NEWSLETTER | The American Philosophical Association

Teaching Philosophy

SPRING 2022

VOLUME 21 | NUMBER 2

ISSN 2155-9708

APA NEWSLETTER ON

Teaching Philosophy

TZIPORAH KASACHKOFF AND EUGENE KELLY, CO-EDITORS VOLUME 21 | NUMBER 2 | SPRING 2022

LETTER FROM THE EDITORS

Tziporah Kasachkoff
THE GRADUATE CENTER, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Eugene Kelly
NEW YORK INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Welcome to the spring 2022 edition of the *APA Newsletter on Teaching Philosophy*. We offer in this edition two articles, one book review, and a poem.

Our first article, "Professors as Teachers," by Steven M. Cahn, argues that college/university professors, though employed by their institutions *as teachers* of their subject, almost always prioritize research over teaching, an attitude that is reflected in and even encouraged by the institutions in which they teach. Cahn makes some suggestions as to why college administrators prioritize research, indicates the various ways in which this prioritization finds expression, and shares his reasons for regarding as lamentable the fact that, as he puts it, "research, not teaching, rules in academia." Cahn goes on to suggest several ways in which this situation may be ameliorated.

Our second article, "Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: One Model," is authored by George Rainbolt and Sandra Dwyer. Rainbolt and Dwyer describe the program they introduced at Georgia State University to prepare students who are studying for their master's degree in philosophy for the teaching career in philosophy that most of them will eventually go on to pursue. The authors indicate the benefits of the program in some detail, and note the challenges—workload and financial—faced by the graduate students who are in the program. The authors detail for our readers the various parts of the training that each of the graduate students in the program undergoes; the courses that each must take and the topics covered in each of these courses; the undergraduate classes that all students-in-training must teach as part of the program and how these classes are mentored. The authors conclude with their reflections on the program.

We are very pleased to also include "The Logician," a poem by Felicia Nimue Ackerman.

We welcome and encourage readers of our publication to write of their experiences as teachers. Additionally, we are happy to consider articles that respond to, comment on, or take issue with any of the material that appears within our pages.

We also encourage our readers to suggest themselves as reviewers of books and other materials (including technological innovations) that they think may be especially good for classroom use. Though we normally list books and other materials that we have received from publishers for possible review in our BOOKS RECEIVED section, reviewers are welcome to suggest material for review that they themselves have used in the classroom and have found useful.

Please remember that our publication is devoted to pedagogy and not to theoretical discussions of philosophical issues. This should be borne in mind not only when writing articles for our publication but also when reviewing material for it.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

If and when you submit writing to our publication, please adhere to the following guidelines:

All papers should be sent to the editors electronically. The title of the paper should appear on the top of the paper itself. However, the author's name and full mailing address should appear on a separate page. Nothing that identifies the author or his or her institution should appear within the body of the paper or in the endnotes of the paper.

Authors should adhere to the production guidelines that are available from the APA. For example, please do not use your word processor's footnote or endnote function; all notes must be added manually at the end of the paper. This rule is important for it facilitates the formatting, by the APA, of your publication online.

Contributions should be sent to:

Tziporah Kasachkoff, Philosophy Department,
CUNY Graduate Center, 365 Fifth Avenue,
New York City, NY 10016: tkasachkof@yahoo.com

and/or

Eugene Kelly, at ekelly@nyit.edu

All articles submitted to our publication undergo anonymous review by the members of the editorial committee (and occasionally other reviewers, if one of our reviewers happens to identify the author of a submitted paper).

ARTICLES

*Professors as Teachers**

Steven M. Cahn
THE GRADUATE CENTER, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

When elementary and secondary school teachers are asked what they do for a living, they typically reply, "I'm a teacher." The usual follow-up, "What do you teach?" elicits replies such as "Second Grade" or "Middle School," or "English and History," or "French and Latin." When, on the other hand, college professors are asked what they do, they usually identify as physicists, economists, literary critics, and so on. Their primary commitment is to their discipline, not their classes.

Indeed, to many, teaching seems not a feature but a drawback of the professorial life. For instance, years ago at a meeting of the American Philosophical Association I overheard a group of graduate students responding enthusiastically as one described a position for which he had just been interviewed. "It's a great job," he told his friends. "There's very little teaching, and I'll have plenty of time for my work." I wish someone had reminded him that, in fact, teaching *was* his work.

During the years I served as a provost, one of my major responsibilities was interviewing candidates for faculty positions. When I inquired about requests they might have, invariably they asked that they be allowed the lowest possible number of courses to teach. Those professors who were teaching three courses per semester hoped to be given two; those who already taught two sought to do one; those with one per semester looked for one per year. Some even expressed a desire to begin their association with our school by being awarded a sabbatical, thus allowing them time to complete a current research project.

Along the same lines, imagine that one day you receive a notice from your dean that as of next year all faculty members at your school will teach two fewer courses than at present. How many of your colleagues would view this news as anything other than wonderful?

Indeed, in academic jargon instructional hours are known as a "load." Research, however, is referred to as an "opportunity." Imagine what faculty members would think of any colleague who announced, "Good news. My research load has been reduced, and I'll have more opportunity to teach."

A feature of the APA Blog is a series of interviews with current graduate students, and the questions asked are revelatory. Here are a few samples: What excites you about philosophy?" "What are you working on right now?" "What is the favorite thing you have written?

The following questions are never asked: "What excites you about teaching philosophy?" "What are you teaching right now?" "What would be your favorite course to teach?"

This lack of concern toward teaching was also apparent when each September my program offered an orientation session for new doctoral students, who were asked their specialty. Those who replied with uncertainty received patronizing smiles, while the response that invariably caused derisive laughter was "I plan to teach."

In all candor, that answer would have been the one I myself would have offered. I wanted to be a teacher, preferably but not necessarily at the college level. As an undergraduate I had found more success in my philosophy classes than in my other major areas of interest, including mathematics, history, political science, and musicology. Hence, I chose to enter graduate school in philosophy.

As to my planned specialty, I didn't have one. Indeed, my earliest writing focused on the issue of fatalism, a subject about which I knew nothing when I began my graduate education. Further, my later work on philosophy of religion, the concept of happiness, and academic ethics were interests I developed after having earned my doctoral degree.

Decades later, when two of my former students, Professors Robert B. Talisse and Maureen Eckert, expressed an interest in presenting me with a Festschrift to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of my association with The Graduate Center of the City University of New York, they asked me for an appropriate title for the book. I replied almost immediately, "A Teacher's Life."

To this day, when I am asked what I did for a living, I answer, "I was a teacher." I may not be asked any subsequent questions as to what, who, or where I taught, but I take pleasure in identifying students as the primary focus of my life's work.

I recognize, however, that while some colleagues share my emphasis on teaching, many do not. And university policies are structured to reward excellence in research, not teaching. A top-notch researcher who is barely adequate in the classroom is far more likely to be promoted than a superb teacher whose scholarly record is thin.

I should explain that while my degree of success in the classroom does not match that achieved by some others

I have known, I take second place to no one in my admiration for the performance of those I consider great teachers. Yet to other members in the department of a celebrated teacher, the situation can be perturbing. How many are comfortable admitting that their colleague's class size is larger due to that individual's superior teaching skills? In such a situation, the inclination is to chalk up their colleague's success to mere personal popularity. Indeed, in an effort to prevent too many students from registering for a course with an acclaimed instructor, a department may place an arbitrary limit on class size and hope thereby to maintain the absurd fiction that all its members are equally skilled in the classroom.

Administrators, too, strongly favor the renowned researcher over the best of instructors. After all, having as a member of the faculty a national or international authority brings prestige to the entire school and in the sciences as well as the social sciences attracts outside funding that contributes significantly to the school's coffers. The superb instructor, though, is only a local celebrity, legendary perhaps on campus but unknown outside its gates. For those reasons, leading researchers have leverage with the administration in a way leading teachers do not.

In sum, while almost all administrators claim to value teaching, their actions tell otherwise. When considering candidates for faculty positions, they typically view as more attractive the promising researcher rather than the promising teacher. When salary increases are distributed, the larger ones go to the successful researcher rather than the successful teacher. When a faculty member is recruited by another institution, more effort is made to retain an outstanding researcher than an outstanding teacher. Granted, an institution may give teaching prizes to a select few while rewarding research for the many, but what is virtually unheard of is giving research prizes to a select few while rewarding teaching for the many. In short, research, not teaching, rules in academia, and candidates for tenure who hope this principle does not apply to them may receive a rude shock.

Can anything be done to change how teaching is viewed? The key is found at the departmental level. Here are a few changes I would suggest. First, doctoral programs should require that all graduate students who seek a faculty position participate in a departmental colloquium that prepares them for offering effective instruction to undergraduates. For many years I offered such a credit-bearing course in the PhD Program in Philosophy at the City University of New York Graduate Center, and results of the extensive teaching practice in class were so dramatic that they were remarked on by the departments where our students taught. Sad to say, however, once I retired, the course was never offered again, and complaints about the performance of our students began to be received from the same schools that had previously offered praise.

Second, departments making appointments should take seriously candidates' quality of instruction. Those invited for campus interviews should be expected to offer both a research paper and a talk on an elementary topic, organized and presented as if for introductory students. Only those candidates whose classroom performance is proficient should be considered seriously. As anyone who has attended such a talk realizes, a candidate's pedagogical ability quickly becomes apparent. Some individuals display requisite skills, whereas others mumble and fumble. While those who cannot ably defend their research are invariably passed over, the same fate should befall those who cannot ably teach.

Third, just as new faculty members should be given permission to observe classes of senior members of the department, so new faculty members should occasionally be observed, not to be formally evaluated but to be offered suggestions where appropriate. Outstanding scholars provide junior colleagues with support in their scholarly endeavors; outstanding instructors should likewise aid junior colleagues in dealing with their pedagogic challenges.

Fourth, as to decisions for promotion and tenure, departments currently care enough about research to undertake an elaborate review of each candidate's scholarship. Similarly, departments ought to be concerned enough about teaching to undertake an equally elaborate review of a professor's work in the classroom. Such a review should involve input from departmental colleagues who visit the professor's classes and examine syllabi, examinations, and term papers to assess teaching performance.

Some suppose that an adequate system of teacher evaluation can rely heavily on student ratings. Students, however, have not mastered the subject in question; hence they are in poor position to judge how well it is being taught. To be sure, they can provide useful information, such as whether faculty members come to class on time, encourage student participation, appear for office hours, and so on. But numerous studies have confirmed that student evaluations need to be considered in the context of peer evaluations.

Fifth, just as an outstanding researcher may be awarded tenure even with a weak performance in the classroom, so tenure should also be available to an outstanding teacher with a thin record of research. Granted, the ideal candidate excels both as researcher and teacher, but if an occasional exception is made so as not to lose a researcher of national stature, an occasional exception should also be made so as not to lose a teacher of extraordinary accomplishment. Admittedly, few teachers can attain such a level of excellence; even taking the lead in developing a new interdisciplinary program, teaching a course that invariably has a high enrollment, offering extra help to struggling students, or attracting crowds to office hours should not by itself overcome a thin record of research. Nevertheless, a faculty member with a superlative record of teaching, unlikely to be matched by any possible replacement, should be considered a strong candidate for a tenured appointment.

Departments that value teaching highly put pressure on administrators to do likewise. For example, if a candidate for a faculty position offers a pedagogical talk that is unsuccessful, that individual's name should not even be

forwarded for the administration to consider. Similarly, if a professor has proven to be a weak teacher, the department should be prepared to turn down that person for tenure, leaving the administration unlikely to try to overturn that peer judgment. Even an administrator not oriented to the importance of teaching will realize the wisdom of supporting the decisions of a department known for its commitment to maintaining pedagogic excellence.

In sum, teaching should matter, and that message can be sent to doctoral students, faculty members, and administrators. Doing so requires enacting policies that emphasize quality of teaching, thus helping to ensure that students receive the high quality of instruction to which they are entitled.

*This article is an expanded version of the author's post on the APA Blog, January 3, 2022.

Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: One Model

George W, Rainbolt*
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

Sandra L. Dwyer**
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

We believe that a significant portion of philosophy graduate programs should be devoted to helping graduate students become better teachers. For those graduate students who will go on to become faculty, teaching will be a significant part of their lives. In addition, the quality of graduate-student teaching has a significant impact on undergraduates. How to help graduate students become better philosophy teachers can and should vary widely from institution to institution. This article describes one model of a philosophy teacher preparation program, the program at Georgia State University (GSU). We have found that our program has many benefits. (1) It increases the quality of graduate student instruction. (2) It prepares graduate students to teach their subject once they assume their own teaching positions. (3) It reduces the percentage of undergraduates who earn a grade of D, W, or F in general education courses. (4) It allows our Department to offer funding to all our graduate students. (5) It helps graduate students discover whether or not they enjoy teaching. (6) It encourages graduate students to learn from one another. (7) Finally, it improves the social atmosphere of the Department. The main problems with the program are that the workload on graduate students is too heavy and their funding is too low.

Work on the program started in 2001. The program developed and changed dramatically over time. It will no doubt continue to evolve in the future. This article describes the program as it existed in 2018-2019, the last full year before the COVID-19 pandemic. It does not describe the long and winding road that got the program to that year. Nor does it address the drastic changes that have been and continue to be made as the Department responds to the profound, rapid, and unforeseeable effects of the pandemic. Nevertheless, the year before the onset of the pandemic is a good time to take a snapshot. In addition, we will lay out the program in a somewhat simplified manner and as if there were no exceptions. There are many complex details and exceptions to almost every rule. However, it would be tedious to describe all of them. (Interested readers are welcome to contact the authors, the current department chair, or the Coordinator to discuss these details.)

The primary goals of GSU's teacher preparation program are (a) to improve the quality of the instruction offered by graduate students and thereby to increase student learning of GSU undergraduates, and (b) to prepare graduate students to teach well after they graduate. In 2000, we faced four interlocking problems. (1) The introductory-level courses, primarily Critical Thinking (taken by about 3,000 students per year) and Introduction to Philosophy (taken by about 1,000 students per year), were taught mostly by adjuncts. (2) The courses were not standardized. Both content and grading standards differed widely from instructor to instructor. This lack of uniformity meant that the grade of an undergraduate student depended more often on which instructor happened to be teaching than on the student's performance. (3) We were able to offer funding to only a few of our MA students. (4) The teaching preparation provided to our graduate students was minimal. It consisted of a one-or-two-day College-run teaching workshop before fall classes started and hit-or-miss mentoring by faculty dependent on the graduate students asking for help. (This workshop has since been discontinued by the College.)

On the budget side, the program's founding idea was simple: use the funds previously allocated to pay adjuncts to support graduate students. On the program side, the basic thrust is twofold. First, graduate students take a three-course sequence of teaching preparation courses (described below). Second, we standardized the introductory-level courses (sometimes called "packaged course" or "a course in a box") to reduce the workload on graduate students while decreasing unfairness to the undergraduates. The program is run by the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching (Coordinator), a permanent non-tenure-track faculty member who teaches the three courses and supervises teacher preparation.

THE THREE-COURSE SEQUENCE

The first course, Teaching Philosophy, is taken by all first-year graduate students. (All first-year philosophy graduate students are funded by the Department.) This course is letter-graded and earning at least a B grade is necessary to continue to receive financial support from the Department. This course focuses on three main areas of preparation: (a) the content of the course in Critical Thinking, which most graduate students will teach the following year, (b) an overview of topics fundamental to teaching undergraduates (such as construction and grading of tests, and how to handle student discussions in class), and (c) questions and concerns that the graduate students have about teaching generally or the profession of teaching philosophy in particular.

To address these three areas of preparation, the graduate students attend a section of the Critical Thinking course taught by the Coordinator and meet weekly with the Coordinator to discuss the course material as well as pedagogical concerns. For some of the weekly meetings, department faculty members are invited to talk with the graduate students about relevant topics such as time management and how to minimize plagiarism. University staff also are invited to discuss available resources such as the counseling center and issues such as the implementation of the Title IX program. To address particular concerns for each cohort, every graduate student sends two questions to the Coordinator a few days before each weekly meeting. These questions are used to jump start the weekly discussions. The questions may address any point of content in the Critical Thinking course, any question about pedagogical techniques or teaching in general, or any other question the graduate students have about the profession of college teaching. The questions of the students naturally differ within each cohort. After all, graduate students are unique individuals with their own interests or worries. However, the questions also raise issues that are relevant to the interests of most other graduate students interested in having a career as a teacher. Questions run the gamut from "How should I dress when teaching?" to "How do I balance my teaching duties with finishing up my coursework and thesis defense?" to "What do you do if a student starts a fight in class?" to "What should I do if I don't know the answer to a student's question?"

In addition, once during the semester, the graduate students each present a short paper on an article from a pedagogy journal such as *Teaching Philosophy* or a chapter from a pedagogy book (such as bell hooks's *Teaching to Transgress* or Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*). In this way, the graduate students quickly become aware of at least twenty articles on pedagogy, while only having to read one. We attempt to introduce this kind of efficiency throughout the teacher-preparation program to reduce the workload of our graduate students.

Once during the semester, every graduate student gives a mini lecture to the undergraduate critical thinking class that that student is attending. This is often the graduate student's first experience teaching. Once they are in front of the class and hear questions from undergraduates, the graduate students almost universally want to engage with them. That experience causes a shift in their perception of themselves from being students to being instructors. The experience our graduate students have of simultaneously being both students and instructors is one of the valuable elements of the program.

Along with the first pedagogy class, first-year graduate students lead Supplemental Instruction sections. They receive training (a workshop before classes start) from GSU's supplemental instruction team. Supplemental Instruction is a form of group tutoring used across the United States and in several other countries. In addition to helping undergraduates with the material of the specific course for which they come for Supplemental Instruction, the tutoring sessions cover such general topics as note taking, time management, and study strategies. Because the Department of Philosophy participates in the GSU's Supplemental Instruction program, the University provides additional funds to support the graduate students. Initially, the Department had five or six graduate students participate in Supplemental Instruction. We quickly noticed that those graduate students were some of the best instructors in the following year. We then assigned all graduate students to lead Supplemental Instruction sections during one semester of their first year.

The second course, Teaching Philosophy Practicum, is taken in the semester in which the graduate students teach their own course for the first time (usually in the summer semester after their first year or the fall semester of their second year). This course is letter graded, and a B is required to continue to receive financial support. In order to teach their own courses, graduate students must have completed the first course of the three-course sequence and earmed a minimum of eighteen credit hours of graduate coursework in philosophy. The second pedagogy course meets once a week and covers topics dealing with some of the administrative aspects of teaching (such as the requirement that final grades must be submitted to the registrar by Friday before 5 p.m.), preparing classes, developing syllabi, preparing lecture notes to use when presenting in classes, grading assignments, etc. As part of this course, the Coordinator observes one class session taught by each graduate student. The Coordinator then provides extensive written and oral feedback on the observed teaching session.

The third course, Advanced Teaching Practicum, is taken by all graduate students who are in their second or subsequent semester of teaching their own course. Because our MA program is designed as a two-year program, most students take this course only once (in the spring semester of their second year). This course is pass/fail, not letter graded, and is largely a one-on-one tutorial between the Coordinator and the graduate student to help the student develop teaching documents. These documents typically include three items. (1) A teaching philosophy statement that notes the skills emphasized when teaching, the methods utilized, and the strategies used to capture student interest. This one-to-three-page statement can be attached to the graduate student's CV when applying for PhD programs or teaching jobs. (2) A teaching summation that can also be added to the student's CV. This document is generally no longer than one page and lists the particulars of teaching experience (course title, number of sections or students, and date when taught) along with student evaluation scores from the College. (3) A teaching portfolio, which includes the syllabi of courses that were either taught or that the graduate student is prepared to teach, samples of feedback that the graduate student gave on students' work, and other such things that might demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Since the teaching portfolio is a more comprehensive document than the other two documents and may not be completed by the time a student graduates, former graduate students often correspond with the Coordinator after they have graduated and when they are ready to apply for teaching jobs. They then complete the Teaching Portfolio at that time.

COURSE STANDARDIZATION

We have extensively standardized the Critical Thinking course. The same syllabus is used across all sections of the course. The same midterm and same final exam are used in all sections. All sections use the same textbook, *Critical Thinking: The Art of Argument* (Cengage 2014), which was written by the authors of this article. (Written with the help of scholars from the social sciences, the natural sciences, the humanities, and the fine arts, the book focuses on critical thinking in college core/gen ed courses and so assists GSU's efforts to improve student learning, retention, and graduation rates.) This standardization (a) increases student learning, (b) reduces the unfairness caused by graduate student instructors with widely different grading standards, and (c) reduces the workload of the graduate students teaching the course. This is all the more important given that, typically, graduate students are in our MA program for only two years and so teach the course in Critical Thinking for only two or three semesters.

Our Critical Thinking course is a flipped course. Students watch prerecorded eight-to-ten-minute video lectures outside of class. These videos were produced by the authors and several graduate students. (There are approximately seventy lectures, available, for free, to instructors at other institutions.) When they come to class, the students focus on doing homework-style exercises. For the first half of class, they typically work on their exercises in small groups, after which they go over the exercises with the instructor. When we converted from a traditional lecture course to a flipped course, we saw an increase of about fifteen percentage points in the percentage of students earning an A or a B and a corresponding drop in the percentage of students earning a C, a D, or an F. In addition, reports from the graduate students indicate that the flipped format reduced their workload.

Introduction to Philosophy, Introduction to Ethics, and some applied ethics courses are less standardized. Many sections of these courses are taught by permanent faculty who teach the course as they think best. The Department has developed a webpage for graduate student instructors that includes syllabi, tests, and assignments from faculty-taught courses and from some courses taught by exceptional graduate student instructors. The Department has also set up folders of uncopyrighted and fair use readings from which graduate student instructors must choose the readings that they assign. They are encouraged to nominate additional readings and, if approved by the Department, those readings are added to the list of reading materials. Because the readings are not under copyright or are available to students under fair use, they are free to the undergraduates in the class. A minimum of 20 percent of the readings assigned in any class must be by women authors, and the Department actively encourages its graduate students to include readings written by members of other underrepresented groups. There are no common exams or assignments. The syllabi of graduate student instructors are reviewed by the Coordinator to ensure that they meet university/department requirements and to make sure that the structure of the course does not overload the graduate student-teacher.

REFLECTIONS

Overall, we are pleased with the results of our efforts to prepare our philosophy graduate students to be teachers. Post-graduation surveys of our graduate students indicate that they are happy to have been part of the program, and those who have gone on to PhD programs report that it has served them well. The quality, consistency, and fairness of instruction in our courses in Critical Thinking and Introduction to Philosophy have increased, the percentage of undergraduates who earn a grade of D, W, or F has decreased, and we have been able to offer funding to all our graduate students. This led to a more supportive atmosphere among the graduate students who previously saw themselves as competing for the few supported graduate lines.

Most graduate students come to our MA program without ever having considered whether they have a desire to teach. One of the highlights of our work has been witnessing our graduate students discover whether they have such a desire, seeing that many young people who love philosophy research also love teaching philosophy, and seeing that they are almost always good at it. The mini lecture discussed above is often a key moment. While most of our graduate students find that they love teaching, some discover that teaching is not for them. The program allows students to make this discovery when it is relatively easy for them to revise their career goals.

One might worry that some prospective graduate students see GSU as a less attractive master's program because we require participation in our teacher preparation program. We have found the opposite to be the case. While we cannot be sure that there are not a few prospective graduate students who decide not to apply to our program due to the unusual emphasis on preparing graduate students to teach, interest in our master's program has increased since we developed the teacher preparation program. Anecdotal reports indicate that prospective graduate students see our teacher preparation as a strength. In addition, many students are drawn to our program because the teacher preparation system allows us to fund all our graduate students. As just noted, universal funding has led to a more supportive atmosphere, and this attracts prospective graduate students.

Additionally, the program has encouraged habits of learning as a group. The graduate students learn by talking to one another that all teachers have problems with disruptive students and plagiarism cases. The sharing engendered by the program exponentially hastens the development of the graduate students' expertise in handling many facets of teaching including how to help each other cover classes when one of them is ill, how to read a paper at a conference, how to make Cartesian doubt interesting to first-generation college students, and how to give feedback on essays to students who come to class with widely diverse academic preparation. All of this helps our graduate students through the difficult process of entering the world of teaching.

The social atmosphere of the students in our Department has improved because the graduate students come together as a cohort. In a large graduate program such as ours, with

over fifty students, it can be difficult for graduate students to get to know each other. This is especially true for those whose research interests differ. Because students of all research interests participate in the teaching preparation program, bonds are formed across this potential divide.

There have been some relatively minor but expected challenges. Some graduate students resist teacher preparation. They want to focus on their research. Other graduate students resist the standardization of the courses because they would like to design their own courses. Still other graduate students want to use inappropriate videos or reading materials in their courses. We see these challenges as relatively minor because the vast majority are resolved by talking with the graduate students about why it is important to learn to teach, why the courses are standardized, and why some videos/readings are inappropriate. Another anticipated challenge is that, because we offer only an MA program, most students teach for only one year. We are always working with a large group of brand-new instructors. For this reason and many others, the Coordinator plays a key role in the success of the program.

However, there are two significant problems. The workload on graduate students is too heavy and their stipends are too low. At base, this is caused by the fact that the largest part of the funds for graduate support came from the funds previously allocated for adjuncts. Stipends are typically $10,000–$12,000. (This includes a tuition waiver, but no health insurance, and no waiver of the University's fees of approximately $1,000/semester.) Matters are made worse by the large size of our undergraduate classes. Critical Thinking sections are limited to forty-five students and Introduction to Philosophy is limited to sixty students. Almost all sections are full. Thus, many graduate students are teaching one hundred students in the fall, as well as one hundred students in the spring while taking their own graduate level courses, writing their master's thesis, and applying to PhD programs!

The Department would like to decrease the size of its graduate program (in part to reflect the change in the market for philosophy professors). If funding were held constant, this would allow the Department to spread its graduate funding dollars among fewer students, and thereby increase the stipend that each receives. Some progress has been made in this direction. However, for reasons having to do with the formulas that the State of Georgia uses to allocate funding to universities, there is pressure at both the College and University level to increase the size of graduate programs. The Department would also like to decrease the teaching load of its graduate students. The current load is generally six sections of Critical Thinking per calendar year (summer, fall, and spring semesters) or four sections of the other courses per calendar year. (Critical Thinking is a two-credit course and the other courses carry three credits.) In a perfect world, we would cut this load in half with no reduction in stipend, though any reduction in load with no reduction in stipend would be welcome. Of course, any reduction in teaching load would require additional resources from the College or University, which is not likely, as our program is not exempt from the challenges caused by the lack of support for higher education that impacts everyone in higher education in so many ways.

Overall, the Department is proud of its teacher preparation program. We believe that it is one of the things that makes our graduate program stand out. More importantly, we believe that it has made a real difference for undergraduates at GSU and at those schools where our graduate students teach after they leave us.

*Before becoming Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of North Florida, George Rainbolt was chair of the Department of Philosophy at Georgia State University.

**Before retiring in 2021, Sandra Dwyer was the Coordinator of Graduate Teaching.

Appendix: Further Readings

This article and the list of further readings below draw on information in an unpublished manuscript, "A Report on Philosophy Teacher Training at Georgia State University," by Sandra L. Dwyer, Robert Bingle, and Emily Cahill. The manuscript (copies available by contacting the authors) provides details about the GSU program and a survey of its former graduate students.

FURTHER READINGS

American Philosophical Association, "American Philosophical Association Statement on Teaching," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 69, no. 2 (1995): 96–100, http://www.apaonline.org/page/teaching.

Benjamin, Martin, "A Graduate Seminar on Teaching Philosophy," *APA Newsletter on Teaching Philosophy* 3, no. 1 (2003): 176–80, https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.apaonline.org/resource/collection/808CBF9D-D8E6-44A7-AE13-41A70645A525/v03n1Teaching.pdf.

Campbell, James, "The Ambivalence toward Teaching in the Early Years of the American Philosophical Association," *Teaching Philosophy* 25, no. 1 (2002): 53–68, https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil20022513.

Cahn, Steven, "Teaching Graduate Students to Teach," *Teaching Philosophy* 27, no. 4 (2004): 321–23, https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil200427446.

Concepción, David W., Melinda Messineo, Sarah Wieten, and Catherine Homan, "The State of Teacher Training in Philosophy," *Teaching Philosophy* 39, no. 1 (2016): 1–24, https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil201621942.

Gendin, Sidney, "Am I Wicked?" *Teaching Philosophy* 18, no. 2 (1995): 167–68, https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil19951821.

Hardin, C. L., "Teaching Philosophers To Teach: The Syracuse Program," *Teaching Philosophy* 18, no. 4 (1995): 327–68, https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil199518443.

Jacquart, Melissa, and Jessey Wright, "Teaching Philosophy Graduate Students about Effective Teaching," *Teaching Philosophy* 40, no. 2 (2017): 123–60, https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil201771366.

Ladd, John, "Kant as a Teacher," *Teaching Philosophy* 5, no. 1 (1982): 1–9, https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil19825111.

Patton, Michael, "Teaching Graduate Students to Teach – An Approach," *Teaching Philosophy* 15, no. 3 (1992): 231–38, https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil199215332.

POEM

*The Logician**

Felicia Nimue Ackerman
BROWN UNIVERSITY

A different version of this poem first appeared in The Providence Journal, *10/20/11. The present version appeared in* Daily Nous, *1/12/18.*

Jerome finds logic thrilling.
He loves to help it grow.
The more results that he can prove,
The more he wants to know.

Jerome craves every honor
His logic work can net.
The more awards that he receives
The more he wants to get.

The Bible may deny it,
And yet it's surely true:
A man can serve two masters, and
That's just what many do.

BOOKS RECEIVED

HACKETT PUBLISHING
Aristotle, *De Caelo*, Translated with Introduction and Notes by C.D.C. Reeve (The A*PA Newsletter on Teaching Philosophy* will be carrying a review of the new C.D.C. Reeve translation of *De Caelo* in our forthcoming fall 2022 issue.)

ADDRESSES OF CONTRIBUTORS

Felicia Nimue Ackerman
Brown University
Department of Philosophy
Box 1918
45 Prospect St.
Providence, RI 02912
Email address: felicia_ackerman@brown.edu

Steven M. Cahn
The Graduate Center, City University of New York
Professor Emeritus
Department of Philosophy
365 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10036
Email address: scahn@gc.cuny.edu

Sandra Dwyer
Georgia State University
Professor Emerita
Department of Philosophy
25 Park Place, 16th Floor
Atlanta, GA 30302-3994
Email address: Sdwyer@gsu.edu

George W. Rainbolt
University of North Florida
Professor of Philosophy
Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies
Building 10, Room 2325
1 UNF Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32224
Email address: grainbolt@unf.edu