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INTRODUCTION

After the post World War II expansion of higher education, a series of critiques followed, culminating in a groundswell during the late 1980s and early 1990s (Calhoun 1999; see for example, Sykes 1988; Bloom 1987). While the critiques were broad ranging, many targeted the teaching mission of colleges and universities, or perhaps better said, the lack of attention to the teaching mission, particularly at doctoral granting institutions. In response, higher education has undergone a series of dramatic changes in the last two decades. For example, a reframing of faculty scholarship was offered, assessment became a central concern, the scholarship of teaching and learning was established, teacher training programs were revitalized or started, and tenure/promotions standards were reconsidered and often changed (e.g., Boyer 1990; Huber and Hutchings 2005; Hutchings and Marchese 1990). While the landscape of higher education has shifted first towards greater attention to teaching, and more recently towards learning, concerns have been raised about the whether continued attention of administrators, departments and even faculty can be counted on in the future (Pescosolido 2008).

In this proposal, we argue that despite the development of a lively research agenda on teaching and learning focused at the undergraduate level, without an understanding of the landscape of graduate training, particularly the place and role of teaching/learning and teacher training now, the gains made over the last two decades will be endangered. Pace’s (2006) claim made for SOTL researching undergraduate learning is even more in evidence at the graduate level: Our ignorance is vast. Further, what we do know about graduate training, in general, or more specifically for teaching, tends to be based in the disciplines (Gale and Golde 2004), an equally precarious situation for maintaining broad institutional changes.

BROAD GOALS

We propose to take advantage of a rare opportunity for IU faculty and graduate students to collaborate with other scholars to address these gaps in our understanding of teaching and learning in training the future professoriate. Broadly conceived, our goal is to engage in theoretical and empirical discussion, analysis and dissemination of the place of teaching in graduate education. Graduate student values and views of the role of teaching in their training combine with their reports of the opportunities, norms and experiences on teaching are available in a high quality, nationally-focused study, the Survey on Doctoral Education (SDE). Conducted by Dr. Chris M. Golde, now Professor of Education, Stanford University, in 1999, this data set avoids many of the limitations of existing SOTL efforts and offers the potential to address the sustainability of current individual and institutional efforts on teaching and SOTL, itself. This data set is not publically available, as Dr. Golde and her colleagues continue to address important questions in her continuing research agenda on retention, satisfaction, programming, etc (see, for example, her earlier work on doctoral attrition 1998; 1999; 2000). Our broad goal, with Golde’s gracious and generous agreement to share the data set with us, is to produce an edited book that brings the insights of faculty and graduate students to central questions on teaching in graduate education.
Feasibility is supported by two factors that form the impetus for the application. First, a core of students in the second semester of the Department of Sociology’s Preparing Future Faculty Program have examined the survey instrument and have expressed enthusiasm for a variety of analyses (see specific below). The third semester in the sequence (S706, Sociological Research in Higher Education) is a SOTL course, requiring a project. Led by Pescosolido, this course has a proven history of publication for both individual (Suarez and Balaji 2007; Dixon and McCabe 2006) and group (Pescosolido et al. 2004) projects. While neither Sociology’s PFF, nor this project is limited to students from the Sociology Department, it is a strength of this application that the level of quantitative training in this Department is nationally recognized. It is no surprise that social science methods and analytic skills are well suited to many SOTL endeavors (e.g., Freese, Artis, and Powell 1999). Our application includes a preliminary roster that includes researchers from other departments, schools and universities/colleges. That roster remains open at this point, with our goal to include two additional graduate students (note two additional TBN student support summers in proposed budget). Second, earlier access to the SDE was provide to a former Sociology PFF student, Dr. Paul Namaste, Assistant Professor at Grand Valley State University, who completed his doctoral thesis “Social Support in Doctoral Education: The Role of Relationship Resources and Gender in Graduate Student Professional Socialization” in December, 2007. Two of the PIs of this proposal served on that dissertation committee (Powell, chair and Pescosolido, member), and were excited by the insights Namaste gained on the role of support in doctoral student problems and successes. There is good reason to believe that there are similar insights on preparation for scholarly teaching, as well as on the implications of this preparation for success in graduate school and beyond. As Lyons (2006) argues, “reflective engagement” can be an effective tool in the professional development of university teaches.

Limitations. This proposal is expressly titled “The Formation of Scholarly Teachers,” an obvious reference to the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate and the conceptual framework of “stewardship” that was developed (Walker, Golde, Jones, et al. 2007). While the four dimensions of stewardship are critical to the development of the “compleat” scholar-teacher (Zanna and Darley 1987), we focus only on new knowledge related to teaching and learning. In particular, however, we focus on the structures and processes of graduate school that shape graduate student values, ideas, knowledge and norms about how to transform that knowledge into explaining and connecting the field to others. There are many other factors and processes that may be involved in successful careers that could be explored, we are limited to the rich but not infinite set of items addressed on the SDE.

SPECIFIC RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The central research objectives center on bringing empirical evidence to bear on descriptive and associational questions about the nature, role and impact of teaching training efforts in U.S. doctoral programs. Quite simply, we do not know if and how graduate programs train Ph.D. students in their role as the future professorate charged with undergraduate teaching and learning. Are there difference by ranking? By region? Systematic types of institutions of higher education (e.g., public vs. private)? We do not know what kinds of engagement faculty have in teacher training, and even in their own participation in training their teaching assistants. Does this vary by level of the class, by discipline, or by the perceived instructor interest in teaching that students report? We do not know what aspects of teacher training have the greatest impact
on student values and orientations toward teaching and learning for undergraduate populations? Is serving as a TA sufficient? Are courses in teaching more effective? Do centralized programs seem to be better received and have a greater impact than those that are departmentally based?

The questions listed above focus on the institutional side. Equally important, however, is whether a “one size fits all model” works. That is, are there clear differences in orientation to teaching, response to T.A. experiences, engagement in teaching by men and women? Students of color? First generation Ph.D. students? Those who plan to go to liberal arts colleges versus research universities? Answers to these questions not only help us understand the most effective means to promote the teaching mission of universities, but also may assist us in identifying strategies to improve the graduate experiences of minority students.

Finally, it would be crucial to get a sense of whether there is a rhythm to the salience of teaching, and views on teaching and training by students at different points in their graduate career. Do those who have just begun to teach respond differently that those who are planning to go on to other professional employment? How do the relationships among the factors of interest change when the focus is narrowed to those who see themselves as first and foremost a member of the future professoriate?

Measures of Success. Judging whether this project has been successful can be seen in 1) the completion of the PFF requirement for those students in the sequence; 2) presentations at professional meetings, both disciplinary specific and larger venues (e.g., ISSOTL), and 3) most importantly, publication of individual articles and the edited book.

SIGNIFICANCE: CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNDEGRADUATE AND GRADUATE EDUCATION GOALS

While there is still much to be done in SOTL to understand the impact of curricular change on undergraduate learning (e.g., Pace 2007), Pescosolido (2008) has recently argued that a focus on institutional changes that will influence the interest and orientation to the next generation of the professoriate will have a major influence on whether the important changes made regarding teaching and learning in the last two decades will become a permanent fixture in higher education or will represent a fleeting period. Thus, while we have seen a set of remarkable changes in higher education with regard to teaching and learning (e.g., the focus on “scholarly teaching,” the establishment of SOTL, changes in the importance of teaching for promotion and tenure standards even among the doctoral granting institutions), these changes will not be permanent unless they are institutionalized (Reskin 2003) and unless the next generation of teacher/scholars receive the type of training that emphasizes teaching. This project is designed to exploit a high-quality existing data set, the Survey on Doctoral Education (SDE) that targeted the future and [now] present professoriate to understand the cultural climate regarding teaching and learning that they will likely support. While this data set was not intended to focus on teaching and learning, its comprehensive nature allows us to explore critical questions outlined above about the future professoriate. The implications of these findings for both undergraduate teaching and learning and for the training of doctoral students are critical to the effort to reform higher education called for by Bok (1986) and others.
METHODS

This project focuses on a secondary analysis of one of the most comprehensive efforts to gather data from graduate students. The Survey on Doctoral Education (SDE) was administered to graduate students in 11 Arts and Sciences disciplines, from 27 universities and one cross-institutional program (the Compact for Faculty Diversity). Fielded through both mail and on-line surveys in the summer and fall of 1999, the targeted sample included all graduate students in their third year or higher. In the end, 4,114 responses were coded.

This data set is not publically available. Dr. Golde has agreed to provide the data (stripped of any individual identifiers) for the project. This will first require the writing of a data sharing agreement and submission/approval by the IUB Institutional Review Board.

The survey itself is quite rich. However, the scope of our project is much narrower, focusing on issues of teaching and learning, the impact of PFF programs, etc. We will be receiving an outline of analyses and publications planned by Golde and her colleagues, and will identify and develop projects that do not conflict.

At this point, it is difficult, if not impossible, to lay out the exact analytic techniques that will be employed since they 1) have to be matched to the question being asked; 2) fit the level of measurement of the particular dependent variable; 1 and 3) not replicate or interfere with planned analyses by Golde and her colleagues. However, all six of the faculty researchers have extensive experience in quantitative analyses, and graduate students in the PFF Program tend to be past coursework. The Sociology Department is routinely ranked in the top 10-15 programs in the nation, and its graduate training program is ranked 4th nationally. Given our emphasis and expertise in methods, we feel confident that the data analyses will be rigorous. Two of the six faculty researchers have already used these data (Golde and Namaste). The traditions of faculty collaboration with graduate students on research (SOTL and otherwise) and peer support on theoretical, methodological and presentational issues form the foundation, along with a demonstrated history of publication in SOTL, for the exploratory nature of this proposal. The team, while heavily weighted toward sociology, is diverse in terms of career stage, background, interest, discipline, and education.

BREADTH AND DEPTH OF FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

The idea of this proposal and project is two-fold: to guide students through a SOTL apprenticeship with faculty who have either been in leadership positions in SOTL (Golde; Martinez), are PFF mentors (Pescosolido, Powell), or are PFF alumni (Namaste). While faculty will be in a leadership position, by the very nature of the data availability and the grass-roots/collaborative project design, the specific topics, analysis plans, and table of contents will evolve.

---

1 For example, when we explore differences across institutions, we intend to use hierarchical linear modeling when appropriate.
DEPARTMENTAL SUPPORT

Departmental support has been provided to the PFF program through a small but annual budget and a yearly PFF Fellowship (this year to Todd Beer, proposed graduate collaborator). Pescosolido’s office routinely has provided editorial assistance to PFF graduate student and faculty projects. This will continue as possible and as needed.

TIMELINE

Pre-grant Period: July – September, 2008: Finalize data sharing agreement; submit secondary analysis (i.e., exempt) application to IU IRB; receive data and set up main data file

Entire Grant Period: 9/1/08 – 12/31/09: Project Meetings (bi-weekly during the academic year; weekly during the summer). In essence, S706 will be through the summer with support to the graduate students to devote full attention to completing drafts and revisions for publication.

BUDGET NARRATIVE

A detailed budget is presented on the following page. The structure of funding is quite simple. There are two major categories of expenses: 1) Support for graduate students; and 2) Travel and consulting funds for the off-site members of the research team. In addition, we have budgeted just over $1,000 for supplies, publication and communication costs.

The graduate student support, which represents the largest budgetary expense, is calculated for ten graduate students for the summer of 2009 at standard stipend rates for social scientists in the College of Arts and Sciences. We include fringe benefits as well. While we have only eight graduate students involved at the moment we would like to hold two additional places for faculty collaborators’ students as well as those from other IU departments. We have budgeted a modest honorarium $500 for each of the 4 visits for the off-site faculty researchers and standard estimates for travel/lodging.

Additional funding, particularly for meeting costs for presentation of findings off campus, will be provided by Sociology’s Preparing Future Faculty Program. Each year for the last decade, the PFF has been allotted a small yearly budget that is used for SOTL costs associated with S706. While it is not guaranteed, we expect this funding to continue throughout the grant period. The PFF program has routinely provided travel funding for graduate students presenting SOTL results at local, regional and national meetings.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Detailed Budget Page
References
Relevant items from the SDE
Short Biosketches of IU Faculty Research Team
CV for Pescosolido and Powell
Nominating Letter and Letters of Support
INTERNAL BUDGET FOR SOTL Leadership Award Competition

PROJECT PERIOD: 09/01/08 - 12/31/09

PIs: Pescosolido & Powell (IU)

PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role on Project</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Inst. Base Salary</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>Requested Fringe</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernice Pescosolido</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Powell</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Hostetter</td>
<td>co-PI</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Martinez</td>
<td>co-PI</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Golde</td>
<td>co-PI/consultant</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Namaste</td>
<td>co-PI/consultant</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>contributed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Research Assistants (10)</td>
<td>RA Summer I</td>
<td>0.0706</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$1,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBTOTAL PERSONNEL $26,000 $1,836 $27,836

CONSULTANT COSTS

($500 honorarium/consultant/trip = 2 x 2 x $500)

$2,000

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

(must cost at least $5,000; no detail required)

$0

SUPPLIES

(no detail required)

$500

TRAVEL

(subtotal domestic; foreign)

RT San Francisco-Bloomington (airfare and ground transportation) x 2 $1,340

RT Grand Rapids, MI - Bloomington (airfare and ground transportation) x 2 $1,040

Lodging & per diem for co-PIs/consultants to spend 2 days at IU on initial project activities ($132 max/day in Bloomington) $660

Lodging & per diem for co-PIs/consultants to spend 3 days at IU on analysis and writing ($132 max/day in Bloomington) $924

Subtotal Domestic Travel $3,964

TOTAL TRAVEL $3,964

INPATIENT CARE COSTS

(no detail required)

$0

OUTPATIENT CARE COSTS

$0

ALTERATIONS AND RENOVATIONS

$0

GRAD. STUDENT FEE REMISSION

$0

OTHER

(List major categories, with cost for each, e.g., long distance telephone, photocopying, shipping costs, subject pmts, printing, advertising, publication costs, rental, non-capital equipment (less than $5,000))

Communication/Teleconference expenses $200

Photocopying/printing $500

Subtotal Other Expenses $700

SUBTOTAL DIRECT COSTS $35,000

SUBCONTRACT COSTS:

(See IU Notice 99-4)

Subcontractor Direct Costs $0

Subcontractor Facilities and Administration Costs $0

TOTAL DIRECT COSTS $35,000

Indirect Cost Base

(Direct Cost less Equipment, Fee Remissions, each Subcontract Cost over the first $25,000) $35,000

INDIRECT COSTS

(F&A rate 51.5% x F&A base; 51.0% yr 2)

No indirect costs - IU internal grant $0

Total Direct Costs, All Years: $35,000 $35,000

Total Costs, All Years: $35,000 $35,000
REFERENCES


SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

RELEVANT ITEMS FROM THE SDE

I selected my advisor because she or he...has a reputation for being a good teacher (1 of 14 reasons; a2h)

My advisor/ My other Mentors...Solicit my input on matters of teaching and research (2 of 48 items; a13x, a14x)

Of faculty in my program, I would say …
  Faculty really care about their teaching (b031)
  Faculty carefully supervise teaching assistants (b03p)
  Faculty seem to believe that students are here to help faculty fulfill their research and teaching obligations (b03w)

Since you started your program, have you developed a clear understanding regarding these items (original emphasis) (Followed by an additional set of questions that asked “What was your primary source of information regarding these items?)

  Fulfilling teaching assistantship obligations: number of courses, number of hours spent (b04e; b05e)
  Customary practices regarding appropriate sexual and romantic relationships with undergraduates (b04l; b051)
  Customary practices for grading student work (b04n; b05o)

For each resource or program listed below, tell us if it is available to doctoral students like you. (This is followed by the question, “IF IT IS AVAILABLE, have you used that resource or participated in that program?”)

  A teaching development center (b07h; b08h)
  A teaching assistant training course, lasting at least one term (b07i; b08i)
  A seminar or course designed to develop you as a prospective faculty member (b07k, b08k)

(The following are preceded by the question, “IF IT IS AVAILABLE, do faculty in your program encourage students to use the resource or participate in the program?”)

  A teaching development center (b07h; b08h)
  A teaching assistant training course, lasting at least one term (b07i; b08i)
Following is a list of opportunities that some campuses have for doctoral students. For each opportunity listed below, tell us if it is available to doctoral students like you.

- Workshop/seminar on teaching in your discipline (b09a)
- An organized trip to another campus to learn about being a faculty member in another setting (b09b)
- Progressively more responsible roles in teaching (b09d)
- Progressively more responsible roles in research (b09e)
- Opportunity to work on another campus (e.g., teaching a course) (b09h)
- Workshop/seminar on faculty roles and responsibilities (b09j)
- Workshop/seminar on history, mission and purpose of higher education (b09l)
- Workshop/seminar on organization and administration of colleges and universities (b09m)

(The following are preceded by the question, “IF IT IS AVAILABLE, have you participated in that opportunity?”)

- Workshop/seminar on teaching in your discipline (b11a)
- An organized trip to another campus to learn about being a faculty member in another setting (b11b)
- Progressively more responsible roles in teaching (b11d)
- Opportunity to participate in campus or department governance (e.g., serve on committees) (b11f)
- Opportunity to work on another campus (e.g., teaching a course) (b11h)
- Workshop/seminar on faculty roles and responsibilities (b11j)
- Workshop/seminar on history, mission and purpose of higher education (b11l)
- Workshop/seminar on organization and administration of colleges and universities (b11m)

Have you ever participated in a Preparing Future Faculty program? (B12)

CAREER PLANS

First, consider what you currently hope and plan to pursue as a career after you complete your doctorate and any postdoctoral training you anticipate.

Currently, how strong is your interest in or desire for each of these career options?

**Career option:**

- To become a professor in a college or university (c01a)
- To teach, but not in a college or university setting (c01b)
- To become an administrator in a college or university (c01d)

(The following are preceded by the question, “Since you began your program, has your interest in this option decreased, stayed the same, or increased?”)
To become a professor in a college or university (c02a)
To teach, but not in a college or university setting (c02b)
To become an administrator in a college or university (c02d)

Regardless of your current interests and desire, we now want you to consider how realistic it would be for you to pursue each career option.

Currently, how realistic would it be for you to pursue each of these career opportunities?

To become a professor in a college or university (c03a)
To teach, but not in a college or university setting (c03b)
To become an administrator in a college or university (c03d)

(The following are preceded by the question, “Since you began your program, has your perception of how realistic it is to pursue each option decreased, stayed the same, or increased?”)

To become a professor in a college or university (c04a)
To teach, but not in a college or university setting (c04b)
To become an administrator in a college or university (c04d)

EXPECTATIONS OF THE FACULTY JOB
In this section we want to learn about your interest in various aspects of a faculty job and the preparation you believe you are receiving for that job.

Are you considering a faculty job at any point in the future? (D1)

At what kind of institution would you prefer to be employed? (D2)

Two year community college (d02a)
Four year liberal arts college, with predominantly undergraduates (d02b)
Four year comprehensive university, with undergraduates and master’s students (d02c)
Large university, with undergraduates, masters’, and doctoral students (d02d)
Other (d02e)

At what kind of institution do you think it is likely that you will be employed? (D3)

Two year community college (d03a)
Four year liberal arts college, with predominantly undergraduates (d03b)
Four year comprehensive university, with undergraduates and master’s students (d03c)
Large university, with undergraduates, masters’, and doctoral students (d03d)
Other (d03e)
Some faculty members are involved with campus life in ways that other faculty members are not. For each of these activities, indicate how interested you are in doing this at some point in your career.

Become a department chair or dean (d04a)
Serve on the academic senate or university governing body (d04b)
Get involved in activities with undergraduates outside of class (e.g., student clubs, in dorms) (d04c)

As a doctoral student, you have probably learned a lot about faculty life. In the first column below is a list of factors that influence people’s interest in being a faculty member. Some people view these factors positively and others view the same factors negatively.

What is your opinion about each of these factors? (D5)
Example: If you think that Salary levels in academia are high, circle the number 4 or 5 in the opinion scale (D5)

Enjoyment of teaching (d05c)

How have each of these factors affected your interest in a career as a faculty member? Has it made you less interested, had no effect, or made you more interested?

Enjoyment of teaching (d06c)

Faculty members do many different tasks. As you look forward to these tasks, to what extent would you say:

I am comfortable and confident in my ability to do this task. (D9)

Teach lecture courses (d09a)
Teach discussion courses (d09b)
Teach laboratory courses (d09c)
Teach specialized graduate courses (d09d)
Incorporate information technology in the classroom (d09e)
Develop and articulate a teaching philosophy (d09f)
Create a classroom climate inclusive of a diverse population of students and diverse learning styles (d09g)
Advise undergraduates (d09h)
Advise graduate students (d09i)

I am interested in and looking forward to doing this task. (D10)

Teach lecture courses (d10a)
Teach discussion courses (d10b)
Teach laboratory courses (d10c)
Teach specialized graduate courses (d10d)
Incorporate information technology in the classroom (d10e)
Develop and articulate a teaching philosophy (d10f)
Create a classroom climate inclusive of a diverse population of students and diverse
learning styles (d10g)
Advise undergraduates (d10h)
Advise graduate students (d10i)

I have been prepared by my program to do this task. (D11)

Teach lecture courses (d11a)
Teach discussion courses (d11b)
Teach laboratory courses (d11c)
Teach specialized graduate courses (d11d)
Incorporate information technology in the classroom (d11e)
Develop and articulate a teaching philosophy (d11f)
Create a classroom climate inclusive of a diverse population of students and diverse
learning styles (d11g)
Advise undergraduates (d11h)
Advise graduate students (d11i)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION
Finally, help us to know a little more about you. For each question, check the selection that
best applies to you.

Gender (E1); Relationship Status (E2); Parental Status (E3); Citizenship Status (E4); Birth
Year (e06a); Birth Month (e06b); Year received bachelor’s degree (E7).

What is the highest level of education reached by your family member? Circle the number that
corresponds with the highest level reached by any family member in each category. If you do not
have such a family member, leave blank. (E9)

Any parent or guardian (e09a)
Any sibling (e09b)
Spouse/Partner (e09c)