How Religion Meets the World:
The Final Report of the Graduate Theological Union Preparing Future Faculty Project

Elizabeth Drescher, Ph.D.
Church Divinity School of the Pacific

Maureen A. Maloney, Ed.D.
Graduate Theological Union

James A. Donahue, Ph.D.
Graduate Theological Union

ABSTRACT: The development of doctoral students in religion and theology as educators whose approaches to teaching and learning integrate questions of meaning and value drawn from course content, student experience, and the world outside the classroom presents challenges not fully addressed by traditional models of professional career development for future faculty. The GTU's Preparing Future Faculty Project applied an alternative vocational development model over two semesters of work with teams of doctoral students and faculty mentors in order to consider factors which encouraged a central pedagogical and professional focus on "big questions" of meaning and value. This report describes the GTU's experience with this integrated, experiential and relational vocational model. Among other findings shared in this report, our project showed peer-to-peer engagement in the context of faculty mentoring and structured institutional support as critical factors in the vocational development of future faculty as "teaching scholars" committed to engaging questions of meaning and value in the classroom.

Introduction

Founded in 1962, the Graduate Theological Union (GTU) is a consortium of nine Christian seminaries, the Richard S. Dinner Center for Jewish Studies, the Center for Islamic Studies, and nine other academic centers and affiliates. As a common enterprise, the GTU offers an M.A., doctoral degrees in thirteen academic areas, a Th.D., and two joint Ph.D. programs with the University of California, Berkeley.

For the most part, graduates of the GTU's doctoral serve in academic positions in seminaries, major public universities, and liberal arts colleges throughout the United States. Beyond coursework and dissertation research, doctoral students have opportunities to prepare for careers as "teaching scholars" by taking a seminar on pedagogy that is offered each year and by serving as teaching assistants for faculty in GTU member seminaries, at the University of California, Berkeley, and other local universities and colleges. However, because the GTU does not have an undergraduate population, opportunities for teaching practice are more limited than would generally be the case in a conventional university or college setting.

In an attempt to provide greater opportunities for professional development, in 2003 the GTU began offering workshops to doctoral students through a structured *Professional Development Program* (PDP) which addressed skills related to (1) successful navigation of a doctoral program; (2) classroom teaching effectiveness; and (3) career planning and development. While the PDP provided important learning opportunities for doctoral students, we recognized that this voluntary program did not address the professional development needs of students in a sustained or systematic way in the course of their doctoral work. As well, learning in PDP workshops was not clearly integrated

into learning in the doctoral classroom or, perhaps more significantly, the mentoring doctoral students received from faculty members.

At the same time, the GTU Board of Trustees, Core Doctoral Faculty, Student Advisory Committee, and other groups had begun to actively explore the role of the GTU in the formation of scholars who were prepared to apply their research and teaching to critical social, cultural, and political issues. Questions related to the development of doctoral students as "public scholars" and efforts to highlight the work of GTU faculty members as such defined the zeitgeist of formal and informal conversation at the GTU as we articulated our institutional location as a place "where religion meets the world."

These two concerns—how best to prepare doctoral students to serve as future faculty in religion and theology and how best to develop doctoral students as teaching scholars engaged with the world —came together in 2006 in the GTU Preparing Future Faculty Project. Funded by grants from the Teagle Foundation and the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion, our project was shaped by three critical decisions: (1) the Preparing Future Faculty Project was to be grounded in experiential learning that integrated pedagogical theory and classroom teaching; (2) learning and development in the project would be sustained in the context of relationships between doctoral students and faculty mentors; and (3) a variety of assessment tools would be used throughout the project to gauge interim and overall effectiveness of the approaches to future faculty preparation applied.

These decisions were, in turn, grounded in our review of current literature on doctoral student professional development and mentoring. [See Appendix A: Resources for Preparing Future Faculty.] While a number of important studies have stressed the need for experiential learning in the development of doctoral students as future faculty, research has tended to emphasize career development in the context of the job search and pre-tenure employment or to highlight disciplinary concerns (DeNeff, 2002; Golde, 2006). These are, of course, important concerns, but they were not central to our project. Rather, our interest in the development of future faculty who would be prepared to teach effectively on the basis of pedagogies of meaning and value—pedagogies oriented to "big questions" emerging from content, drawn from student experience, and entered into the classroom from the world outside—called on a more vocational and formational model of mentoring.

Project Teams

In order to ensure that the project allowed for the development of sustained relationships between doctoral students and faculty mentors, the project cohort was limited to twelve faculty-student teams who would work together through two semesters. Faculty mentors were selected in consultation with presidents of GTU member seminaries, the GTU Academic Dean, and the GTU President. On the basis of this consultation, the Preparing Future Faculty Project Team identified twelve Mentors —nine from GTU member seminaries and the Center for Jewish Studies; one from the University of California, Berkeley; and one from JFK University. In the selection of Mentors, consideration was also given to representation across GTU doctoral areas and to gender, ethnic, and other diversity concerns. Mentors were drawn from doctoral areas in Art and Religion (1), Biblical Studies (2), Ethics and Social Theory (2), History (1), Interdisciplinary Studies (1), Jewish Studies (1), Liturgical Studies (1), Near Eastern Studies (1), and Religion and Psychology (1).

The twelve doctoral students who would serve as Fellows on the project were selected competitively from a pool of 48 applicants by the project Mentors. Here, as well, consideration was given to gender, ethnic, and other diversity concerns. In general, Fellows were selected from the same or closely allied academic fields as their mentors. These included: Art and Religion (1), Biblical Studies (1), Ethics and Social Theory (2), Interdisciplinary Studies (1), Liturgical Studies (2), Near Eastern Studies (1), Psychology and Religion (1), and Theology (2).

In case of both Mentors and Fellows, demographic balance was pronounced:

	Mentors		Fellows	
	#	%	#	%
Female	7	58	6	50
Male	5	42	6	50
African American	0	0	1	8
Asian/Asian American	3	25	3	25
Caucasian	9	75	7	58
Indian	0	0	1	8

Project Design

Prior to developing the overall project design, the Project Team conducted an extensive literature review on doctoral student development, mentoring, and pedagogy. In addition, we consulted with a number of experts on educational excellence, pedagogy, and doctoral student professional development. This background research and consultation grounded the development of a five part structure for the project, which would unfold from August 2007 to May 2008. Project components included:

August 2007	Learning and Teaching Academy I (LTA I)
Fall 2007	Teagle Seminar: The Vocation of Teaching
January 2008	Fellows' Observation of Mentor Course Learning and Teaching Academy II (LTA II)
Spring 2008	Fellows' Supervised Instruction

This major project streams, which will be described in more detail shortly, were supplemented by a number of critical activities for Fellows, Mentors, and the wider GTU community. During the course of the project, the GTU core doctoral faculty participated in two Project Forums in which guest speakers presented insights on the current environment in liberal education and the relationship between classroom teaching and pedagogies of meaning and value. The first forum, in Fall 2007, featured William Sullivan of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The second forum, held in Spring 2008, featured the Alexander and Helen Astin of UCLA's Spirituality in Higher Education project and included presentations by project Fellows. The forums engaged the wider-GTU community in the work of the project.

In addition to the forums, the project Fellows met on a regular basis throughout the project to share experiences as they observed Mentors' courses, developed their own courses, prepared project portfolios, and taught under the supervision of their Mentors. As we will discuss in the final section, these peer group meetings were a central site of learning and development in the project that we did not fully consider in our initial planning. Fellows' engagements as peers—both in a number of significant conflicts and in ongoing collegial support—had powerful formational significance for many of the Fellows, helping them to more effectively engage their faculty Mentors and their students while allowing them to practice the skills of collegiality that sustain much of professional life for faculty members.

Throughout all project components, measurement and assessment was a key concern. As we will discuss below, indirect and direct assessment methods were used to gage performance of Fellows, Mentors, and the project overall. Assessments were conducted from a variety of perspectives to create a fuller picture of successes and opportunities for improvement for Mentors, Fellows, and GTU doctoral program administration.

Project Components

As noted, the GTU's Preparing Future Faculty Project was grounded in the assumption that the most effective and lasting learning takes place experientially and relationally. Because we also grounded the project in continuous learning through measurement and assess, each project component had clear, practical deliverables that would contribute to a final project portfolio to be produced by each student. Deliverables included:

LTA I:	Vocational statement draft
	Introductory course proposal
Seminar:	Vocational statement revision
	Statement of pedagogical philosophy
	Draft syllabus for supervised course
Observation Semester:	Syllabus for supervised course
LTA II:	Pedagogical colloquium presentation
Supervised Semester:	Assignment examples
	Assessment examples
	Revised syllabus

Project deliverables allowed each Fellow to create a meaningful teaching portfolio that documents their development through the course of the project and also supports eventual application for faculty positions.

LTA I: Collegiality and Conflict

The first Learning and Teaching Academy, held in August 2007, focused on basic approaches to the undergraduate classroom. Over two weeks, Fellows participated in a series of learning modules with

experts from the GTU, the University of California, Berkeley, the University of San Francisco, and panelists from a number of local colleges and universities. The structure of the modules was intended to move from professional identity to institutional context to classroom engagement. [See Appendix B: LTA I Schedule.] Key modules included:

- Teaching, scholarship, and vocation
- The current liberal education environment
- Diversity and disability
- Intercultural teaching and learning
- Learning styles
- Developing a course proposal
- Course structure and syllabus design
- Instructional technologies
- Measurement and assessment

Most LTA days included two content modules. Each day was concluded with a small group discussions of the day's contents and the issues it raised for the Fellows' development of the key deliverable for the LTA: a course proposal to be presented to an audience of Mentors, students, and administrators in the final days of the LTA. Each morning, Fellows would meet as a large group to discuss issues their small groups had considered in the previous afternoon. Though not originally designed in this way, the Fellows reshaped the morning debrief sessions so that a Fellow facilitated each session, often providing supplemental content to the group.

This structure allowed the Fellows to have exposure to a wide range of practical content which they could immediately begin to work with in conversation with their peers. The large group discussions allowed the Fellows to bring their own interests and areas of expertise into the common learning environment, empowering them to shape their own learning experience in important ways. In this way, responsibility for learning more clearly shifted to the Fellows themselves as they increasingly saw themselves as responsible for the value of the experiences they were having in the project. Not least among these was the value of learning that grew out of conflict among peers, between the Fellows and the Project Team, and between Fellows and module presenters.

Though we had not considered the role of peer-group conflict in our initial project planning, we would see by the end of the project that the challenges of authority and leadership among the Fellows were a critical part of a process of articulating their own "big questions" of meaning and value. These questions largely seemed largely focused on identity and authority—Who am I when I come into the classroom? How does my own life experience shape my teaching? What authority does it give me? What authority does it give me in relation to the authority of others? As Fellows worked with each other, with the Mentors, and with Project Team members to engage and address these questions, they often refined their approach to the classroom and its own diverse student population. "Big questions" tended to become less abstract and conceptual, and more directly associated with the practical realities of various student populations and the communities with which they engaged. Pedagogical values that shaped classroom practice were increasingly articulated by the Fellows in terms of context and identity rather than being anchored to a particular theoretical or ideological position.

Teagle "Big Questions" Seminar and Mentor Observation Semester

The Teagle Seminar on the Vocation of Teaching (which came to be known as the "big questions" seminar) took place in the same semester in which the Fellows were observing their faculty Mentors teaching, Fall 2007. [See Appendix C: Teagle Seminar Syllabus.] The idea here was, again, that academic content would be tied to practical experience in the context of meaningful professional relationships. This allowed that, for instance, Fellows might consider how questions of identity, vocation, institutional context, disciplinary norms, and so on factor into the practical planning and teaching of an introductory course.

During the semester, the Fellows met on at least a weekly basis with their project Mentors to discuss what they were learning in the seminar, what was happening in the observation class, and how both of these experiences were influencing their planning for the supervised teaching semester. In addition, Fellows met regular for peer group lunches during which they discussed their work with their mentors, the development of their course syllabi and assignments, project concerns, and other matters related to their development as "teaching scholars." Though a certain level of conflict continued in both the seminar and the peer group lunches as Fellows jockeyed for perceived status or attempted to claim authority in the cohort, the fall semester also saw the growth of valuable peer relationships within a number of clusters of the larger group. As these collegial relationships developed, conflicts were generally resolved or muted as Fellows began to mentor each other.

As in LTA I, the fellows also took on significant responsibility for their own learning and vocational development. A group of Fellows, for example, developed a blog for the project where they could reflect on their developing pedagogical philosophy and practice. [Blog postings can be found at http://futurefacultygtu.blogspot.com/.] As noted above, Fellows also participated in the Spring Faculty Forum, offering responses to a presentation of research findings by Helen and Alexander Astin. Less formally, Fellows shared resources, helped each other to problem-solve nettlesome classroom situations, manage relationships with mentors, began to support each other as study partners, and periodically socialized together.

On the surface, then, the Teagle Seminar seemed like a fairly traditional content-oriented component of the project. But it played an important structural role in grounding a range of engagements between Fellows and Mentors and among the Mentors as a peer group. Final seminar presentations of pedagogical philosophies brought all of this experience into a recognizable but not entirely conventional academic format.

LTA II: Teaching Scholarship as Academic Cultural Practice

The second Learning and Teaching Academy took place in January 2008, just before the supervised teaching semester. Driven almost entirely by the Fellows' own work, LTA II provided the opportunity for Fellows to present a fully-developed, 90-minute pedagogical colloquium which highlighted their approach to teaching "big questions" of meaning and value in the context of religion and theology (Shulman, 1995).

In this project component, Fellows were entirely responsible for content, showing the fruit of their work over the previous summer and semester. This emphasis on the Fellows' work was highlighted by an extensive degree of assessment and feedback. Each fellow presented to a mixed audience of peers, Mentors, other faculty members, administrators, and students, receiving detailed feedback on

their presentation style, pedagogy, institutional alignment, content knowledge, communication skills, and integration of questions of meaning and value. [See Appendix D: LTA II Assessment Form.] In addition to the written assessments provided by presentation observers, each fellow was coached by a Mentor or other faculty member on her or his colloquium.

The LTA II pedagogical colloquia had at least two powerful effects. First, it created a broader public for the Fellows' work, raising the stakes for their presentations and, generally, sharpening their performance. Secondly, it highlighted the work of the project overall to a wider community of learners and colleagues, raising the profiles of the Fellows in the GTU community. This elevation of the Fellows' status among their doctoral student peers and to the faculty in general should not be understood as an superficial vanity. Rather, we came to see these moments of engagement by the fellows with the wider community as having significant cultural influence, amplifying the importance of effective teaching, of sustained mentoring, and meaningful engagement with "big questions" to the GTU as an institution. The elevated status of the Fellows as their competitive selection and competent work was emphasized in the course of the project focuses on what we hope will be widely seen as a core institution value at the GTU—an orientation toward the development of engaged teaching scholarship.

So, too, the support the project provided to the project Mentors was meant to be very clear in valuing their contribution to the project and in highlighting the significance of sustained, intention, attentive mentoring in the doctoral program. Thus, Mentors were compensated for their work with Fellows throughout the project. While the Mentors were generally selected because they were already known as exemplary educators and dedicated advisors to doctoral students, the attention given to their work as Mentors and the honoraria they were awarded during the observation and supervision semesters added a structured, systematic dimension to this important aspect of doctoral student development. The structure of the project itself insisted that less experience faculty Mentors actively reflect on their own mentoring experiences and consider how they might effectively mentor project Fellows. More experienced faculty Mentors were challenged to articulate ways of coaching, challenging, and encouraging doctoral students that had become habitual.

At the same time, we strained through the course of the project to set the Mentors' involvement as an enhancement to their regular responsibilities rather than as an additional burden. Because of this, we took great care not to require extensive meeting time or additional administrative work. We considered, but ultimately decided not to require any initial training for the Mentors beyond a brief orientation to the project, its goals, and core components. As a practical strategy for sustaining the involvement of a chronically over-stretched faculty cohort, we worked to focus the faculty Mentors' time and energy on their direct engagements with the Fellows.

Certainly, we lost much important data about the mentoring towards vocation in the process. But we also gained much in terms of faculty involvement. Further, we learned much about the importance of making it easy for faculty to participate in new programming. This care, we believe, paid off extensively in the Mentors' involvement in the Fellows' supervised teaching semester.

Supervised Teaching and Project Assessment

Most of the Fellows taught an introductory religious studies or theology course under the supervision of their mentor in the Spring 2008 semester.[1] In general, Fellows and Mentors worked together on the adaptation of an existing course or the design of a new course which the Fellows taught in the following semester under the supervision of the Mentor.

The vision for this part of the project assumed that allowing Fellows to design specialized courses which drew from their particular areas of expertise presented the best chance of inviting the Fellows to grapple with "big questions" of their own, and of encouraging them to integrate big questions from their students and from the wider culture into their courses. Indeed, all but one of the Mentor-Fellow teams selected this creative option rather than adapting a course already on the books. However, because these new courses were electives, issues arose with course scheduling conflicts (i.e., the project course conflicting with or, more provocatively, competing with existing courses), with under-enrolled classes, and with attendant reductions in student-faculty ratios. At the same time, allowing Fellows to teach introductory courses already designed, scheduled and "owned" by their faculty Mentors raised tricky ownership issues for Mentors and authority and development issues for Fellows. In both cases, Fellows were challenged to consider their teaching in the context of particular institutional curricula, but also in relation to other faculty members within that context—very often their own Mentors. Negotiating these institutional and junior-senior collegial challenges raised questions about power and authority that were significantly resonant with questions of identity and authority that the Fellows had been grappling with during the seminar.

The realities of assessing our project were even more complicated. First, we had to attend to the "institutional culture and climate for assessment" (Peterson and Vaughan, 2002) at our consortial institution as well as within the participating seminaries and outside universities. "Culture" here refers to "deeply embedded values and beliefs collectively held by members of an institution that can have a positive or negative impact on the assessment effort (Banta, Lund, Black, and Oblander, 1996); "climate" refers to the "current patterns or important dimensions of organizational life, together with members' perceptions and attitudes toward them" (Peterson, 1988).

We used assessment strategies from our two accreditation agencies, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and the Association for Theological Schools (ATS), to align our efforts with various institutional climates and cultures. The GTU doctoral program and all of our member schools are accredited by ATS while over half of these institutions and the universities representing faculty Mentors from outside our consortium receive WASC certification. WASC and ATS accreditation processes aim to promote a "culture of evidence" where performance indicators are used to measure achievement and, more importantly, are looped back to practice to inform subsequent tactics and strategies (WASC, 2002). Some performance indicators are "indirect," reflecting the perceptions of relevant constituents, including learners, about whether or not learning occurred. Other indicators consist of "direct" evidence, i.e. actual and authentic proof of both intended and unintended learning. This kind of "learning organization" approach reflects the ways in which institutions involved in this project plan and implement educational policy.

Formatively, we used daily debriefing sessions of the previous day's activities and experiences and weekly forums to solicit indirect evidence about program effectiveness and

---

1 One Fellow taught a supervised course in Fall 2007, the same semester in which he observed a Mentor course.

individual learning from the Fellows during the Academies. Seminar instructors used Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) throughout the fall semester to regularly gauge learning and assess the alignment between that learning and the instructors' goals. They also devoted a large portion of one class session midway through the semester to allow Fellows the opportunity to critique course design and delivery. Fellows used minutes from their monthly discussions together to provide project leaders with feedback about all aspects of the project including their reflections on mentoring successes and challenges. Fellows and Mentors had dinner together with project leaders midway through the project to allow both groups the chance to share their perspectives about the program.

This was all done to allow project leaders to progressively evaluate effectiveness and to perform "mid-course corrections," i.e., project revisions and adaptations continually focused in meeting project goals. Qualitative data from Fellows and Mentors suggest that these formative assessment efforts were essential for, without them, we would have lacked the ability to strategically recognize when we had strayed off course and/or risked the possibility of a loss of confidence in the project.

Overall program and individual Fellow assessment was summative and based on the Fellows success to engage "big questions" in their spring courses. Several indirect indicators including results from surveys and questionnaires administered to all the participants throughout the project evidenced a strong alignment between our program goals and project participants' perceptions. Fellows and Mentors indicated that all the components of the project were helpful and needed in developing ways to engage "big questions," though a common criticism was the magnitude of the project for Fellows, i.e. the time commitment required throughout the year. Still, Fellows and Mentors indicated that limiting preparation to just one aspect of the project would risk divorcing conceptualization and reflection from practice leaving the Fellows to proceed with their work either unguided or untested.

Scoring rubrics were used to evaluate the Fellows' pedagogical philosophy statements and provided direct evidence of learning from the fall seminar. Content analysis of course syllabi illustrated a similar kind of alignment between what was presented in the Academies and seminar and, subsequently, reflected in the Fellows' courses. In general, we concluded from our assessment activities that our structured, intentional program was both desirable and successful.

Individual assessment is "in service" of learning goals (Gardner, 1993) and pedagogical strategies (hooks, 1994; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Boyer, 1990). Project leaders systematically analyzed August LTA course proposals, pedagogical philosophy statements from the fall seminar, "job talks" or pedagogical colloquia from January, and the final teaching portfolios this past spring and found strong evidence of learning, particularly in comprehension and synthesis. The indirect data described above corroborated this result and illustrated how Fellows effectively applied what they had learned to their spring courses. We lacked direct evidence of success from particular "learning episodes," e.g. course proposals and pedagogical colloquia, because Fellows did not actually propose courses to a discriminating curriculum committee or apply for jobs during the course of the project. We still need to triangulate an analysis of the work done by Fellows' students in the spring courses to see if this direct evidence provides further corroboration (…we suspect it will).

It was easy for us to identify and use assessment strategies to evaluate the Fellows. The bigger challenge for our project, one similar to that described by the Astins in evaluating "spirituality" and "spiritual growth" among students as a result of student-centered pedagogies, was

measuring "effective mentoring." Here, a balance between what Peter Gray (1985) calls a "positivist, scientific" approach with a "subjectivist and intuitionist" perspective helped us do two things: a) begin to identify ways to make claims about how well mentoring contributed to learning and b) evaluate a more constructivist approach used in our design of the LTAs and seminar where goals did not always precede action (Cohen & March, 1991) and where we found "knowledge as one or more human constructions, uncertifiable, and constantly problematic and changing" (Stufflebeam, 2001). One conclusion to be drawn is that, in the development of future faculty, assessment of performance against classroom learning goals and institutional priorities needs to be linked to assessment of the overall mentoring experience. For example, a 360-degree assessment of Fellows, Mentors, and students in the supervised course could be conducted. This assessment would attend to the degree to which the course engaged questions of meaning and value, to the impact of the mentoring relationship, and to the course's fit with specific institutional goals and objectives.

Another significant conclusion that follows from our understanding of the need for 360-degree assessment has to do with the inter-relatedness of student, faculty mentor, and *institutional support* in developing future faculty, perhaps especially around more nuanced concerns in postsecondary education like the integration of questions of meaning and value into the classroom. That is, a large volume of meaningful, helpful scholarship and practical guidance exists on the role of the faculty mentor-doctoral student relationship in the preparation of future faculty. Indeed, much of this work has a subtle assumption that the best mentoring relationships position faculty and students together as allies in negotiating the institution as a force "out there" that must be grappled with so a faculty member can get on with the work of scholarship and teaching. Our project took a different approach—one that assumed that the institution itself is central in the development of future faculty by encouraging and supporting focused and intentional mentoring and *paying close attention* to its effectiveness. We have more work to do on fully articulating this approach, but for now we can say that its components run from the seemingly small gesture—paying faculty mentors for their participation in the project, for instance; or honoring doctoral students with professionally and financially meaningful fellowships—to structured institutional participation such as we developed through the LTAs and forums; to the anchoring of such programs to a core ideological and practical commitments, such as our "big questions" pedagogical orientation and its linkage to practical classroom experience; to assessment that takes all of these elements into account. This integrated approach to the development of future faculty seems to us to be the one of best ways forward if we truly are to address the wider social, ethical, and spiritual relevance of postsecondary education in the world today.

Mentoring Toward Pedagogies of Meaning and Value: Key Learnings

In the semester since the final project evaluations, we have had the opportunity to reflect on the experience of the GTU Preparing Future Faculty Project both formally and informally. Formally, project participants delivered papers at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion in November 2008. [See Appendix E: AAR Panel.] These papers will be published in the Summer 2009 issue of the *Journal of Religion and Education*. Less formally, Fellows, Mentors, and project members have had much conversation about what worked and what we would do differently in the future. These collective thoughts form the basis for several key learnings that we hope may be applied in other institutional settings:

- Start at the top. The GTU is in a fairly unique position to engage diverse perspectives on vocational learning because we are a community of seminaries and program units in a neighborhood of large and small educational institutions. We started our conversations about the project with the presidents of the member schools, ensuring their commitment and involving them in the selection of faculty. Presidents and deans of member school and the Academic Dean of the GTU were able to use the project to reward effective faculty members and to encourage the development of junior faculty. This allowed our project to contribute to the member schools and to get off on firm inter-institutional footing.

- Consult with experts. When we began planning this project, no one on the project team had extensive experience with doctoral student professional development. We began, then, by talking with Lee Shulman at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, David Bartholomae at the University of Pittsburgh, Mariatte Denman of the Stanford Center for Teaching and Learning, and Patricia Cross at the University of California, Berkeley. Early conversation with these varied experts who were able to point us to valuable resources and validate or challenge our ideas helped us to shape our project more confidently and, we hope, competently.

- Make faculty participation easy. Our temptation early in the project was to do lots of assessment with faculty, to do training, and to involve them in project design. There is much to recommend such an engaged approach, but, as noted above, demands on faculty time in general are significant. The best faculty members—those whom we wanted to participate in the project—are called upon even more to take on extra work. Our decision to fairly compensate faculty, to allow the Fellows to serve as teaching assistants during the observation semester, and to minimize their direct project involvement while maximizing director Mentor engagement allowed the structure to support what good faculty members are already inclined to do in their work with doctoral students.

- Make student involvement meaningful. The demands on doctoral student time are also considerable. GTU doctoral students are not fully-funded, so most make ends meet as teaching assistants for GTU member schools or adjuncts at local colleges and universities. A number of the fellows also had other non-academic employment. The Preparing Future Faculty Project was very demanding for the Fellows in terms of time and commitment. Highlighting their work among fellow students and faculty and, further, ensuring that the project deliverables contributed to a genuinely useful teaching portfolio helped to make the extra work more valuable and meaningful in light of other doctoral student demands.

- Less is more. This learning had two applications in our project. First, the financial boundaries of our grant funding and our desire to fairly compensate Fellows, Mentors, instructors, and administrators through the project meant that we could only develop a limited cohort. This was probably all to the good in that, though the GTU is committed to the vocational and professional development of *all* of our doctoral students, we are not convinced that a significantly larger project would be as effective. The smaller cohort allowed valuable relationships to develop and allowed project administrators to spend more time addressing issues that came up in the course of the project. And, as noted above, it also contributed to the status of the project in the GTU community.

- Less is still more. While our LTAs covered a wide range of expert- and student-generated content that was extremely valuable overall, it was probably too much. Fellows and project administrators were overwhelmed by the end of the first two-week intensive. Further, though the Fellows quickly engaged one another and began to form important collegial relationships, the intense pace of the LTA left less time for open conversation, conflict resolution, and general reflection than we would have liked. In the future, we would be likely to break the LTAs into one-week units over the course of two academic years.

Concluding Observations

As the Graduate Theological Union stove to deepen our practical commitment to engagement with the most pressing questions of meaning and value facing communities and the world today, it became clear to us that developing our doctoral students as engaged teaching scholars was critical. It likewise became clear that traditional models of doctoral student mentoring which focus primarily on career development and advancement or on disciplinary development were not entirely helpful. Rather, we undertook to develop institutionally-supported practices of vocational development focused on practical classroom engagement with questions of meaning and value across the disciplines of religion and theology. Our project showed the importance of active, experiential learning across multiple matrices of significant professional relationships—those with faculty mentors, colleagues, and administrators. Negotiating these complex professional relationships, while also planning and teaching courses that emphasize "big question" learning, allowed Fellows to live the role of junior faculty member in very practical ways that pressed on easy philosophical or ideological approaches to learning and teaching.

The GTU Preparing Future Faculty Project also invited us, as an institution, to consider the ways in which we can systematically encourage and support effective mentoring toward vocations of teaching scholarship. The impact of this is, we believe, both challenging and encouraging, pressing for a change in academic culture that will allow the GTU to function more fully as a place "where religion meets the world."

The significance of the Teagle Wabash Project cannot be underestimated in terms of what it has meant to the GTU. The cultivation of a nucleus of graduate students and faculty committed to excellent teaching has created a hub of conversation, research and collaboration that has enlivened our already stimulating academic environment. One of the goals of the GTU is to become a national center of excellence for the training of future generations of teachers in theological and religious studies. We believe with the funding from the Teagle Foundation and Wabash Center we are on our way to achieving this.

Appendix A: Selected Resources for Preparing Future Faculty in Theology and Religion

NB: Texts marked with a ◆ were provided as reference materials for all project Fellows.

Bok, Derek. *Universities and the Future of America.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean Claude Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture.* London: Sage, 1977, 1990; rpt. 2000.

Brown, Sally and Angela Glasner, eds. *Assessment Matters in Higher Education: Choosing and Using Diverse Approaches.* New York: McGraw-Hill , 1999.

Cunningham, David S. "Revisiting the Idea of Vocation: Theological Explorations." *Theological Studies* 66, no. 4 (2005).

Daloz, Laurent A. *Mentor: Guiding the Journey of Adult Learners.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.

◆ Davis, Barbara Gross. *Tools for Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.

DeNeff, A. Leigh. "The Preparing Future Faculty Program: What Difference Does it Make?" Association of American Colleges. Washington, DC: 2002.

Donovan, Mary Ann. "The Vocation of the Theologian." *Theological Studies* 65, no. 1 (2004).

Foster, Charles R., et al, eds. *Teaching Clergy : Teaching Practices and Pastoral Imagination.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. 2nd Edition. New York: Continuum, 2000.

Gardner, Harold. *Multiple Intelligences: New Horizons in Theory and Practice.* 2nd Edition. New York: Basic Books, 2006.

Giroux, Henry. *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling, A Critical Reader.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997.

Golde, Chris, ed. *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.

hooks, bell. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom.* New York: Routledge, 1994.

◆ Jones, L. Gregory and Stephanie Paulsell, eds. *The Scope of Our Art: The Vocation of the Theological Teacher.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe. "The Challenge of Liberal Education: Past, Present, and Future." *Liberal Education* 89, no. 2 (2003).

Marsden, George. *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Non-Belief.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

◆ McKeachie, Wilbert and Marilla Svinicki. *McKeachie's Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers.* 12th Edition. New York: Wadsworth Publishing, 2005.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Palmer, Parker. *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998, 2007.

_____. *Let Your Life Speak: Listening for the Voice of Vocation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Purpel, David E. and William M. McLaurin. *Reflections on the Moral & Spiritual Crisis in Education*. New York: Peter Lang, 2004.

Reinarz, Alice G. and Eric R. White, eds. *Beyond Teaching to Mentoring.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.

Reisetter, Marcya F. and Jennifer J. Fager, Jennifer. "Assessing the Effectiveness of the Beginning Teacher from a Constructivist Perspective." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA (April 18-22, 1995).

Roberts, Jon H. and James Turner. *The Sacred and the Secular University*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Schwehn, Mark R. *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Seldin, Peter. *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions.* 2nd Edition. Boston: Anker Publishing, 1997.

Simon, Roger I. *Teaching against the Grain: Texts for a Pedagogy of Possibility*. New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1992.

Tisdell, Elizabeth J. *Exploring Spirituality and Culture in Adult and Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Shulman, Lee S. "The pedagogical colloquium: Three models." *AAHE Bulletin* (May 1995).

Zachary, Lois. J. *The Mentor's Guide: Facilitating Effective Learning Relationships*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Appendix B: Learning and Teaching Academy I Schedule

See document titled, "GTU-Wabash Summer Learning and Teaching Academy"

Appendix C: Teagle Seminar Syllabus

Vocation, the Liberal Arts, Theology, and Teaching the "Big Questions"

James A. Donahue   Maureen A. Maloney
President and Professor of Ethics   Dean of Students
Graduate Theological Union   Graduate Theological Union
Berkeley, California 94709   Berkeley, California 94709

Office: Hewlett Library, 2nd Floor   Office: Rm 310, 2465 LeConte Ave
Office Hours: By appointment   Office Hours: By appointment
        (Call 510-649-2410)   (maloney@gtu.edu; 510-649-2464)

The Course:

   This seminar will examine the salient issues entailed in teaching in the disciplines of theology and religious studies in the context of a liberal arts curriculum. Its organizing assumption is that liberal arts education in American higher education today is in crisis, and that it is increasingly failing in its ability to engage undergraduate students in a meaningful exploration of fundamental questions of human meaning, purpose and value (the "big questions"). The instructors advance the claim that these "big questions" are essential components of liberal arts education. Our focus will be to develop an understanding of how the teaching of theology and religious studies provides opportunities for engaging these big questions.

Goals and Purpose:

   The goal of the course is to create a framework for engaging the following issues and questions:

- What is liberal arts education—its history, its premises, its goals?
- Why are the "big questions" important? What are the goals in teaching the "big questions?"
- What does it mean to understand teaching as a vocation for the teacher? What is the relevance of the idea of vocation for the student?
- How does the discipline of theology/religious studies relate to the core intentions of liberal arts education? What does it mean to be a theologian in the teaching role?
- What epistemological issues are at play in liberal arts education and in the learning process? What is "success" in teaching theology?
- What are the dynamics of learning and teaching that are crucial for liberal arts education?
- How can we engage these questions in ways that acknowledge, reflect and accommodate diversity among learners, teachers, contexts and that which is to be learned?

Outcomes for the Course:

At the end of this course students will have developed the following:

- A clear(er) sense of vocational direction with regards to future career choices.
- An understanding of the role of theology in the academy and the role of the theologian in the classroom (and beyond).
- A sense of the diversity of learning and teaching styles that makes for effective educational results.
- An understanding of some of the epistemological issues that situate academic life today that provides the context for teaching theology and the liberal arts.

Assessments of the Course ("Deliverables"):

By the end of this course students will have developed the following:

- A personal statement outlining the dimensions of a philosophy of teaching, learning, and education at the college level;
- A revision of the "Teaching as Vocation" narrative, first developed in preparation for the August Learning and Teaching Academy;
- A syllabus for the course they will be teaching in the spring for presentation and critique;
- A preliminary portfolio for employment purposes.

In addition, the assessment of the course's success will focus on the measurement of student response in achieving course goals, and the production of course materials.

Course Requirements

- Students will be required to attend each class session prepared to discuss the reading assignments for each class.
- Students will be asked to prepare and submit the "deliverables" described above by established deadlines.
- Students will give a brief presentation of their course syllabus during the last three weeks of the course.

Course Outline

Week 1, September 12   **The Predicament of the Liberal Arts**

What is liberal arts education? We will examine definitions of the liberal arts, review some of its historical assumptions, assess its contemporary context and challenges, and explore how it engages the "big questions."

How is theology situated in liberal arts education? What is the relationship between theology and the big questions? What does it mean to identify oneself as a theologian?

<u>Readings:</u>

Arcilla, Rene V., "The Questions of Liberal Education," pages 14-19;
Marshall, David, "The Places of the Humanities: Thinking About Bureaucracy," pages 34-39, and
Huber, Mary Taylor, Hutchings, Pat, Gale, Richard, Miller, Ross, and Breen, Molly, "Leading Initiatives for Integrative Learning," pages 46-51,
in
<u>Liberal Education</u> (Association of American Colleges and Universities) Vol. 93, No. 2; Spring 2007;

Berube, Michael "Reasonable Disagreements" in *What's Liberal About the Liberal Arts?: Classroom Politics and "Bias" in Higher Education* (W.W. Norton: New York, 2006), pages 1-25;

Schneider, Carol G., "Liberal Education: Slip Sliding Away?" in Hersh, Richard H. and Merrow, John (eds) *Declining By Degrees: Higher Education at Risk* (Palgrave MacMillan: New York, 2005), pages 61-76;

Donahue, James A., "Creative Teaching, Careerism and the Ethics of Autonomy: A Theological Response," in <u>Horizons</u> Vol. 15, No. 2: 1988, pages 316-336

Week 2, September 19   "**Big Questions**"

What does it mean to engage issues of meaning, value and purpose in undergraduate liberal arts education? Why are these issues important – for humanistic reasons, religious reasons, and/or for the purposes of creating civil society? What about issues of ethical relativism and cultural and religious particularity?

<u>Readings:</u>

Connor, Robert W., "Watching Charlotte Climb: Little Steps toward Big Questions," pages 6-13;
Adler, Norman, "Faith and Reason on Campus," pages 20-27, and
Astin, Alexander W., Astin, Helen S., Chopp, Rebecca, Delbanco, Andrew, and Speers, Smauel, "A Forum on Helping Students Engage the 'Big Questions'," pages 28-33,
in
<u>Liberal Education</u> (Association of American Colleges and Universities) Vol. 93, No. 2; Spring 2007;

Palmer, Parker J., "Education as Spiritual Formation" in *To Know as we are Known: Education as Spiritual Journey* (Harper Collins Publishers: New York, 1993), pages 17-46

Parks, Sharon Daloz "Meaning and Faith" in Big Questions, Worthy Dreams: Mentoring Young Adults in Their Search for Meaning, Purpose, and Faith (Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 2000), pages 14-33

Benhabib, Seyla The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era (Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 2002), pages 24-48

Week 3, September 26   **The Idea of Vocation**

What is vocation and why is it a relevant issue for teaching and learning in the liberal arts? We will distinguish vocation, career, profession, occupation, job, and role. We will examine vocation and its theological interpretations and assess the contemporary cultural context of vocation. We will situate your own vocational journey—a vocational autobiography.

Readings:

Fowler, James W., "Education as Spiritual Formation" in *Becoming Adult, Becoming Christian: Adult Development and Christian Faith* (Harper& Row Publishers: San Francisco, 1984), pages 72-106

Gallagher, Susan VanZanten, "Speaking of Vocation in an Age of Spirituality," in Change May/June: 2007, pages 32-37

Gilpin, W. Clark, "The Formation of the Scholar" in *The Scope of Our Art: The Vocation of the Theological Teacher*, L. Gregory Jones and Stephanie Paulsell, eds. (Wm. B Eerdmans Publishing Co.: Cambridge, 2002), pages 3-16

Keller, Rosemary Skinner, "My Vocational Kinship with the United States' First Female Theologian" in *The Scope of Our Art: The Vocation of the Theological Teacher*, L. Gregory Jones and Stephanie Paulsell, eds. (Wm. B Eerdmans Publishing Co.: Cambridge, 2002), pages 75-95

Parsons, Talcott, "The Professions and Social Structure" in *Essays in Sociological Theory* (Free Press: Glencoe, 1958), pages 34-49

Sullivan, William M., "What is Professional Knowledge?: Expertise and Professional Education" in *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America* (Harper Collins Publishers: New York, 1995), pages 159-190

Werpehowski, William J., "The Professions: Vocation to Justice and Love" in *The Professions in Ethical Context: Vocations to Justice and Love*, Francis A. Eigo, editor (Villanova University Press: Villanova, 1986), pages 1-24

Week 4, October 3   **Teaching and the Construction of Identity**

What do we mean by "identity?" We will examine the idea of identity including its history and contemporary context. We will examine the pluralism of identities e.g. multiculturalism, ethnicity, race, gender, class, sexual orientation, globalism. How do we think of identity as something personally constructed, collectively constructed? Why is it important to understand identity among our learners, teachers?

Erikson, Erik H., "Eight Ages of Man" in *Childhood and Society* (W.W. Norton & Company, Inc: New York, 1963), pages 247-274.

Gutmann, Amy, "Is Religious Identity Special" in *Identity in Democracy* (Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 2003), pages 151-191.

Appiah, Kwane Anthony, "The Ethics of Individuality" in *The Ethics of Identity* (Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 2005), pages 1-35.

Seligman, Adam B., "The Self in the Social Sciences" and "Authority and the Self" in *Modernity's Wager: Authority, The Self, and Transcendence* (Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 2000), pages 15-59.

Week 5, October 10   **The Institutional and Cultural Context of Teaching:**
                          Two Case Studies

What are the ways that the institutional context frames the parameters and boundaries of teaching and learning? How does learning and teaching occur as a curricular activity, as a co-curricular activity? How has the structural segmentation in the University influenced teaching and learning? Where should the "authority" of the University reside in the lives of students and teachers?

Intercollegiate Athletics

Bowen, William G. and Shulman, James L., "Prelude" and "Preface" in *The Game of Life: College Sports and Educational Values* (Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 2001), pages xv-xxxvi.

Fried, Barbara H., "Punting Our Future: College Athletics and Admissions," in Change May/June: 2007, pages 9-15

Funk, Gary D., "The Dumb Jock: Fact or Fiction" in *Major Violation: The Unbalanced Priorities in Athletics and Academics* (Human Kinetics Publishers: Champaign, 1991), pages 11-30.

Lewis, Michael, in *The Blind Side* (W.W. Norton & Co.: New York, 2007), pages 197-230.

Rhoden, William C., "The Conveyor Belt: The Dilemma of Alienation" in *$40 Million Slaves: the Rise, Fall, and Redemption of the Black Athlete* (Crown Publishers: New York, 2006) pages 171-195

Colleges Admissions

Bowen, William G. and Bok, Derek, "Historical Context" in *The Shape of the River: Long Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions* (Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 1998), pages 1-14.

Bowen, William G. and Bok, Derek, "Diversity: Perceptions and Realities" in *The Shape of the River: Long Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions* (Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 1998), pages 218-255.

Week 6, October17   **Theology as an Academic Discipline**

How is theology situated in liberal arts education? Is the term "formation" relevant to teaching and teacher development, how? What does it mean to be a theologian? What are the "family disputes" between Theology and Religious Studies?   How does one navigate one's intellectual journey with one's journey of faith? How does theology and vocation relate to one another; education and vocation?

Cronon, William, "Getting Ready to do History" in *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline* (Jossey-Bass Publishers for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: San Francisco, 2006), pages 327-349.

Golde, Chris M.. "Preparing Stewards of the Discipline" in *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline* (Jossey-Bass Publishers for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: San Francisco, 2006), pages 3-20.

Golde, Chris M.. and Walker, George E., "Doctoral Education in History" in *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline* (Jossey-Bass Publishers for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: San Francisco, 2006), pages 291-294.

Hyman, Gavin, "The Study of Religion and the Return of Theology," in the <u>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</u> (March: 2007), 72:1, pages 195-219

Week 7, October 24   **No Class – Reading Week**

Assignment: Revise your "Teaching as Vocation" narrative to reflect changes you would like to make following the Learning and Teaching Academy and 7 weeks of the seminar. Include with your narrative a brief version of what we described as a "pedagogical colloquium," i.e. a description that demonstrates your understanding of teaching and how to teach in your discipline.

Week 8, October 31   **Knowledge and the Learning Process**

How can we effectively connect/intersect the dynamics of the learning process with what goes in the classroom and in the preparation of course materials? We will examine the idea of "multiple intelligences" and "frames of meaning/frames of ideas? We will explore the power dynamics and social purposes of the educational process. What does it mean to "appropriate" knowledge and how does that contribute to the learning and teaching endeavor? We will consider the "Cultural Wars" in the academic disciplines, i.e. what do Structuralism, Modernism and post modernism, colonialism and post colonialism really mean and how do they present themselves in the academy?

Beaudoin, Tom, "Foucault – Teaching - Theology," in <u>Religious Education</u> (Winter: 2003), 98:1, pages 25-42.

Chickering, Arthur W. and Gamson, Zelda F., "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" in <u>AAHE Bulletin</u> (March: 1987), 7 pages.

Gardner, Howard, "A Critique of the Theory of Multiple Intelligences" in Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (Basic Books: New York, 1993), pages 21-69.

hooks, bell, "Engaged Pedagogy," in *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (Routledge: New York, 1994), pages 13-22.

hooks, bell, "Embracing Change: Teaching in a Multicultural World," in *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (Routledge: New York, 1994), pages 35-44.

hooks, bell, "Confronting Class in the Classroom," in *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (Routledge: New York, 1994), pages 177-190.

hooks, bell, "Eros, Eroticism, and the Pedagogical Process" in *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (Routledge: New York, 1994), pages 191-199

Morris, Marla, "Unresting the Curriculum: Queer Projects, Queer Imaginings" in *Queer Theory in Education*, William F. Pinar, ed. (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: New Jersey, 1998), pages 275-285.

Week 9, November 7   **The Art and Practice of Teaching**

        In what ways is teaching and learning a practice? We will explore the idea of "practices as" an ethical and theological construct. What does it mean to pursue teaching as reflective practice?

Bourdieu, Pierre, "Structures, *Habitus*, Practices" in *The Logic of Practice* (Stanford University Press: Stanford, 1990), pages 52-65.

Bourdieu, Pierre, "The Logic of Practice" in *The Logic of Practice* (Stanford University Press: Stanford, 1990), pages 80-97.

MacIntyre, Alasdair, "The Nature of the Virtues" in *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (University of Notre Dame Press: Notre Dame, 1981), pages 169-189.

Schön, Donald A., "From Tehcnical Rationality to Reflection-in-Action" in *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (Basic Books: New York, 1983), pages 21-69.

Week 10, November 14   **Teaching as Scholarship**

        We will examine the possibilities for and tensions associated with the notion of "teaching as scholarship." How has the work of the academy changed throughout the years to lend to and detract from this concept? In what ways does the faculty reward system in the American academy contribute and/or detract from this notion? In what ways does pursuing teaching as scholarship facilitate learning, strengthen higher education and the liberal arts, more specifically, clarify the aims and goals of colleges and universities, and/or help make connections between higher education and social, political, religious challenges?

Boyer, Ernest L., *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton University Press for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: Lawrenceville, 1990), pages 1-81.

Week 11, November 21   **No Class, AAR/SBL Annual Meeting**

Week 12, November 28   **Student Presentations**

Appendix D: LTA II Assessment Form

TW Fellow's Name:_____ **Colloquium Date:** _____

About You: ☐MA/MDiv Student ☐ PhD Student ☐ Faculty ☐ Admin

This assessment is designed to help future faculty in religion and theology to improve their practice of classroom teaching, particularly with regard to engaging questions of meaning and value that students bring to and draw from a particular course or subject area. In this sense, the assessment is primarily developmental. However, the assessment also has an evaluative component which is intended to provide future faculty with feedback on their performance as potential faculty members from a variety of perspectives—that of potential faculty colleagues, students, and administrators.

As you reflect on your observation of the colloquia, please consider the evaluative categories and performance criteria which follow, rating the Fellow as "underdeveloped" (1), "developing (2), "prepared" (3), or "exemplary" (4). If you are a *student observer*, it may be helpful to consider how you might feel about taking a class from this Fellow as an undergraduate or first year graduate student. If you are a *faculty observer*, you might consider how comfortable you would be in recommending this Fellow as a junior colleague for an open position appropriate to her or his area of expertise, regardless of whether that field differs from your own.

Criteria	Underdeveloped (1)	Developing (2)	Prepared (3)	Exemplary (4)
A. Institutional Alignment	Fellow's pedagogical colloquium shows an understanding of the institutional context in which s/he hopes to teach, its mission, departmental goals, and student population.			
A1. Institutional context is clearly identified				
A2. Elements of institutional mission are present and some understanding of departmental goals is present				
A3. Knowledge of student population is evident				
B. Pedagogical Influences	Fellow's pedagogical colloquium illustrates the influence of key pedagogical thinkers and critical issues in liberal education in ways that a diverse audience of students and faculty can understand.			
B1. Fellow shows awareness of key pedagogical thinkers and issues in liberal education				
B2. Pedagogical influences are consistently linked, functioning in critical relationship to the pedagogical philosophy and teaching approach				
C. Content Knowledge	Fellow's pedagogical colloquium exhibits competence within the subject area or field in which s/he hopes to teach even to students and faculty who are less familiar with that field.			
C1. Content knowledge illustrates fellow's command of her/his area of specialty within the broader content of the subject area or field				
C2. Fellow's specialized and general content knowledge is effectively integrated into the pedagogical philosophy and teaching approach				
D. Presentation Skills	Fellow's colloquium illustrates an ability to set pedagogical goals, organize material for a general audience in light of those goals, and to effectively manage time. Use of one three models for the colloquium –(a) course narrative or argument-centered; (b) course idea or concept-centered; (c) dilemma-centered, or another model defined by the fellow is in evidence.			

D1. Pedagogical colloquium is well organized so that participants understand its structure and goals Stated goals are clear, measurable, and attainable within the colloquium				
D2. Fellow is able to complete the colloquium within the time provided without rushing or obviously truncating the presentation				
E. Communication Skills	Fellow's colloquium illustrates an ability to communicate effectively to different stakeholders (students, faculty, administration), engage participants, effectively pose and respond to questions.			
E1. Fellow's understanding of the differing interests of participants is clearly integrated into the colloquium				
E2. Fellow is able to consistently generate discussion and engage participants				
E3. Fellow listens carefully to questions and comments, often reframing them to ensure understanding				
E4. Fellow responds effectively to comments and questions, asking for clarification when necessary				
F. Questions of Meaning and Value	Fellow's colloquium illustrates an understanding of questions of meaning and value arising from the subject area or field from the perspective of the particular student population of a defined institutional context. Fellow raises, provokes, and engages such questions through the colloquium.			
F1. The centrality of questions of meaning and value is clearly articulated in the pedagogical colloquium and the Fellow is able to engage such questions in some depth with participants				
F2. Questions of meaning and value as they are explored in the colloquium shows some linkage to key disciplinary, departmental, and institutional concerns				

Appendix E: AAR Panel
November 2008

Proposal Overview

In 2007, with funding from the Teagle Foundation and the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Religion and Theology, the Graduate Theological Union (GTU) undertook a two-part project to mentor doctoral students as future faculty in religion and theology who could practice pedagogies which would engage "big questions" questions of meaning and value provoked by the content of their courses as well as those which students bring to the undergraduate classroom and which they face in the world outside the university. In part, the project responds to research undertaken by Alexander and Helen Astin through the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) on the spiritualities of college faculty (Astin and Astin, 1999; Lindholm, Astin and Astin, 2006) and on the spiritual lives of college students (Astin, Astin and Lindholm, 2004). These studies indicate a high level of disconnect or even conflict between the questions of meaning and value that are important to faculty and students in their spiritual lives and the goals and practices of the postsecondary classroom (Kuh and Gonyea, 2006). It also attends to what has been seen as an epidemic of ethical lapses in contemporary society and concerns about how and whether liberal education can better prepare students to participate as ethical contributors to society (Walton, 1998; Calhoun, 2006). Thus, the GTU's Preparing Future Faculty project considers, in particular, the unique position in the postsecondary liberal arts curriculum of religious studies and theology to contribute both to concerns about the relationship between spirituality and education and to the ongoing cry for attention to the ethical character of American culture.

Our aim in the Preparing Future Faculty project was to help developing faculty members to more effectively bridge this gap and address such conflicts in the undergraduate classroom through a two-year project which paired twelve doctoral Fellows with faculty Mentors who would work with them as observers of their teaching and supervise them in delivering courses which integrated questions of meaning and value into student-centered pedagogies, meeting with them on a regular basis as senior reflective parishioners with whom the Fellows could consider the larger implications of their teaching as these play out in practical issues of course design and delivery. As well, the project aimed to develop among the Fellows a collegial community that would enable them to undertake the sustained practice of reflection upon and conversation about the practical and existential aspects of their teaching that participate in their own sense of vocation and which we believed, based largely on the Astins' work, factor into students' sense of a faculty member's ability to engage questions of meaning and value in the classroom. The project also included two two-week Learning and Teaching Academies, which provided the fellows with training on a range of practical elements classroom teaching, and a semester-long doctoral seminar on pedagogies of meaning and value. A parallel collegial conversation was established among the Fellows themselves through regular lunch meetings, discussion groups, and other common activities which invited them into intentional dialogue with their peers on the central issues raised by the project. As well, regular forums brought the Fellows and Mentors together with experts—including the Astins—on various pedagogical issues of related to the project's core concerns.

Overall, our research interest in the project was to determine how faculty charged with the development of future faculty can best mentor toward a vocation of teaching scholarship in which questions of meaning and value are central in practical approaches to classroom teaching. As well,

we were concerned to develop the practical classroom teaching skills of the Fellows so that the vocational commitments and pedagogical philosophies could more effectively be enacted in the design and delivery of undergraduate courses in religion and theology. In this panel, convened by GTU President James A. Donahue (Principle Investigator), project team members Maureen A. Maloney, Ed. D. (Project Director and GTU Dean of Students) and Elizabeth Drescher, Ph.D. (Research Associate) present background, findings and conclusions from the project. In addition, project Mentor Marty Stortz, Ph.D. (Professor of Historical Theology and Ethics at the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary and GTU Core Doctoral Faculty Member) offers an inside perspective on the mentoring process. As well Teagle-Wabash Fellows Steven C. Bauman and Melissa James offer a dialogical reflection on their participation in the project as it contributed to their development as teaching scholars committed to deploying pedagogies which encourage engagement with questions of meaning and value that students bring to the classroom, which arise from the content of a course, and which emerge from broader social and cultural concerns. Finally, Alexander and Helen Astin will respond to the panelists on the basis of their research.

Abstract:

In 2007, the Graduate Theological Union undertook a two-part project to mentor doctoral students as future faculty who could practice pedagogies which would engage "big questions" questions of meaning and value provoked by the content of their courses, and which students bring to the undergraduate classroom and which they face in the world outside the university. Our research interest was to determine how faculty charged with developing future faculty can best mentor toward vocations of teaching scholarship in which "big questions" are central in practical approaches to classroom teaching. In this panel, project team members present findings and conclusions, while a project Mentor and two project Fellows offer inside perspectives on the mentoring process. This concluded by Alexander and Helen Astin, who respond on the basis of their research on spirituality and higher education.

Convener:
James A. Donahue, Ph.D.
President and Professor of Ethics and Social Theory
Teagle-Wabash Preparing Future Faculty Project Principle Investigator
Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, CA

Respondents:

Alexander W. Astin
Allan M. Cartter Professor Emeritus of Higher Education, University of California, Los Angeles and Founding Director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA

Helen S. Astin
Professor Emeritus of Higher Education
and Senior Scholar of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA

Panelist #1:
Maureen A. Maloney, Ed.D.
Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
Teagle-Wabash Preparing Future Faculty Project Director
Graduate Theological Union
Berkeley, CA

"Engaging the Institution:
Mentoring Future Faculty, Big Questions of Vocation, and the Reality of Assessment."

Abstract:

"Engaging the institution" within the Preparing Future Faculty Project raised a number of interesting challenges with regard to the element of the project involving course design and delivery as well as with assessment. This paper explores these issues as they unfolded through the course of the project and identifies key learning for the development of future faculty that emerged from the process of working through them. Preliminary recommendations are provided for creating structured, intentional programs for the mentoring of future faculty in religion and theology whose teaching is anchored to pedagogies which encourage engagement with big questions of meaning and value generated by students, faculty members, course content, and wider cultural concerns. [112 words]

Paper Description:

"Engaging the institution" within the Preparing Future Faculty Project raised a number of interesting challenges with regard to course design and delivery as well as with assessment. This paper explores these issues as they unfolded through the project and identifies key learning for the development of future faculty that emerged from the process of working through them. Preliminary recommendations are provided for creating structured, intentional programs for the mentoring of future faculty in religion and theology whose teaching is anchored to pedagogies which encourage engagement with big questions of meaning and value generated by students, faculty, course content, and wider cultural concerns.

The twelve student Fellows in the project were competitively selected to represent a broad range of scholarly areas as well as to mirror demographic diversity that characterizes our institution. Faculty mentors were selected by the presidents of nine seminaries in our consortium, from the GTU's Center for Jewish Studies, and from two outside institutions, the University of California, Berkeley and JFK University. Fellows worked with ~~project~~ Mentors in the classroom over two semesters, each of which was preceded by a two-week Learning and Teaching Academy (LTA) in which Fellows were introduced to content related to course design and delivery, educational technology, and assessment strategies and practiced classroom presentation strategies. Fellows also took a seminar on liberal education, pedagogy, and questions of meaning and value in the first semester. Through the course of the project, Fellows had the opportunity to develop critical elements for a teaching portfolio: course proposal, pedagogical philosophy statement, syllabus, assignment examples, and course evaluations.

The center of the project was the mentoring relationship with experienced teaching scholars who worked with the Fellows in the classroom over the course of two semesters. In the first semester, the Fellows observed their Mentors teaching an introductory course. Fellows also met regularly with their Mentors to discuss their observations and reflections on pedagogies which engage big questions of meaning and value as they saw them playing out in their Mentors' teaching. In addition, the Fellows and Mentors worked together on the adaptation of an existing course or the design of a new course which the Fellows taught in the following semester under the supervision of the Mentor.

The design of this part of the project ~~had~~ assumed that allowing Fellows to design specialized courses which drew from their particular areas of expertise presented the best chance of inviting the Fellows to grapple with "big questions" of their own, and of encouraging them to integrate big questions from their students and from the wider culture into their courses. Indeed, all but one of the Mentor-Fellow teams selected this creative option rather than adapting a course already on the books. However, because these new courses were electives, issues arose with course scheduling conflicts (i.e., the project course conflicting with or, more provocatively, competing with existing courses), with under-enrolled classes, and with attendant reductions in student-faculty ratios. At the same time, allowing Fellows to teach introductory courses already designed, scheduled and "owned" by their faculty Mentors raised tricky ownership issues for Mentors and authority and development issues for Fellows. In both cases, Fellows were challenged to consider their teaching in the context of particular institutional curricula, but also in relation to other faculty members within that context —very often their own Mentors. Negotiating these institutional and junior-senior collegial challenges raised questions about power and authority that were significantly resonant with questions of identity and authority that the Fellows had been grappling with during the seminar.

The realities of assessing our project were even more complicated. First, we had to attend to the "institutional culture and climate for assessment" (Peterson and Vaughan, 2002) at our consortial institution as well as within the participating seminaries and outside universities. "Culture" here refers to "deeply embedded values and beliefs collectively held by members of an institution that can have a positive or negative impact on the assessment effort (Banta, Lund, Black, and Oblander, 1996); "climate" refers to the "current patterns or important dimensions of organizational life, together with members' perceptions and attitudes toward them" (Peterson, 1988). Assessment included an evaluation of our work as project designers and implementers, i.e. using program assessment to evaluate the Learning and Teaching Academies. Formative (K. Patricia Cross and Classroom Assessment) and summative assessment measures (rubrics work from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges) to evaluate student learning in the seminar were conducted. In addition, a 360-degree assessment of Fellows, Mentors, and students in the supervised course was conducted. This assessment attended to the degree to which the course engaged questions of meaning and value, to the impact of the mentoring relationship, and to the course's fit with specific institutional goals and objectives.

Assessment is "in service" of learning goals (Gardner) and pedagogical strategies (hooks, 1994; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Boyer, 1990) and, as such, it was easy for us to identify and use assessment strategies to evaluate the Fellows. Program assessment strategies also made program level evaluations fairly straight forward. The bigger challenge, one not un-related to the Astins' challenge of evaluating "spirituality" and "spiritual growth" among students as a result of student-centered pedagogies, was measuring "effective mentoring." This was much like what our seminaries

face when they evaluate "non-academic" outcomes such as spiritual development. Here, a balance between what Peter Gray (1985) calls a "positivist, scientific" approach with a "subjectivist and intuitionist" perspective helped us do two things: a) identify ways to make claims about how well mentoring contributed to learning and b) evaluate a more constructivist approach used in our design of the LTAs and seminar where goals did not always precede action (Cohen & March, 1991) and where we found "knowledge as one or more human constructions, uncertifiable, and constantly problematic and changing" (Stufflebeam, 2001). One conclusion to be drawn is that in the development of future faculty assessment of performance against classroom learning goals and institutional priorities needs to be linked to assessment of the overall mentoring experience.

Panelist #2:
Elizabeth Drescher, Ph.D.
Teagle-Wabash Preparing Future Faculty Research Associate
Graduate Theological Union/Church Divinity School of the Pacific
Berkeley, CA

"Re-Engineering the Teaching Machine: Big Questions from the Inside Out and the Outside In"

Abstract:

The title of this paper is a play on Gayatri Spivak's *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, a work that assumes that "as the margin or 'outside' enters an institution or teaching machine, what *kind* of teaching machine it enters will determine its contours" (1993: ix). For the Fellows participating in the Preparing Future Faculty Project, questions of "insider" and "outsider" status and the effect of various disciplinary and institutional "teaching machines" on the vocational identities and authority of developing teaching scholars were central. This paper considers the Fellows' discursive practice over the course of the project by way of discerning a developing vocational and pedagogical *habitus* and the kernels of a transformational "pedagogy of educated hope" (Giroux, 2003) that participates in the "re-engineering" of the liberal arts "teaching machine" by emphasizing the interfacing of its ethical, political, and social functioning with its personal and existential role.

Paper Description:

The title of this paper is a play on Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, a work of cultural theory that assumes that "as the margin or 'outside' enters an institution or teaching machine, what *kind* of teaching machine it enters will determine its contours" (1993: ix). For the Fellows participating in the Preparing Future Faculty Project, questions of "insider" and "outsider" status and the effect of various disciplinary and institutional "teaching machines" on the vocational identities and authority of these developing teaching scholars were at the center of the mentoring process. And, for the project Mentors, not unlike faculty in the Astins' study whose own vocational identities and sense of meaning are constructed and enacted in relation to scholarship and teaching (Astin & Astin, 1999), the project raised questions of their own and Fellows' preservation of, access to, and initiation into "the guild" as "stewards of the discipline" (Gold, 2006). As these questions of individual vocational identity played out, the project simultaneously called on both Fellows and Mentors to think about and experiment in the classroom with ways of "re-engineering" the teaching

machines of liberal education so that they can more effectively prepare postsecondary students to respond to the "big questions of meaning and value" that are so vexing in contemporary society.

Questions of identity and meaning associated with the vocation of the teaching scholar—*What am I called to do in my life? How can my work be meaningful and satisfying? How can my work and my life encourage others to pursue lives and careers of meaning?*—are often read in a more "existential" or "spiritual" register (Astin & Astin, 2007). Social or cultural "big questions," on the other hand—*What are the causes of suffering and how can these be addressed? What is the nature of a civil society and how can it be sustained?*—emerge out of the specific contingencies of particular times and places and are read in a situational and ethical register (Giroux, 2000). The two registers are brought into conversation in the postsecondary classroom, I argue in this paper, through the vocational projections and pedagogical ideologies of teaching scholars as these shape classroom practice. Teaching which contributes to meaningful, positive social change is also teaching which contributes to meaningful, positive personal growth—understood intellectually, ethically, spiritually, and otherwise. As the Fellows worked with each other as colleagues and with their Mentors, the intersection of these registers—not always harmonious; indeed, often quite contradictory—characterized their developing vocational identities and pedagogical philosophies as these were expressed in a series of writing projects during the project: a vocational reflection before the first Learning and Teaching Academy, a revision of this reflection in the seminar, a statement of pedagogical philosophy, and periodic pedagogical reflections on the project blog site.

In this paper, I review and analyze the Fellows' discursive practice over the course of the Preparing Future Faculty Project by way of discerning both an developing vocational and pedagogical *habitus* in the field of religion and theology (Bourdieu, 1977) as well as the kernels of a transformational "pedagogy of educated hope" (Giroux, 2003) that participates in the "re-engineering" of the liberal arts "teaching machine" by emphasizing the interfacing of its ethical, political, and social functioning with its personal and existential role. I consider this *habitus* and transformational pedagogy as critical elements of an emerging "signature pedagogy" (Foster, et al, 2006) in religion and theology that more fully situates the field in the liberal education academy as central practical and "imaginative context in which teaching and learning can assign significance to a wide variety of kinds of knowledge and disciplines of thinking" (Sullivan, 2006) in ways that reach beyond the postsecondary experience to the most pressing needs faced by communities, nations, and the natural world today.

Panelist # 3
Martha E. Stortz
Professor of Historical Theology and Ethics
Teagle-Wabash Preparing Future Faculty Project Mentor
Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary/The Graduate Theological Union

"The Stakes involved in 'Going Spiritual': Mentoring Future Faculty toward Meaning and Value"

Abstract:

One of the biggest questions is belonging: we are the company we keep. How do we belong to the world? the academy, the institution, the faculty? In a sense, this is a question of citizenship, understood as concretely as what it means to "join a faculty" and understood as spiritually as what it

means to be a citizen of the universe. As new faculty wrestle with these questions, they model right -- and wrong! -- ways of belonging for their students. This presentation explores the big question of belonging by way of considering what happens in the postsecondary classroom in any discipline when faculty elect to 'go spiritual,' in the potent words of one colleague. What is at stake for students, faculty, and institution when questions of meaning and value are central to the exploration of academic content?

Description:

Recent scholarship by Alexander and Helen Astin and their colleague Jennifer Lindholm reveal both commonality and a conundrum in how undergraduates and their teachers understand the relationship between education and spirituality—a more culturally current word for the existential element of what the Preparing Future Faculty Project has been exploring more broadly as "big questions of meaning and value." On the one hand, the Astins' studies of undergraduates (Lindholm 2006) and of faculty members (Astin & Astin, 1999) show that both groups value education which engages them at the level of what they understand as the spiritual. Additional research has suggested that student centered pedagogies which connect to questions of meaning and value enhance not only the existential experience of postsecondary education, but also learning (Lindholm & Astin, 2008). Clearly, within the demands of academic content as it is presented across disciplines, *both* students and faculty members see deep engagement with big questions of meaning and value as sources of educational enrichment.

At the same time, faculty feel challenged, according to the Astins' research, by the risk of religiosity and the potential for proselytizing by both students and faculty when questions that seem "too spiritual" emerge from course content. A series of "listenings" with faculty, students, and administrators on "big questions" conducted by the Teagle Foundation in 2005 echoed this anxiety. But, the Astins' research and my own experience with colleagues—even in an institution in which "big questions" would seem to be our stock in trade—reveals a further, professional anxiety. "I worry," said a colleague who is also a Mentor on the Preparing Future Faculty Project, "when the class starts to 'go spiritual.'" Our discussion suggested that "going spiritual" represented a sliding into flights of academically ungirded spiritualizing that would undermine critical thinking and real learning in the classroom. The 65,000 faculty members who participated in the Astins' survey seemed to have worried about this "going spiritual" as well—about what it would do to learning in the classroom and how it might effect their professional status if it got out around the campus or within the wider discipline.

In this presentation, I explore how we *can* take up big questions of meaning of value—existential ones as well as broader culturally derived questions—without "going spiritual" in any academically or professionally nefarious way. One of the biggest questions is belonging: we are the company we keep. How do we belong to the world? the academy, the institution, the faculty? In a sense, this is a question of citizenship, understood as concretely as what it means to "join a faculty" and understood as spiritually as what it means to be a citizen of the universe. As new faculty wrestle with these questions, they model right -- and wrong! -- ways of belonging for their students. This presentation explores the big question of belonging by way of considering what happens in the postsecondary classroom in any discipline when faculty elect to 'go spiritual.' What is at stake for students, faculty, and institution when questions of meaning and value are central to the exploration of academic content? How doe we make such questions central to the academic rigor of our teaching. How do we mentor future faculty to move through the professional anxieties of "going

spiritual" so that they can contribute to the revitalization of liberal education rather than merely reproducing the sterile rehearsal of content that drains the academy of it relevance in the lives of students and faculty as they engage the wider world?

Panelists #4-5
Steven C. Bauman
Teagle-Wabash Preparing Future Faculty Doctoral Fellow
In Religion and Psychology
Graduate Theological Union
Berkeley, CA

Melissa James
Teagle-Wabash Preparing Future Faculty Doctoral Fellow
In Ethics and Social Theory
Graduate Theological Union
Berkeley, CA

"Big Questions of Vocation, Professional Identity, and Classroom Practice:
A Conversation between Colleagues"

Abstract:

Using words like "anguish," struggle, and "isolation," René Arcilla suggests that for today's students "disorientation is a central feature" of their postmodern education (Arcilla, 2007: 19). As James Donahue notes, such "confusion and alienation" instigate "an intense search for security and definition" (Donahue, 1988: 326), which both writers observe ends in premature resolution of the "big questions." This is highly problematic, as the premature closing off of possible futures restricts the scope of a student's world, and consequently, inhibits engagement with bigger questions. In this paper, two Preparing Future Faculty Project Fellows draw from work in their respective disciplines, their shared participation in this two-year project, and subsequent combined interdisciplinary efforts, to offer their own unique insights into this problem and provide suggestions for possible remedies which take seriously the Astins' challenge that 'there is much more faculty and colleges can do to facilitate students' spiritual development.' (HERI, 2005)

Description:

Using words like "anguish," struggle, and "isolation," René Arcilla suggests that for today's students "disorientation is a central feature" of their postmodern education (Arcilla, 2007: 19). As James Donahue notes, such "confusion and alienation" instigate "an intense search for security and definition" (Donahue, 1988: 326), which both writers observe ends in premature resolution of the "big questions." This is of course highly problematic, as the premature closing off of possible futures restricts the scope of a student's world, and consequently, inhibits engagement with bigger questions. In this paper, two Preparing Future Faculty Project Fellows draw from work in their respective disciplines, their shared participation in this two-year project, and subsequent combined interdisciplinary efforts, to offer their own unique insights into this problem and provide suggestions for possible remedies which take seriously the Astins' challenge that 'there is much more faculty and colleges can do to facilitate students' spiritual development.' (HERI, 2005)

In the first section, drawing upon participation in this project, and work in cognitive, developmental, and social psychology, one Fellow from the area of Religion and Psychology describes a faculty constructed learning environment, or "pedagogical container," characterized by *safety* (Garbarino, 1995), *solidarity,* and *high frustration tolerance* (Ellis), which elicits conditions of *flow* (Csikszentmihalyi), thereby enabling learning as an autotelic experience—having advantages not only

for classroom learning, but for students' spiritual development as well. Additionally, the Fellow argues that these four principles—flow, high frustration tolerance, safety, and solidarity—are also critical components of faculty spiritual development or else we risk anomie, burnout, (or worse), resentment in the profession (cf. Gardner, Csikszentmihalyi, & Damon, 2001).

Applying the work of a Project mentor in "spheres of wonder," this Fellow imagines the potential for a pedagogical practice of wonder to stimulate a habit of "knowledge seeking curiosity" (Bulkeley, 2005: 199), where exploration of neglected, repressed, or newly discovered "epistemological universes" (Beaudoin, 2003: 37), is unbounded. The Fellow concludes that it is precisely in moments of wonder, as students (and faculty) catch sight of an infinite horizon, that we will find our students (and ourselves) open to new big questions beyond our wildest dreams.

In section two, a Fellow in Ethics and Social Theory, argues further that big questions, when integrated into one's educational philosophy, shapes all aspects of teaching and scholarship. Within the Lutheran tradition, in which this Fellow is a rostered leader, these are often captured in the exploration of "vocation." Definitions for vocation vary from Parker Palmer's advice to listen for what one's life tells them (Palmer, 2000) or the ever popular definition offered by Frederick Buechner of vocation being where the desires of our hearts meet the world's greatest needs (Buechner, 1993) and many others. Drawing on work as Associate for Discernment and Mentoring in a vocation focused program for college students, this Fellow looks at how the questions "Who am I? Who are we? To whom/what are we accountable or connected? What are my gifts and passions? Who will benefit from the use of these gifts and passions?" shape both the understanding of the vocation of teaching as well as how students engage questions of vocation. The Fellow suggests that these questions are best addressed through the relationship between what bell hooks terms "engaged pedagogy" which focuses on the holistic education of students and what Ernest Boyer calls "scholarship of application." (Boyer, 1990)

In the final section of this paper, the Fellows offer what they saw as the most portable insights from the Preparing Future Faculty program for development of future faculty. Particular attention is paid to the importance of interdisciplinary collegiality and (in) authenticity of faculty members. For instance, through the PFF program, we found that contact with teachers and scholars from a variety of disciplines brought challenges and insights that shaped and expanded both our pedagogical resources as well as our ability to identify and frame "big questions." This in addition to developing authenticity in and out of the classroom based in our communities of accountability and our own spirituality shapes our ability to engage student is "big questions" of meaning and value and spirituality.