The CO–CA Cluster: Initiatives for Preparing Future Faculty

Susan E. Clarke, *University of Colorado, Boulder*
Oneida Meranto, *Metropolitan State College of Denver*
Jenny R. Kehl, *University of Colorado, Boulder*
With PFF participants

Why PFF...and Why Now?

In Golde and Dore's succinct analysis, "doctoral programs and doctoral students are operating at cross purposes." (2001, 44) While many factors contribute to this assessment, two are especially germane to the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) initiative: the question of mismatch and the limited notion of scholarship emphasized in many doctoral programs.

What's Wrong with the Ph.D.?

Most of us are familiar with the diagnoses of higher education woes as "too many Ph.D.s" or "not enough faculty jobs." Many national initiatives aimed at rethinking the doctorate, however, redefine the issue in ways that call into question the nature and purpose of doctoral education. To many, there is a growing sense of mismatch between the character of doctoral education and student goals as well as societal needs. As Golde and Dore (2001) report, "The training doctoral students receive is not what they want, nor does it prepare them for the jobs they take." In their survey of over 4000 doctoral students in 1999, 63% of the respondents answered "yes" when asked if they were "interested in a faculty job at any point in the future," and 24.1% said "maybe." But 48.2% see this as a "definitely" realistic option with 43.1% considering it a "possibly" realistic option. Anyone familiar with the political science job market will find this optimism unsettling.

The purpose of doctoral education is also under scrutiny. Few challenge the notion that the Ph.D. is and should be a research degree. But a broader concept of scholarship encompasses the scholarships of integration, application, and teaching as well as the scholarship of discovery (Boyer 1990). To the extent that doctoral education programs slight teaching, they deter many students from pursuing one of the passions that brought them into graduate programs. They also limit their chances to develop a broad set of transferable skills that will prepare them for academic and nonacademic jobs. In Golde and Dore's survey, 83% cited "enjoyment of teaching" as a factor influencing their decision to pursue a graduate degree, but a much smaller percentage reported feeling confident and prepared to take on these teaching tasks. As one of Nyquist et al.'s (1999) student respondents characterizes it, "I hear every day that it's an irrational choice to spend time on teaching. I have not felt that teaching is valued within the department. It's belittled, basically—only he who is not a good researcher has to be a good teacher."

Unraveling the mismatch issue and asking what we really want our political science graduate students to learn can lead departments into uncharted territory. But these are the kinds of issues and questions we need to confront if the doctorate in political science is to retain its meaning and value. Hewing to a narrow perspective on the purpose of graduate education and a limited concept of scholarship ignores the many ways in which the problem-solving skills developed during doctoral training can be applied in socially beneficial ways. It also tends to blind us to the diverse academic job opportunities available to students beyond the Research-1 orbit.

Political Science and the Future Professoriate

By sponsoring conferences, issuing reports, awarding grants, producing publications and providing other supports, a core set of organizations increasingly acts as a subsystem defining doctoral education issues and generating a range of potential reforms[1]. One of the most important reform efforts is the PFF initiative. PFF is nationally recognized as one of the most comprehensive efforts to address these concerns by expanding the preparation for the professoriate—and beyond—available to graduate students; it emphasizes giving graduate students experience with many facets of faculty roles and responsibilities and with many types of institutional settings.

In its last funding period, PFF funds were allocated competitively through disciplinary associations rather than through the central PFF apparatus. APSA's proactive response to this opportunity is one of several indicators of the discipline's growing sensitivity to graduate education issues. APSA's rostering program, for example, reflects recommendations in many recent analyses of doctoral education for providing greater transparency and more information about the nature of doctoral programs and faculty roles, placement rates, and departmental programs supporting professional development of graduate students. Most recently, APSA President Theda Skocpol has named a special Task Force on Graduate Education, chaired by David Collier (Berkeley).

The Window on the Boulder Campus

Similarly, graduate education issues are on the agenda in the political science department at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Many aspects of our graduate program work well. The department ranks highly in terms of the productivity of its Ph.D. students (McCormick and Rice 2001). We've reconsidered how to make the comprehensive exam format more flexible and more appropriate to varied student research paths. There is a departmental tradition of collaborative research and publication by faculty members and graduate students; increasingly, graduate student collaborations with each other result in joint- and single-authored publications. Students also receive departmental support for participation in conferences and summer research-skill workshops. Students excelling in research *and* teaching are awarded mini-fellowships for a semester. Our two-semester, one-credit hour course on Teaching Political Science was developed and offered regularly prior to PFF funding. Graduate students are active in departmental governance as nonvoting members of recruitment committees and other ad hoc committees. Their organization, Graduates in Political Science, operates with an independent budget. They also organized the Mentors of Political Science to offer peer mentoring (see Fugate, Jaramillo, and Preuhs 2001); MOPS organizes workshops, brown-bag lunches, and other activities in which senior graduate students mentor their younger peers.

But as in most departments, faculty held differing views on how best to train our students; as in many departments, we rarely had the luxury to ask ourselves what we wanted our students to learn as they prepared to be future faculty. We saw the APSA competition for Preparing Future Faculty programs as an opportunity to continue and expand a series of reforms in our graduate training program.

Fortunately, the campus window for graduate education initiatives was wide open. The University of Colorado at Boulder campus participated in earlier, non-disciplinary-based rounds of PFF. Boulder also supports a nationally recognized Graduate Teacher Program (GTP) on campus; Dr. Laura Border directs a series of workshops and seminars designed to provide graduate students with a certificate in teaching skills. Boulder is also one of 14 universities invited to participate in the Woodrow Wilson Foundation's Responsive Ph.D. project. The campus is also home to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

four Carnegie Scholars, one of the largest cohorts in any university; all are involved in both graduate and undergraduate education initiatives. So the timing was right for the disciplinary-based PFF IV awards: the department was reshaping its doctoral program; graduate education initiatives on campus had momentum; a number of faculty were successful in gaining competitive external funds to support various professional development programs; an institutional infrastructure existed to support graduate professional development; and there were sufficient "champions" of doctoral reform initiatives in higher administration to support those willing to take on these challenges.

Launching a PFF Program

In June 2000, APSA awarded a Phase IV PFF grant to the University of Colorado at Boulder; the PFF cluster included a second graduate institution—Stanford University—and several partner institutions: San Jose State University, U.S. Air Force Academy, University of Colorado at Denver, and Metropolitan State College of Denver. Our joint proposal emphasized the multi-ethnic, multi-cultural context in which our campuses operated. To us, that meant more pluralistic, integrative training in our graduate education programs and more extensive preparation of our graduate students for a range of job prospects. In the absence of such changes, we anticipated the loss of future generations of graduate students and young faculty finding little relevance in traditional political science graduate programs. Growing diversity in the graduate and undergraduate student populations will present another set of challenges: future faculty are likely to be teaching undergraduate and graduate students from more varied ethnic, racial, and class backgrounds. Our goal was to address the implications of this greater diversity for research training, teaching and learning styles, and professional development.

Cluster PaFrtnerships

Linking Stanford and Colorado with cluster partners serving multiethnic and multicultural students addressed our concerns with training and teaching a broader range of students. Metro State, CU-Denver, and San Jose State feature highly diverse student bodies, including many first-generation students. Although this suited our design, the CO–CA cluster also stemmed from personal and professional relationships among participants. All the cluster partners had some sort of tie to at least one other partner when the project began.

Our kick-off conference in Boulder in 2000 identified several issues that became pervasive themes over the grant period: the distinctive campus environments represented by each cluster member; the PS academic job market; the extent to which Ph.D. training prepares students for nonacademic paths; and new programs that might add to the skills of students interested in nonacademic options. Our Colorado–California cluster meeting held in California in January 2002, organized by Luis Fraga, Stanford University, and Terry Christensen, San Jose State University, became the signature CO–CA event. At Stanford, the workshops featured strategies for publishing/research, developing career paths, creating teaching portfolios, consulting with Stanford's Teaching and Learning Center, race and ethnicity issues in the classroom, and alternative professional development models. Terry Christensen and his colleagues organized sessions on the San Jose State campus focusing on learning from SJSU's success in placing students in internships, working with multicultural student populations, considering service learning options, and anticipating the first year on the faculty.

Although we'd hoped for more cluster activities, these workshops offered prime opportunities to get together. While the CO–CA cluster enjoys a locational advantage, capitalizing on proximity has not been as easy as anticipated. This is due in part to the overload that faculty and grad students face: even the 30 miles between Denver and Boulder or the scenic 90-minute trip to Colorado Springs seems to present too many logistical hazards in the midst of the semester. We spent more time together as a cluster when we traveled to other locations. The CO–CA cluster participation in the national PFF conferences in Colorado Springs (2000) and Boston (2001), and in PFF sessions at APSA meetings proved to be key opportunities to spend time with each other and to meet faculty and students in other PFF-like programs. One implication is that participation by cluster faculty and graduate students in brief 2-day multidisciplinary workshops might be a realistic alternative to the repeated mentoring visits currently advocated by the PFF program. More staff support to help organize joint activities is an obvious solution, but time constraints are persistent barriers to greater contact and visits, even among neighboring campuses.

Lessons Learned

The observations of Jenny Rebecca Kehl, University of Colorado at Boulder and cluster partner faculty member Dr. Oneida Meranto, Metropolitan State College of Denver, point to other lessons learned from the CO–CA collaboration.[2]

Jenny Rebecca Kehl, University of Colorado at Boulder: The Value-Added of Preparing Future Faculty

For graduate students, Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) offers future faculty a more comprehensive understanding of the responsibilities of faculty and the variations between academic institutions. However, the greatest value-added of PFF is from professional skills development and job preparedness, not solely exposure to different academic environments. PFF equips future faculty to be *successful* in academia. The conferences and workshops provide concrete strategies for doing the job of faculty, and doing it well. It helps demystify how, specifically, to demonstrate competence in fulfilling the responsibilities of faculty.

The value-added from PFF is most notable in two areas: the balance of teaching and research, and the preparation for an academic job appointment. PFF works to cultivate competent and effective scholars in teaching and research. Most of this work is done through conferences and workshops that facilitate the exchange of ideas and practical techniques for teaching and learning. PFF also holds formal discussions how to balance both teaching and research responsibilities, and more advanced discussions about how teaching and research can inform and serve each other.

The balance of teaching and research can be framed in the context of making substantive contributions to the criticism and growth of knowledge (Lakatos and Musgrave 1997). In addition to teacher training for future faculty, PFF also offers information and practical strategies for how to conduct and publish scholarly research. The program provides conference meetings and workshops with practical applications, such as what to include in a cover letter to the editor when submitting an article for publication, and how to write a book prospectus.

The PFF training helps to develop more advanced graduate students and facilitate their smooth transition into faculty. This is most evident as graduate students start out on the job market. The site visits and exposure to a wide variety of academic environments show the different balance of responsibilities, and help future faculty pick the right type of institution for their skills and interests. It can make the application process more deliberate, and the selection process more accurate in matching new faculty with other colleagues, undergraduate student bodies, and institutional environments. Another important aspect of PFF regarding job preparation is the exchange of information about the expectations of potential employers at colleges and universities. Participants in PFF have the opportunity to talk to faculty about what skills they need to develop in order to be marketable, how to gain those skills and experiences, and most importantly, how to demonstrate their capabilities on the job market. A less obvious, but equally important, result of this preparation is that when the future faculty become new faculty these skills continue to be beneficial. New faculty continue to use PFF information and strategies for demonstrating their competence as scholars, in both teaching and research, which benefits them in the tenure process.

One improvement that could be made is to reorient the focus from a traditional training format to a more experimental, innovative training style. In other words, use the PFF workshops to *model* new or innovative teaching techniques, rather than using a lecture format to describe or explain innovative teaching techniques. Another area in which PFF could improve is in training future faculty to be more deliberate and more explicit

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

about the rationale behind their course design. One of the most common concerns that comes up in the classroom is "why do we have to do this?" Students are often unclear on the purpose that specific assignments serve. This is particularly salient if teachers ask students to do something that is uncommon in the rest of their classes such as public speaking, group presentations, classroom debates, classroom simulations, graphing, modeling theory, long research papers, or critical analysis exercises. For example, the class may be designed to serve four purposes (or any combination the teacher determines to be appropriate): to communicate information about the subject, to improve critical analysis skills regarding that subject, to improve writing skills, and to heighten civic engagement. If the teacher can directly link each assignment to a specific purpose of the class, students may be more amenable to the assignment and may see more clearly why it is a beneficial skill for them to develop. Although it seems intuitive, it is not and cannot be assumed.

In sum, the most value-added by PFF is found in its training of graduate students to make a smooth transition into being faculty. PFF contributes to this process by suggesting concrete strategies for balancing teaching and research responsibilities, discussing a variety of teaching styles and classroom management techniques, and increasing preparedness for the job market. In the future, PFF could adjust its focus from a conventional training style to more experiential training techniques. This would provide actual models of distinct teaching techniques and allow future faculty to experiment with different learning environments. In addition, PFF can work to encourage future faculty to be more deliberate about the purpose of their teaching and more explicit about the methods they employ to achieve that purpose. With these new directions and the current contributions, PFF will continue to be beneficial to the professional development of graduate students and to the success of new scholars as they become faculty.

Oneida Meranto, Metropolitan State College of Denver: Views from the Cluster

Naturally, the main objectives of the PFF Program are very appealing to Metropolitan State College of Denver (MSCD). Our school is a large urban state school with a student population of 19,000. The average age of a student is 27, and a large number of them have numerous concerns that prevent education from being a top priority. MSCD is a non-traditional college where many of our students are first generation college students. The level of diversity, the required community and school service, plus teaching four classes per semester often requires more preparation and training than typically offered in Ph.D. programs.

The number of full-time faculty in our Political Science Department is small, making us highly dependent on adjunct professors to teach the numerous classes we offer. More importantly, given the current economic situation, and the projected cuts foreseen in higher education, it is very likely that the trend to hire more part-time faculty will continue. This reality has forced our department to seek alternatives that have the potential of strengthening our teaching capacities to our diverse and ever-increasing student population.

What then are the potential benefits we see for our department by participating in the PFF Program as a partner institution? One of the goals of PFF is to enhance and expand doctoral training by exposing graduate students to a variety of higher education institutions. Combine this goal with the stated role of partner institutions that do not have graduate students, such as MSCD, and a marriage of sorts develops. Our participation in the PFF Program no doubt becomes a win-win solution for the hosting and home schools as well as reaching the main goal of the PFF Program: preparing future faculty.

Not all graduate students will teach in a setting that replicates the environment of their graduate school or are these graduate schools able to address the numerous situations any one of their graduate students might confront. That is to say, many of these students will accept teaching positions in community colleges, state or private colleges or an assortment of institutions that are very diverse from the setting with which they are familiar. To prepare future faculty without recognizing this array of diverse settings, is to inadequately prepare future faculty.[3]

Many of the adjunct professors that MSCD hires are well published and often fully understand the importance of publishing, particularly while seeking full-time employment. What many of them do not understand is how to become accomplished in teaching, publishing and service, and recognizing the importance of these areas even though they may not become full-time faculty. The competitive nature of the discipline demands that graduate students and adjunct faculty learn not only how to teach and publish but also how to do so in schools that possibly weigh differently faculty teaching, publishing, and service.

PFF alerts future faculty to the importance of learning how to juggle the responsibilities of teaching, publishing and service. Since an important role of a partner institution such as MSCD is maintaining a strong connection to the community, service learning and community service is a relevant and important area. Many of our adjunct professors are well connected with agencies in the community. In addition, MSCD encourages a hands-on approach to learning. In order to complement the classroom experience we encourage our students and faculty to participate in those experiences that provide a forum for practicing the knowledge they receive or share in the classroom, i.e. working for political parties, campaigns, or interning at government agencies.

What then does a partner institution such as MSCD "get out" of being a partner in the PFF Program? The PFF Program benefits our department in the following ways: it creates and maintains strong ties with other institutions of higher education; educates our PFF representatives to the ever-changing needs of the discipline of Political Science; prepares future faculty who may or may not become part of our institution to be a better educator of Political Science; provides graduate students and adjunct professors with a forum for learning how to improve their teaching, publishing, and participation in community service, which in turn has the capacity to significantly enrich the discipline; exposes our department to a variety of pedagogical approaches; and prevents our department from developing feelings of isolation within the discipline—it keeps us informed.

Many of our newly hired faculty suggest that they understand the responsibilities associated with being a faculty at our school. However, it soon becomes apparent that many of them do not. Given our distinctive institutional mission and student constituencies, we discovered few faculty are prepared to teach at MSCD. Our efforts at partnerships with other universities persuaded us of the need for a PFF-like structure to guide these partnerships.

Since becoming a participant in PFF, our primary goal as a partner institution has changed. Our department still believes that graduate students and undergraduate students share a unique understanding of the discipline and bringing graduate students into our classrooms may encourage our students to consider higher learning, but that is no longer our only goal. Rather, our goal, simply put, is "preparing future faculty." Our short participation in the PFF Program has provided tools that enable MSCD to focus more directly on creating conditions that improve teacher training. As a result of our partnership with PFF we now understand that a major component in our other partnerships is often missing: the necessary skills to train, expose and assist graduate students in becoming future faculty. Overall, we suspect that with our participation and the participation of other partner institutions in the PFF Program, political science as a discipline will broaden its scope and improve significantly.

How Did the CO–CA Cluster Do?

Boulder and Stanford students are oriented towards professional development at a very early stage of their graduate careers. Did PFF make a difference among these motivated, well-organized students? They say it did: several students commented that PFF gave them more teaching skills and understanding as well as a better sense of academic lives beyond R-1 university settings. Several participated in panels on PFF and professional development at APSA and Midwest conferences; some also published on graduate education issues (Fugate, Jaramillo, and Preuhs 2001; Kehl 2002). There is some evidence that PFF has made individual students more successful on the job market. Political science students participating in earlier phases of PFF at CU report that their PFF experiences and mentorships

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were instrumental in gaining their current faculty positions.

To gain a sense of the strengths of this initial venture and areas where we need to improve the program, we asked graduate student participants for their views on where and how the program makes a difference.

Adam Resnick (Assistant Professor, Western Washington State): I participated in the 98–99 academic year (PFF III). I did my PFF stint at the U.S. Air Force Academy with Lt. Col. Gwendolyn Hall, doing around five visits total, each one covering about 2/3 of a workday (e.g. 8-2). I found the experience quite worthwhile and am very glad to have participated. First, the program was very loosely structured. That worked fine for me: I signed up for one of the site visits and I found a mentor in short order, based on faculty I met that day. Second, I was lucky to have Gwen as my mentor. The success of my visits was the result of her efforts to expose me to a variety of settings at the institution including Academy-level committee meetings, in-class simulations, small seminars, lunchtime faculty workouts and office hours. Third, I learned many valuable lessons, particularly lessons about how an undergraduate-focused institution works differently from a Research 1 institution. Those folks do research, but their primary "mission," as they put it, is training young future officers. The idea of PFF, as it was presented to me, was that we'd get to see how things work at different types of institutions. I definitely got that and I have found it quite valuable in my transition to a smaller, teaching oriented university.

The PFF highlights included: the opportunity to craft a customized experience at the institution of my choice, with a faculty member of my choice; many good lessons about teaching at a more liberal arts type of place; the opportunity to see how different other departments are in terms of research/student focus, collegiality, role within the broader institution and other factors—I found this very valuable during my later job talks; meeting colleagues, who all treated this ABD, stressed out student with hospitality and candor. Some might be helped by more structure, but there are flexibility downsides to that; a little more financial sweetener, particularly for the travel time involved, would help. But overall, the program was great for me. I think it relied on an enthusiastic mentor and a self-starter student, both willing to risk valuable time for an unknown payoff.

David Lai (Assistant Professor, U.S. Air War College/DFS): As one of the first group of graduate students to participate in the Preparing Future Faculty program at CU Boulder, I found the program very valuable and enjoyable. Through this program, I established contact with a faculty member at the Air Force Academy. We then developed a course on East Asia Politics. With financial support from the PFF, I made several trips to the Academy and gave guest lectures to the seminar there. We did not have this course in the CU Boulder PS curriculum; as a graduate student, I was not in a position to propose a new one. But I felt back then that a teaching experience in this subject would be a valuable addition to my curriculum vitae. I was very grateful that the PFF was inaugurated. It offered us an opportunity to pursue something that was not available in our home department.

Greg Young (doctoral candidate, University of Colorado): First, there is very little in the curriculum to get us excited about teaching and that is what most of us will be doing with our degrees. The three PFF seminars that I attended reminded me of that fact. Teaching will never replace research in the minds of promotion and tenure committees, yet more research will only very rarely get our undergraduates to leave the classroom with more information to make them better citizens or better critical thinking skills with which to maneuver the pitfalls of life. No matter how many years one has been teaching, it is always a benefit to watch others and to update one's techniques and pedagogy. Maybe PFF should be expanded to more senior faculty as well. PAF (Preparing All Faculty) might be more appropriate. Second, we tend to be very insular in our graduate study. It is very good just to get out and see how other folks do the same thing we do.

Greg Fugate (Analyst, Colorado Office of the State Audior): Our PFF program not only addressed the political science career in various academic environments, but also ventured into non-academic careers. While this is not the primary focus of PFF, for students like myself I found our discussions about the non-academic career (or dare I say post-academic career!) to be insightful and to touch on issues that are likely to become more central to political science as a discipline. Indeed, political science, in my view, seems to remain very much within the walls of the academic institutions and only rarely, at election time, does it move beyond them. However, I have found through my own experiences at the Colorado Office of the State Auditor that graduate training in political science prepares students to do much more than simply research or teach in the university/college environment. Of particular value to me was/is the broad, non-subfield-specific, training in analytical and critical thinking, testing theories, and evaluating large amounts of information. In order to market myself in the non-academic world of state government, I had to change, perhaps broaden, my focus. No longer is the academic community the sole or even primary consumer of my work. With this slight adjustment to my target audience, I found that my graduate training continued to serve me well outside academia. The PFF discussions and forums provided me (and several other students) the chance to explore these additional career possibilities. Until I started participating, I too, had a rather myopic view of what I could do with a Ph.D. in political science.

Eric Brahm (graduate student, University of Colorado) We do a pretty good job at preparing researchers, but PFF has been useful for me in terms of developing an understanding of my other obligations as an academic. I have been able to draw on the experience of other participating faculty and students; I have a greater awareness of resources available to me and a better understanding of the range of job opportunities I will be faced with. It was a nice balance between things that can help me now in my recitations and things that will pay off in my job search and career in general. In terms of areas of improvement, I think we could have done a better job of sustaining momentum along the way. It is difficult to have more regular functions given how busy we all are, but it would be beneficial.

And finally, a newly minted Ph.D. on the job market notes that "PFF provides training and experience in pedagogy for the college classroom, with the goal of making future faculty more effective teachers and enabling them to balance the demands of teaching, service and research placed on young faculty. And it meets these goals well.

But it also provides a bonus for the young job-seeker—something that can perhaps help land that first job. Having participated in PFF conferences, I was better able to convey to my interviewers that I had a vision of the life I would lead as an assistant professor, and that I had definite plans for fulfilling my research agenda while being a good teacher and university citizen. And I was able to provide to the graduate students who I might end up teaching the next year a vision of the pedagogy-improving and career-building programs (modeled on PFF) I would be able to establish in their department. The faculty were reassured that I had a realistic map for navigating the road to tenure, and the graduate students were excited to know that I could offer them more than specialized knowledge."

Embedding PFF as a Goal in Political Science

If we move beyond the "too many Ph.D.s/too few jobs" diagnoses, a more strategic assessment of graduate education in political science begins to emerge. The gains from a more reflective and strategic approach include not only improving the training of Ph.D. students but also developing a stronger sense of stewardship for the discipline. The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate emphasizes the importance of disciplinary stewards: they are capable of generating new knowledge, of understanding how political science fits into the larger intellectual landscape, and of applying and transforming disciplinary knowledge in different arenas. The sense of stewardship implies an active responsibility to care for the well-being of the discipline by preserving the "best of the past" while also moving the discipline forward. Preparing future faculty who understand their professional responsibilities in these larger terms, rather than in terms of individualistic career advancement and departmental reputations, would serve the discipline well in future years.

PFF is only one model for developing future faculty. And it is important to recognize that two years is not enough time to expect PFF to make major changes in the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

culture and orientations of a department, much less the discipline. Four PFF programs are operating in political science departments; a number of departments participated in earlier PFF campus programs; even more are involved in various aspects of graduate education initiatives; and many others have independently developed programs to focus on professional development as a goal in their graduate programs.[4] Formal evaluations are probably premature (and face some of the evaluation issues noted here); for such a short time period, the primary impacts are on the individual students and faculty participating. But there is an opportunity to use the recent PFF experiences to assess the prospects for the next generation of graduate education reforms.

Time and Money

Of course, more resources would strengthen the effectiveness of the program. Our experience, however, indicates time constraints are at least as significant as funding issues. Limitations on the uses of PFF funds mean that it has not been possible to "buy" faculty time or support student involvement in ways that mitigate the time constraints. With the inability to support staff or provide stipends, PFF existed and prospered depending on the other obligations of the principal faculty. Lack of time to focus on the implementation of the program, therefore, is chronic for all cluster participants.

For both students and faculty, there are significant opportunity costs in participating in PFF activities. While there is not the resistance to such participation often noted in the sciences, there are many competing demands on faculty and student time. Graduate students, in particular, are too overloaded to share in the direction of the program without some support. In the absence of organizational and support staff to handle the complex logistics of setting up visits, meetings, and conferences among faculty and graduate students at several different campuses, faculty and student participation is likely to dwindle. As a colleague in a PFF program in another department at Boulder pointed out, "It takes a lot of time and energy to make PFF work. This cannot be an add-on to faculty who are already overburdened and underpaid!"

The absence of adequate support for PFF-like programs underscores one of the many ways in which doctoral programs operate at cross purposes. Recent empirical studies document the unrealistic expectations graduate students have about the job market and their career trajectories as well as about the daily demands on university faculty. Seeing and hearing first-hand how faculty deal with these tensions and uncertainties is an invaluable factor in student success. An intangible value of PFF, therefore, is the insights into the realities of academic life that become available to students through observations of faculty life. But without a properly supported PFF infrastructure, neither faculty nor students will find these opportunities.

Institutionalization

Institutionalizing PFF on campus and in political science departments is an ongoing challenge. As R-1 universities, both CU and Stanford have unique missions, structures, and cultures. As Cuban (1999) argues, research trumps teaching in these institutions, not to mention nonacademic interests and civic engagement. Any effective integration of a broader agenda in graduate education must be framed in the logic and language of the research culture. Along these lines, we have instinctively framed our PFF goals in terms of professional development, but more widely than academic options alone.

The institutional locus for PFF is not always obvious. At many public universities, graduate student funding is based on undergraduate enrollments and teaching-assistant positions. As a result, it is debatable whether PFF is a broader function of a college of arts and sciences with primary responsibility for undergraduate education or a Graduate School's mission to support graduate education. In the process, and in the absence of an administrative "champion," PFF can languish and remain underfunded.

Clusters and Partnerships

The value-added for the partner institutions can be unclear. Gaining sufficient, significant participation from faculty and students facing heavy teaching, research, and service responsibilities at the partner "consumer" campuses can be daunting. From their perspective, the gains from participating in the PFF initiative can be mixed and long-term at best. To the extent that they serve as a "demonstration" of academic life beyond the R-1 setting, there is little incentive for their participation, which ultimately depends on good will and a generous spirit rather than any evidence of concrete benefits. So the benefits for the "consumer" schools need to be reconsidered and better articulated in future PFF programs.

Measuring Effectiveness

Even with more time, more funding, and greater program certainty, the measurement issues remain problematic: there is some danger of being seduced into the typical success measures of the political economy of academia—numbers of articles on PFF published, citations, etc. Yet the assumption is that something else is meant to happen to PFF participants. How do we capture this?

Tracking and assessment issues are troublesome. Tracking alumni requires staff resources. The Boulder Political Science department maintains reasonable records on grad alumni but there is no way to claim that PFF or any of our other graduate education initiatives made a difference in their job prospects and choices unless we ask them on a systematic and consistent basis. The department is devising "exit interview" mechanisms for its own evaluation purposes but I suspect we are not alone in dealing with a campus with few resources available for graduate education assessment.

There is also the "substitution" issue: what occurs through PFF that wouldn't have occurred without PFF interventions? Individual measures are not sufficient here: most CU and Stanford graduates get academic jobs if that is their goal; most get tenure, publish in leading journals, and become active in disciplinary activities and other hallmarks of academic life. They did this before PFF and they will continue to do so independent of their involvement in PFF activities. Similarly, our cluster partners will continue their adroit management of complex teaching, research, and service commitments as they did prior to PFF. On occasion, they may hire adjuncts from their PFF partners and send their students to PFF campuses but this would be a modest increase in existing patterns.

Rather, the substitution issue can be addressed more pragmatically as an organizational need. PFF lowers the transaction costs, if you will, for departments recognizing the need to complement their research training with a broader professional development orientation. To many of the student participants, PFF provides a structure for learning about faculty life and talking about teaching and civic engagement issues. Not that this does not or could not happen in the absence of PFF—it surely does—but PFF provides an organizational structure that ensures it happens for all those students interested in exploring these issues. It also legitimates these broader concerns, especially for students in intense, competitive R-1 settings who seek some context that permits questioning and exploring other career dimensions.

PFF-like departmental programs also "signal" potential students and faculty of a departmental commitment to an extensive and intensive program of graduate training. A more extensive graduate program integrates professional development agendas with the more intensive graduate training every political science department offers to its Ph.D. students. And as Oneida Meranto points out, four year colleges gain as well from seeing their adjunct and mentoring choices in a professional development orientation rather than strictly in terms of filling teaching slots.

The Role for APSA

As we see it, the disciplinary associations play a critical role for the next generation of PFF. To the extent that professional development is grounded in disciplinary values and cultures, PFF needs to be as well. There is little belief in broad, generic "PFF-principles" that presume to stretch across disciplines. It remains for each discipline to track and interpret critical trends in higher education along with the findings from campus and regional initiatives in graduate education and to apply these understandings within disciplinary conditions and contexts. Our PFF experience, for example, suggests the next generation of PFF in political science could benefit from seeing

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

professional development in broader terms rather than sampling the range of possible campus settings in which students might work. The intellectual excitement and problem solving skills that are the heart of any graduate education program are transferable to a wide range of important responsibilities outside the university.

Disciplinary associations are also best able to articulate PFF with other graduate education initiatives: Carnegie's Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and CID programs; the debate on "reforming the Ph.D.," voiced by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation; and programs supported by the AAHE, the AACU, and the Council of Graduate Schools among others. It would be mutually beneficial to link these efforts, particularly in light of the new APSA Task Force on Graduate Education. APSA can serve as a conduit for bringing information about these initiatives to the membership; it might also provide links and resources on the larger graduate education assessment agenda.

A more distinctive APSA role is also possible: many of the conversations at national PFF conferences center on initiating summer workshops—on a regional or national basis-addressing professional development issues within disciplines. There are a growing number of models for providing research training workshops—ECPSR, ICPSR, CQRM—but little experience yet in designing discipline-specific programs for professional development.[5] Developing a summer professional development program linked to or incorporating PFF—and perhaps coinciding with prospective teaching workshops—would increase the viability of PFF, demonstrate APSA's value to an expanded constituency, and provide incentives for further faculty involvement in campus efforts.

Given the critical issues regarding graduate training and broader professional development needs, APSA initiatives need to reach beyond the usual R-1 stakeholders to address the broader membership working in other academic settings, including community colleges. Our PFF experience indicates this membership will need solid incentives for participating in PFF-like programs. Similarly, creating alliances with political scientists working outside the academy seems another necessary step but one where the payoffs for participation by the nonacademics are not especially clear.

These uncharted territories may be mapped by relying on the hallmarks of the scholarship of discovery—the traditional research culture—to indicate how to prepare and initiate the next generation of disciplinary leaders. PFF suggests we identify the purpose of doctoral education in political science in the face of the trends and changing conditions reshaping American higher education, frame apparent problems with doctoral education programs as opportunities to analyze and redesign the mechanisms by which we produce Ph.D. students, "go public" with these critiques and analyses in the same way we publish our findings on research problems, build on the practices and experiences of other departments through critical assessments of their practices, and reward departments and faculty contributing to a better understanding of the pedagogy of research and of teaching.

Notes

1. The National Science Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, and Pew Charitable Trust provide important support for graduate education initiatives. The Re-envisioning the Ph.D. project funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate are especially influential fora. With NSF support, for example, the Geography Faculty Development Alliance at the University of Colorado at Boulder provides early career faculty and advanced doctoral students with summer workshops on the scholarship of teaching and learning, linking research and teaching, field study, faculty roles, and more practical knowledge—such as time management and student assessments—essential to balancing the diverse responsibilities facing new faculty members. Follow-up seminars and panels at the annual disciplinary conference continue the summer activities and extend them to other participants (Ken Foote, PI: NSF DUE-0089434).

2. These comments and those from other graduate student participants later in the text are abridged to meet page limit restrictions; the full set of comments is available from APSA in Susan E. Clarke. 2002. *Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) in Political Science, 2000–2002 Report on the Activities of the Colorado-California Clusters in Year II.*

3. The tensions new faculty face when teaching in diverse settings were fully addressed at the 2002 CO–CA PFF meetings at San Jose State University: how to introduce new perspectives; how to encourage students to draw on their own experiences; how to prepare students to function in their home cultures or in an emergent global culture; and assisting students in developing definitions of critical thinking, literacy, and argument.

4. Many of these graduate education initiatives are described at www.apsanet.org, graduate education sections; information on PFF programs is available at cgsnet.org and www.aahe.org. A national inventory of programs encouraging the scholarship of teaching and learning is available at The University of Kansas' Center for Teaching Excellence site www.ku.edu/~cte. See also www.carnegiefoundation.org for the range of programs supported by Carnegie. A key resource for information on professional development programs is at www.podweb.org.

5. In addition to the four PFF projects, more specialized campus-based initiatives include NSF ADVANCE projects and campus programs supported by Pew, Carnegie, and other foundations. This is not to slight the contributions of programs such as NSF's IGERT and Young Investigator awards but to suggest the specialized research training available through such programs is likely to have greater impact if young scholars develop a broader sense of stewardship for the discipline.

References

Boyer, Ernest. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered.* Carnegie Foundation.

Susan E. Clarke. 2002. Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) in Political Science, 2000–2002 Report on the Activities of the Colorado-California Clusters in Year II. Washington, DC: APSA.

Cuban, Larry. 1999. *How Scholars Trumped Teachers: Change without Reform in University Curriculum, Teaching, and Research, 1890–1990.* Teachers College Press.

Fugate, Gregory A., Patricia A. Jaramillo, and Robert R. Preuhs. 2001. "Graduate Students Mentoring Graduate Students: A Model for Professional Development." *PS* 34: March.

Golde, C.M., and Dore, T.M. (2001). *At Cross Purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education* (www.phd-survey.org). Philadelphia, PA: A report prepared for The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Kehl, Jenny R. 2002. "Indicators of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Political Science." *PS* 35: June.

Lakatos, Imre; Musgrave, Alan (Eds). 1997. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCormick, James M., and Tom W. Rice. 2001. "Graduate Training and Research Productivity in the 1990s: A Look at Who Publishes."*PS* 34: September.

Nyquist, Jody D. Laura Manning, Donald H. Wulff, Ann E. Austin, Jo Sprague, Patricia K. Fraser, Claire Calcagno, and Bettina Woodford. 1999. "On the Road to Becoming a Professor: The graduate student experience." *Change* May–June, p. 18–27.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001245 Published online by Cambridge University Press