

# The State of Teacher Training in Philosophy

DAVID W. CONCEPCIÓN<sup>1</sup>

MELINDA MESSINEO

*Ball State University*

SARAH WIETEN

*Durham University*

CATHERINE HOMAN

*Siena College*

*Abstract:* This paper explores the state of teacher training in philosophy graduate programs in the English-speaking world. Do philosophy graduate programs offer training regarding teaching? If so, what is the nature of the training that is offered? Who offers it? How valuable is it? We conclude that philosophers want more and better teacher training, and that collectively we know how to deliver and support it.

## *Introduction*

This paper explores the state of teacher training in philosophy graduate programs in the English-speaking world. Do philosophy graduate programs offer training regarding teaching? If so, what is the nature of the training that is offered? Who offers it? How valuable is it? The answers that follow are the result of a snapshot of current practices in the discipline taken in late 2014. Summary tables of our findings are provided in the appendix. The central findings we discuss throughout are:

- (1) With the exception of a handful of programs, (i) the discipline of philosophy requires no, and offers little, teacher training for graduate students; (ii) the training that is offered is delivered by faculty or graduate students with little expertise in teaching and learning and (iii) the training usually does not go much beyond the introductory level.
- (2) A majority of philosophers (i) know little about best practices in teaching and learning, (ii) receive fewer than twenty hours of formal teacher training during graduate

school, and (iii) believe they are well prepared for the teaching aspects of the professoriate.

We begin with a brief description of our methods and a presentation of our findings. We then reflect on the findings, including a discussion of the potential incongruity between a majority of respondents reporting that they receive little (2ii) and predominantly introductory (1iii) formal teacher training and yet feel prepared for the teaching aspects of the professoriate (2iii). We conclude with recommendations.

### *Methods*

Two surveys were created in Qualtrics;<sup>2</sup> one consisted of 69 questions that targeted graduate students and early career faculty and the other had 61 questions that solicited information about graduate preparation from faculty in philosophy departments with a graduate program.<sup>3</sup> Topics of the surveys include frequency of training, nature of training, breadth and depth of topics covered, background of the trainers, and perceptions of effectiveness. Draft surveys were reviewed by philosophy content experts and experts in teaching and learning (e.g., Directors of Teaching and Learning Centers), and in some cases by colleagues who are both (e.g., members of the board of the American Association of Philosophy Teachers). The revised surveys were approved by an institutional review board,<sup>4</sup> and the instruments were distributed electronically through campus e-mail lists, listservs, and disciplinary websites. The contact addresses were gleaned from philosophy departmental webpages in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa as well as the 2014 *American Philosophical Associations Guide to Graduate Programs in the Philosophy*.<sup>5</sup> The survey was available for five weeks and three participation reminder e-mails were sent. 644 responses from the graduate student and early career professionals survey and 238 responses from the survey of graduate faculty knowledgeable regarding their department's teacher training (e.g., graduate directors and/or department chairs) were valid.<sup>6</sup> The combined response rate of the surveys is 10.3%.<sup>7</sup> The participation was representative in terms of geographic region and institution type. One might predict that programs without training or a low commitment to training would, upon seeing the topic, choose not to participate in the study or drop out rather quickly. If this supposition is true, the responses reported below would over-represent programs and people most engaged in developing teaching. If such a supposition is true, our findings are likely to, if anything, overestimate the training that does exist.

In addition to the survey, we reviewed the websites of 219 philosophy graduate programs in the English-speaking world: 146 in the

United States and 73 from outside the United States (32 = United Kingdom, 18 = Canada, 14 = Australia/New Zealand, 4 = Ireland, and 5 = other). We sought to discover if there are any differences that might warrant further investigation between what faculty and students report regarding teacher training through the survey and what departments publicly present on websites. We discovered that there are not differences that warrant further investigation. We did, however, note one important quantitative difference: philosophy graduate programs' websites suggest that there is less teacher training taking place than the survey data suggest. Departmental websites usually do not provide much information regarding the duration, content, format, or perceived value of the training available, nor do they provide details regarding the expertise of the trainers. Since the website data is less illuminating than, but not inconsistent with, the survey data, below we focus on the survey data.

### Analysis

We ran a frequency distribution in order to obtain an overall picture of the sample. Females are 37.5% of respondents (Table 1), which is higher than the representation of women in philosophy, which stands at slightly less than 30%.<sup>8</sup> The sample consists of 81.4% of respondents who identify as from European origin (Table 1), which is slightly lower than the 86.4% of regular members of the American Philosophical Association who identify as white/caucasian.<sup>9</sup> Over 60% of respondents have completed three years of graduate study at the time of survey taking (Table 1), which suggests that we may be confident that a majority of respondents would have experienced, or have reliable knowledge of forthcoming, training. Among the early career faculty, 72.4% of respondents report that their first academic job after completing a PhD in Philosophy was *not* tenure-track. Similarly, our study suggests that only 12.6% (or 1 out of 8) of recent PhDs in Philosophy gains a job in an institution that traditionally strongly emphasizes research over teaching (Table 2). These findings differ slightly from data discovered by the American Association of University Professors, which reports that as of 2007 almost 70% of faculty members are employed off the tenure track.<sup>10</sup> While researchers must always be careful to not over-generalize their findings, the congruence of our data with other data gives us confidence that this study is representative of philosophy as a discipline at the time of its administration.

In attempting to describe the frequency and nature of the teaching training offered to graduate students in philosophy we were sensitive to the fact that different types of programs and geographic regions might offer varied training programs. We were also aware that different students with different experiences might seek out training to varying

degrees that might impact the findings. To tease out these effects we ran correlations, cross-tabulations, and means tests to determine if any statistically significant differences existed by groups or experience characteristics. Correlations identify when two variables are related. The data contained many correlations, most of which were not especially interesting (e.g., those respondents that went to more training sessions received more total hours of training).

We ran means tests (for responses that can be represented numerically) and cross tabulations (for nominal variables, those that do not have an inherent numerical value—e.g., male/female) to further examine the correlations that were discovered. We ran chi-squared tests on the cross tabulations to determine if there is a significant difference between the expected frequencies and the observed frequencies in one or more categories. The findings in the appendix identify those situations where group differences exist. We did not find significant differences based on age, level or quantity of training, desire for more teacher training, topics covered in training, or trainer expertise. The responses of survey participants also did not vary relative to national origin. If they had, we would not have been able to establish whether the variance was significant because the number of people not-of-European origin was too small. The sample of women was large enough to run comparisons; men and women were very similar in their views and assessments of training, except in one case: women (51.5%) “strongly agree” that they want more teacher training during graduate school more frequently than did men (39.8%). In short, we have confidence in the summary findings presented because we have no reason to believe that there are systematic biases in the findings that are a result of group differences.

### *Central Findings*

In this section we report central findings. The appendix provides more detail.

#### Do Graduate Programs in Philosophy Value Teacher Training?

In philosophy at least, it is assumed that teaching is some sort of talent [that] requires no training at all, something which of course is not true. How are we to change such deep-seated prejudice is a mystery to me.—Survey Respondent

The vast majority (95.2%) of faculty in graduate programs “agree” or “strongly agree” that it is important for philosophy graduate programs to prepare students for the teaching aspects of professorial work (Table 3). This may reflect a social desirability bias given the nature of the survey, but it nevertheless indicates a strong commitment to the

importance of teacher training.<sup>11</sup> When asked specifically about their own program, 69.9% of faculty members in graduate programs (Table 3) “agree” or “strongly agree” that their graduate program should offer more teacher training. In short, faculty in philosophy programs self-report that they value teacher training, but as the representative epigram above illustrates, many graduate students perceive that their faculty do not value teacher training.<sup>12</sup>

### What is the Quantity of Current Training?

It is criminal that more students are not interested in philosophy and the fault lies primarily at our own feet because most philosophers are bad teachers because they are not trained to teach.—Survey Respondent

70% of early career philosophers and current graduate students report that they received (or anticipate receiving) fewer than twenty hours of formal teacher training during their years in graduate school (Table 4).<sup>13</sup> 89.2% of faculty in graduate programs believe their students receive fewer than twenty hours of formal teacher training (Table 4). Some conscientious graduate students pursue optional teacher training, but most of the learning is through the inefficient means of trial and error, and there is little quality control on initial trials (Table 5).

### What is the Nature of Current Training?

Though I was required to take a pedagogy seminar for course credit as part of my PhD coursework, the seminar was rarely about pedagogy. Rather, it was about various aspects of professional academia (e.g., CV construction, applying for academic jobs, etc.).—Survey Respondent

The few hours of formal training graduate students receive is typically not intensive and only attentive to introductory level material. The vast majority (93.8%) of the sessions respondents attended did not require participants to perform preparatory work (e.g., reading) (Table 6). In only 2.5% of all trainings were participants expected to produce products to be used in future teaching (Table 6). Advanced topics in teaching and learning (e.g., how learning happens, integrated course design) were covered less than 30% of time (Table 7).<sup>14</sup> When advanced topics were addressed, it was usually in trainings provided by teaching and learning professionals, not philosophers (Table 7).

### What is the Expertise of the Trainers?

I felt prepared for my current job, but very little of that was the result of intention training on the part of my graduate department. Most (90%) of the formal training I received was from outside my department.—Survey Respondent

The level of teacher training is either abysmally low or just abysmal. Training in teaching philosophy cannot be done by people who are not familiar with philosophy, but the vast majority of opportunities for learning about teaching techniques come from people outside of philosophy. This is basically useless. This s&\*^ needs to change. But what faculty wants to step up? They're busy with their own stuff, so no one does. Graduate students are left in the lurch.—Survey Respondent

Most teacher trainings attended by philosophy graduate students are facilitated by philosophy faculty in the student's home department (Table 8). Only 10% of these philosophy faculty facilitators are experts in teaching and learning (Table 8).<sup>15</sup> When reflecting on their home institution, graduate students are less satisfied with departmental trainers than they are with trainers who are not philosophers (Table 8). Yet graduate students are more satisfied with trainers who are philosophers when they are not from their one's home institution (Table 8). This suggests that graduate students are receiving valuable training by philosophers who are also teaching and learning experts in settings outside of their home institutions.

### How Valuable is the Current Training?

It seems that those running the seminar are just going through the motions or teaching only for the benefit of the truly inept.—Survey Respondent

Only 21.7% of graduate students experiencing trainings report that their participation led to what they perceived to be significant improvement in their teaching (Table 9). This should be unsurprising when we combine two findings reported above. First, (i) philosophy graduate students are most satisfied with teaching trainers who are both philosophers and experts in teaching and learning, (ii) only 10% of respondents have a teaching and learning expert in their department, and (iii) most training is by a departmental faculty member. Second, the nature of a majority of training is not demanding and the topics covered do not often include advanced material.

### What are Graduate Students Doing to Learn How to Teach?

Students who got me in my first year of teaching got a raw deal.—Survey Respondent

Approximately 43% of respondents believe that “trial and error,” sometimes in conjunction with “talking to other graduate students [i.e., non-experts] about teaching,” is the aspect of their graduate experience that most positively contributed to the current quality of their teaching (Table 5). This result is unsurprising given how little formal training is undertaken and how little of it is experienced as leading to

significant improvement. When combined with the fact that 69.5% of early career philosophers feel well prepared (Table 10), one could be forgiven for concluding that a large number of philosophers believe that trial and error without feedback from relevant experts is sufficient for being a good teacher.

### The Desire for More Training

It is a sad commentary on undergraduate education that my students are forced to learn from somebody with basically ZERO training as a teacher.—Survey Respondent

Although 36.1% never lead their own class, all but 3.1% of graduate students receive some teaching experience while in graduate school (Table 11). 84.6% of graduate students and early career philosophers “agree” or “strongly agree” that their graduate program should offer more teacher training (Table 3). 74% of graduate students and early career philosophers report that they received fewer than twenty hours of formal teacher training while in graduate school (Table 4). A high majority of graduate students and early career philosophers both have little formal teacher training and want more.

### *Discussion*

Survey respondents wish graduate faculties were doing more to prepare the newest members of our profession to excel as teachers. 84.6% of current graduate students and early career philosophers “agree” or “strongly agree” that their philosophy graduate program should offer more teacher training (Table 3). Given the strength of this perception, why isn’t more teaching training in philosophy offered?

Perhaps the answer could be found in singularly quantitative thinking. Let us assume that a PhD requires fifteen 3-credit graduate courses or a minimum of 1440 hours of effort. Add to that the additional hours spend on comprehensive exams and dissertation writing, which conservatively adds another 1000 hours, for a total of 2440.<sup>16</sup> Of course, if we assume a typical PhD student teaches or assists in eight 3-credit courses, as our findings reveal (Table 11), a typical graduate student would spend 768 hours on teaching. This hypothetical quantitative scenario results in graduate students spending roughly 25% of time on teaching and 75% on research. Such a distribution of graduate student effort will likely not strike many people as especially problematic. After all, if one does not have content expertise, then no amount of teaching expertise will produce a high quality course.

The problem we are noting, however, is qualitative, and so a response framed in purely quantitative terms misses the point. During

the estimated 1440 hours of course work, graduate student learning is highly structured by faculty. All graduate students receive regular formative feedback from relevant experts during this time. In contrast, 70% of graduate students receive fewer than twenty hours of formal training during their initial teaching work (Table 4).

Further, where most entering graduate students have an undergraduate major worth of training in philosophy, almost none have any training in teaching, beyond their experience as students. We nurture the already experienced scholar in our graduate students before we encourage them to submit a paper for publication, while we put inexperienced, and often completely untrained, graduate students in front of undergraduates. The concern is not that most graduate students are not working on teaching while in graduate school. Rather, it is that they start at a greater deficit in teaching than they do in content expertise, and so the need for guidance regarding teaching is more acute, especially if one agrees that the harm of a rejection from a journal is not as bad as providing a poor course to a number of young people trying to get an education.

Most philosophy graduate students surveyed learned most of what they know about teaching by (i) doing what seems like a good idea based on their idiosyncratic past experiences and (ii) fixing the mistakes their idiosyncratic experience allows them to recognize. They neither make use of literature that contains evidence, nor do they receive much formative feedback from experts who understand the nature of learning, have a store of best practices ready for adaptation, and know how to guide improvement. Rather, when most graduate students do consult others, the vast majority of them talk with other inexperienced teachers, their fellow graduate students, who themselves have little knowledge of evidence-based best practices or learning theory that explains why certain actions engender more learning than others (Table 8). This is not an indictment of the intentions and teaching efforts of any particular philosophy graduate student. A good number of individual graduate students hone their craft with impressive results. Rather, this is a comment on the discipline of philosophy's effort to produce good teachers. With some notable exceptions, as a field, we are leaving the barely experienced to lead the totally inexperienced.<sup>17</sup> This is a disservice to philosophy graduate students and the undergraduates they teach.

The disservice to graduate students is both practical and emotional. Given that only approximately 30% of all jobs in academia are tenure-track, graduate students will be applying to jobs that emphasize teaching and their teaching credentials will be carefully scrutinized. Outstanding researchers who are not among the lucky few to obtain a tenure track position may also not get non-tenure track jobs because they will be beaten out by better teachers. Further, when one is a good teacher, being with students is usually a joy. There is a positive

feedback loop between poor teaching and gloomy classroom experiences: poor teachers can engender poor student interactions, which then “confirm” the poor teacher’s belief that bothering to be a good teacher is not worth the effort. After some period of time, teaching failures can be so disheartening, that one comes to dread the classroom and rue students. Conversely, when students know they are learning, they are pleased, and frequently associate their positive experiences with their teachers. Enjoyable interactions follow. (Recall your favorite teacher. Didn’t s/he seem to be enjoying her/himself?) Most days for good teachers are fun.

Beyond the lost opportunity of joyful teaching days, the harm of a discipline failing to intentionally attempt to produce quality teachers falls disproportionately on students. Perhaps the intensity of the “pipeline” problems in philosophy would be reduced if we were better teachers, for the best teachers provide inclusive pedagogy.<sup>18</sup> Good teaching is a justice issue.<sup>19</sup> We owe tuition paying students (and taxpayers in many cases) better learning experiences.

### Incongruous Perceptions?

Our findings reveal that the discipline of philosophy offers less teacher training than most of its practitioners want, and that the quality of the training that many receive is too low. Yet, most emerging philosophers feel well prepared for the teaching aspects of the professoriate. These self-reports appear incongruous. Syllogistically, one might think: If one feels well prepared, then one should not want more and better training.

But there are reasons to think this entailment is false. First, there is a drop in the perception of preparedness reported by graduate students (76.2% “agree” or “strongly agree” = well prepared) to that reported early career philosophers (69.5% “agree” or “strongly agree” = well prepared). Some philosophers learn that they were not as prepared as they thought they were. Second, if only 76.2% of philosophy graduate students feel they are, or will be, well prepared for the teaching aspects of the professoriate, then it seems appropriate to give our collective graduate training a “C” grade with regard to teacher preparation. There is no incongruity in thinking that a discipline that is earning at best a “C,” and at worst a borderline “D+,” in teacher training would contain a majority of people who report a desire for more and better teacher training.

Finally, our concern is not that survey respondents are producing incongruous responses (if they are), but rather with how these responses might be used. Critics may argue that since a majority of respondents feel well prepared for the teaching aspects of the professoriate, no changes in the discipline of philosophy’s teacher training are needed. We offer two responses to this argument. First, that only 69.5% of early

career philosophers report feeling well prepared for teaching strikes us as a cause for alarm, not a reason to rest on our laurels.

Second, to constructively advance the discipline of philosophy with regard to teaching effectiveness is to pursue research-based best practices independent of perceptions. No doubt, there are a small number of good philosophy teachers who learned nearly exclusively through trial and error. It is likely that these people possess high emotional intelligence and metacognitive skills (i.e., those who can accurately gauge how well students are learning from them and innovate to become more successful at engendering learning). But learning is most efficiently produced and retained when the learning process involves deliberate practice:

[While] time on task is necessary for learning, it is not sufficient for effective learning (77) . . . Most important is how people use their time while learning (235) . . . Learning [e.g., learning how to teach] is most effective when people engage in ‘deliberate practice’ that includes active monitoring of one’s learning experiences. Monitoring involves attempts to seek and use feedback about one’s progress. (58–59)<sup>20</sup>

Additionally, novices most effectively move toward more expert performance when an expert provides timely formative guidance, especially regarding how experts group, access, and deploy knowledge.<sup>21</sup> In short, learning with expert guidance generates more expertise, more quickly than does all but the luckiest trial and error. The point, again, is not that one could not be a good teacher if one has not received expert guided teacher training. Rather, the point is that as a field the method of teacher training philosophers most frequently use—trial and error without expert guidance—is inferior to a method we could use. The discipline of philosophy is currently not employing best practices regarding teacher training.

Even ruthless prudentialists must concede that teacher training in philosophy should improve when we emphasize that 87.4% of emerging philosophers do not get tenure-track positions at predominantly research-oriented institutions (Table 2). If current budget trends continue, the percentage of emerging philosophers obtaining tenure-track positions at predominantly research-oriented institutions will likely continue to decrease. While a small number of these 7 out of 8 emerging philosophers eventually move into tenure-track positions at predominantly research-oriented institutions, most do not. Seventy percent (70%) of philosophers are not in tenure-track positions, much less tenured.<sup>22</sup> When job retention depends heavily on teaching ability, teacher training matters. Nor should we forget that being a good enough teacher to retain one’s teaching job is not equivalent to being an excellent teacher. As a discipline, we should do better.

### *Recommendations*

If we consider our findings in concert, recommendations regarding the future of teacher training in philosophy begin to emerge. For-credit coursework regarding teaching and learning is perceived as the format of training that is most correlated with improved teaching (Table 9). This result is buttressed by the value of high impact trainings—where pre-meeting work is, and the construction of products related to one’s teaching are, required—since for-credit course work is most frequently high impact. Additionally, respondents are most satisfied with training from philosophers outside of their department (Table 8), which may be correlated with satisfaction associated with training from experts in teaching and learning who are also philosophers.<sup>23</sup> The content of teacher training that is most likely to lead to improvement is training that enhances participants’ learner-centeredness. If a teacher asks first, “What do these students need to do next to grow in the ways they should?” then s/he has a learner-centered approach. When one designs sequences of experiences so that students actively take themselves, with expert guidance, to these rich forms of growth, then one is learner-centered in execution. What the field of philosophy needs are for-credit, semester-long teacher training courses, led by philosophy faculty with expertise in teaching and learning who guide graduate students through demanding assignments that move beyond introductory teaching topics.

Participants in high impact teacher training experiences would read some of the best literature regarding how learning happens, how to design maximally effective courses, and how to improve classroom practice.<sup>24</sup> A graduate course could be designed to enhance participants’ ability to make effective pedagogical choices.<sup>25</sup> The interactive sessions could provide opportunities for participants to receive formative feedback from philosophers who are also teaching and learning experts regarding how to individualize evidence-based best teaching practices to one’s own idiosyncratic teaching contexts. Participants could learn how to identify and select challenging and transformative learning objectives, and how to design and assess sequences of learning activities to make the achievement of those goals highly likely.

Such a course would have a reading list as excellent as any other graduate course, and would require meaningful assignments where students develop teaching products as rigorous as a term paper in a content mastery course. A step toward this ideal is for each program that does not currently have a teaching and learning expert to hire someone with such expertise or support a current faculty member as s/he develops the relevant expertise. Crucial to the success of an effort to transform the quality of teaching in our discipline by such steps is the adoption of promotion/tenure and salary/merit systems that permit, if not encourage, diverse teaching-centered routes to a successful career.

Some universities already have a system that supports careers that prioritize teaching over research. At the University of British Columbia (UBC), for example, there are two professorial tracks, each of which includes a path to tenure and full professorship.<sup>26</sup> Where the job of “traditional professor” involves scholarly activity, teaching, and service, colleagues in the “teaching professor” path pursue teaching, educational leadership, and service. While faculty in the teaching track tend to teach more courses than those in the traditional track, faculty in the teaching track are not contingent.<sup>27</sup>

We also have examples of graduate programs that have integrated for-credit coursework regarding teaching into their curriculum. At Georgia State University most Masters students complete two teacher training courses, and some complete a third. Institutional support for the development of philosophers who are guided toward teaching excellence is not merely possible, but already happening in a few rare institutions.

Critics may argue that most graduate programs will not devote precious resources to advance teaching. We hope for more of our graduate programs, for the status quo leaves tens of thousands of undergraduates less well served than they need be. Training structures like those at Georgia State University, content like that of the American Association of Philosophy Teachers workshops, and faculty positions such as those at the University of British Columbia, show us what is possible. It is disingenuous to claim that we haven’t done better because we don’t know how; we already have structures, content, and institutional practices that work. What we appear to lack is will.

### *Conclusion*

Philosophers want more and better teacher training, and collectively we know how to deliver and support it. Our task, from the departmental level to the level of the national American Philosophical Association, is to facilitate the creation of appropriate infrastructure. Let’s get to it.

**APPENDIX**

## Findings

**Table 1: Demographic Information***Respondent Key*

GS Graduate Student

ECP Early Career Philosopher (PhD no older than three years at time of survey)

F Faculty member at a school with a graduate program

Unless explicitly noted, responses are from all three groups

## 1.1 Birth Year (Respondents: GS &amp; ECP)

|       |                 |
|-------|-----------------|
| 9.8%  | 1976 or earlier |
| 19.9% | 1977–1981       |
| 40%   | 1982–1986       |
| 30.4% | 1987–1993       |

## 1.2 Gender (Respondents: GS &amp; ECP)

|       |                |
|-------|----------------|
| 0.7%  | Gender Diverse |
| 37.5% | Female         |
| 61.8% | Male           |

## 1.3 National Origin/Ethnicity (Respondents: GS &amp; ECP)

|       |                                  |
|-------|----------------------------------|
| 81.4% | European origin                  |
| 6.1%  | Two or more predominant origins  |
| 4.5%  | Other/Did not respond            |
| 3.8%  | Asian origin                     |
| 2.2%  | South American origin            |
| 1.2%  | Middle Eastern origin            |
| 0.3%  | Indigenous North American origin |

## 1.4 Year in Graduate School (Respondents: GS)

|       |                              |
|-------|------------------------------|
| 5.1%  | First year                   |
| 31.1% | Second or Third year         |
| 47.2% | Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth year |
| 16.6% | Seventh year or more         |

**Table 2: Initial Post-PhD Employment (Respondents: ECP)**

- 72.4% of respondents’ first academic job after completing a PhD in Philosophy is not tenure-track.
  - Of the 27.6% of respondents whose first post-PhD academic job was tenure-track, they are at
    - An R1 University = 12.6%
    - A Comprehensive University = 10.2%
    - A Liberal Arts College = 3.2%
    - A Community College = 1.6%
  - Only 12.6% (or 1 out of 8) of recent PhD’s in Philosophy first post-PhD employment is at an institution that traditionally strongly emphasizes research over teaching.

**Table 3: Perceived Need for Teacher Training in Philosophy Graduate Programs**

- 95.2% of faculty in graduate programs agree or strongly agree that it is important for philosophy graduate programs to prepare students for the teaching aspects of professorial work
- 69.9% of faculty members in philosophy graduate programs agree or strongly agree that their graduate program should offer more teacher training
- 84.6% of graduate students and early career respondents agree or strongly agree that their graduate program should offer more teacher training

**Table 4: Quantity of Teaching Training**

| Hours of Formal Teacher Training | GS & ECP | F     |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------|
| 0                                | 4%       | 7.7%  |
| More than 0 but less than 20     | 70%      | 89.2% |
| At least 20 but less than 80     | 23%      | 1.6%  |
| 80 or more                       | 3%       | 1.5%  |

**Table 5: “What has most positively contributed to your current level of teaching ability?”**

- 43% of current graduate students and early career respondents responded to this open-ended question with “trial and error” or a cognate such as “practice” or “experience”

**Table 6: Format—Nature of interaction and intensity of participant effort**

(GS & ECP respondents experiencing a type of training and F respondents indicating that their program offers a type of training)

|   | All Sessions |      | Most Sessions |       | Some Sessions |       | No Sessions |       |
|---|--------------|------|---------------|-------|---------------|-------|-------------|-------|
|   | GS & ECP     | F    | GS & ECP      | F     | GS & ECP      | F     | GS & ECP    | F     |
| (1) No preparatory work (e.g., readings) before session & non-interactive (e.g., lecture) session           | 1.7%         | 0.8% | 14.6%         | 3.4%  | 54.5%         | 39.9% | 29.2%       | 25.6% |
| (2) No preparatory work before the session & interactive session (e.g., small group discussions)            | 10.1%        | 9.2% | 37.1%         | 23.5% | 46.6%         | 38.2% | 6.2%        | 2.1%  |
| (3) No preparatory work, interactive session, and participate in novel activities                           | 6.5%         | 1.7% | 21.7%         | 18.1% | 51.1%         | 37.0% | 20.7%       | 13.9% |
| (4) Preparatory work, interactive and participatory session   | 4.0%         | 5.9% | 12.4%         | 14.3% | 45.4%         | 34.9% | 38.2%       | 15.1% |
| (5) Preparatory work, interactive and participatory session, and produce products to use in future teaching | 2.5%         | 2.5% | 6.3%          | 13.9% | 35.6%         | 29.4% | 55.6%       | 26.9% |

- 93.8% of GS & ECP experienced (type 2, interactivity but no pre- or post-session work) training all or most of the time
- Only 8.8% of GS & ECP respondents experienced (type 5, high interactivity and both pre- and post-session work) training all or most of the time

**Table 7: Content of Teacher Training (by trainer type)**

| Type of Training  | GS & ECP respondents encountering it (Of those who did experience it, from whom? Philosopher/ Non-Philosopher/ Don't Remember) | F respondents indicating that their department does not offer training on this topic* |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Teaching Basics:</b>   | <b>Average: 59.1%</b><br>(62/35/3)   | 11.5%   |
| Selecting Appropriate Course Content  | 56.2 (78.6/18.1/3.3)   | 8.8%  |
| Syllabus Construction   | 65.6 (65.0/34.1/9)   | 0.9%  |
| Assignment Construction   | 60.5 (59.7/36.7/3.6)   | 11.8%   |
| Exam Construction   | 44.3 (62.5/30.6/6.9)   | 20.2%   |
| Grading   | 77.0 (67.6/30.3/2.1)   | 4.6%  |
| Central Features of Relevant Technology   | 53.1 (33.8/63.1/3.0)   | 22.7%   |
| <b>Classroom Practice:</b>  | <b>Average: 55.9%</b><br>(55.9/40.9/3.2)   | 17.3%   |
| How to Lecture  | 54.7 (60.5/37.7/1.8)   | 15.1%   |
| How to Lead a Class-wide Discussion   | 77.2 (58.3/40.5/1.2)   | 4.6%  |
| How to Facilitate Discussion Groups   | 78.5 (56.8/41.5/1.7)   | 10.1%   |
| How to Facilitate Student Presentations   | 33.7 (45.7/44.4/8.7)   | 21.8%   |
| How to Show Students How to Listen and Take Notes   | 26.5 (48.4/42/9/8.7)   | 34.9%   |
| <b>Other Topics:</b>  | <b>Average 41.0%</b><br>(51.2/47.3/1.5)  | 28.9%   |
| Writing a "Teaching Philosophy" Statement   | 50.2 (62.9/36.3/8)   | 16.0%   |
| Advanced Teaching Technology Training   | 22.3 (19.2/78.9/1.9)   | 42.9%   |
| Time Management and Work/Life Balance   | 38.9 (55.3/42.1/2.6)   | 40.3%   |
| Review of University and Departmental Policies and Procedures (e.g., FERPA, attendance, office hours) | 68.8 (51.2/47.3/1.5)   | 16.4%   |
| <b>Pedagogy:</b>  | <b>Average 38.5%</b><br>(67.6/27.7/4.7)  | 31.7%   |
| How to Teach Students How to Read Philosophy  | 40.6 (91.1/4.7/4.2)  | 22.7%   |
| How to Teach Students how to Write a Philosophy Paper   | 56.0 (88.6/8.9/2.5)  | 13.9%   |
| How to Implement Experiential or Service Learning Pedagogies  | 27.4 (49.6/46.6/3.8)   | 41.2%   |
| How to Implement Case- or Problem-based Pedagogies  | 33.3 (58.4/36.6/5.0)   | 41.2%   |
| How to Implement Competency- or Mastery-based Pedagogies  | 28.3<br>(47.8/40.4/11.8)   | 47.5%   |
| How to Implement Diversity-sensitive Pedagogies   | 45.0 (51.4/45.0/3.6)   | 23.5%   |

|   |   |       |
|---|---|-------|
| <b>Learning Theory:</b>   | <b>Average 29.9%</b><br>(34.6/61.1/4.2) | 52.2% |
| A Learning Taxonomy (e.g., “Learning Styles,” “Bloom’s Taxonomy”)       | 35.6 (26.6/69.2/4.1)                    | 52.1% |
| Expert/Novice Differences   | 25.9 (41.8/52.5/5.7)                    | 53.8% |
| The (brain) Science of Learning/How Learning Happens                    | 24.5 (31/66.4/2.6)                      | 58.8% |
| Types of Learning Objectives (e.g., content mastery, skill development) | 36.5 (35.8/60.7/3.5)                    | 40.8% |
| Metacognition, Learning How to Learn                                    | 27.3 (40.0/54.6/5.4)                    | 55.5% |
| <b>Course Design:</b>   | <b>Average 27.7%</b><br>(44.3/50.1/5.6) | 48.4% |
| Integrated, Reverse, or Backward Design                                 | 23.9 (45.1/47.8/7.1)                    | 55.0% |
| Alignment (of learning objectives, activities, and assessments)         | 42.4 (46.8/51.2/2.0)                    | 29.4% |
| Scaffolding   | 22.1 (38.5/52.9/8.6)                    | 54.6% |
| Repetitive, Deliberative Practice                                       | 25.2 (46.6/48.3/5.1)                    | 55.0% |
| Formative vs. Summative Assessment                                      | 26.0 (42.3/49.6/8.1)                    | 47.9% |

\* Responses indicate confidence that their department does not offer it. Respondents are NOT indicating that they know that their department does offer training regarding this topic.

- Relatively few GS & ECP respondents experience training regarding the type of content that leads to learner-centered teaching and on-going innovation:
  - Learning theory, 29.9%
  - Course design, 27.7%
- These topics tend to be learned from non-philosophers:
  - Learning theory, 61.1% from non-philosophers
  - Course design, 50.1% from non-philosophers

**Table 8: Satisfaction (by type of trainer) (Respondents: GS & ECF only)**

|   | Received training from such a person | Very Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Philosopher in my department                | 76.6%                                | 20.4%          | 36.5%              | 27.1%                 | 16%               |
| Philosopher outside my department           | 19%                                  | 25.2%          | 48.7%              | 19.3%                 | 6.7%              |
| Non-philosopher at my home institution      | 59.7%                                | 16.8%          | 48.7%              | 24.6%                 | 9.9%              |
| Non-philosopher outside my home institution | 14.4%                                | 20%            | 52.2%              | 17.8%                 | 10%               |

- Ranking of satisfaction by trainer type
  - Philosopher outside my department (73.9% satisfied, 25.2% very/48.7% somewhat)
  - Non-philosopher outside my home institution (72.2% satisfied, 20% very/52.2% somewhat)
  - Non-philosopher at my home institution (65.5% satisfied, 16.8% very/48.7% somewhat)
  - Philosopher in my department (56.9% satisfied, 20.4% very/36.5% somewhat)
- Of the training received from philosophers in one's department, approximately two-thirds is by faculty (one-third is by fellow graduate students). Only 10% of departmental faculty leading teacher training are experts in teaching and learning, where "expert" is defined as "a person who has sustained engagement with the scholarship of the teaching and learning; using it to innovate, presenting at conferences, or publishing in journals such as *Teaching Philosophy*."

**Table 9: Perceived Usefulness (by type of training)**

|                         | One-on-One Consultation |      | Meeting with Official Departmental Teaching Mentor |      | Teaching & Learning Workshop (one session) |      | Teaching and Learning Seminar (multi-session) |      | For-Credit course work on Teaching |      | Average  |      |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|------|--|------|--|------|---|------|------------------------------------|------|----------|------|
|                         | GS & ECF                | F    | GS & ECF   | F    | GS & ECF                                   | F    | GS & ECF                                      | F    | GS & ECF                           | F    | GS & ECF | F    |
| Significant Improvement | 13                      | 23.9 | 26   | 38   | 12   | 15.2 | 22  | 31.3 | 36                                 | 44.4 | 21.7     | 30.7 |
| Some Improvement        | 45                      | 59.4 | 40   | 56.5 | 36   | 60   | 41  | 51   | 35                                 | 40.3 | 39.3     | 53.4 |
| A Little Improvement    | 35                      | 15.9 | 28   | 5.4  | 36   | 21   | 28  | 16.7 | 23                                 | 11.1 | 30       | 14.0 |
| No Improvement          | 8                       | 0.7  | 6  | 0.0  | 16   | 3.8  | 9   | 1.0  | 6                                  | 4.2  | 9        | 1.9  |

- GS & ECP perceived usefulness by type
  - For-Credit coursework (71% improvement, 36% significant/35% some)
  - Meeting with departmental mentor (66% improvement, 26% significant/40% some)
  - Teaching and learning seminar (63% improvement, 22% significant/41% some)
  - One-on-one consultation (58% improvement, 13% significant/45% some)
  - Teaching and learning workshop (48% improvement, 12% significant/36% some)
- Faculty perceived usefulness by type
  - Meeting with departmental mentor (94.5% improvement, 38% significant/56.5% some)
  - For-Credit coursework (84.7% improvement, 44.4% significant/40.3% some)
  - One-on-one consultation (83.3% improvement, 23.9% significant/59.4% some)
  - Teaching and learning seminar (82.3% improvement, 31.3% significant/51% some)
  - Teaching and learning workshop (75.2% improvement, 15.2% significant/60% some)
- Faculty (30.7%) believe that formal teacher training results in significant improvement in graduate student teaching at rates higher than the graduate students (21.7%) themselves report experiencing significant improvement

**Table 10: Perception of Preparation for Teaching Aspects of Professorial Work**

|  | Current Graduate Students: “Will be well prepared for the teaching aspects of professorial work” | Early Career Philosophers: “Was well prepared for the teaching aspects of professorial work” | Faculty in Graduate Philosophy Programs: “Our students are well prepared for the teaching aspects of professorial work” |
|--|--|--|---|
| Strongly Agree   | 29.5%  | 27.8%  | 33.2%   |
| Agree  | 46.7%  | 41.7%  | 46.7%   |
| Disagree   | 15.4%  | 22.7%  | 14.8%   |
| Strongly Disagree  | 5.7%   | 7.7%   | 5.2%  |
| Not Applicable: I do not intend to pursue employment that has teaching aspects | 2.6%   | (not a response option)  | (not a response option)   |

- More than two-thirds of graduate students, early career philosophers, and faculty in graduate programs agree or strongly agree that emerging philosophers are well prepared for the teaching aspects of professorial work.

**Table 11: Teaching Experience\***

|   | GS & ECP | Faculty |
|---|----------|---------|
| Obtained some form of teaching experience in graduate school  | 96.9%    | NA      |
| Served or will serve at least one term as a teaching assistant  | 82.7%    | 89.4%   |
| Of those who served or will serve as a teaching assistant, those who served or anticipate serving three terms or more   | 72%      | 66.4%   |
| Served or will serve at least one term as a primary/co-instructor   | 63.9%    | 82.6%   |
| Of those who served or will serve as primary/co-instructors, those who served or anticipate serving three terms or more | 67.4%    | 43.8%   |
| Served or will serve as a grader  | 40.7%    | 48.3%   |
| Of those who served or will serve as a grader, those who served or anticipate serving three terms or more               | 32.6%    | 15.2%   |
| Served or will serve in some other teaching capacity (e.g., tutor, guest lecturer)                                      | 7.3%     | NA      |

\*GS & ECP report their actual experience or expectation; F report what they believe graduate students are doing.

- 36.1% of graduate students report that they did not serve as a primary/co-instructor of a course while in graduate school.
- Graduate students are teaching more than Faculty believe they are.

**Table 12: Type of Teacher Training**

(GS & ECP respondents experiencing a type of training and F respondents indicating that their program offers a type of training)

|  | GS & ECP | F     |
|--|----------|-------|
| Teaching and learning workshops (single session training)  | 51.8%    | 46.2% |
| One-on-one consultation (e.g., end of year review, review of classroom observation, working with teaching and learning center) | 46.3%    | 59.7% |
| Teaching and learning seminars (multi-session training)  | 35.7%    | 42.9% |
| For-credit graduate coursework regarding teaching and learning   | 22.7%    | 32.8% |
| Regular contact with an official departmental teaching mentor  | 19.5%    | 42.0% |
| Other  | 1.2%     | 13.0% |
| I experienced no training/Our program offers no training   | 22.3%    | 15.5% |

### Notes

1. Corresponding author.

2. Qualtrics and all other Qualtrics product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA. <http://www.qualtrics.com>. Copies of the surveys are available upon request from the corresponding author.

3. An early career philosopher is a person whose PhD was granted no more than three years prior to survey completion.

4. Ball State University Institutional Research Board protocol #628839-1.

5. <http://www.apaonline.org/?page=gradguide>.

6. The technical use of “valid” among social scientists means, roughly, “a single survey completed by a human being.” Valid surveys are not empty files, not duplicates of existing entries, and not false entries (e.g., filled with nonsense data from an automated computer).

7. A 10% response rate is not unusual for an online survey. We pushed an invitation to every usable e-mail address we could find on the web for philosophy graduate students, early career philosophers, and graduate faculty knowledgeable regarding the teacher training offered by their program. It took weeks of fulltime effort from undergraduate student employees to create this massive distribution list. In other words, we did not randomly sample 10% of the relevant population and receive a 100% response. Rather, we surveyed (nearly) 100% of the relevant population and received a 10% response. As we note in the main text, the representativeness of this sample allows us to have confidence in the meaningfulness of our data.

We sent a survey to 4827 graduate students or emerging scholars (66 Australia/New Zealand; 180 Canada; 25 Ireland; 486 U.K.; 4070 U.S.A.) and 3826 faculty at institutions with graduate programs (160 Australia/New Zealand; 221 Canada; 53 Ireland; 560 U.K.; 2832 U.S.A.). We sent a survey with fewer, but many identical, questions to responsible

faculty (either graduate directors or department chairs) at 160 institutions offering graduate degrees in philosophy. (10 Canada; 3 other; 12 Australia/New Zealand; 16 U.K.; 119 U.S.). Total surveys pushed to individual e-mail addresses: 8813. Of these addresses, 51 bounced back as failed or invalid. Finally, we posted invitations to take the survey on listservs and blogs that are popular with philosophers. Total valid responses: 882. Approximate response rate: 10%.

8. Women constitute less than 30% of philosophers in English-speaking countries. Sally Haslanger, "Changing the Ideology and Culture of Philosophy: Not by Reason (Alone)," *Hypatia* 32(2) (2009): 210–33; and Yann Benétreau-Dupin and Guillaume Beaulac, "Fair Numbers: What Data Can and Cannot Tell Us about the Underrepresentation of Women in Philosophy," *Ergo: An Open Access Journal of Philosophy* 2(3) (2015): 59–81, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/ergo.12405314.0002.003>.

9. American Philosophical Association, Member Demographics, <http://www.apaonline.org/?demographics>.

10. <http://www.aaup.org/report/tenure-and-teaching-intensive-appointments>.

11. Social desirability bias occurs when people present themselves in positive ways to the community to generate favorable impressions. Our survey respondents may want to represent a more pro-teaching self to the researchers. This bias, however, is less likely to occur in an online anonymous survey where there is less need for face saving measures and the topic is less personal. <http://psychologydictionary.org/social-desirability/>. C. Nancarrow and I. Brace, "Saying the 'Right Thing': Coping with Social Desirability Bias in Marketing Research," *Bristol Business School Teaching and Research Review* 3(11) (2000).

12. The ambivalence regarding teaching found in the early years of the American Philosophical Association appears to still be with us. James Campbell, "The Ambivalence toward Teaching in the Early Years of the American Philosophical Association," *Teaching Philosophy* 25(1) (2002): 53–68.

13. "Formal teacher training" is a technical term here. It excludes informal discussions of teaching with faculty or other graduate students.

14. Paralleling the teaching and learning literature, we classify the topics grouped under "Learning Theory," and "Course Design" as advanced topics. Cf. Robert B. Barr and John Tagg, "From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education," *Change Magazine* 27(6) (November/December 1995): 13–25; James E. Zull, *The Art of Changing the Brain: Enriching the Practice of Teaching by Exploring the Biology of Learning* (Sterling, Va.: Stylus Publishing, 2002); Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, *Understanding by Design*, 2nd ed. (Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development, 2005); Susan A. Ambrose, Michael W. Bridges, Michele DiPietro, Marsha C. Lovett, and Marie K. Norman, *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching* (Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass 2010); Linda B. Nilson, *Teaching at Its Best*, 3rd ed. (Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass, 2010); Maryellen Weimer, *Learner-Centered Teaching* (Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass, 2013); Linda B. Nilson, *Creating Self-Regulated Learners* (Sterling, Va.: Stylus Publishing, 2013); and Terry Doyle and Todd Zakrajsek, *The New Science of Learning: How to Learn in Harmony With Your Brain* (Sterling, Va.: Stylus Publishing, 2013).

15. In the survey, an expert in teaching and learning is defined as a person who has sustained engagement with the scholarship of the teaching and learning, using it to innovate, presenting at conferences, or publishing in journals such as *Teaching Philosophy*.

16. Another way to calculate this is: Assume a 7.5 year average to PhD graduation in philosophy. Assuming a forty-week work-year and 8 hours per day during 2.5 years of course work (4000) and 4 hours per day during 5 years of post-course work effort (4000), we arrive at 8000 hours of guided effort toward the development of content expertise during graduate study.

17. One notable exception is Georgia State University, which has a three-semester teacher training program for their Master's students.

18. The phrase "pipeline problems" refers to the loss of diversity among the practitioners of philosophy as one moves from the undergraduate to the graduate to the professorial level. Cheshire Calhoun, "Musings: The Undergraduate Pipeline Problem," *Hypatia* 24(2) (2009): 216–23; Molly Paxton, Carrie Figdor, and Valerie Tiberius, "Quantifying the Gender Gap: An Empirical Study of the Underrepresentation of Women in Philosophy," *Hypatia* 27(4) (2012): 949–57; Tina Fernandes Botts, Liam Kofi Bright, Myisha Cherry Guntur Mallarangeng, Quayshawn Spencer, "What Is the State of Blacks in Philosophy?," *Critical Philosophy of Race* 2(2) (2014): 224–42; Jennifer Saul, "Implicit Bias, Stereotype Threat, and Women in Philosophy," in *Women in Philosophy? What Needs to Change*, ed. Fiona Jenkins and Katrina Hutchison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Benétreau-Dupin and Beaulac, "Fair Numbers."

19. Compare Parker Palmer, *The Courage to Teach* (10th Anniversary ed.) (Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass, 2007) and *Healing the Heart of Democracy* (Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass, 2014).

20. John D. Bransford, Ann L. Brown, and Rodney Cocking, eds., *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2000).

21. John D. Bransford, Ann L. Brown, and Rodney Cocking, "How Experts Differ from Novices," in *How People Learn*, 31–50.

22. <http://www.aaup.org/report/tenure-and-teaching-intensive-appointments>.

23. Future research could examine this preference more deeply. Perhaps the satisfaction comes from the ability to be vulnerable and troubleshoot failures when one is working with people who have no power over one. Perhaps it is because external trainings tend to self-select predominantly enthusiastic participants.

24. See note 13. Also consider Thomas A. Angelo and K. Patricia Cross, *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*, 2nd ed. (Jossey-Bass, 1993); Stephen D. Brookfield, *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher* (Jossey-Bass, 1995); Barbara J. Duch, Susan E. Groh, and Deborah E. Allen, eds., *The Power of Problem-Based Learning* (FALMER/KP, 2001); Ken Bain, *What the Best College Teachers Do* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004); Bette L. Erickson, Calvin B. Peters, and Diane W. Strommer, *Teaching First-Year College Students* (Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

Among the best, recent philosophy-specific works are Emily Esch, Kevin Hermeberg, and Rory E. Kraft Jr., eds., *Philosophy Through Teaching* (Charlottesville, Va.: Philosophy Documentation Center, 2014); Emily Esch, "A Cognitive Approach to Teaching Philosophy," *Teaching Philosophy* 36(2) (2013): 107–24, 10.5840/teachphil201336216; Jeffrey Maynes, "Thinking about Critical Thinking," *Teaching Philosophy* 36(4) (2013): 337–51, 10.5840/teachphil2013931; Patrick Stokes, "Philosophy Has Consequences! Developing Metacognition and Active Learning in the Ethics Classroom," *Teaching Philosophy* 35(2) (2012): 143–69, 10.5840/teachphil201235216; Ann J. Cahill and Stephen Bloch-Schulman, "Argumentation Step-By-Step: Learning Critical Thinking through Deliberative Practice," *Teaching Philosophy* 35(1) (2012): 41–62, 10.5840/teachphil20123514; John Rudisill,

“The Transition from Studying Philosophy to Doing Philosophy,” *Teaching Philosophy* 34(3) (2011): 241–71, 10.5840/teachphil201134332; Stephen Bloch-Schulman, “When the ‘Best Hope’ Is Not So Hopeful, What Then? Democratic Thinking, Democratic Pedagogies, and Higher Education,” *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 24(4) (2010): 399–415, 10.1353/jsp.2010.0018; Cynthia Coe, “Scaffolded Writing as a Tool for Critical Thinking: Teaching Beginning Students How to Write Arguments,” *Teaching Philosophy* 34(1) (2011): 33–50, 10.5840/teachphil20113413; John Immerwahr, “The Case for Motivational Grading,” *Teaching Philosophy* 34(4) (2011): 335–46, 10.5840/teachphil201134446; Daryl Close, “Fair Grades,” *Teaching Philosophy* 32(4) (2009): 361–98, 10.5840/teachphil200932439; Alexandra Bradner, “Teaching Modernity in Appalachia,” *Teaching Philosophy* 31(3) (2008): 229–47, 10.5840/teachphil200831325; and J. Carl Ficarrotta, “How to Teach a Bad Ethics Course,” *Teaching Philosophy* 32(1) (2009): 53–68, 10.5840/teachphil20093214.

25. The American Association of Philosophy Teachers has been successfully implementing a model seminar for decades. It is available for emulation. Contact the Executive Director of the AAPT, [philosophyteachers.org/](http://philosophyteachers.org/).

26. For a full description, see Christina Hendricks, “What Kind of Position I Have,” <http://blogs.ubc.ca/chendricks/2015/03/13/my-position-at-ubc/>.

27. For more on how to support quality teaching, see L. Dee Fink, “Better Organizational Support for Faculty,” in *Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An Integrated Approach to Designing College Courses*, 2nd ed. (Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass, 2013).

*David W. Concepción*, Dept. of Philosophy & Religious Studies, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana; [dwconcepcion@bsu.edu](mailto:dwconcepcion@bsu.edu). *Melinda Messineo*, Sociology Department, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana; [mmessine@bsu.edu](mailto:mmessine@bsu.edu). *Sarah Wieten*, Centre for Humanities Engaging Science and Society, Durham University, Durham, UK; [s.e.wieten@durham.ac.uk](mailto:s.e.wieten@durham.ac.uk). *Catherine Homan*, Philosophy Department, Siena College, Loudonville, New York; [choman@siena.edu](mailto:choman@siena.edu).