



Small Grant Application

Visit <http://www.apaonline.org/?grantfund> to submit.

Submission Deadline: June 30, 2018

Contact Information

Primary Contact Name: Alexandra Bradner

Email Address: Alexandra Bradner

APA Member? Yes No *Only APA members may submit grant applications. Membership will be verified.*

Funding Information

Fiscal Agent: _____

Fiscal Agent Contact Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Email Address: _____ Phone Number: _____

Total Funding Amount Requested: _____ *Proposals over \$5,000 normally are not funded.*

Project Information

Project Title: _____

Abstract: *Abstract may be used by APA in publicity materials related to funded grants. Maximum 150 words.*

Steering Committee

Name	Institutional Affiliation	APA Member?
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Attach a brief CV (maximum two pages) for each person listed, highlighting activities relevant to the project.

Project Purpose

Provide a brief account of the project's purpose, explaining its benefits for the profession and/or how it involves community outreach. Attach additional pages as necessary.

Project Status

Describe the groundwork already laid for the project or, in the case of projects involving community outreach, the relationships already developed in the community. Attach additional pages as necessary.

Project Plan and Timeline

Attach additional pages as necessary.

Outreach Plan

Describe how the project will be advertised to the larger philosophical and/or lay public. Attach additional pages as necessary.

Accessibility Plan

If the proposal involves public lectures, performances, presentations, or films, describe how the project will be accessible for disabled persons, including deaf/hard of hearing and blind/visually impaired individuals. Attach additional pages as necessary.

Evaluation Plan

Describe how the project will be assessed at its completion with an eye to what worked and what could be improved. Attach additional pages as necessary.

Website Plan

If the proposal includes the creation of a website, complete the following items:

Where will the website be hosted? _____

Website URL (if known): _____

Funding Plan

Describe how the project will be supported financially. Indicate other sources of funding, including funding sought and funding received/confirmed. If applicable, explain how the project will be funded after the APA grant term ends.

Budget

In third column, mark amounts requested but not confirmed with an asterisk ().*

Project Expense	Budget Amount	Amount confirmed or requested* from other sources	Amount requested from APA

Proposals requesting more than \$5,000 normally are not funded.

APPENDIX I: Sample Assessment Report from AAPT Teaching and Learning Seminar

To: AAPT Board of Officers
From: David W. Concepción
RE: 2018 T&L Workshop: **Boston** (4.6.18)
Date: 4.19.18

The Seminar was a success!

Participant Comments:

The workshop gave incredibly useful tools for thinking about teaching
A huge boost to those who are serious about teaching, and wanting to get better at/more systematic about it
Fun and informative - a game changer!
Your future students will thank you!
No matter how you teach philosophy, this workshop will improve your teaching.

For an overview of the workshop, a list of facilitators and participants, and a more detailed summary of participant responses, please see far below.

(1) Summary of Participant Evaluations

31 of 40 participants returned evaluations. All respondents found the seminar helped them grow as learning-centered teachers who can well identify valuable learning objectives, construct pedagogies to help students achieve these objectives, and assess how well students are doing (and identify how to change mid-stream if necessary).

QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES

(4=*Strongly Agree*; 3=*Agree*; 2=*Disagree*; 1=*Strongly Disagree*)

The seminar increased my understanding of learning-centered teaching.	AVE. 2.97
The seminar illustrated how to identify how I want students to grow (learning objectives).	AVE. 3.38
The seminar illustrated how to construct integrated learning sequences or castle-tops (pedagogy).	AVE. 2.54
The seminar illustrated how to discover how my students are doing (assessment).	AVE. 2.79

(2) Summary of Facilitators' Reflections on the Workshop in light of the evaluations

Strengths

- Discussion time in pods
- Variety of activities
- Transparent alignment, learner-centeredness, assessment
- Respondents are able to articulate innovations they plan to implement
- 83% of respondent's would recommend the workshop. (While a strength, I believe this is the first time it hasn't been 100%)

Weaknesses

- Many participants wanted more "concrete" teaching techniques; some participants wanted more lecture on what the teaching research says

- The learning objective of the pedagogy section was not clear to many participants

(3) Concepción's Overarching Recommendations Going Forward

(i) Keep the same basic structure:

- Stress (intentional and transparent) alignment of learning objectives, pedagogy, and formative assessment
- Retain the Fink reading as centerpiece to the entire experience
- Keep the number of facilitators at three, with varying presentation styles and practices modeled

(ii) I forgot to explain why the workshop is pitched where it is, which is related to weakness number 1. Normally when I ask folks to think about a particular course throughout the day I say that they should do so to help themselves generate tips by applying the strategies we discuss to the class they are focused on.

(iii) Make sure to give participants an explicit statement of the outcome that is expected at the beginning and the end of a section.

(iv) Consider having a phone debriefing among facilitators/shadowers before the evaluations come back.

(v) We need to think much more seriously about returning to our former limit of 20 participants per workshop.

Reflection

The numbers in the qualitative evaluation for this workshop are noticeably lower than is typical. Part of the explanation for these low numbers, I believe, is the number of participants. We accepted 56 people, 41 of whom showed up (40 of whom stayed the entire day). As a result we put people in groups of approximately eight to simulate intimate group discussion. They stayed in these groups throughout the day. We chose to put the most experienced folks together into two groups. In my experience, if you spread the experienced people throughout all groups, they complain that the conversation is pitched too low. If you concentrate the experienced people, some of the inexperienced people do not know how to get much out of the workshop. In other words, with a large group, there is no way to meet the needs of both the experienced and the inexperienced. We suffered the latter problem of inexperienced folks not getting as much as they would have liked.

Another part of the explanation is the our hosts (MIT and BU) were very aggressive in how they encouraged their graduate students to participate. There were likely more participants who attended not-entirely-voluntarily than is usual.

We can anticipate that despite all the preparation time, first time facilitators will not be as polished as the old hands. I recommend that before the workshop, old hands discuss with first-timers how much interjection from the old timer during the first-timers presentation is appropriate.

Takeaway: I have long said, "Let's give such a valuable experience that we generate the problem of too much demand. Then we can address that problem if it arises." I believe we are now at the point where we need to address the problem of too much demand. We need to think much more seriously about returning to our former limit of 20 participants per workshop.

American Association of Philosophy Teachers
Teaching and Learning Workshop:
Boston: MIT
An Overview

The AAPT Workshop on Teaching and Learning shows participants how to improve their skills as learning-centered teachers. Participants study how to identify and select challenging and transformative learning objectives. By understanding the principles of integrated course design, participants appreciate how to best guide students to the successful achievement of these goals. Further, participants develop educative assessment strategies that allow them to measure success, continue to innovate, and create even deeper learning.

Readings

Prior to arriving for the face-to-face seminar, each participant should **read** the following:

Core Reading

- (1) L. Dee Fink, “A Self-Directed Guide to Designing Courses for Significant Learning”<https://www.deefinkandassociates.com/GuidetoCourseDesignAug05.pdf>
- (2) L. Dee Fink, *Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An Integrated Approach to Designing College Courses* (Jossey-Bass, 2003), App. A.

Additional Required Reading

- (3) Kristie Dotson, “Concrete Flowers: Contemplating the Profession of Philosophy,” *Hypatia*, 26/2 (Spring 2011): 403-409.
- (4) Paul Green, “How to Motivate Students: A Primer for Learner-Centered Teachers,” AAPT Studies in Pedagogy 1 (2015). DOI: 10.5840/aaptstudies20159184
- (5) Susan A. Ambrose, et. al., *How Learning Works: seven research based principles for smart teaching*, Chapter 5, (Jossey-Bass, 2010): 121-152.
- (6) Susan A. Ambrose, et. al., *How Learning Works*, Chapter 7, (Jossey-Bass, 2010): 188-216.

Schedule

Time	Topic
8:00-8:30	Informal meet and greet
8:30-9:15	Overview: Learner-centeredness and transparent alignment of learning objectives, pedagogies, and assessments (Concepción)
9:15-11:15	Learning Objectives (Concepción) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ideal, inclusive, motivation
11:15-12:30	Pedagogy I (Hermberg) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explicitness
12:30-1:45	Lunch
1:45-2:45	Pedagogy II – (Hermberg) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Metacognition
3:00-5:00	Assessment (Lieberman) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grading• Assessment beyond grading
5:00-5:15	Tie it all together (Concepción)

Shared Meanings

By “Learning Objectives” we mean whatever is the answer to this question: How do you want students to be different after their time with you?

By “Pedagogy” we mean whatever is the answer to this question: What will you design for students to do, and in which order, so that they end up different in the way you hope?

By “Assessment” we mean whatever is the answer to these two questions: How do you know if your students have changed in the way you hoped they would (at time X in the semester)? Given the answer to the previous question, how should you adjust?

Facilitators and Participants

Seminar Facilitators:

David Concepción, Ball State University, dwconcepcion@bsu.edu

Kevin Hermsberg, Dominican college (NY), kevin.hermsberg@dc.edu

Alida Liberman, University of Indianapolis, alida.liberman@gmail.com

Shadows

Cheryl Cline, Queen’s College (CAN), clinec@queensu.ca

Jennifer Mulnix, UMass-Dartmouth, jmulnix@umassd.edu

Mike Mulnix, Salem St. Univ., michael.mulnix@salemstate.edu

Participants:

Zara Amdur	BU (grad)	Zeamdur@bu.edu
Emma Atherton	MIT (grad)	emmaa@mit.edu
David Balcarras	MIT (grad)	balc@mit.edu
Nancy Bauer	Tufts Univ. (Dean, full)	nancy.bauer@tufts.edu
Ian Blaustein	BU (grad)	iblau@bu.edu
Thomas Byrne	MIT (grad)	tjbb@mit.edu
Harry Chalmers	Brown Univ. (grad)	harrison_chalmers@brown.edu
Colin Cmiel	BU (grad)	colincmiel@gmail.com
Kevin Dorst	MIT (grad)	kmdorst@mit.edu
Tobias A. Fuchs	Brown Univ. (grad)	Tobias_Fuchs@brown.edu
Nicole Garcia	MIT (grad)	ncg@mit.edu
Paul Goldberg	Brown Univ. (grad)	plgold@bu.edu
Sally Haslanger	MIT (full, distinguished)	shaslang@mit.edu
George Heffernan	Merrimack College (full)	heffernang@merrimack.edu
Emma Jerndal	BU (grad)	jerndal@bu.edu
Brendan de Kenessey	Harvard Univ. (post-doc)	brendan.dekenessey@gmail.com
Susan Kennedy	BU (grad)	skenn@bu.edu
James Kinkaid	BU (grad)	jkinkaid@bu.edu
Jordan Kokot	BU (grad)	jdkokot@bu.edu
Allison (Ari) Koslow	MIT (grad)	akoslow@mit.edu
Rebecca Leiby	BU (grad)	rleiby@bu.edu
Rose Lenehan	MIT (grad)	rlenehan@mit.edu
Getty L. Lustila	BU (grad)	glustila@bu.edu
Michaela McSweeney	BU (asst)	m3@bu.edu
Katy Meadows	MIT (post-doc)	kmeadows@mit.edu
Lynn Niizawa	BU (grad)	lniizawa@bu.edu
Elliott Risch	BU (grad)	elliotttrisch@gmail.com
Tamar Schapiro	MIT (assoc)	tamschap@mit.edu
Nathaniel Schwartz	MIT (grad)	nhs@mit.edu
Erin Seeba	BU (grad)	ekseeba@bu.edu

Katy Shorey	Northeastern Univ. (lecturer)	katyshorey@gmail.com
Adam Shmidt	BU (grad)	ashmidt@bu.edu
Daniel Solecki	BU (grad)	dsolecki@bu.edu
Ryan Sosna	BU (grad)	rsosna@bu.edu
Kirsi Teppo	MIT (grad)	kteppo@mit.edu
Maité Cruz Tleugabulova	BU (grad)	maite@bu.edu
Katherine Valde	BU (grad)	kgvalde@bu.edu
Joel Van Fossen	BU (grad)	joelv@bu.edu
Mallory Webber	MIT (grad)	mkwebber@mit.edu
Leo Yan	Brown Univ. (grad)	leo_yan@brown.edu

Post-Workshop Evaluation Responses

QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES

(4=Strongly Agree; 3=Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree)

The seminar increased my understanding of learning-centered teaching.	AVE. 2.97
The seminar illustrated how to identify how I want students to grow (learning objectives).	AVE. 3.38
The seminar illustrated how to construct integrated learning sequences or castle-tops (pedagogy).	AVE. 2.54
The seminar illustrated how to discover how my students are doing (assessment).	AVE. 2.79

Do you plan on implementing one or more innovation in a course as a result of your participation in the workshop? If yes, please describe at least one change and the motivation behind it.

- Yes, I think I'll think about how to design courses very differently: not what I want to cover but what dispositions I am hoping students will have adopted.
- Yes; lots of small changes about in-class activities (mostly that got brought up in my pod), and also some larger changes about thinking more carefully about the relationship between what I want students to learn and how I want them to grow, and the way assignments are structured in my courses.
- Yes. I'll be doing in-class writing assignments, so as to get immediate practice/immediate feedback early on that will help my students build up to the larger writing assignments.
- I will design a self-assessment rubric for student papers.
- I plan on rethinking my assessment strategy. In particular, I want to eliminate timed exams, create a series of assignments that involve incrementally more complex tasks, and use ungraded reading responses as checkpoints of understanding.
- Yes! I am completely re-thinking my learning objectives.
- Yes - will aim to make explicit to students that certain skills I'm teaching them can be used as self-checks for understanding and progress
- Be more explicit with grading criteria.
- Yes: metacognition
- I found the idea of scaffolding useful as a way of getting students to perform the kind of task you're aiming for.
- I need to rethink the skills I am trying to get my students to develop so they are more in line with my objectives.
- No
- Not particularly.
- Yes--one thing I'll implement in my classes is the "hand-raising method" for regaining order in a classroom. It seems easier and more effective at regaining order than the more traditional "repeatedly call out until everyone hears you" way.
- I might use some of the learning objectives that people suggested.
- Yes. More partner and small group activities that focus on practicing specific skills, and designing assessments that students understand are being given in order to test their improvement in developing those skills.
- No

- Yes, I plan on reviewing the alignment between course goals, activities, and assessment to ensure a coherent learning experience.
- Yes, the pod structure of the workshop made me realize how effective group work can be when done right.
- Yes. For example, in course planning, I will implement some of the insights based on the "reverse engineered" class - getting clear on who my students are, in order to adjust my syllabus and lesson plans, in order to get them where I hope to get them.
- integrative alignment - I plan on working in class activities that practice active reading, small group discussion/debate, and in-class writing reflections and self-assessments, since these activities better align with my learning goals than do lectures.
- Yes. The value of an integrated syllabus---one where both I and the student can understand how each part relates to the learning objectives---seems clear and important to me.
- I realized my learning objectives with respect to written work may be clear to me, but they aren't reflected effectively in assignments. I need to structure writing assignments so as to give students practice at building specific writing skills.
- Project-based in-class learning--It gets the whole room involved in the discussion
- I plan to add learning objectives to each assignment sheet, rather than just in my syllabus.

Has participation in the workshop changed the way you think about teaching and learning? If yes, please describe one way in which your thinking has changed.

- Yes, I think I have thought too much about how to present material and not enough about what the point of presenting it was.
- A little bit; it helped me get more clear about some things that were bothering me about my own teaching. I'm not sure I could explain exactly how, though.
- Yes. I'd taken 'learning objectives' as administrative boilerplate that had little to do with what I actually cared about/tried to do in class. I realized that thinking of it this way was allowing myself to miss a significant opportunity for clarifying and unifying how my classes are made.
- Yes. I am much more attuned to the learner-centered approach—though I do not want to give up the content-oriented approach!
- The workshop has motivated me to get clearer about why particular forms of assessment contribute to my learning objectives, in particular in light of the needs of a particular body of students.
- Yes: it has expanded my thinking about what I'm trying to do in my classroom.
- Not in a big way, though it did provide some useful language/frameworks which may help me check for myself whether my teaching practices are as I think they should be
- Transparent alignment is a useful thing for me to keep in mind moving forward.
- Yes: growth mindset
- Thinking of the objectives of the course from a learning-centered perspective was really helpful. I hadn't previously thought of how the objectives might change depending on the kind of university/students/course.
- I realized that my approach isn't as student centered as it could be - I have often placed more balance on discipline centered teaching. I want to be more explicit about learning centeredness.
- Yes -- most unfortunately I had my impressions about teaching about teaching confirm with Colin that concrete discussion and advice is a shoot in favor of kind of anti-intellectual background ideology
- Not especially, although spending a day focusing on my priorities was still a good use of time.
- Yes--I now see the value of starting with learning goals first (backwards design), and designing the rest of the course with them in mind.
- No
- Yes. I tend to focus too much on the curriculum and the delivery of content, and I need to put more more care and attention in the way students are accessing that content in and out of class.
- No
- Yes, I will now think about teaching goals beyond content and skills, including dispositional goals as well.
- Yes, I now believe that I need to be much more explicit and learner centered in my teaching goals.
- Yes. It has expanded and deepened my ability to consider the students' perspective in designing course activities.
- Yes. I used to struggled with what I now see is a false dichotomy between structure and accuracy of content (lecturing) and chaos (discussion), in which I found it difficult to identify the learning benefits of things like discussion and group work. I now see that active class engagement oriented towards doing and producing a specific product is beneficial for

the student who does the activity. It is fundamentally important to allow students the space to practice things like critical thinking on their own, and that such practice can be guided and structured by appropriate class activities.

- It made me feel more motivated to solicit and share ideas about pedagogy with my colleagues.
- It motivated me to cut back on the diversity of writing assignments I give in favor of iterations of similar writing assignments so that feedback on each is more useful for students to implement.

Considering content, format, presenters' style, or other variables, what would you say are the strengths of the workshop?

- Lots of great discussion in pods, lots of very useful tools and phrases that will stick in my memory, no-apologies presentation of teaching as a highest priority, Dave's expertise and thoughtfulness
- I found Dave and Alida's presentations/styles to be really helpful. I got the most out of Dave's session, which really helped me think about realigning my courses. I also got a lot out of Alida's sessions, I think in large part because I got to spend a lot of time talking to my pod, which was probably the most helpful part of things for me.
- So many!
- That is hard to say, but I very much enjoyed the collegial atmosphere.
- It was especially useful to have seasoned teachers as participants, as well as facilitators, of the workshop.
- The interaction was great. Dave was amazing, and Alida was very good. The pacing of the workshop was impressive: the activities held my attention all day.
- Discussions in the pods were great, especially when they were set up well by the presentations
- Highlighting the importance of transparent alignment.
- Focus on student learning, not teaching
- I really enjoyed working in the pod and the variety of activities. It was extremely engaging and the day flew by!
- David's presentation at the beginning on learning objectives was excellent. I also found Alida's session well-organized, well-led, and very helpful. She exemplified pedagogical skills that I will use.
- Being put in the table with Philosophy teachers to explicitly discussed teaching philosophy.
- Varied activities were nice
- I thought that the workshop had a nice balance of listening to speakers' presentations and group discussion within our pods. Also, the people in my pod were very invested in the event, and that made discussion with them all the more rewarding.
- The strongest part of the workshop was the part of trying to define philosophy-specific learning objectives.
- Engaging; clear; helpful activities, small group environment fosters productive conversation
- The workshop both reviewed material discussed in the assigned readings, while also making vivid some of the points along with allowing for discussion on the specifics of different general ideas and particular strategies.
- Opening with transparent alignment and learner centered teaching was really helpful.
- The group exercises are very valuable. They provide concrete examples, force participants to engage with particular questions, and bring out contributions from the participants, thus greatly increasing the 'knowledge pool'.
- Dave has a clear and concrete presentation style. I really appreciated the connections to particular classroom scenarios he's encountered.
- I very much enjoyed the initial "lecture-style" segment, where we were given some research and helpful ways of framing the task of course design.
- The first and third presenters had different styles but both were effective communicators.
- The last section was the most helpful.
- Clear, clean presentation of content.
- Hearing ideas and feedback from your table (and from report-out from the room) was a major strength

Considering content, format, presenters' style, or other variables, if you could change something about the workshop, what would it be?

- By the afternoon I felt like the group was flagging a little bit and some more physical activity would have helped. I also felt like I didn't come away with as firm an understanding of teaching students to be self-directed learners as I would have liked.
- I found some of the strategies to be patronizing and a little offensive. For example, I found the "let me model this teaching technique for you by doing it to you!" thing to be a bit much/made me feel like people didn't think I was an adult. I also was irritated by having to do busy work in the service of making a cute point (e.g. the recipe exercise). Finally, I sometimes found that the presenters took themselves to be total authorities on the subjects of teaching and

learning, when there were some really experienced teachers in the room whose views and ideas I wanted to hear, and I sometimes felt like they were shut down by the presenters.

- Maybe a little shorter. We ran out of gas pretty badly post 3pm. Also, I didn't understand the good of the 'get in line from most to least in need of changing your learning objectives' exercise.
- That is very hard to say—perhaps I would not change a thing.
- Hearing more concrete stories of successes and failures from seasoned teachers would help to make the pedagogical theory more applicable.
- Kevin's session. I thought that he was a poor presenter and that the materials and exercises he used were not doing what he wanted them to do.
- Tone was sometimes patronizing and/or self-congratulatory; (2) Would have liked more ideas for learning activities coming from presenters (even if they were only given to us after we had come up with our own, so that we could still engage in the process of thinking about our own)
- I was hoping and expecting that there would be a lot more evidence driven content. For example, "such and such is shown to be best for this," "in this situation (e.g. an overly dominant student) this has been shown to work," "studies show that students are x% more likely to remember something if repeated twice, than if only said once," "when commenting on a paper, studies show that students won't take in more than X points, so limit yourself to that many points." Etc. Lots of what was said was interesting and got me thinking about things, but I left with, if anything, more questions than I started with. And indeed, that seemed to be the intended format: the workshop asks an important question (e.g. what is/should be assessment?), then gets us to talk about it in a group (ok fine), but never gives us anything concrete to take away (also, my group was a group of TAs with no more experience than I have — I don't want their opinions (at least not in this workshop, I can talk to fellow TAs whenever I like) I want evidence and research etc.). And this format just repeated: ask a question, we think about it and become increasingly puzzled by the question ... let's write a scattering of ideas on the board ... and move on to the next question. In general, the number of concrete things I could take away and apply in my next seminar or grading session was very few. Another thing was that the course was very directed at professors as opposed to TAs (creating courses as opposed to TA-ing courses): given I won't be creating courses for at least 3 years, a lot of the material was not all that relevant to me. Lastly, from my own experience, all of the best learning experiences from my undergraduate education were, without exception, from really well given lectures (in the standard format); it was from good lectures that I learnt the most (and that is not to denigrate my TAs, I had really good TAs — but I also went to some fantastic lectures). But it was just taken as a given (at least it seemed to me), that lecturing was not a suitable format anymore (similarly, I learnt more from the opening 30 mins "lecture" from David, than I did from any other segment of the course).
- Length; more breaks
- I was a bit confused about the activities regarding the explicitness theme and what I was meant to take away from that presentation
- I found Kevin's section of the day not as helpful as I would have liked. I found the long discussion of explicitness about assignments unhelpful. The recipe example wasn't sufficiently analogous to a writing prompt and the recommendations about how to improve the prompts were too vague ("make it explicit"!). I was eager to learn more pedagogical techniques or new ways of thinking about pedagogy, and this didn't happen.
- The presentations would be much more concrete. Instead of looking at recipes and paper topic schemas get a list of actual paper topics, some better than others, some better for some types of students than others, and discuss them. Instead of talking about classroom manner and extraordinarily general terms, we would talk about concrete ways to foster discussion (is restating students points back to them and buffed up terms helpful or destructive? What does unsuccessful group work look like and how can it be avoid it?
- More concrete examples or suggestions, more focus overall.
- While I liked David's and Alita's presentations, I had very negative feelings about Kevin's. He seemed unprepared, his instructions were unclear, and what little information he did share was not nearly as helpful as that given by the other two presenters. Moreover, I found his presentation style annoying. At the end of the event, I talked to some of my pod members about their feelings on the event, and they agreed that Kevin's portion was by far the worst part of the event. For future events, I'd recommend finding someone else to replace him or, failing that, making sure that he does more to prepare.
- There was too much time devoted to not-so-helpful activities (i.e. discussing clearly flawed teaching materials, like the quiz on 'Community'; part of the reason this was not-so-helpful is that the teaching material was too much of a straw man. It might be better to discuss more common problems in teaching materials)
- More activities, sample syllabi, assignment construction and workshoping, and greater use of visual aids

- The content was somehow both redundant and unhelpful; I was hoping for more actual strategies that could be deployed in the classroom, and less general, vague, "think about whether or not you're going XYZ" instruction. Also, (i) group work is terrible and unproductive, and (ii) the whole attitude of the workshop felt both infantilizing and insincere.
- The pedagogy portion of the workshop was not very helpful at all. The facilitator did not seem well prepared or have a clear understanding of the main ideas he wanted to convey.
- More time for the section on assessment, particularly more about effective feedback.
- I would replace the facilitator who ran the pedagogies section of the workshop.
- The middle segment of the workshop was less helpful, mostly because it was more difficult to follow the second presenter's directions and that part of the workshop stayed at a level that was too abstract.
- I wish the other parts of the workshop had been like the first. I'd prefer more time learning about how good teachers (and research) have figured out how to design effective courses, rather than spend so much time brainstorming with a bunch of other (fairly inexperienced) grad students.
- I wanted more specific guidance in session two. The presenter in that session did not communicate very effectively overall. Also I did not think the exercise in session three, about the TV show "Community", was worth the time. I wanted more content related directly to the tasks we face.
- I left with some interesting abstract thoughts about teaching/learning, but wish the workshop was a bit more "applied"/I don't really know where to go from here. Also, I think it should be shorter.
 - Content could be more involved. We are all already highly skilled and thoughtful teachers (otherwise we wouldn't bother going to teaching workshop). The material could be more "in depth." B) I'm not so sure about your attempts to implement the teaching strategies that you preach in the same setting that you are preaching them. It came off as a bit pedantic at times.
- Would have liked to learn a bit more about pedagogy research / techniques that have been shown to be successful. The "think up your own ideas and discuss" methodology of the workshop was nice in some ways, but it left me wishing to have more information and tools given to me directly.
- More time to hear from presenters regarding the specific assignments and methods of assessment that they use

Would you recommend the workshop to others? If yes, how would you describe the workshop experience to others?

- Yes--the workshop gave incredibly useful tools for thinking about teaching and for reorienting classroom time in light of those ideas. It also made me think a lot about how bad so much college-level teaching is, and be angry about that, and hope that many more people (both grad students and faculty) will take this course. There were many moments where I thought, "That seems SO OBVIOUS once you say it and yet I have never thought about it and nearly every class I have taken has failed to meet that standard." I think the profession would benefit hugely if the ideas that were presented were considered basic knowledge that every philosophy teacher needs to have.
- Yes. I think the workshop was helpful overall, and from talking to people I got the sense that it was particularly helpful to people with very little teaching experience/experience designing their own courses.
- Yes. I'd describe it as a huge boost to those who are serious about teaching, and wanting to get better at/more systematic about it.
- I highly recommend the workshop to all philosophy teachers.
- Yes. I'd tell people that it is the best such workshop I've attended because it spurs your thinking and allows you to re-imagine your pedagogy in small groups with people at similar stages.
- It depends on what person - it seemed better suited to less-experienced teachers to me
- Sorry, but I would not. It was very long, and I don't think I took more away from it than I took from the assigned readings.
- Yes: good for professors to improve teaching skills
- Yes! The workshop was fun and informative - a game changer!
- I recently described it as 2/3 excellent, and that's better than usual for teaching workshops.
- Maybe, if one has never thought about ed psych before this could be an informative introduction
- Yes--I'd say to them that they're likely to learn a great deal of information about constructing an effective course, as well as helpful strategies for leading a class
- No
- Yes. Your future students will thank you! I am already implementing the guidance I got at the workshop in my teaching and prep.

- No
- I would recommend the workshop as an opportunity to begin the exploration of issues in teaching philosophy, but that reading the assigned material might be almost as good.
- Yes, I would say that it changed the way I think about teaching.
- Yes
- Yes. It's a long day, but it's engaging and fun to talk to others who have grappled with teaching puzzles. It was beneficial to hear the ideas of experienced teachers.
- I don't think so---unless it was changed to be less brainstorming- and more information-heavy.
- Yes - it was fun, engaging, helpful - I especially enjoyed being able to solicit and share ideas with others in my pod.
- Yes. Most valuable part was an opportunity to have in-depth discussions with fellow teachers (the pods)
- Yes - it's a unique opportunity to hear from other philosophers (most SoTL events or Teaching and Learning conferences are interdisciplinary)

Please report any other thoughts you have about the workshop, or things you would like to say to the facilitators, here.

- Thank you very much; I am so grateful to have participated in this workshop.
- Thank you very much!
- No matter how you teach philosophy, this workshop will improve your teaching.
- Thank you!!
- Thank you so much for all of your hard work organizing this workshop! It was a really valuable experience!
- I liked the way that the workshop encouraged us to reflect on our own goals and methods, rather than telling us what the "best" methods are. I liked that we had lots of opportunities to discuss teaching practices in small groups and could learn from each other. I liked the vibe in the room and the fact that we were all philosophers and so shared some basic values and tasks (unlike in more general teaching workshops aimed at anyone, say, in Arts and Sciences). I liked the sense of cooperativeness and constructiveness in thinking about the issues. I would have liked more concrete suggestions for teaching. I was looking for more "outside the box" strategies and more creative ideas that would prompt me to shake up my classes. I was also looking for more concrete suggestions to promote inclusiveness and diversity. I was disappointed that race and gender were not specifically addressed (we did talk about some differences: rural/urban, conservative/liberal, class differences, some gestures towards ethnic differences (deferential/non-deferential). But I was surprised there wasn't more on this.
- I appreciated the pod system, but my pod was full of inexperienced teachers. This meant I was among the most experienced in the group, and I think this prevented me from really getting much out of the day. Maybe having more integrated groups so this doesn't happen would be nice, but it might be unavoidable.
- I appreciated the extent to which the workshop facilitators involved everyone in active learning, rather than just lecturing.
- I expected a syllabus workshop because we were asked to bring a syllabus. I was disappointed that we didn't have one.
- Thanks! It was an excellent and enriching experience for me.
- I appreciate how much time and effort you put into this, but it was disappointing on a lot of levels. I wouldn't attend another AAPT workshop, nor would I recommend it to peers. Everything vital could have been covered in a three hour talk, not a ten hour slog.
- The pedagogy presentation should really be greatly changed for a more illuminating and helpful learning experience.
- Thanks!
- I'm glad I went to the workshop.
- Thank you!
- The group activities seemed ineffective to me. I feel like I learn much more from a well-researched and well-organized lecture.
- Maybe don't start quite so early? I need to get up early 5 days a week for class--having a bit of a morning to myself on Saturday is very valuable. While the workshop was worth the disruption, I don't see why it couldn't have started a couple of hours later.

APPENDIX II: Steering Committee CVs for AAPT Workshop on Inclusive Pedagogy

Dave Concepción, Chair, APA Committee on the Teaching of Philosophy; former President, AAPT

<https://www.bsu.edu/academics/collegesanddepartments/philosophy-religious-studies/contact-us/directory/concepciondavid>

Emily Esch, former Executive Director, AAPT

<https://www.csbsju.edu/philosophy/faculty-and-staff/emily-esch>

Andrew Mills, President, AAPT

<http://faculty.otterbein.edu/AMills/>