Overall, our academic units consider teaching preparation as part of graduate students’ education and value the transferability of teaching skills to other professional domains. More than half of IUB academic units currently require participation in a comprehensive sequence of activities that prepares graduate students for their teaching responsibilities. Academic units are encouraged to align their programs at minimum with these benchmarks of associate instructor preparation.

**Orient graduate students to disciplinary teaching practices and policies**
- A mandatory, multi-day academic unit orientation to teaching that addresses topics such as: duties, responsibilities, and policies; course preparation; motivating student learning; disciplinary teaching methods; teaching technologies; classroom management and civility; assessing learning; grading practices; academic honesty; learning and teaching support offices;
- A course-specific orientation to teaching;
- Training about inclusive teaching practices, such as the Associate Instructor Workshop on Classroom Climate; and
- A required course that addresses pedagogical theory, research, and practice: http://citl.indiana.edu/services/pedclass.php.

**Provide ongoing support for graduate students as associate instructors**
- Regular staff meetings for associate instructors teaching multi-section courses;
- Observations by new associate instructors of sessions taught by experienced instructors; and
- Teaching mentoring by individual faculty members.

**Provide feedback to associate instructors about their teaching performance**
- Classroom observation and feedback by faculty;
- Mid-semester student evaluations of teaching; and
- End-of-semester student evaluations of teaching with feedback.

**Recommendations for AI Preparation**

Based on the 2010-2011 annual reports on associate instructor preparation, the following activities highlight successes and address concerns in discipline-based programs.
- **Provide a variety of teaching opportunities** – Whether as course assistants, section leaders, guest lecturers, or instructors of record, graduate students who gain teaching experience are prepared for faculty life and acquire valuable communication, organization, and management skills.
- **Rethink orientation** – Plan orientation programs that engage graduate students in essential teaching skills practice during orientation week. Consider what content and skills could be developed over a semester or year through a weekly brown bag seminar.
- **Seek collaborations with cognate disciplines** – Scarce resources are more efficiently utilized among graduate students from related disciplines who share a common teaching concern.
- **Engage experienced associate instructors** – Need people to observe and provide feedback to new AIs? Need people to facilitate brown bag seminars about teaching? Experienced, successful AIs may lead energetic, thoughtful orientation activities and provide expert teaching mentoring. They have contextual knowledge of the teaching challenges at IU and have developed effective strategies to address teaching challenges particular to AIs.
- **Assess impact** - How do you know that effort in AI preparation matters? Articulate your outcomes for your associate instructor programs. Gather and evaluate multiple forms of pertinent data.

Staff from the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (citl@indiana.edu) can work with faculty mentors to plan, implement, and assess programs for associate instructors.
In early April 2011, 85 department chairs were invited via email from the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (OVPUE) to complete a SurveyMonkey.com online questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of single option, multiple option, and open-ended items about teaching orientation activities, ongoing teaching support, and methods for teaching assessment for associate instructors. The questionnaire link was sent from Bloomington Evaluation Services and Testing (BEST). By the end of April, 54 reports had been completed, for a response rate of nearly 64%. This was an increase in reporting of almost 10% compared to 2009-2010. Responses were compiled by the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (CITL).

Respondents who provided feedback about the questionnaire in general liked the online reporting format; however, many of these respondents wanted access to their previous years’ responses so that they did not have to retype information which had not changed substantially from year to year. Although respondents can print their report before submitting it, BEST is exploring long-term solutions for addressing this concern. Additionally, smaller units that engage a one-on-one mentoring model for preparing AIs to teach, especially departments in the Jacobs School of Music, found some of the report questions irrelevant to their context. BEST and CITL will review the questionnaire for fit to different mentoring styles.

Innovations in associate instructor (AI) preparation are not limited to a few pioneering academic units; over half of our programs described successful new AI preparation tactics in the past two years, broadly improving the quality of both undergraduate education and graduate training at Indiana University. A few academic units describe formal programmatic improvements, such as new required orientation sessions, workshops, or even credit-bearing graduate pedagogy courses. More remarkably, dozens of units are developing organizational infrastructure for AIs’ insights to feed-back into the training program. Thru informal lunch discussions, peer-shadowing, online wikis and drop boxes, working groups, formal surveys, and organized panel symposia, AIs are encouraged to talk about, write about, and share their successes and challenges. These feedback mechanisms give academic units a clear view of the most relevant aspects of AI preparation. Moreover, the open discourse about pedagogy advances an institutional culture that values the craft of teaching.

Areas of Concern in AI Preparation

Missed opportunities

About three-quarters of the academic units do not require their PhD students to teach and almost 90% do not require Master’s students to teach. Many faculty mentors aspire to an incremental introduction to teaching so that: 1) graduate students can adjust to their research, coursework and teaching responsibilities; 2) graduate students can become familiar with the content to be taught; and 3) teaching mentoring can happen gradually rather than amassed into the week before classes. Yet graduate students who have the opportunity to gain teaching experience typically begin their responsibilities as associate instructors (AIs) in their first year on campus. Fewer than half of programs have funding situations that allow their students to defer teaching until at least their second year or to a non-prescribed time.
Areas of Concern in AI Preparation (continued)

Variability in preparation
There is wide variability across academic units in the length and types of teaching orientation activities for graduate students. About a quarter of reporting units have extensive programs lasting over 20 hours. Conversely, 38% of reporting units have short programs of 1-5 hours. Regardless of the length, these orientation programs typically required attendance at both a discipline-based and course-specific orientation to teaching, as well as attendance at the mandatory Associate Instructor Workshop on Classroom Climate. About half of academic units reported that their new AIs practiced teaching skills through microteaching during orientation, and a similar number required their students to enroll in a pedagogy course as an opportunity to discuss teaching theory and practice.

Decreasing disciplinary influence
An increasing number of academic units are seeking campus-based assistance and resources to provide opportunities for graduate student teaching development. Many respondents have assumed all of the AI mentoring responsibilities; they were grappling with ways to engage additional colleagues, especially with observing and providing feedback on AI-taught classes, and requested more workshops and a campus-wide pedagogy course to augment the increasingly limited support they are able to provide in their own units. For example, compared to previous years, more academic units relied on campus activities to address issues of inclusive teaching practice. Several units said they did not address inclusive teaching practices in any way. Only a couple units have regular workshops or meetings throughout the year to discuss inclusive teaching practices.

Limited measures of success
Academic units relied on a narrow range of sources to evaluate the success of their teaching preparation programs, despite a wide arrange of data and resources possible. Respondents most commonly noted positive student evaluations (and/or a decrease in negative student evaluations), followed by faculty observations of the AIs teaching, as measures of success of their training programs. Additional, but rarely mentioned, measures of success included: mid-term student evaluations; feedback from the AIs themselves (either informal or through survey/exit interviews); students' participation in workshops and the contribution of any program to teaching practice; teaching portfolios, a known requirement in many departments; placement as instructors of record for a course; successful recruitment into academic/teaching positions; presentations of pedagogy research/findings at national meetings; and receipt of teaching awards at department, campus, and system levels.