degree program with our criminal justice program. Until the incoming class of 2013, we offered a dual bachelor’s degree in psychology and Master’s degree in occupational therapy in conjunction with the Occupational Therapy department. At present, we have approximately 160 majors across these degree programs.

I joined the faculty as an assistant professor in August 2010 after finishing my doctorate in experimental psychology that summer. In graduate school I taught three courses as an instructor of record: Introduction to Psychology, Human Sexuality, and Research Methods. In addition to classroom experience, I also completed numerous graduate courses in college teaching in general and the teaching of psychology in particular. Although I had some unique experiences in graduate school to prepare me for teaching, my transition to the academy was not without challenges. HU values four areas for professional development: teaching, scholarship, service, and advising. In the following sections, I will address the transitions I faced with regard to each area. I will also offer some “lessons learned” on my relatively brief journey thus far.

Teaching

HU is primarily a teaching college, but all four areas are important for advancement and promotion. I have a 4/4 teaching load with additional (optional) opportunities for teaching during the winter and summer terms. Since 2010, I have taught eight unique courses at HU, three of which I developed.

My first year was a whirlwind of prepping classes, delivering lectures, and grading. In graduate school I taught one class per semester and often was aided by several graduate teaching assistants. As an assistant professor, I was teaching four classes simultaneously without teaching assistants. After the first semester at HU, I began developing a routine, pacing myself, and emerging from the recesses of my office more frequently. As I started to offer the same courses most semesters, I have been able to continuously tweak and update
both the content and teaching techniques I use each semester while reducing my overall prep time.

In all of my classes, I routinely use many different types of assignments, projects, and assessments (short-answer and essay questions more than multiple-choice questions) but grading takes a considerable amount of time. I have developed several strategies to space assignments across classes and distribute the grading evenly throughout the semester. I have also developed several rubrics and templates to provide thorough, but quick, feedback to my students. There are, however, some points during the semester that are always busy regardless of how I carefully plan the semester—namely mid-term and the last week of the semester.

HU is considerably smaller than my graduate institution. In graduate school, smaller classes ranged from 60-80 students and larger classes ranged from 150-300 students. At HU, larger classes consist of 25-40 students while smaller classes range from 10-15 students. My first year at HU I relied on developing lectures that centered on a PowerPoint presentation with some prompted discussions throughout. Although this approach, which I adopted from my earlier teaching with larger classes, was rated highly by students on teaching evaluations, I felt a considerable disconnect between myself and the students. I wanted to more fully engage students in class discussions, drawing out their ideas, knowledge, and life experiences. Students seemed to understand course concepts, but I did not feel my students were able to “see” these concepts in their daily life. In the following semesters, I began to include more applied examples and questions centered on current events in all of my classes. Centering on current events, particularly those trending in popular culture, helped me connect to students the most. Once I was able to draw in students with a relevant (and often times humorous) example, I could introduce psychological concepts and applications with more student interest and engagement.

Students also seemed too focused on the content of my PowerPoint slides. I did not want students spending class time transcribing every detail of my slides. After the first semester, I began to optimize the content on my PowerPoint slides, reducing the sheer volume of content and focusing on quality content. Although that technique increased student attentiveness to my elaborations and examples, I soon realized that the strictly linear nature of my presentations either stifled productive discussion or neglected pedagogically meaningful conversations with my students. During my third year, I abandoned formal presentations altogether in favor of a dry erase marker and discussion clouds. Unbeknownst to my students, I still use an outline to organize my thinking for each class and to make sure I cover relevant course concepts. This technique is not with student criticism to be sure. One student remarked (on a teaching evaluation) recently, that “he really doesn’t teach us anything. He just talks to us about psychology all class long.” This shift in teaching style and focus is emblematic of a shift in my personal teaching philosophy. I am no longer content teaching just psychological content. I am interested in teaching students to be critical consumers of psychological information who can develop successful strategies for
adaptation in our rapidly changing field (and world). I believe students are learning to think about psychological topics, rather than just remember them.

Fortunately, over the past 4 years I have had very low incidence of disruptive classroom behavior, including plagiarism and cheating. One of the most problematic areas for me, however, has been group work. In every course, I use a group or team project to help students understand or apply class content. I have varied the methods of assigning groups between random assignment and students selecting their teams. I have also built in numerous ways to assess individual as well as overall group performance. Despite my best efforts, students struggle with intragroup conflict, unequal levels of group participation, and general disorganization. These issues remain among my most unresolved teaching challenges. I am continuously thinking, experimenting, and reading about potential solutions.

Overall, teaching is my passion and I have truly enjoyed my first few years in the academy. The transition from graduate school to the professoriate focused on aligning my expectations, developing an adaptive approach to pedagogical endeavors, and simply staying afloat. Although I am still relatively new to the profession, my head is above water and I can see the shore in the distance. Here are a few things that I have learned so far about teaching:

• Less truly is more. Reducing the volume of course/lecture content is not the same as sacrificing course/lecture content. Providing a compass (or starting point) can often orient students and help them find their own way.

• A little extra goes a long way. Learning students’ names, providing small, class-wide extra credit incentives, and something as simple as saying “hello” to a student outside of class can pay dividends in student interest, engagement, and attention in class.

• Finding my teaching style. I have had the privilege of studying under and working with truly great professors, who drew on their individual strengths, training, and personality to create truly unique styles that, although worthy of emulation, are not reproducible.

• Excitement is contagious. So is boredom. I find that my level of enthusiasm, or lack thereof, for a particular content or topics is mirrored by my students. For each content area that I teach, I try to find something that particularly appeals to me. And, yes, sometimes I resort to “faking” enthusiasm.

• Assessment is crucial. Grading is often painful. Opting for short-answer questions, essay questions, and multi-phase projects provides for greater understanding of student mastery, but makes for longer work days.

Scholarship
For me, the most significant discrepancy between graduate school and the professoriate is in the area of scholarship. In graduate school, research was my primary focus and teaching a secondary focus. Although I applied to primarily teaching-oriented colleges, I expected to
During my first year in the academy, I quickly realized that the time demands of prepping new classes, grading, and advising, left little time (and energy!) for research endeavors. I began to restructure my research goals from semester goals to yearly goals.

During year two I developed my first independent line of research at HU and got underway...slowly. My first experimental study required approximately 300 participants, two phases of data collection, and some financial support. Fortunately, the university offers several institutional grants for which I applied for and received the necessary funding. Recruiting participants and training undergraduate research assistants to run participants took considerable effort and time, however. I realized quickly that I needed to adapt to a smaller participant pool and begin designing smaller, within-subjects experiments. Nonetheless, this study was a resounding success even though we found no statistically significant results after three semesters of data collection. Our study examined the testing effect—that repeated testing promotes better long-term recall than comparable periods of study—using novel musical stimuli. The study examined whether testing effect would be found using non-verbal stimuli (musical patterns) as it had been by other researchers using verbal stimuli (narrative passages, word pairs, etc.) I was amazed at my research assistants’ interest and enthusiasm for doing psychological research. Surprisingly, students (research assistants and those interested in being one) also began to develop research ideas of their own.

Here are two pieces of advice that I can share from my endeavor:

- Engage students in the research process. Engaging students in research can have numerous benefits for both students and instructors. Research experience is invaluable for students aspiring to go to graduate school, and student enthusiasm is contagious.
- Cultivate a culture of data and science. Teaching students to think critically and skeptically about psychological topics fosters a fertile ground for undergraduate research.

Service

In graduate school I had little exposure to university service. During my first year at HU, I did not serve on institutional or faculty committees, but participated in faculty, departmental, and program meetings. After my first year, I began serving on two faculty committees yearly and eventually rotated to different committees (due to expiring terms). I have also been a co-advisor for Psychology Club since 2010 and chartered a chapter of Psi Chi in 2014.

There were several challenges that I faced when I first became involved with service. First, my initial university committee assignments were on seasoned committees—meaning that members had served on the committee continuously for many years without rotating off. Although an advantage to serving on committees with long-term serving members is having informed members to contribute and lead these groups, the disadvantage was continuously...
feeling “out of the loop” or not having a comparable wealth of knowledge to guide my contributions. In addition, the existing members were not too interested in educating the new guy. The second challenge was serving on a committee that may not have been well suited for my training and expertise. I found it difficult to make meaningful contributions so far outside my area and experience in higher education. The final challenge to me for becoming service-oriented was taking a job in a new area and not having established connections with other professionals for service opportunities outside the university. HU considers two broad arenas for service: service within the university and service to the community or the discipline (outside the university). It took several years for me to cultivate enough networks to locate such opportunities. Here are two lessons I’ve learned thus far:

- Find the best fit for your professional skills. There is definitely plenty of service work to go around. Find committees or endeavors that not only appeal to your professional expertise, but also those that can help shape your professional development. I am now serving on the Institutional Review Board, which better fits my research background than my previous service appointments.
- Learn to say “no.” Although you will get “volunteered” for committees, subcommittees, or tasks sometimes, do not be afraid to say no to some service opportunities, especially if those opportunities might become an obstacle for another professional area (teaching, scholarship, or advising).

**Advising**

During graduate school I never advised students beyond the occasional student asking questions about research or career directions. Advising was, by far and away, the first of the four professional areas that I encountered first as a new assistant professor. As soon as my HU e-mail account was setup (weeks before the start of class my first semester) I was inundated with e-mail from students requesting a change of schedule or wanting to meet and discuss their progress through the HU curriculum. I quickly learned the registration software and began to understand the layout of our curriculum. During the add/drop period that first semester and nearly every semester since, students constantly demand every morsel of my free time to help them rearrange their schedules. During the rest of the semester, however, I meet with students to discuss longer range plans including careers and graduate school. It was during these meetings with undergraduates that I truly began to see the importance of advising or, the term I prefer, mentoring.

Students live in a complicated macrosystem that encapsulates their academic life, work life, family life, relationships, roommates, successes, failures, good behavior, and bad choices. Advising helped me develop an appreciation for the stresses (eustress and distress) that students face. Advising also helped me realize that we are educating a whole person, one with penchants and abilities that are truly unique and that define how they see themselves and their world.

Advising certainly has its challenges. Successful mentoring requires empathy, which can be emotionally exhausting at times. In addition, students may feel the need to disclose personal
information or limitations to explain academic struggles, which could potentially blur the professional boundaries of being an advisor or mentor. And, no matter how awesome you are as an advisor, some students will continue to struggle and not succeed in the college environment. The single greatest lesson learned about advising is:

- **The most meaningful, potentially life changing interactions often happen outside the class.** In my 4 years as an assistant professor, I have had the opportunity to advise and interact with some truly wonderful students. Many of them have gone on to promising careers in their intended field and an increasing number have gone to graduate school.

### Conclusion

For me, entering the professoriate was not so much a choice as a carefully chosen path. Although my first 4 years in the academy has presented me with several challenges, my job has been rewarding and, at times, fun. My teaching and research are adapting to meet the goals of the university, department, and program, as well as my professional and personal constraints. Service to the university is still perhaps the most challenging area of my academic life. I am confident that continued service and assuming leadership roles in those service opportunities will help me develop this area further. Finally, academic advising has been an unexpected and pleasant surprise. I hope that I can continue to develop strong rapport with students inside and outside the classroom in an effort to further their educational and career goals. I will end with a final lesson I have learned during my first 4 years as an assistant professor:

- **Semesters are good. Summers are great!** Transforming students’ lives is but one of the rewards that the professoriate has to offer.
My first few years as a tenure-track assistant professor have involved a variety of experiences. Some of these experiences have been welcoming, familiar, and pleasant. Other experiences have been rather unexpected and less pleasant. Most certainly every individual beginning the transition from graduate student to assistant professor will experience aspects of this transition that he or she had not anticipated. Therefore, the following is offered merely as a reflection of my experiences in the hope that the information herein, along with the other chapters of this book, may provide an array of insights from which readers may draw upon as they transition to the new professoriate.

In order to best understand my experiences, it is helpful to put them in the context of my training. The path to my current position, like many others, has not been a direct route from undergraduate school to graduate school to a faculty position. After completing my undergraduate degree I worked full-time at a community mental health organization. I then completed a master’s of science degree in clinical psychology, after which I worked as a therapist and became a licensed professional counselor. After 2 years of professional work, I entered a doctoral program in clinical psychology. I completed my coursework and defended my dissertation before beginning my 1-year American Psychological Association-approved internship. My next career step was a 2-year postdoctoral research fellowship. After completing my post-doc, I was finally ready to go on the job market.

My search for a tenure-track position was successful. Currently I am an assistant professor in a small undergraduate psychology department. My percent effort is split 75:20:5, between teaching, research, and service. I teach three courses a semester (although I have taught an overload for the past several consecutive semesters). I conduct research and involve undergraduates in my lab. And, of course, I provide service to my department, campus, university system, and profession.

It is within this context that I have experienced the transition as a new professoriate. During this transition, I have experienced success and faced challenges in three areas: mentorship, self-promotion, and getting a well-rounded start.
Successes

Mentorship
Looking back on my 4 years as an assistant professor, one of my biggest successes has been developing relationships with mentors. Throughout graduate school as I prepared to become a faculty member, I heard many times the sage advice to “find a mentor.” Thus, the concept was not a novel one to me. And, to be clear, the development and nurturing of a good, supportive mentoring relationship takes effort for both parties—I do not mean to imply I have succeeded in this endeavor single-handedly. However, what I have found particularly advantageous has been developing these mentoring relationships with a wide variety of individuals.

Most likely there will be some members in any psychology department who are able to offer new faculty a wealth of perspective regarding departmental history, politics, and issues. However, not everyone is well-suited to be a mentor. Mentorship from within the department can help ease a new faculty member’s transition by providing guidance regarding specific departmental policies. In addition to this type of mentorship, it is important to understand the role of the department not only from the inside out, but from the outside in. This “outside in” perspective can be gained by creating mentor relationships with faculty in other disciplines—and I am not referring solely to other social sciences. New faculty should not be afraid to reach out to people in the arts, humanities, mathematics, and sciences. Not only may these individuals provide valuable insight into the workings of the campus promotion and tenure procedures and/or other relevant topics, but they may also be less invested or encumbered by specific departmental issues and social relationships.

Mentor relationships are often formed between the junior tenure-track faculty member and a tenured faculty person. These relationships can be invaluable, specifically with regard to advice about promotion and tenure. However, do not underestimate the value of other relationships, too. Forming connections with other first-year faculty can forge a sense of camaraderie. Meeting with junior faculty who are a few years senior to oneself can provide insight into the third-year review process. Engaging with associate professors may help to clarify one’s understanding of the journey between assistant and full professorship. Additionally, it can be very helpful to form relationships with non-tenure-track faculty and staff to gain perspective about how all institutional positions, not just tenure/tenure track faculty, interacts. All of these relationships combined can serve to increase the sense of collegiality and create a pleasant working environment, one in which a new faculty member’s productivity will be optimized (Worley, Borus, & Hilty, 2006).

Self-promotion
The second most valuable lesson I have learned is to be my own cheerleader. Once again, I remember being given this counsel by my graduate school advisors, and I appreciated their advice. In graduate school, I applied for awards or positions, and by doing so gained practice in self-promotion. However, this skill is infinitely more important as a new faculty member. Often campuses, institutions, or professional organizations will offer faculty awards for
research, teaching, and service. When the call for nominations is announced, new faculty should not automatically delete the email and think to themselves “I’m not qualified for that. I’m just a junior faculty member”. Rather, read through the requirements and seriously consider your qualifications. Consider asking a colleague to review your vita, the information that will form the nomination packet, and gather their opinions on the appropriateness of your application. The old adage “it never hurts to throw your hat in the ring” applies here. At best, new faculty will receive recognition for their excellent work. At worst, their work will be reviewed by members of a committee and their visibility among colleagues may increase. Ultimately, the receipt of an award shines a positive light on the individual, his or her work, and the department. Promotion and tenure committees tend to acknowledge such awards when reviewing candidates’ dossiers.

It can feel extremely awkward to toot one’s own horn, and it can be very hurtful to be rejected after applying for an award. Yet, new faculty should try, try again. Junior faculty should keep in mind that some awards historically receive several nominations from one person before the award is bestowed upon that particular applicant. One’s colleagues may be very impressed with one’s work, and yet be quite busy themselves. If new faculty wait for others to nominate them, they could miss the opportunity. In the words of one of my advisors: “the evaluation of your performance is too important to be left up to others” (J. E. Groccia, personal communication, October 3, 2013).

**Getting a Well-rounded Start**

Do not wait to get a well-rounded start on both your teaching and research! Your first lecture, on your first day, of your first semester as a brand new professor will inevitably arrive. Preparation for this teaching moment will be completed (even if you finish your lecture slides only an hour before class starts) and the lecture will be accomplished. However, preparation for the next lecture, and the next lecture, and lecture after that one, will continue on, and then there will be exams to create and grade, projects to develop and assess, advising sessions for the upcoming semester, and so on. Due to the immediate deadline of your next class period, your teaching duties for the semester will keep you marching forward. Within this context, one can easily get wrapped up in teaching duties, and neglect getting a research program established. However, do not fall in this trap of focusing on teaching and putting aside research. Establish your lab, involve students, and start data collection right away (Henslee, 2013). Failure to get started early on your research could have harsh consequences. It may seem daunting to get Institutional Review Board approval, train research assistants, and conduct a study during your first or second semester as a new faculty member—especially if your position is teaching-focused. However, keep in mind that many first-year faculty also receive some sort of course release and/or lighter service load. Be aware, too, that however busy you feel during your first year, your responsibilities will only increase hereafter.

To avoid any potential consequences from not starting your research program soon enough, consider the following tips. First, students are aware of when a new faculty member is coming to their department. Indeed, many departments include students in the job
interview process. Utilize the excitement of your arrival to engage students in conversations about your research, and perhaps to recruit potential research assistants. Second, when conceptualizing a research study, do not get bogged down in trying to create the perfect experiment, one worthy of a million dollar grant that will forever list your name in the annals of psychology. This sort of cognitive process may prove to be more paralyzing than motivating. Therefore, even if you start with a small pilot study, just get started. Third, utilize the new and varied connections you are making for mentorship as possible future research collaborators. Whether you join an existing project or collaborate on a new study, these efforts can help you get your research under way.

**Challenges**
The transition to a new position, no matter what it may be or when it occurs in your career, is rarely ever flawless. Rather than remain idealistic, and risk disappointment, attempt to prepare yourself as best you can for future challenges.

**Mentorship**
As I noted earlier, seeking a variety of people with whom to establish a mentoring relationship has its benefits. One of these benefits is receiving multiple viewpoints on different issues. However, take your time in meeting people, establishing relationships, and gathering viewpoints before drawing a conclusion on who appears to be a good fit as your mentor(s). Although it may be tempting to grab the arm of the first friendly face who offers assistance, remember to broaden your scope. Getting an accurate “pulse” of the department, campus, and institution will take time. Remember, too, that not everyone’s perspective is a representative or widely held one, not every opinion will be an accurate reflection of the facts, and not everyone has the new faculty member’s best interests in mind.

Some institutions have a formal mentoring process by which new faculty are paired with more senior faculty. Take advantage of this opportunity if it is presented to you. However, do not constrain yourself to your designated mentor. Other mentoring relationships can be forged, as mentioned previously, but there are also a multitude of informal mentoring relationships with which you can supplement your experience. Many campuses offer scheduled seminars or luncheons through the academic year—whether they are sponsored by the advising office, the center for teaching excellence, or a multidisciplinary research group, take advantage of these sessions as opportunities to learn more about your department, your campus, and the expectations for tenure-track faculty.

**Self-promotion**
Occasionally, a challenge one faces when trying to self-promote is backlash from others. Although it might not make any rational sense, others may feel threatened by a new faculty member’s ambition and initiative. The effects of such a backlash will depend on the person and their proximity to one’s work environment (e.g., another first-year faculty member in your department vs a research collaborator at a different institution). Healthy intradepartmental competition among colleagues can be supportive and motivating when everyone’s unique strengths are recognized. However, an unsupportive environment can
foster bitterness among colleagues, especially if they are unable to be happy for one another’s success.

Getting a well-rounded start
Although getting an early start on setting up a research program can be invigorating and exciting, a new faculty member will want to avoid some potential pitfalls as well. There is a balance to be found between getting one’s feet wet and jumping in over one’s head. While collaborating with others, either via starting a new project or by joining an existing one, can be beneficial, new faculty members should also evaluate the amount of time and effort they will invest in the work, whether the project is a good fit with their research agenda, and how their effort towards a potential publication will be viewed during the promotion and tenure process. If new faculty members accepted a faculty position straight out of graduate school, they will likely be familiar with how the workload is shared and how authorship order is decided among collaborators within your training program. However, your new associates may have a very different set of expectations. Clarifying these issues is always important, but they may even be more important during the early years of one’s career so that one can make the best use of one’s time.

Summary
There are many horror stories of graduate students suffering through coursework, research, and dissertation defense—grueling years of feedback and criticism accumulate during graduate school. Once the graduate student becomes a professor, a shift in tenor occurs. Vernon (2004) recalled the transition to the faculty as an “unanticipated…amount of respect, encouragement, and general positive reinforcement” (p.152). Indeed, many new faculty experience a sense of acceptance and collegiality from their department, campus, and institution.

Although many have heard the horror stories of graduate school, there remain a few survivors who tell a different version of the tale. There are some graduate programs and faculty who set high standards for their graduate students, provide a constant stream of constructive criticism, and continually push their students to excel while at the same time maintaining good rapport, appropriate boundaries, and a supportive environment. If you were fortunate enough to be trained in such a program, your transition to a faculty position may be a rather smooth one—going from a supportive training environment to a supportive work environment. Alternatively, you could find yourself transitioning from a supportive training environment to a less supportive work environment. Although you felt pressure in graduate school, without the proper “respect, encouragement, and general positive reinforcement” from your new colleagues and mentors (Vernon, 2004) this can create a very difficult transition. The grass is not always greener on the other side of the fence (or lectern, in this case).

It can be challenging to find the right group of mentors, to promote oneself, and to get a well-rounded start as one transitions from graduate school to the new professoriate. Time spent daydreaming as a graduate student about how things will be different (e.g., “just wait,
when I’m a professor...”), may not quite come to fruition. Nonetheless, the life of a faculty member is an incredible one. I have found support and inspiration from my mentors, camaraderie among colleagues across the spectrum, success in my teaching and scholarship, and most importantly my dream job.

References
Navigating the Transition from Trainee to Assistant Professor

Todd A. Smitherman

I obtained my PhD in clinical psychology from Auburn University in 2006 after completing a predoctoral internship at the University of Mississippi Medical Center (UMMC) and Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Jackson, MS. Although I entertained taking a faculty position immediately after internship, I opted instead to complete a 2-year postdoctoral fellowship at UMMC to obtain licensure and further experience in behavioral medicine. During my second year as a fellow, I accepted an assistant professor position in the Department of Psychology at the University of Mississippi (UM).

UM is a public state university with nearly 800 full-time faculty and an enrollment of over 18,000 at the main campus in Oxford. The Carnegie Foundation classifies UM as a Research University with High Research Activity (RU/H). Psychology is one of the most popular majors in the College of Liberal Arts, with approximately 700 majors currently. With two PhD graduate programs, one in Clinical Psychology and the other in Experimental Psychology, our department is home to 25 faculty, 17 of whom are tenured or tenure-track faculty, and approximately 60 graduate students. The department expects its tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach two classes per semester, advise 25-30 undergraduates, maintain a productive program of research, and contribute to service on departmental and university committees.

I was drawn to UM because of its strong graduate programs, productive yet laidback faculty, history of strong behavioral training, and proximity to my family and friends. The Clinical Psychology program at UM has a long history of training behaviorally-oriented clinicians and academics, and most of the faculty adopt behavioral or cognitive-behavioral orientations in supervision. This perspective dovetailed almost perfectly with my own graduate training at Auburn University, at which I worked under the tutelage of Dr. Dudley McGlynn and several other faculty with strong backgrounds in behaviorism and learning theory. My time at UM has been a happy marriage, but certainly the transition from trainee to assistant professor was a challenge unlike any other in my professional life.

Adjusting to Independence

Few occupations provide the freedom that accompanies being a professor in a university setting, but adjusting to this newfound independence can be daunting. For me, the transitional challenge lied in shifting from an environment of structure, clear responsibilities, and being supervised by others to one of nearly unlimited freedom, varied expectations, and serving as supervisor for many undergraduate and graduate students. As a young PhD, I was not much older than many of my graduate students!
Quickly I came upon a startling revelation: I had little direct training for many of my new faculty responsibilities. I had been involved in multiple research labs as a trainee, but never was I taught how to run one myself. When should I hold office hours? How should I go about advising students on classes and careers? What style of clinical supervision should I adopt? What service activities should I take on and which ones should I avoid? What is the best way to go about networking with colleagues? My graduate courses had provided me with extensive knowledge about the discipline of clinical psychology but no explicit answers to any of these questions.

I assumed that the best way to approach tasks unfamiliar to me was to emulate the educational styles of professors and supervisors who strongly influenced me as a trainee. I edit graduate students’ writing extensively because that is how Dr. McGlynn taught me to improve my writing. I lecture in an interactive and humorous style because I saw how positively students responded to Dr. Bill Buskist’s approach to teaching. (I never stand behind the lectern—even in auditoriums holding 350 students I step down from the stage and walk through the aisles and even around the back of the room while lecturing or facilitating discussion.) I weight exams heavily toward applied questions because the professors I learned most from were those for whom application of knowledge was paramount. I provide detailed yet constructive feedback when reviewing journal articles because Drs. Donald Penzien and Judith O’Jile at UMMC helped me realize that an oft-overlooked duty of a journal reviewer is to help the authors actually improve their paper, not merely to point out its shortcomings.

Although “borrowing” some techniques of those whose styles benefitted me, I sought to develop a unique professional identity. My research mentors were full professors, and their stimulus value was far different than mine: Their mere presence commanded respect from students and colleagues. The respect I desired had to be earned gradually and in different ways from undergraduate students than from graduate students. In no context was this discrepancy more apparent than my struggles to efficiently conduct lab meetings. Having never been in a lab the size of the one I run, I lacked exemplars for organizing lab meetings in ways that fostered the development of both undergraduate and graduate students. I adopted an empiricist approach, trying multiple permutations of meeting frequency, composition, and content. As the lab grew in size, I simply could not find the time within the same meeting to assist undergraduates with their lab tasks and career development, and have theoretical discussions about project ideas with graduate students. I settled on having separate meetings for undergraduate research assistants and graduate students, who meet jointly for discussions on large projects and working on conference presentations. Within the separate meetings, the senior students mentor the newer students and within the joint meetings, the graduate students mentor the undergraduates.

Dividing labor and delegating in this way did not come easily to me, but I ultimately conceded that I could maintain a high level of productivity while simultaneously micromanaging students. I can only train them as well as my time allows, and as they
become proficient, I afford them opportunities to informally mentor one another, hoping that good and frequent training is sufficient even if not always directly from me. This approach has worked well in general, but from time to time graduate students need more—when struggling to formulate a sound project idea, when low self-confidence begins to jeopardize their ability to succeed, or when personal matters begin to negatively affect their training. In every instance of this sort, providing a little extra of my own time has helped them turn the corner. Reinforcement occurs infrequently for students (especially for graduate students), and the simple acts of listening, encouraging, and caring take on profound significance in the context of mentoring them. Some students need little else; others require a more individually tailored approach. As a result, I learned quickly that treating every student equally was more fantasy than reality. I now endeavor to treat them all fairly while realizing I am not able to, nor should I, treat them all equally.

Managing Time and Obligations

Being employed in a research-focused university, research productivity has been the primary criterion by which my performance is judged by my peers, followed in turn by teaching and service. As a behaviorally-trained psychologist, the relevance of matching law (Herrnstein, 1961) was not lost on me: I rationed my discretionary time as a function of the consequences (i.e., continued employment, respect from colleagues, raises) associated with research, teaching, and service. Thus, outside the hours I am required to teach and advise students, most of my time the first few years was devoted to setting up my research lab, beginning a line of research independent from prior mentors, and both recruiting and mentoring a large number of undergraduate research assistants and graduate students.

A slightly smaller but meaningful portion of my time as a beginning faculty member was dedicated to prepping courses and lectures, grading papers and exams, and providing clinical supervision to graduate clinicians in training. In graduate school I had the privilege of being mentored for years by Dr. Bill Buskist. Under his supervision I was instructor of record for an undergraduate course, supervised graduate teaching assistants, and participated in Auburn’s inaugural Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program. As a postdoctoral fellow, I delivered guest lectures to medical students in training at UMMC, spoke at the Psychiatry Department Grand Rounds seminar, and taught two courses as adjunct faculty at nearby Mississippi College. These experiences prepared me exceptionally well for my teaching responsibilities, and without them (and the one-course teaching reduction the chair provided me my first year), I certainly would have needed to devote more “behind the scenes” time to my teaching.

My decision to prioritize time for research and teaching was a function also of the wisdom I received from my faculty mentors. To this day I recall fondly numerous conversations I had with my major professor, many of which involved me quietly listening and nodding in response to Dr. McGlynn’s numerous musings on life as an academic. In referring to the numerous responsibilities of the academic clinical psychologist, on many occasions he opined something of this sort: “Time does not afford one the ability to excel as a researcher, a teacher, and a clinician. Hardly anyone can truly excel in all three domains; on very rare occasions one can be exceptional wearing two of these hats.” This advice resonated with me.
when I began as an assistant professor, and I have since endeavored to excel in research and teaching. (Dr. McGlynn also advised me never to attempt to determine a colleague’s salary, as the resulting information was likely only to upset me. I did not heed this advice; he was right.)

As in most universities, service is expected but weighted least in terms of annual evaluations and tenure/promotion. I thus volunteered for service activities very selectively, being careful not to take on activities requiring considerable time during my first few transitional years. During my second year, I was both surprised and honored to be asked by a university administrator if I were interested in being the next chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). This role came with a one-course teaching reduction annually and would have been quite impressive to list on my annual service report, but my own inclination was to decline so that I could stay focused on my other academic priorities. Before deciding I sought out the counsel of my department chair and two other full professors, all of whom advised me against taking the position. Looking back, declining an administrative position of such importance early in my faculty career was a wise choice because it allowed me to establish myself foremost as a productive researcher and strong teacher. I still took on various service responsibilities, such as advising students, serving on department and university committees, and assisting with orientation sessions for incoming students, but I made every effort to protect large amounts of time that I instead wanted to devote to research. As my research program became more established, I took on more involved service commitments, particularly those in which I had a strong personal investment (such as organizing an annual departmental research conference and revising our policy on comprehensive exams). Presently my time is divided into approximately 50% research, 40% teaching, and 10% service.

I realized my first year that much of the work expected of me could not easily be accomplished in the office. Most of my teaching and advising responsibilities could be handled on campus, but composing journal submissions in the office was no easy task. If my office door was open, inevitably students and faculty would come by. Because I did not want to be cordonned off inside my small, claustrophobia-inducing office, I quickly learned the value of identifying contexts more conducive to scientific writing. The library was too quiet to keep me mentally stimulated long enough to be productive, and during the weekends I longed to be outside. Other settings provided a modicum of privacy and enough stimulation to prevent boredom—my covered back porch, the recliner with my television on in the background, a coffee shop with a strong brew and friendly faces, and on occasion even a local bar with wireless access and a different sort of strong brew. Other faculty were known to spend long hours at the office over the weekends, but so long as I was publishing and receiving strong teaching evaluations, my absence from campus on weekends was not of concern to my faculty colleagues. I am not suggesting that new faculty attempt to write in the contexts that I do, which are admittedly quite distracting for most people, but this experience underscores a fundamental lesson I learned: Managing the responsibilities of an assistant professor is an entirely personal experience—find what works and go with it.
Random Pieces of Advice

In addition to navigating the transition to independence and managing competing demands on my time, several other behaviors benefitted me in the tenure process, creating a pleasant workplace, and understanding department politics. Strategies that I found helpful in these domains are outlined below; their utility may vary as a function of one’s own academic context.

1. Obtain explicit expectations for tenure and promotion. Most departments have a document that lists the guidelines or expectations required for tenure. Obtain a copy early on, and ask the chair to clarify anything that is unclear or vaguely worded.

2. Find a senior faculty mentor within the department. Particular faculty are more knowledgeable about university governance and department politics than others. I found myself frequently hovering in the doorway of two full professors at UM, Dr. Alan Gross and Dr. Ken Sufka, both of whom are prolific scholars and exceptional mentors to students. Whenever I needed consultation on any issue of significance, I sought them out. (Fortunately they were close friends with each other and shared similar views on academia.) Over time, they began to seek me out for advice!

3. Seek regular, direct feedback from the department chair. At a minimum, such feedback is typically provided during annual evaluations. A good department chair will be very clear about one’s progress in relation to expectations.

4. Choose battles wisely. In general, new faculty should listen more than they talk, particularly in faculty meetings. Faculty commonly have different views on seemingly minor issues, and often these perspectives are based on prior experiences and departmental politics with which new assistant professors are usually unfamiliar. Exception: Do not sit quietly if a student is being judged unfairly.

5. Collaborate with colleagues. Collaborating with other faculty serves many functions. Collaborating facilitates networking (personally and professionally), conveys respect, and makes the work environment more enjoyable for both faculty and students. Good collaborations also yield increases in research productivity. Dr. Sufka and I are in the process of completing a series of studies developing and validating an animal model of migraine headaches. Our work not only has expanded my knowledge of translational research using behavioral endophenotyping and his understanding of migraine pain clinically, but this collaboration has resulted in numerous research presentations and publications, exciting ideas for future studies, and a very meaningful friendship.

6. Make the staff feel special. Secretaries, custodial staff, and physical plant workers can be a faculty member’s best friends or worst enemies. Take time to talk to and appreciate the staff; these individuals are charged with providing essential services so that faculty can devote their time to educating instead of other tasks. A few extra minutes letting them know they are valued can pay great dividends in making the work environment more pleasant and productive.
7. Realize that the productivity does not go unpunished. Productive researchers have to spend more time documenting their research activity for annual reports than do less productive faculty. Those who willingly volunteer for service activities are sometimes expected to take on a responsibility shirked by other faculty. Faculty with a history of successfully mentoring difficult students may accumulate more students than they can easily manage.

8. View students’ successes as personal reinforcers. With the exception of publications and grants (and the rare raise), tangible reinforcers for new faculty are infrequent and delayed. Learn to share in the successes of students (e.g., an undergraduate who presents her first conference talk or is admitted to graduate school, a struggling graduate student who passes a required class on the second attempt) and the rewards will be more apparent and meaningful. For faculty genuinely committed to students, these rewards far outweigh any other type of reward.

In closing, my transition from trainee to assistant professor presented numerous challenges, primarily those involving adjusting to freedom that makes academia such a treasured profession. Taking tips from mentors who influenced me, prioritizing responsibilities as a function of their weight on annual evaluations, and being willing to experiment with new approaches were of great value during my first few years as an assistant professor. Indeed, these strategies continue to guide my work as an academic.
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I began applying for academic positions while I was finishing my dissertation proposal at Auburn University (AU). I knew I would be entering into the highly competitive academic job market with the dreaded label of “all but dissertation” (ABD), and this label made me question if I was ready for the transition from graduate school to my career. My graduate training helped shape my strong interest in both teaching and research, but I was unsure of the type of university that would best support my future career goals. I followed the advice of my adviser and applied to a variety of universities seeking assistant professors in applied behavior analysis programs. I was fortunate enough to receive invitations for three on-site interviews where I experienced vastly different academic environments. I was invited to a small undergraduate teaching-intensive university, a large research-intensive university in Canada where I would have mentored PhD students starting in my first year, and California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) where I would teach both undergraduate and Master’s students. My interview at CSUS was a very telling experience for me because I felt like the mission of the university fell perfectly in line with my values as a future professor. I boarded my return flight to graduate school more nervous than before the interview because I had found an environment that would support my transition to becoming an independent professor. I was fortunate enough to receive an offer from CSUS, which I gladly accepted.

CSUS is the only 4-year comprehensive university in California’s capital city, and it is part of the California State University system, along with 22 other institutions. The student population of roughly 28,500 accurately represents the surrounding community in its high level of diversity, and CSUS offers 58 undergraduate majors and 41 Master’s degrees to its students. The university seeks to prepare its graduates to enter careers that will benefit the Sacramento region, and the student fees at CSUS are among the lowest in the nation. The Psychology Department is the largest in its college; however, the 20 full-time faculty members are not able to keep up with the student demand for the major, resulting in the recent declaration of impaction for all psychology programs. This climate presented some unique challenges during my first year as an assistant professor that helped shape my skills as a teacher, researcher, and member of my new university and community.

Teaching
It was quite clear that teaching and learning were a priority to CSUS during my job interview. I was pleased to find that this priority (and core value of my own) was reflected in the Psychology Department’s retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) policy. Formally, my teaching competence is weighted at 51%. My scholarly activity, service to the university, and service to the community are weighted at 29%, 10%, and 10%, respectively. I was also pleased with the division of my responsibilities because I felt confident in my teaching abilities from my graduate training. I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to take part in AU’s Teaching Fellows program, which allowed me to complete three pedagogy courses, receive detailed feedback on my instruction, and
teach undergraduate courses independently for 3 years. I was also able to teach two graduate seminars, one as a co-instructor and one as an independent instructor, during my time at AU. In addition, I had the opportunity to teach two courses as an adjunct professor at LaGrange College’s (LaGrange, GA) evening program for nontraditional students during my graduate training.

My teaching experiences as a graduate student prepared me well for the transition to teaching as an assistant professor. However, the transition from graduate school to a more teaching-focused state university presented some unique challenges during my first year. As I mentioned above, the psychology major at CSUS is impacted, which means that there are more students interested in the major than the faculty can adequately serve. Impaction allows for the deceleration of students into the major by requiring an application process with fairly high admission standards (e.g., completion of certain lower-division courses, a grade point average cutoff). Ultimately, the effects of impaction will benefit the department because the heightened requirements will shift student demand to other, more resourced majors. The process of impaction takes time, and I began teaching at CSUS not long after the Psychology Department declared impaction. Therefore, I experienced large waitlists for my courses due to this timing, and managing these waitlists during the first 2 weeks of each semester took a lot of my time. I listened to many distressed students trying to enroll in my course, and I felt terrible turning them away. Fortunately, other faculty helped me develop my own waitlist procedure to make future semesters more manageable.

The two courses that I taught in my first year were courses that I had taught during my graduate training, so I had a preconceived notion that I would be able to teach the same content at my new university. However, these courses were organized much differently in the curricula across institutions. In my graduate training, these courses were offered as upper-level electives, and generally, I taught 40-student sections of juniors and seniors. At CSUS, my courses were offered in a category model curriculum in an impacted major, which led me to teach 120-student sections where about half of my students were in their first year at CSUS as transfer students from a number of local junior colleges. This large increase in student variability forced me to take a step back in my teaching and ask students about their needs early in the semester. I learned that many of my students were intimidated by having essays on their exams because they had grown so accustomed to multiple-choice testing. I also learned that students experienced a variety of barriers (e.g., economic, language) in the classroom. The feedback my students were able to provide gave me new ideas to help them succeed. For example, I now post my notes online in multiple formats so that students who cannot afford to print hard copies can have electronic access during class. I also spend much more time reviewing exams and providing study tips early in the semester to give students the opportunity to succeed rather than moving forward in the course with the assumption that they will learn good habits from their peers.

I was fortunate in my graduate training to teach courses that were small in size. Teaching small classes gave me the opportunity to form relationships with the majority of my students, and I believe that these relationships increased the likelihood of students approaching me for assistance outside of the classroom. Although my future graduate courses at my new university will be small, my undergraduate courses will likely remain at a 120-student capacity. At first, I thought I was going to drastically change the way in which I taught and tested in order to accommodate the number of students I had in my classroom. However, I believe that my students deserve the feel of a small, intimate classroom even though they are sitting in a large lecture hall. I still attempt to learn as many student names as possible, and I still begin each class by asking how my students are doing, asking for questions, and opening the room up for discussion before diving into my lecture. I have also
refrained from using all multiple-choice items on my exams. I now spend significant time early in the semester training my teaching assistants how to help me grade essay responses so I can continue incorporating critical thinking and writing components into my large courses.

My experiences in the classroom during my first year as an assistant professor have taught me to be more flexible as an instructor and to respond to the ever-changing needs of my students. My students have taught me that quality of understanding is much more important than the quantity of material I present, and taking the time to build rapport with my students has truly paid off. I look forward to the feedback my students and colleagues will provide in future semesters.

Research and Scholarly Activity
I remember presenting several exciting lines of future research to my hiring committee during my job interview, however, the priority for my research and scholarly activity during my first year on the job was to complete my dissertation. I knew that I would be arriving with roughly half of my data collected. It was very stressful to have a clause written in my appointment letter stating a deadline to have my PhD in hand because so many aspects of data collection are out of the control of the experimenter. I decided to manage my anxiety by taking advantage of the aspects of my transition that I did have control over to set myself up for success. First, I negotiated for a course reduction in my first semester in order to get my lab space operational as quickly as possible. Second, I took inventory of my graduate lab space in order to develop a list of equipment that I would need to purchase when I arrived at CSUS. Third, I contacted my new colleagues and asked for assistance in getting a human subjects Internal Review Board application submitted so I would have approval for my protocol when I arrived. I also asked those same colleagues for a list of contacts in the community so I could begin to establish relationships from a distance with agencies that might allow me to collect data. Fourth, during my first week teaching, I described my research to my class and handed out research assistant applications to interested students so I could get students involved in my research during my first semester. Finally, I used my winter and spring teaching breaks wisely to write up my results and prepare for my oral defense. I also scheduled my oral defense during CSUS’ spring break so I could avoid the stress of scheduling and preparing for guest lecturers in my absence.

While completing my dissertation, I agreed to advise both a Master’s student thesis project and an undergraduate student research project. Both of these students approached me because they had research interests similar to mine. I was hesitant to take on these students, and I sought my colleagues’ advice before I agreed. I was frank with these students about my priorities and my own research timeline, and I believe that our honest conversation left each of us with realistic expectations for developing new projects. I will admit that these students added some late night hours to my first year, but I do not regret my decision. These student projects allowed me to pursue a line of research that I find exciting, build new relationships with community agencies, and shape my skills as an adviser.

Service to the University and Community
Although the weight associated with my service commitments is much lower than my teaching and research responsibilities, I found that service ends up taking a significant portion of my time. I have heard this sentiment echoed by many of my colleagues, and I think young professors overcommit to service opportunities for a few reasons. First, it is difficult to turn down a service opportunity because new faculty members battle an underlying fear that another opportunity may not surface. However, I have found this notion is not true; service opportunities have surfaced regularly in the past year. Along this same line, it is difficult to quantify service, and it is difficult to understand if I am
meeting my responsibilities—I continue to wonder if I am taking on enough service duties. Third, the right service opportunities can be quite enjoyable. It is nice to serve on committees that will directly benefit my students and colleagues.

During my first year, I was placed on three departmental committees, and I participated in a few college- and university-level service activities that the RTP committee considers lower level commitments (i.e., they do not require regular meetings). I also connected with a local nonprofit agency serving the clinical population I have a history of serving, and I was elected to the agency’s executive board of directors. I have found that the best way to make service-related decisions has been to seek the advice of (a) a younger faculty member who is experiencing similar struggles and (b) a helpful member of the RTP committee. My gut reaction to every service opportunity over the past year was to agree to the commitment and later devise a plan for somehow fitting a new obligation into my life. Fortunately, my trusted colleagues provided me with a lot of helpful guidance and have appropriately discouraged me from taking on a level of service that would have hindered my other responsibilities as a faculty member.

**Conclusion**

I recently reflected with some colleagues on my first-year experience as an academic. Both colleagues asked how I got through completing my PhD while taking on the responsibilities of a full-time faculty member and made comments that must have been miserable. I admit that wearing the hat of a graduate student and an assistant professor was not easy, and there were certainly times where I was concerned I would not meet the deadline to complete my degree. However, I can honestly say that I felt extremely supported by my new department in my endeavors, and I have truly enjoyed my first year as an assistant professor. I believe that my success in the past year is due in part to example set for me by my excellent graduate mentors and to my new colleagues who serve in a similar role. I think that it is extremely important to identify a few individuals in one’s department, and also a few outside of the department, to help guide one in making smart decisions. As past graduate students, academics have a learning history of overcommitting and not questioning our poor work-life balance because we operated under the mindset that our current environment is only temporary. I am now finding that I need to shift that mindset and take steps in finding the right balance so I can advise my own students to do the same when they enter the workforce in California.
42. Thriving—Not Surviving—During the Transition from Graduate School to Academia

Jared W. Keeley

The transition from graduate school to academia can be intimidating. As a graduate student, one’s duties are relatively well defined, and often defined by other parties. In contrast, as a tenure-track faculty member, one has decidedly more degrees of freedom in determining one’s activities, but also more responsibility for meeting certain expectations (that are sometimes ill-defined). Articles such as this one often talk about “surviving” the transition from graduate school. That term makes it sound as if there is a strong possibility a person will not make it through the process. Rather, the characterization should be to what degree a person thrives during the process. This essay details some of the issues I encountered when making that transition along with my advice for how best to navigate the process. However, before describing my transition, it is necessary to provide some context about my graduate training and where I currently work.

I received my PhD in clinical psychology from Auburn University in 2009. The academic environment when I was at Auburn was incredibly flexible in that students had the freedom to tailor their graduate studies and activities to whatever career goals they chose. So, if a person desired a practice-oriented career, she could devote the majority of her time to gaining practicum experience. I knew that I was interested in an academic life, so I completed extra research projects through multiple labs and gained as much teaching experience as I could. The program at Auburn provided excellent academic preparation, through a variety of means (see Buskist, 2012 for more details). First, there was a Teaching Fellows program that combined multiple semesters of didactic teaching training with the opportunity to be the Teacher of Record for a course. I was lucky enough to teach my own sections of both Introduction to Psychology and Statistics, which provided a strong foundation for both applying to academic jobs and transitioning to teaching full-time. I also had the good fortune to participate in Auburn’s Preparing Future Faculty program, which exposed me to many broader issues about academia, including service work, departmental and institutional politics, balancing the responsibilities of research and teaching, and many others.

While completing my internship, I considered both post-doctoral and tenure track faculty positions. I applied for both, and managed to be accepted for a position at Mississippi State University (MSU), which is a large, land-grant university located in the small town of Starkville, Mississippi (population approximately 20,000). It has an enrollment of about 17,000 undergraduate students and about 3000 graduate students (thus effectively doubling
the town’s size). At the time I arrived, the psychology department was home to over 400 psychology majors and three graduate degrees: a doctoral degree in Cognitive Science and Master’s degrees in Experimental or Clinical Psychology. In the span of the last few years, the Clinical Master’s degree has been transitioned into a PhD program. I state all of this information simply to highlight the fact that where I went to graduate school looks substantially similar to where I got my first job. Both schools are in the same NCAA conference, are about 4 hours away from each other, and have nearly identical student bodies. That degree of similarity in academic settings is certainly not the case for all first-time faculty, but it played a substantial role in easing my transition to the professoriate.

Teaching
My teaching load at MSU has been two courses per semester, most often one undergraduate course and one graduate course. My first semester involved two new “preps”: undergraduate Abnormal Psychology and graduate Psychopathology. My experience having prepped courses before proved invaluable in predicting how much time I could reasonably devote to each course. Because I had a solid foundation in syllabus development, presentation skills, discussion facilitation, test construction, etc., I was not stumbling through each of those tasks for the first time. The savings in time and effort because I had taught courses before (even though they were not the same courses) was immense. But perhaps more important was the fact that I had a solid foundation in pedagogical theory and research that could help guide my decisions when constructing my new courses. I was able to start with identifying goals and objectives for my students’ learning and then construct course activities, assignments, and assessments that would best support those goals. Because I had a good basis of what works when promoting and fostering learning, everything flowed from there and the myriad decisions I faced when constructing my courses had straightforward answers. Perhaps the best advice I can give to a graduate student hoping to have a teaching-related career is to learn empirically-based, theory-driven principles of human learning and memory while still in graduate school. This knowledge will demystify the educational process and make this aspect of a new job far less intimidating.

Along the same lines, many new faculty are concerned about their teaching evaluations, because they know these assessments will play an important role in their tenure application. The best advice I can offer in this realm is to focus first on becoming a better teacher; good ratings will inevitably follow. By seeking regular feedback from students and fellow faculty, a new teacher will receive the information she needs to improve the quality of her teaching. Perhaps the most important factor here is nothing more than the perception that one is trying to improve. Regardless of how well a teacher actually does in any given class or on any given day, if the students believe that she takes her teaching seriously and is doing her best to improve her service to them, they will appreciate the effort. From what is known about halo effects in ratings (Feeley, 2002; Thorndike, 1920), this appreciation will bleed across students’ ratings of other domains. This strategy is the one I have employed, and the comments and ratings I receive from students have reflected that the rapport I strive to form...
with them and my efforts to improve my teaching translate into an experience that they value and appreciate.

Another piece of advice I would offer to newly minted faculty is to seriously consider the values one wishes to uphold during one’s career. For example, I strongly value writing as a core educational competency, and it tests a domain of understanding not accessible through multiple-choice tests. Thus, in my undergraduate courses I strive to include a writing component. However, the logistical realities of my institution make that difficult. I often have around 100 students in a course, which makes grading essays on tests or term papers a distinct challenge. Thus, I was strongly tempted (and advised as well) to drop the writing component from my undergraduate courses. Nonetheless, I concluded that I valued the educational benefits of these assignments too much to sacrifice them. Instead, I am willing to devote the necessary time (meaning that the time must be reapportioned from some other task) to grading these assignments. My point in providing this example is not that all faculty should value writing to the same degree that I do. Rather, my point is that all faculty at one time or another will be faced with a similar decision about what they most value as instructors. The reality of a situation will conflict with the values a faculty member upholds. Every faculty person will have to decide when to hold one’s ground and when to concede. No one can offer universal advice for how to handle such situations; they will be based upon the particular values and intricacies of the specific situation. However, what can ease the difficulty of the situation is having a clear sense of values (in career, personal life, etc.) so that a new faculty member is not simultaneously trying to puzzle out what she values when faced with such an inevitable situation.

Research

One of my personal pet peeves of academic culture is the sentiment that good teachers cannot also be good researchers, and vice versa. This myth is pervasive in academia—in one form or another—even though it is rarely commented upon publicly. The sentiment is something like, “If you are a good researcher, you do not have the time to devote to being a good teacher,” or “The skills required to be a good teacher are incompatible or antithetical to those for being a good researcher.” Because I found myself at a research-intensive institution, the values of my university and department, rather unsurprisingly, favor research productivity over other metrics of academic success. Part of the transition for me has been finding a means of continuing to emphasize the value I place upon teaching and service (and the personal rewards I receive from engaging in these activities) while also achieving an expected level of research productivity. To be clear, I am not claiming that research institutions such as MSU do not value good teaching or service. They are most certainly committed to excellent education and community involvement. However, the perception at such places is that one form of productivity is more valued than the others, and thus any individual faculty member should plan his or her time and effort accordingly.

However, I do not view the various branches of academic activity as incompatible. Instead, they are complimentary, if approached in the right way. For example, I mentioned above that my first two courses were undergraduate Abnormal Psychology and graduate
Psychopathology. Essentially, both courses cover similar material (albeit at different levels), and so my preparation of each overlapped to a certain degree. However, as a clinical psychologist, I also conduct clinically relevant research. Thus, the readings I assigned or the material I reviewed for those courses also served as background work for my research projects. I often assign my graduate students to read the papers that I am interested in reading and would have read anyways. The classroom discussions of material prompt new research ideas. I present my research projects in class as a means of helping students to recognize that research is accessible and relevant and to foster interest in research generally. Simultaneously, I have prepared a day’s lesson and a conference presentation. In that way, teaching and research effort need not be separate; they could (and I argue should) be aspects of the same enterprise. Many institutions have faculty teach courses in their specialty area. I encourage new faculty to find ways to make their efforts overlap, so that they are not doubling their effort but synergistically enhancing what they do when working in multiple domains.

Because I ascribe to an empiricist point of view, I believe in the collection of data to systematically evaluate and improve what I do. Thus, whenever possible, I gather data through sound methodologies as part of my teaching and service that can lead to peer-reviewed empirical journal publications. Thus, my approach to my teaching and service work also augments my research productivity. Any teacher who is interested in improving his or her classes can do so through a systematic, data-driven approach, and thereby engage in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning when conducting and disseminating that work. Similarly, if we are engaged in any sort of service, we will want to know if that service is effective at accomplishing its goals. The evaluation of service work can become research if done in a thoughtful, scholarly manner. The publications generated in this way then reflect research productivity, even though they came from teaching and/or service work.

Service
Because I am a clinical psychologist, my transition from graduate school to academia may be different in the realm of service than individuals from non-applied disciplines. An expectation in my department was that I would pursue professional licensure and engage in the provision and supervision of psychological treatment and assessment through our clinic. Thus, in addition to my teaching and research obligations, I was also expected to maintain a certain client load. Although the content of the issue may be different, the principle in question is the same as for other new academics: maintaining balance. Indeed, maintaining balance among the areas of teaching, research, and service and between work and home life is the primary concern of early career academic psychologists (Good, Keeley, Leder, Afful, & Stiegler-Balfour, 2013). For me, this issue manifested itself in trying to schedule client appointments during my already busy day, which often led to my only available times being in the evenings. I struggled to find a balance between serving my clients—motivated both by professional and personal priorities—and maintaining my own well-being. The first few years of one’s academic career can be the hardest, especially in terms of the sheer number of hours spent working. I knew that I needed to prioritize time for relaxation and recreation. I
found that I had to schedule such times into my calendar (such as going to the gym), or it was too easy to let fun slide in light of other responsibilities.

The thing about service is that there is always more to do. A new faculty member will always be approached with more opportunities for service than a person could ever complete. I recommend that one attempt to integrate service activities with other professional goals. One should seek service activities that are consistent with one’s interests or skills. If possible, articulate a “service mission” that defines the aims and scope of intended service contributions. For example, my service mission is the promotion and excellence of educational practice. Hence, writing an article like the current piece is consistent with that goal. My involvement in committees and professional organizations mirrors that mission. Certainly, there will be times when a person is asked to complete service commitments she would rather not do; these jobs are a practical reality of running any institution. The purpose of a service mission is not to refuse all obligations that are inconsistent with the mission. Instead, it can help to narrow the list of possibilities and not take on too many commitments.

Final Thoughts
Transitioning from graduate school to academic life certainly can be an intimidating process. However, it is also the bridge to one of the most rewarding and fulfilling professions. Simply by putting forth one’s best effort, the transition will most likely be a successful one. The advice I offer in this essay is by no means exhaustive. Other excellent points may be found in the other chapters of this volume and other works. The more preparation one can achieve in graduate school (and the more preparation the field scaffolds into its graduate training), the better the outcomes will be for not just surviving the transition, but thriving within it.
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Patricia J. Brooks, Emily A. A. Dow, Svetlana Jović, Philip Kreniske, Aliza Panjwani, Jeremy Sawyer, Anna M. Schwartz, Christina Shane-Simpson, Francis D. Yannaco, and P. Ozlem Yuksel-Sokmen

Teaching today’s undergraduate is a demanding enterprise, requiring the organization of courses and activities to optimize learning, the incorporation of technology and writing into the curriculum, and the engagement and support of diverse learners. Although the new professoriate may be well-schooled in psychological theory and practice, instructors generally receive little formal training in the pedagogy of psychology. Despite the existence of numerous research-backed tips and methods for teaching, between conducting research and performing departmental service, new instructors may find little time to navigate through the plethora of teaching resources when preparing their courses.

Our goal in this chapter is to assist graduate student instructors and new faculty in sifting through various books and Web sites in order to help them develop a strong foundation for effective pedagogy and to prevent them from having to reinvent the wheel through trial and error. As members of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology’s Graduate Student Teaching Association (GSTA), we are well-versed in the trials and tribulations of teaching for the first time. In this chapter, we have organized especially helpful books and Web sites that may assist new instructors in course design and assessment as well as the utilization of research on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). Our selections also address topics such as activity-based instruction, Internet-enhanced teaching, development of undergraduate writing skills, management of diverse classes, and methods of inspiring students through service and community involvement. We encourage readers to use our chapter to select the resources that are most relevant to their needs. We hope that these resources will arm the new professoriate with strategies to confidently challenge, redefine, and manage the 21st century undergraduate classroom.

Getting Started
Buskist and Benassi’s volume delivers an updated, empirically informed account of successful teaching practices in both classroom and online settings. This resource is not just the conventional “how to” book—in addition to providing detailed information on implementation, it offers a rationale and evidence for specific teaching practices, including learning-centered lecturing, active learning, leading discussions, and assessing student learning. Curzan and Damour book covers a variety of issues highly relevant to graduate teaching assistants and new instructors, ranging from teaching (e.g., grading, designing assignments) to professional development (e.g., balancing school and teaching, preparing for the job market). Korn and Sikorski’s e-book is a free online resource offering useful professional and practical advice to new teachers.

**General Tools and Tips for Teaching**


These books provide a well-rounded introduction to collegiate teaching in any discipline. Each book covers the basic elements of course design, learning objectives, class activities, assessment, and skill-based learning. The Griggs and Jackson and the Sternberg volumes are edited collections of teaching tips intended specifically for teachers of introductory psychology, but the teaching techniques and insights from both volumes generalize to other psychology courses as well. Nilson’s book reads like a textbook for new teachers and applies evidence-based teaching strategies to higher education.

**APA Guides for Undergraduate Teaching**


The American Psychological Association (APA) takes the teaching of psychology very seriously because, of course, teaching is the primary means by which the field disseminates information and attracts new teacher-scholars. These resources provide APA’s professional standards for teaching undergraduate psychology courses: All are digitally accessible, with the exception of the Halpern volume, which provides a philosophical framework for teaching that emphasizes ethical and applied considerations in undergraduate psychology education.

**Course Planning**

Planning a course is often more overwhelming than actually teaching the course. As the adage goes, “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure”; a well-planned course will prevent a great deal of trouble later in the semester. Instructors should consider two key items during planning. First, they should think seriously about their teaching philosophy and write a statement conveying their teaching approach—including, for example, considerations about desirable classroom dynamics, and teachers should reflect on their position on the relative importance of content knowledge versus transferable skills. In creating their teaching philosophy statements, teachers should craft clearly written documents that are updated regularly based on classroom experiences. Many useful references for developing one’s teaching philosophy exist, including an online tutorial from the University of Minnesota.

Second, instructors should identify specific learning objectives for their students. Learning objectives, or goals, should be measurable outcomes (e.g., knowledge or skills) that instructors desire students to gain during the course. For some courses, departments may already have specific objectives in place to increase consistency across instructors. For other courses, instructors may develop their own learning objectives. All learning objectives should be measurable through student assessments; thus, learning objectives and assessment strategies should be developed in tandem. Linking assessments with course objectives makes assessments more meaningful for students and provides essential feedback for instructor and student improvement. By considering course goals at the start of planning, instructors are implementing “backwards course design.” This approach is useful in ensuring that students leave each course with the knowledge and skills necessary for future academic coursework and/or professional success.

**Teaching Philosophy**

University of Minnesota Self-Paced Tutorial for Writing Your Teaching Philosophy


Prompts for Starting Your Teaching Philosophy


Teaching Philosophy Template


The University of Minnesota offers online tutorials to help instructors develop and write a teaching philosophy statement, including samples from domains outside psychology. Additionally, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* has published several useful articles on creating a statement of teaching philosophy.

**Writing Learning Objectives**


These resources are a great place to start for developing useful and sound learning objectives: Anderson and Krathwohl’s article provides an in-depth discussion on how to use Bloom’s Taxonomy in the classroom (see also Krathwohl, 2002). The Eberly Center at Carnegie Mellon University online resource provides concrete examples of how to write learning objectives. Boysen’s guide provides step-by-step instructions for developing learning objectives for psychology courses.

**Assessment**


These resources go well beyond traditional assessment tools (e.g. multiple-choice exams, final term papers) and challenge instructors to think critically about assessment. Angelo and Cross’s now classic volume offers a plethora of concise assessment methods, many of which can be adapted to today’s technology-oriented classrooms. Huba and Freed’s edited book provides many hands-on tools for effective assessments in learner-centered (as opposed to teacher-centered) classrooms. Rueda’s book approaches assessment through problem-solving strategies and identifies ways to address specific gaps in student performance and achievement.

**Learner-Centered Curricula**


The learner-centered classroom is a philosophical approach to teaching wherein all aspects of course design focus entirely on students’ learning experiences. These books explain how to organize and develop a learner-centered classroom, and identify specific processes students use to construct knowledge and ways for teachers to encourage student learning.

**Backward Course Design**


These titles are excellent resources for instructors wanting to adopt backwards course design. Isecke’s book offers step-by-step instructions on how to structure course materials starting with student learning goals. Richlin’s book is an excellent resource for backwards course design at the college level. Wiggins and McTighe volumes are geared towards all educators, from elementary to higher education.

**Applying Psychological Science to Pedagogy**

Since the time of William James, Edward Thorndike, Hermann Ebbinghaus, and Wilhelm Wundt, the topics of learning, memory, and thinking have been foundational in psychological research. Decades of research on these topics provide critical evidence of how to enhance learning, and improve students’ study habits, metacognition, and critical thinking skills. However, the application of psychological research to educational practice (referred to as “Translational Educational Science” or “Evidence-Based Teaching” by Roediger, 2013, and Buskist & Groccia, 2011, respectively) has been lacking. All too often teachers over-rely on personal experience and anecdotal observations rather than consulting research findings.
when designing their classes. This section provides an overview of resources on learning, memory, critical thinking, and metacognition that highlight the relevance of psychological research to teaching and learning.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) has emerged as a grassroots “do-it-yourself” movement, in which teachers use their pedagogical practices as research material. Instructors engaging in SoTL evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching methods using established research methods, refine their classroom practices based on their research findings, and disseminate these findings through professional conferences and peer-reviewed publications. In 2014, STP’s journal Teaching of Psychology celebrated its 40th year of publication and APA Publications launched a new journal, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology, to provide a new venue for critical research on teaching and learning.

**Online Resources Promoting Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)**


Association for Psychological Science Website for Teaching

http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/members/teaching

CUNY Office of Academic Affairs Report on Best Teaching Practices

http://www.cuny.edu/academics/resources/teaching-practices.html

The Teaching Center, Washington University in St. Louis

http://teachingcenter.wustl.edu/Pages/Home.aspx

Benassi, Overson, and Hakala’s free e-book provides an excellent overview of the emerging field of the science of learning. Teaching resources available through the APS include a library of educational videos, recent publications, links to other online resources, as well as grant opportunities to support pedagogy research. The CUNY Best Teaching Practices guide lists many of the most influential SoTL journal articles. The Teaching Center at Washington University in St. Louis promotes teaching excellence through a wide range of online resources including research reviews, videos, and teaching tips.

**Textbooks**


The Dunlosky and Metcalfe and Halpern textbooks are intended for cognitive psychology courses, but are excellent guides for new teachers who need basic information about metacognition and critical thinking. Mayer’s book highlights SoTL research, and is a suitable text for a graduate course on the teaching of psychology.
These popular books are equally useful for undergraduates as well as new instructors aiming to maximize their classroom learning. Ambrose et al.’s book provides an easy-to-read resource designed to bridge the gap between teaching research and practice, with each chapter defining a research-based principle of learning and offering examples of how to apply it in the classroom. Brown, Roediger, and McDaniel’s book highlights several of the most effective teaching and learning practices using illustrative and memorable examples. The Hattie and Yates book presents myriad research findings with a focus on the learner being both the student and the teacher. It is based on the premise that learning is optimized when teachers view the learning process through the eyes of their students, and students view themselves as their own teachers. Willingham’s book uses anecdotes to bring research to life; his Web site and blog help educators stay abreast of current research by providing links to his “Ask the Cognitive Scientist” column, published in the American Educator, as well as summaries of journal articles and recent books.

“How To” Guides for Developing SoTL Projects


These books serve as a call-to-action for teachers to participate in SoTL research. Gurung and Schwartz’s book urges teachers to survey and apply research findings when designing their courses, and to collect data while teaching in order to develop and refine best practices. Hatch’s volume starts with the premise that new faculty frequently find themselves isolated and without community support for teaching. As a potential solution, Hatch argues for participation in SoTL, concluding with a collection of SoTL resources for teachers.

SoTL Scholars on Specific Educational Issues

These volumes assemble the voices of serious scholars of teaching and learning to address specific issues in education. Buskist and Groccia’s work presents empirical support for several instructional practices, including problem-based learning, case-study, team-based learning, and service learning, as well as interteaching and just-in-time teaching. Chapters in the Hacker, Dunlosky, and Graesser volume provide a comprehensive look at how metacognition is related to student processes, such as self-regulation, and offer sound reasoning for why metacognition is critical for student development in reading, writing, and math. This volume concludes by addressing issues of measurement in research. The Mayer and Alexander handbook summarizes theory and current trends in pedagogical research. Sawyer’s book begins with a broad overview of theory and methodology in pedagogical research that includes interdisciplinary contributions to the teaching and learning sciences, a summary of constructivism, and attention to literacy and mathematics. Schwartz and Gurung’s book synthesizes the best ideas from research for use in undergraduate instruction, organized by topic (e.g. technology in the classroom).

**Activity-Based Teaching**

The past two decades have seen increasing interest in the application of cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) to education. Activity theory’s appeal is due in part to increasing dissatisfaction with the “transmission” model of education in which students passively absorb and reproduce an inert body of knowledge that is often irrelevant to their lives. In contrast, CHAT asserts that thinking and learning occur through purposeful, meaningful, and practical activity. CHAT portrays learners as active agents, similar to Piaget’s constructivism, but further emphasizes that learning is not a matter of individual construction, but rather a social co-construction, taking place within ever-changing historical and cultural contexts. For Vygotsky, Leontiev, and other Soviet originators of CHAT (which has since spread to the West), collective activity opens up a zone of proximal development for individual learning and social transformation, which means that instructors can facilitate collaborative projects among peers of various skill levels, engaging students’ proximal, “ripening” abilities that might not develop as effectively in isolation. As students engage in meaningful activities, they acquire cultural tools—purposeful ways of thinking and doing developed by human societies to address their needs—and develop their identities as scientific investigators in the process. Active, scaffolded, and inquiry-based approaches to education developed in the West (e.g. Dewey, Bruner, Duckworth) share CHAT’s emphasis on practical, active learning. This section reviews useful sources for cooperative learning methods, tips for lively demonstrations, group activities (especially for large classes, where implementing group
activities is challenging), collaborative approaches to research design, and meaningful, real-life statistics.

“Active” Pedagogical Theory

Dewey’s concise and readable classic encapsulates his theory of progressive education for a truly democratic society that is based on social and real-world experience, experimentation, and purposeful, active learning. Duckworth’s volume outlines the value of Piagetian ideas in helping students feel the power of developing their minds and creative capacities, and makes a passionate argument for what democratic education should be today. Vygotsky’s book addresses the relationship between learning and development and introduces the zone of proximal development as a framework for teaching and learning.

Promoting Student Engagement

Volume 1 of this two-volume series establishes why engagement matters and guides readers through several methods that promote it, from joining psychology organizations to participating in internships and curricular-learning communities. This volume addresses community service and civic engagement, engagement in online courses, and within multicultural classrooms. Volume 2 includes a variety of practical suggestions for spicing up student interest in a wide variety of psychology courses and topics, from sexuality to educational psychology to the history of psychology, and helps teachers to assess the level of student engagement their lessons provide.

Developing and Implementing Classroom and Extracurricular Activities

Benjamin’s book contains 67 activities, experiments, and discussions and simulations for both inside and outside the classroom drawn from teachers around the nation. Each lesson plan comes in an easy-to-follow format, and activities are grouped under a wide range of psychological topics. The three Ware and Johnson volumes are a collection of articles from the STP’s highly respected *Teaching of Psychology* journal. These volumes provide teaching strategies and activities for a wide range of psychology classes (with an emphasis on social, developmental, research methods, statistics, and history of psychology). They are especially useful for teaching introductory psychology courses because they cover all the major topics in introductory textbooks.

**Cooperative Teaching Methods**
Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day*. Eugene, OR: International Society for Technology in Education.

The Bergmann and Sams book traces the development of the flipped classroom, wherein students view pre-recorded lectures (videos or podcasts) prior to coming to class, with in-class time devoted to cooperative problem-solving activities, projects, discussions, and other classroom exercises. The authors provide abundant practical advice based on their experiences in implementing the flipped classroom, which they have now developed into the new and improved “flipped-mastery” model. The Vazin and Reile chapter provides a concise overview of cooperative learning, emphasizing the process of cooperation and ways to design effective collaboration.

**Teaching Research Design and Statistics**

The APA Web site for research in action is a useful resource for introducing students to psychological research that can be personally useful and relevant to their everyday lives. Miller et al.’s STP volume includes several real-life models of undergraduate research programs that have been established at various universities, and offers suggestions for facilitating specific types of research, including community-based and archival research.
The Writing Process
Developing writing proficiency is a major hurdle for undergraduates and serves as a gatekeeper for their future professional endeavors. Unfortunately, given the popularity of the large lecture format to serve expanding enrollments, psychology students often have inadequate writing experiences in introductory and mid-level coursework, and thus risk graduating with poor writing skills. An important challenge for psychology instructors is how to teach college writing to students who seem to be constantly texting, messaging, and blogging in a variety of media, but may lack basic literacy skills. This shift in recent years to digital and explicitly social media-based writing opens up an opportunity to improve student writing proficiency by stressing its functional social use for goals beyond the classroom. For example, assignments might include posting or commenting on a course-relevant blog, editing a psychology-related wikipedia page, or tweeting questions and answers during class. Approaching writing as a multifaceted tool may help educators consider new ways of strategically integrating writing into their courses and thus supporting their students’ writing development. Below we list and describe select readings that provide guidance to educators on ways to incorporate writing into their undergraduate and graduate-level psychology courses.

Writing Across the Curriculum

Bean’s book is the quintessential text embodying the principles of the writing-across-the-curriculum movement, with the goal of promoting writing as a tool for learning. Besides its valuable theoretical analysis of the “writing-to-learn” approach, this book offers a broad array of practical suggestions and concrete in- and out-of-class activities to support student engagement, critical thinking, expression, and knowledge acquisition. Landrum’s book is crafted with students in mind and provides valuable guidance to psychology majors as they conceptualize their research papers, develop a thesis statement, sift through relevant literature, organize their writing, and learn how to address different audiences.

Mechanics of Writing

Helping students plan their writing is a critical component of any writing assignment. Shaughnessy’s work is replete with suggestions for helping students use proper grammar
and sentence structure and avoid spelling errors. The Smagorinsky volume discusses methods for communicative writing for scholars and students alike. Silvia’s book lays out a clear and concise strategy for writing intended for professors and graduate students, but the key strategies are useful for writers at any level.

**Expressive Writing, Meaning Making, and Analysis**


Daiute’s book provides educators with a set of approaches for analyzing students’ narratives, with an emphasis on the importance of audience (i.e., the intended reader of the story) in this process. Lepore and Smyth’s work include key reports from the field of expressive writing and shows how short and simple writing tasks can promote overall well-being.

**Digital Writing**


The Devos, Eidman, and Hicks book explains the importance of digital writing; it is suitable for teachers of high school students as well as college students. In Gold’s edited volume, educators are likely to find the section on blog posts to be the most useful. Lunsford’s work provides instructors with technical tools to help their students tailor writing for specific audiences and media. The Myers book explains the key differences between conventional writing and writing in digital formats.

**Teaching with Technology**

Digital technology has taken hold in higher education, allowing for an unprecedented level of student engagement and collaboration (Chen, Lambert, & Guidry, 2010). New digital technologies have arrived along with a new set of expectations from employers that graduates will have a diverse set of technological skills. College students are expected to engage in modern technologies as part of their coursework, and educators are expected to help students hone their skills by using multimedia presentations, computer software, and Internet-based learning to deliver course content (Jones, 2008). This section covers resources for digital engagement with 21st century students: For example, content management systems, like Blackboard, Moodle, or Angel, transform a jumble of papers into a living collection of accessible, up-to-the-minute content. These tools allow instructors to make more time for individualized student attention in open online conversations, and use
message boards and collaborative platforms to empower students to communicate their ideas to the class. So-called “blended learning” (or hybrid) techniques can be used to mix the best of online content delivery with more traditional face-to-face classroom instruction, using pre-recorded lectures (see the earlier section on Cooperative Teaching Methods, which describes the flipped classroom model). In this section, we address a range of teaching styles and expertise and bring together resources for effective integration of technology in the classroom.

*Free Online Resources for Teaching Web-Enhanced Courses*
- Clips for Class [http://clipsforclass.com/](http://clipsforclass.com/)

These Web sites provide organized collections of syllabi, lectures, readings, and activities. The Open Courseware Consortium is a nexus of all-in-one course listings; stand-alone materials are available from STP’s TeachPsychScience peer-reviewed collection. For open alternatives to the bookstore, the Noba Project is a free, peer-reviewed psychology textbook authored by experts. The Online Psychology Lab enables students to design their own experiments, collect data from their classmates, and analyze the data for research reports.

*Teaching with Technology*

Clark and Mayer’s book is an evidence-based inquiry into the principles of teaching effectively with technology. For a broad overview of the challenges and applications of technology-enhanced teaching, Dunn and colleagues’ collection covers a variety of approaches, implications, and solutions. Shank’s guide assists teachers in finding, selecting, and integrating open digital resources into their courses.

*Online Course Engagement*

Conrad and Donaldson’s collection of adaptable activities for online teaching draws from both classic and cutting-edge sources and includes a variety of icebreakers, research skills
quests, teamwork challenges, reflective prompts, and games. Lehman and Conceicao’s book identifies challenges that students face when working online, and covers strategies for motivating and retaining online students.

**Online Course Design**

Vai and Sosulski’s book presents a practical, step-by-step approach to online course development, whereas Smith’s book (aimed at first-time teachers) along with Thormann and Zimmerman’s volume navigates readers through the finer practicalities of online instruction, while grounding the advice in traditional learning theory. Palloff and Pratt’s book provides a comprehensive organizational approach covering everything from software selection to dealing with inherited course designs.

**Hybrid and Blended Course Design**

Caulfield’s work examines hybrid integration of face-to-face and Internet-based instruction while highlighting tools for implementing online discussion, group work, grading, and feedback, with real-world examples to back it up. Garrison and Vaughan’s book combines best practices in face-to-face and online interaction to foster cohesive communities of inquiry. Glazer’s volume explores five case studies in hybrid learning based on real classrooms, with special focus on the advantages of blended practice.

**Transforming Education to Serve a Global Society**
Recent decades have witnessed enormous changes in the composition of the university student body with respect to age, socioeconomic status, culture, ethnicity, language, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and preparation for college work. First-generation college students, students with disabilities, and non-traditional students who juggle family and work responsibilities bring different sets of challenges and strengths to college. Such students may have heightened anxiety about coursework along with counterproductive study habits and may be less likely to seek help from their professors. Hence, instructional
guidance and responsiveness to student concerns are critical to building student confidence and fostering engagement.

The United States Department of Education has issued a nationwide call for more democracy and civic engagement in higher education (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Educators must be ethically committed to equality and social justice in the classroom. New instructors need skills to address diversity and help students engage with the important emerging political and social issues of the 21st century. Integrating multiculturalism into the psychology curriculum is challenging, yet creates opportunities for experiential learning, civic engagement, and community service. Participatory action approaches, in particular, encourage students to engage in collaborative research activities in order to enact changes in society. In this section, we describe resources to cultivate an ethical learning environment with the goal of engaging students in discussions of complex social topics relevant to life after college.

**Online Resources for Engaging Diverse Students**


International Teaching of Psychology Network [http://interteachpsy.org/Main/HomePage](http://interteachpsy.org/Main/HomePage)


The APA and the AACU (Association of American Colleges and Universities) URLs provide excellent resources in support of increasing diversity in students and faculty. The International Teaching of Psychology Network Web site aims to foster exchanges of international experiences and perspectives on teaching, learning, and psychology research. The Jigsaw Classroom URL describes a cooperative learning methodology developed in the wake of the civil rights movement to integrate racially diverse students. It aims to transform an individual’s competitive tendencies into cooperative ones to reduce prejudice, encourage teamwork, and improve academic as well as social outcomes for students.

**Controversies in Higher Education**


These books capture current debates in higher education about the value of a college degree in the context of skyrocketing student debt and the limited job opportunities facing many graduates; these volumes are must-reads for policy makers, educators, students, and parents. Drawing from national surveys, transcripts, and standardized tests of undergraduate outcomes in the first 2 years of college, Arum and Roksa’s work suggests that
a substantial percentage of undergraduates fail to develop broad-based academic skills, such as critical thinking, complex reasoning, and writing, with implications for their future career prospects. Bok’s books posit that colleges and universities are failing at their core mission: to prepare active and informed citizens for a global society. He argues that training exceptional educators and applying evidence-based teaching practices will lift the quality of teaching and learning in colleges. Amidst historic scarcity in state funding and never-ending tuition hikes, Kamenetz’s work argues that a new generation of learners will “hack” their own education through the use of interactive technologies offered by myriad Web sites and learning services at little or no cost.

**Experiential and Community-Based Service Learning**


These resources make the case for building a more democratic pedagogy, emphasizing opportunity and fairness. Jacoby et al.’s book provides models of inquiry-based teaching, community engagement, and service learning to facilitate a more comprehensive educational theory and teaching practice. McKernan’s volume encourages teachers to develop curricula based on action research and describes techniques for research methods (observation, self-report, discourse analysis) and data analysis. Moore’s book provides strategies for promoting self-monitoring and mindful learning (e.g., through journal writing, role playing) to help students connect the abstract world of academia with the complexities of real life.

**APA Guides for Ethical Teaching and Engaging Students in Diversity Issues**


Ethical teaching aims to use the psychology curriculum to strengthen ethical decision-making processes. In Dunn et al.’s book, various psychology professors discuss ways to integrate
controversial topics into coursework to foster moral and complex reasoning within a safe teaching and learning environment. Landrum and McCarthy’s volume provides a framework for ethical teaching, and covers topics ranging from choosing a textbook to online instruction and supervision of off-campus learning. It addresses pedagogical issues surrounding student and faculty behavior and values. Instructors will find Pedersen’s compilation of group exercises (organized by class size, role-play activities, and experiments) valuable for teaching about diversity.

*Multicultural Learning and Diversity*


Ginsberg and Wlodkowski’s book provides practical strategies to motivate diverse students inside and outside the classroom. Their framework helps instructors implement a culturally responsive pedagogy that values inclusion while fostering student competence and development from a culturally informed perspective. Going beyond teaching tips, Gurung and Prieto’s book introduces scholarly approaches for integrating diversity across academic disciplines and provides exercises to develop multicultural competence.

*Addressing Issues of Race, Gender, and Ethnicity in Education*


Steele’s research in social psychology offers an in-depth exploration of how identity and stereotype threat contribute to minority students’ underperformance in academic settings. He provides scientific insights on how to reduce achievement gaps from the perspectives of both teachers and learners. Tatum’s work encourages educators to integrate conversations about racial inequality into the curriculum to affirm the value of diverse perspectives and build relationships. She provides a key set of resources used in her classes and workshops to facilitate cross-racial dialogues.

*Resources for Effective Instruction for Non-traditional Students*


Oslund’s work reminds us that diversity embodies a growing number of capable students with invisible disabilities, such as autism spectrum disorder, attention deficit disorder, and mental health issues. Readers will learn about specific types of disabilities and how to utilize universal design in accommodating students in both large and small classrooms. Spalding’s book provides practical tips for teaching diverse classes comprising both traditional and nontraditional students. It encourages instructors to reflect on their performance throughout the semester and be flexible in addressing shortcomings in teaching and learning.
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