

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON TESTING AND TRAINING PROSPECTIVE GSIs

9/02

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Constance Cook, Chair

- Director, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT)
- Janet Gerson**, Department of Economics (LS&A)
- John Godfrey**, Assistant Dean, International Education (Rackham)
- Nancy Kerner**, Department of Chemistry (LS&A)
- Diane Larsen-Freeman**, Director, English Language Institute (ELI)
- Elizabeth Mullane**, Treasurer, Michigan Student Assembly (MSA)
- Irfan Nooruddin**, Graduate Employees Organization (GEO); doctoral student in Political Science (LS&A)
- Rachel Parker**, School of Music Representative, Michigan Student Assembly (MSA)
- Christine Psujek**, Student Services Associate, Program in Biology (LS&A)
- Paul Rasmussen**, Associate Dean, Research & Graduate Studies (LS&A)
- Douglas Richstone**, Chair, Department of Astronomy (LS&A)
- Romesh Saigal**, Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering, College of Engineering
- Pavitra Sundar**, Graduate Employees Organization (GEO); doctoral student in English and Women's Studies (LS&A)
- Crisca Bierwert** (ex officio), Interim Assistant Director, CRLT
- Sarah Briggs** (ex officio), Testing and Certification, ELI
- Peggy Westrick** (ex officio), Program Representative, Research and Graduate Studies (LS&A)
- Adele Smaill** (GEO alternate), doctoral student in Music

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON TESTING AND TRAINING PROSPECTIVE GSIs

9/02

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Task Force Endorsements

Endorsement by Task Force Members

Endorsement by Graduate Employees Organization (GEO)

Task Force Report

Executive Summary

Findings and Observations

Recommendations

- I. Establish procedures for ongoing evaluation of GSI testing and training programs
- II. Expand and improve GSI training programs so that all units have a minimum of four hours of pedagogical training
- III. Without discriminating on the basis of citizenship, identify which graduate students require testing and training of English language classroom competency
- IV. Establish equitable and adequate pre-teaching training for all UM GSIs
- V. Establish equitable and adequate monitoring, mentoring and additional training for all GSIs while they are teaching

Appendices

- I. Charge to Task Force
- II. Task Force Meeting Dates and Agendas
- III. Background Information and Bibliography on GSI Training
- IV. GSI Training at CIC Institutions
- V. Table: Numbers of GSIs by School and College
- VI. Table: Numbers of New GSIs by School and College
- VII. Table: Graduate Students Teaching in Their First Term
- VIII. Table: GSI Training in the Schools and Colleges
- IX. Early Evaluations Feasibility Study
- X. Recommended Procedures for Using Initial Exemption Criteria

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON TESTING AND TRAINING PROSPECTIVE GSIs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of the Provost and the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LS&A) constituted the Task Force on Testing and Training Prospective GSIs in response to issues raised in contract negotiations between the University of Michigan (UM) and the Graduate Employees Organization (GEO). The Task Force was charged with review of current programs for testing and training prospective graduate student instructors (GSIs) in order to find ways to identify those needing assistance in a manner that conforms with the terms of the May 2002 UM-GEO contract. The Task Force was asked to consider whether current programs appropriately prepare GSIs for classroom instruction and to determine what changes to current practices are needed to support them in their role as GSIs. The Task Force was asked to recommend improved processes and programs to the Provost. The charge to the Task Force and its meeting agendas appear in the appendices of this report, together with background information about GSI training nationally and at UM.¹

The Task Force is in strong agreement that the University must support its mission to provide excellent professional training for its graduate students; many will embark on faculty positions and nearly all will use teaching skills during their careers. As a great public research university, the University must ensure that GSIs make the best possible contributions to undergraduate education. Often, it is under the guidance of GSIs that undergraduates encounter a new and difficult field of study, and the experience can make or break that field for undergraduates. The recent report of the President's Commission on the Undergraduate Experience placed emphasis on the emerging intellectual and social importance of globalism. In practical terms, many undergraduates personally and directly experience globalism through the varied backgrounds and accents that international GSIs bring to their classrooms. Thus, the University has a responsibility for fully preparing both its GSIs and undergraduates to make these threshold experiences as rewarding as possible.

The language of the new GEO contract presented the Task Force with two issues. The first was the University's practice of using citizenship status as a factor to determine whether international graduate students, before being hired as GSIs, were tested for English language classroom competency and given more instructional training than their U.S. citizen peers. The new contract states that citizenship is an impermissible factor for such decision-making. The second contract issue concerns the uniformity of GSI training. Under the new contract, GSIs doing classroom instruction should have training that is at least four hours in length.

The Task Force recommends that all UM GSIs receive equitable and adequate testing, pre-teaching training, and ongoing support as developing teachers. Otherwise, prospective GSIs may be insufficiently prepared and supported in their teaching assignments. Currently, some schools and colleges do no testing of English language classroom competency for any GSIs, while others do substantial testing. Similarly, the length and content of GSI training vary by unit of appointment, and some GSIs receive no pedagogical training at all.² Development of an equitable and adequate system

¹ See Appendices I, II, III, and IV.

² Currently, the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) provides university-wide GSI training as well as support for training programs in the academic units. The English Language Institute (ELI) tests English language classroom competency for international students in LS&A and Engineering, the two colleges with the majority of GSIs. ELI and CRLT collaborate to provide training programs for students in both of these schools who need more English language classroom fluency. Two programs (two weeks in length for LS&A and three evenings for Engineering) serve graduate students who have been on campus for at least a year. While Engineering has a policy of exempting first-term international graduate students from teaching, a number of LS&A departments have international graduate students teaching in their first term. For new LS&A GSIs who need more English language classroom competency, an ELI/CRLT program provides a

of preparation and support requires greater consistency in policies and practice throughout the University.

The Task Force has five recommendations for testing and training of GSIs and believes that implementation should begin within the next year. The recommendations are as follows:

- I. Establish procedures for ongoing evaluation of GSI testing and training programs
- II. Expand and improve GSI training programs so that all units have a minimum of four hours of pedagogical training
- III. Without discriminating on the basis of citizenship, identify which graduate students require testing and training for English language classroom competency
- IV. Establish equitable and adequate pre-teaching training for all GSIs
- V. Establish equitable and adequate monitoring, mentoring, and ongoing training for all GSIs while they are teaching

In keeping with the University's institutional culture of local responsibility and autonomy, the Task Force suggests that the preceding recommendations be implemented in a flexible manner that recognizes differences in academic units' instructional needs and practices.³

three-week training program in August. ELI also gives English language classroom competency training to doctoral students in the Business School. Sometimes GSIs from additional schools and colleges enroll in ELI coursework to enhance their classroom language skills.

³ In this report, a "unit" refers to a school, college, program or department.

FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

During the course of its work, the Task Force identified key findings and observations.

- Citizenship has been used as a basis for determining testing and training requirements for GSI appointments in some schools and colleges.
- The University collects no central data about GSI training, and currently there is no central information about, or reporting on, GSI training programs in the schools and colleges. While there have been periodic reviews of GSI training and some evaluation activities for individual orientations and other programs, no central, systematic, and comprehensive evaluation of GSI training is done on a regular basis.
- GSIs appointed in some academic units are not required to receive pedagogical training before going into the classroom; GSIs appointed in other schools and colleges receive less than the four hours of training mandated by the new GEO contract.⁴
- With the exception of LS&A and Engineering, and with the exception of the Business doctoral program for which ELI provides English language classroom competency training, no other schools or colleges have testing or training specifically for international GSIs.
- Some departments, especially in the physical sciences, employ first-term graduate students to teach very challenging, heavily enrolled courses in which undergraduates typically have their first experience with GSIs. Several of these departments recruit graduate students with the least English language classroom fluency and the least familiarity with educational systems comparable to the University of Michigan.⁵
- Some GSIs receive no mentoring, monitoring, or evaluation, and others receive very little.
 - Not all schools and colleges provide funds for graduate student mentors (GSMs).
 - Even among those colleges that do, there is uncertainty about funding and about the role of GSMs.
 - Some departments lack a department-wide faculty GSI Coordinator, i.e., a person with responsibility for all GSI issues in the department; and some Coordinators lack training or support for their roles.
 - Some lead faculty, i.e., faculty teaching large courses with GSIs, lack clear authorization, support, and time to provide systematic feedback to their GSIs.
- In the absence of mentoring, monitoring, and evaluation standards:
 - Some GSIs receive no feedback (e.g., classroom observations or student evaluations) while they are teaching, even during their first term.
 - Although some departments provide training and feedback for GSIs while they are teaching, especially during their first term, most GSIs lack this support.
 - Some academic units have no mechanism for identifying, helping, or reassigning GSIs who are having difficulty with their teaching or performing unsatisfactorily.
- Undergraduates receive little guidance about the role, responsibilities and value of GSIs, including international GSIs, and how to learn most effectively from them.

⁴ See Appendix VIII.

⁵ See Appendix VII.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. Establish procedures for ongoing evaluation of GSI testing and training programs.**

While it is important that academic units provide discipline-based training, decentralized responsibility has led to inequitable – and, in some cases, inadequate – recruitment, testing, training, monitoring, and evaluation of GSIs. By asking CRLT, ELI, and the academic units to report on their GSI testing and preparation programs, the University would be able to evaluate their effectiveness, to monitor improvements and to provide equitable GSI access to training and support opportunities.

 - A. The Task Force recommends that the Provost oversee recommendations made in this report and appoint a committee to create a plan for university-wide evaluation of the testing and training of prospective GSIs. The committee might include representatives of CRLT, ELI, Rackham, LS&A, and Engineering, as well as another school or college with GSIs. This committee might also include undergraduate and graduate representatives. Evaluation should be formative in nature, collecting data via multiple methods to improve the testing and training offered to GSIs at all levels.⁶
 - B. The evaluation committee should report periodically to the Provost and deans. An external evaluation of UM GSI testing and training should take place at regular intervals, such as every five years.

- II. Expand and improve GSI training programs so that all units have a minimum of four hours of pedagogical training** (see Appendix VIII). The Task Force recommends that, to comply with the UM-GEO contract, all units develop a minimum of four hours of pedagogical training, along with any other instruction on logistical, safety, or operational responsibilities the units want to provide.

- III. Without discriminating on the basis of citizenship, identify which graduate students require testing and training of English language classroom competency.** Use of the criteria recommended below eliminates citizenship status as a basis for determining the testing and training needed for prospective GSIs.
 - A. Use uniform University-wide exemption criteria to make the initial determination of which graduate students need testing and training. The criteria should be either receipt of an undergraduate degree from a U.S. college or university or an undergraduate degree in which English was the primary medium of instruction.⁷ Students who meet one of these two criteria should be exempted from testing or training for English language classroom competency (see Appendix X).
 - B. Provide an ELI review of the documentation for all prospective GSIs in all schools and colleges who are not exempted based on the initial criteria in section **III.A**.
 - C. Offers of funding to graduate student candidates should not be contingent, even in part, on first-term or first-year GSI appointments requiring successful completion of testing

⁶ As many changes in GSI testing and training may not be implemented until 2003-2004, the evaluation committee should collect benchmark data during the 2002-2003 year to determine the effectiveness of the current testing and training system and its impact on GSIs, faculty, and undergraduates.

⁷ Rackham Graduate School should provide information to all departments each year about whether their newly matriculated graduate students meet one of these criteria. The departments should provide to their deans this information about all of their prospective GSIs, and the deans, in turn, should notify ELI about which prospective GSIs in each school might need testing and training. The procedures and forms for these notification processes appear in Appendix X.

and training before the first term begins. That is, a department making a GSI offer to a first-year student is responsible for providing non-instructional support during the first year if the student is unable to pass the training and testing requirement for a GSI position, or if the student must be removed from a GSI position during the first year for lack of preparedness. Testing and training requirements for GSI appointments should not be a precondition for a graduate student's enrollment at UM.

- D. Because there is little time for testing and training prior to the start of the fall term, the Task Force recommends that, whenever possible, graduate students should not teach in their first term. Instead, units that want graduate students to teach early in their graduate program should allow time to prepare students for teaching.
- E. Improve recruitment of international graduate students by providing procedures and training to faculty recruiters so they can better assess applicants' English language classroom competency, educational background, and level of preparation for a GSI appointment, when such an appointment is likely to be sought by the applicant after admission.⁸

IV. Establish equitable and adequate pre-teaching training for all GSIs. The Task Force recommends that pre-teaching training programs be made available more uniformly, with CRLT and ELI providing support and coordination.

- A. Provide English language classroom competency training for all prospective GSIs who are not exempted from it, including GSIs in schools and colleges that presently do not test or train prospective GSIs for English language classroom competency.
- B. Offer English language training to any GSI who requests it, with departmental approval, as the UM-GEO contract requires.
- C. Either in the CRLT GSI orientation or in department orientations, offer prospective GSIs who are exempted from language instruction the option of a pedagogical training module on topics that help graduate students with undergraduate degrees from universities unlike the University of Michigan make the transition to teaching undergraduates here.⁹ This optional training module should also include a series of practice teaching opportunities, with feedback from trained observers.¹⁰
- D. Create pre-teaching preparation opportunities for prospective GSIs not yet ready to teach, such as observation of classes taught by GSIs; supervised tutoring; and/or practice teaching with feedback from trained observers.

⁸ Rackham Graduate School and ELI should work with the departments to improve screening of international graduate student applicants.

⁹ This optional training module would provide information on the diversity of the Michigan student body and would cover topics like those covered in the ELI/CRLT summer workshops: e.g., intercultural communication relevant to students educated in English abroad, and instruction on how to engage undergraduates in the learning process and promote active learning; how to teach inclusively, in contexts of diversity; and how to respond to expectations and pre-conceptions of UM undergraduates.

¹⁰ Practice teaching opportunities, a mainstay of existing training in the ELI/CRLT summer workshops, could be phased into all CRLT, ELI, and departmental pre-teaching training.

- E. Expand the capacity of ELI and CRLT to provide the testing and training described in sections III.A and B, and IV.A, B, C, and D above.¹¹
 - F. Rackham Graduate School, as part of the offer-of-admission packet, should send all incoming graduate students information about pre-teaching training opportunities.
- V. Establish equitable and adequate monitoring, mentoring, and ongoing training for all GSIs while they are teaching.** The University needs evidence that investments in testing and training programs produce results. The Evaluation Committee (see section I) should evaluate the effectiveness of the following recommendations.
- A. Provide specific appointment responsibilities and training for faculty GSI Coordinators, lead faculty, and GSMs so they can better supervise GSIs.
 - 1. Appoint faculty GSI Coordinators in every department appropriate to the number of GSIs in the department and assign them to work with deans to oversee the testing and training of GSIs.
 - 2. Provide training and resources specifically for faculty GSI Coordinators.
 - 3. Provide a retreat (or seminar session) and handbook for faculty working with GSIs.
 - 4. Appoint at least one GSM for every department with GSIs (or combine small departments' GSIs so that all GSIs have a GSM).
 - 5. Provide funding for GSM positions at the rate of approximately one position for 10 GSIs who have classroom responsibility, with large multi-section courses having priority for GSMs.
 - 6. Make GSM training mandatory, rather than optional, for GSMs who are assigned to provide classroom observation, student feedback, or other consultations for GSIs.
 - B. Provide ongoing training for GSIs, especially during their first teaching assignments and when the type of assignment changes.¹²
 - C. Provide more information and training to new UM undergraduates about the role, responsibilities, and value of GSIs, including international GSIs, and how to learn most effectively from them.¹³
 - D. Develop procedures for early monitoring of GSIs during each term they are teaching. Monitoring of GSIs during the term might include:
 - 1. Classroom observations with feedback to the GSI
 - 2. E&E forms¹⁴ (i.e., student ratings early in the term or at midterm, as well as the current end-of-term ratings), with identification and support for those GSIs who need it¹⁵

¹¹ The testing and training procedures for GSIs from the eleven schools that do not now have them (i.e., those other than LS&A, Engineering and Business) will increase the numbers relying on ELI and CRLT for support (see Appendix VIII). ELI and CRLT may want to create a new classroom communications course during the term and/or expand the capacity of the summer workshops for prospective GSIs. It will also be necessary for CRLT to expand its current orientation programs and its capacity to consult with departments and schools about creating or expanding their own GSI training programs.

¹² ELI currently offers a one-term practicum course to GSIs teaching in their first term who may need support. The Task Force recommends expansion of one-term practicum courses offered by departments or by ELI or CRLT.

¹³ CRLT has developed a video for use in New Student Orientation to acquaint incoming undergraduates with the roles and responsibilities of GSIs, and there are paragraphs in the student handbook, *M-Planner: Insider's Guide to the University of Michigan*, about GSIs. These efforts are insufficient.

¹⁴ E&E forms are the student ratings forms supplied by the Evaluations and Examinations Office.

- E. Develop procedures to identify and correct GSI problems.
1. At the time of appointment, specify in departmental or college appointment letters the criteria for GSIs' satisfactory performance in their teaching assignments.
 2. Develop departmental procedures for use when undergraduates express concerns about GSIs.
 3. Develop departmental procedures for supporting GSIs who are not performing satisfactorily.¹⁶
 4. Remove from teaching assignments during the term any GSIs who are unresponsive to support interventions or who otherwise are not meeting departmental criteria as specified in the letter of appointment and in conformity with the UM-GEO contract agreement.
 5. Reappoint GSIs only if their performance has been satisfactory.

¹⁵ On 9/24/02, MSA approved by consent a "Proposal for the Funding of an Early Evaluations Feasibility Study" of student evaluations of GSIs in selected large, multi-section courses early in the term, with CRLT providing support to those GSIs who need it (see Appendix IX).

¹⁶ CRLT will need additional capacity in order to provide training to additional GSIs and faculty GSI Coordinators (V.B), and both CRLT and ELI will need capacity to provide ongoing training for GSIs during their first teaching assignments (V.C) and support for GSIs identified as needing support early in the term (V.E).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. CHARGE TO TASK FORCE

In response to issues raised in the recent contract negotiations between the University (UM) and the Graduate Employees Organization (GEO), the Office of the Provost and the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (LS&A) established the Task Force on Testing and Training Prospective GSIs. The Task Force was constituted in May 2002 and charged with review of current programs for testing and training prospective graduate student instructors (GSIs). The Task Force was asked to make recommendations for improvements to the Provost.

The key issues for the Task Force included testing decisions and training needs, particularly where students' citizenship status has been used as a factor in the past. The charge itself stated:

- Review current training and testing procedures for non-native speakers of English who wish to be hired as GSIs to determine whether these programs appropriately identify those needing assistance and appropriately prepare these graduate students for classroom instruction in the English language.
- Review current testing and training procedures for graduate students whose educational experience has not been in the U.S. educational system or a similar system to determine whether these programs (1) appropriately identify those needing assistance understanding aspects of American culture that are relevant to instructional activities at UM and (2) appropriately prepare these graduate students for classroom instruction in the U.S. educational system.
- Determine whether changes to current practices are needed to support and value the employment of GSIs from diverse educational, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds.

The Task Force charge grew out of the following language in the UM-GEO contract, signed on May 7, 2002, which states in Article XX:

Any training or testing of communicative skills required by the department or the University as a qualification of employment must be required of all applicants who have not previously been employed in an instructional capacity by the University. [...] No exemption to either [testing or training] requirement[s] can be granted on the basis of impermissible factors, as defined by Article IV of this agreement.

Section A of Article IV defines the following as “impermissible factors,,:

[A]n employee's race, creed, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, marital status, familial status, HIV antibody status, sexual orientation, parental or pregnancy status, political belief, membership in any social or political organization, participation in a grievance or complaint whether formal or informal, or any other factor irrelevant to his/her employment status or function.

Article XX also states:

Each department will be required to hold an employee training/orientation program for all new employees. The content and length of the program will be determined by the department chairperson or designee with input from the employees. This program shall be no less than four (4) hours in length, but may be split into multiple sessions held during the semester at the department's discretion.

APPENDIX II. TASK FORCE MEETING DATES AND AGENDAS

May 13

- Charge to Task Force and Overview of Issues
- Overview of Notebook
- Discussion of Reports and Data Collection

May 21

- Presentation by Connie Cook, CRLT Director: Overview of GSI Training at the University of Michigan
- Data Collection Regarding Numbers of GSIs
- Presentation by James Diana, Associate Dean, SNRE: GSI Training in SNRE

May 29

- Presentation by Virginia Richardson, Chair, Educational Studies: GSI Training in the School of Education
- Presentation by Sarah Briggs, Research Associate, ELI: ELI Testing
- Review of Questions for the Next Meeting on ELI / CRLT Workshops
- Review of Key Questions Raised by Task Force Members

June 7

- Presentation by A.T. Miller, CRLT, and Elizabeth Axelson, ELI: Engineering Testing and Training for Prospective GSIs
- Presentation by Brenda Imber, ELI, and A.T. Miller, CRLT: ELI / CRLT Workshop Training for Prospective GSIs in LS&A
- Review of Questions for the Next Meeting, and Data Remaining to be Collected

June 14

- Review of CRLT's "Training Graduate Student Instructors at UM: Recommendations for High Quality Programs,, of 9/98; plus Discussion of Philosophies and Models of GSI Training
- Review Recommendations of Task Force Members to Date
- Review "Making the Most of Your Instructors,, in the student handbook entitled *M-Planner: Insider's Guide to the University of Michigan*, Office of New Student Programs. 2002-2003 edition

June 26

- Presentation by Martha Boron, School of Business Administration: ELI / Business School Doctoral Program Training for Prospective GSIs
- Presentation by Pavitra Sundar, GEO Representative: International Center Fall Orientation for Students and Visiting Scholars
- Presentation by John Godfrey, Assistant Dean for International Education, Rackham Graduate School: First Year Graduate Student GSI Appointments
- Continued Discussion of Recommendations; Distinction of Short Run and Longer Run Recommendations
- Determination of Any Further Data Collection Needed

July 3

- Handouts of Individual Task Force Members' Recommendations
- Review of Recommendations

July 12

- Continued Discussion of Task Force Members' Recommendations

July 16

- Continued Discussion of Task Force Members' Recommendations

August 15

- Discussion of Task Force Report draft

August 21

- Discussion of Task Force Report draft

September 16

- Final Discussion of Report

APPENDIX III. BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND BIBLIOGRAPHY ON GSI TRAINING

For over two decades, scholars from diverse backgrounds – including historians of higher education, conservative critics of the academy, and educational reformers – have critiqued the research university for its lack of attention to undergraduate teaching (e.g., Anderson 1996; Arenson 1998; Boyer Commission 1998; Clark 1987; Cuban 1999; Hutchings & Shulman 1999; Sykes 1988). The graduate student instructor (GSI) figures into this critique quite prominently, for when new, undertrained graduate students are suddenly expected to teach their first sections of large gateway courses, this creates the “greatest possibility for poor teaching at the time that the freshman needs the best teaching and mentoring,, (Boyer Commission, p. 29; see also Tice, Gaff & Pruitt-Logan 1998).

Critics of the quality of undergraduate instruction are joined by others who point to the interrelated concerns embedded in the U.S. system of graduate education: “Current graduate education does not adequately match the needs and demands of the changing academy and broader society; there is a lack of systematic, developmentally appropriate supervision for many who are seeking careers that require or benefit from the attainment of a Ph.D.; and there exists a growing concern about the high level of attrition among doctoral students,, (Nyquist & Wulff 2002). Graduate education at research universities is often ill-structured to provide the mentoring that students need, especially regarding teaching. At research universities, teaching is often a “private affair,, (Seldin 1990, p.5). Faculty and graduate students often teach their own courses in isolation, with little opportunity to learn from the excellent instructor down the hall.

Fortunately, a number of new initiatives have been established nationwide to enhance the preparation of doctoral students. These include the Pew Charitable Trusts “Re-envisioning the Ph.D.” program (<http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/index.html>), the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation “Responsive Ph.D.” initiative (<http://www.woodrow.org/responsivephd/>), the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Initiative on the Doctorate (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/CID/index.htm>), and the National Science Foundation Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (<http://www.nsf.gov/home/crssprgm/igert/start.htm>). Although the particular focus of each of these programs varies, most target graduate students’ professional and pedagogical development through mentoring, increased interdisciplinary training, internships, instructional workshops, and greater attention to the needs of academic, industrial, and government employers.

These programs demonstrate that although future faculty members most obviously benefit from GSI instructional preparation, pedagogical training is an essential element of high-quality graduate and professional education, even for those who seek employment outside of the academy. Instructional and communication skills are needed in virtually every contemporary career, in functions such as giving presentations, training co-workers, briefing supervisors, and synthesizing data (Van Note Chism 1998).

The University of Michigan takes seriously its responsibility to parents, undergraduates, and graduate students to provide a high-quality educational system that benefits all. As the 1995 “Report on Teaching Assistant Training and Development at the University of Michigan,, states, UM “should guarantee a reasonable and meaningful teaching experience to its graduate students just as it strives to guarantee effective and dedicated teaching to its undergraduates,, (Lipschutz & Weisbuch). At this large, public university, GSI positions make possible more individual attention and active learning experiences for undergraduates in small sections, as well as contributing to the professional development of graduate students.

There are many exemplary programs on campus that prepare graduate students to teach and develop their instructional expertise throughout their postbaccalaureate career. Many of these have emerged since the 1995 Lipschutz & Weisbuch Report. The College of Literature, Science & the Arts has required departments to ensure that their GSIs have twenty hours of training. The College of Engineering requires pre-teaching training of all its GSIs in a centralized program developed and provided by CRLT. The Business School requires all doctoral students to complete a four-semester pre-teaching curriculum, including a teaching methods course, several classroom observations, and multiple practice teaching sessions. In addition, some units provide ongoing training by funding Graduate Student Mentors (GSMs), experienced GSIs who mentor their peers. Finally, the Rackham Graduate School and CRLT provide a capstone program for advanced graduate students throughout the University. A five-week program in May on preparing future faculty builds on GSI experiences to help graduate students make the transition to handling faculty responsibilities.

At UM and other U.S. universities, training requirements are more extensive for most international graduate students for several reasons. Undergraduates may perceive international graduate students as being less effective teachers than native English-speaking instructors (Rubin 1992), and even experienced international graduate student instructors may worry about their own communication skills (Bauer 1991; Kulik 1995; Smith et al. 1992). Because students' perceptions of teaching performance and of communication competence are closely correlated (Al-Khameis 1996), numerous programs at universities across the country focus on oral English language proficiency assessment and enhancement, cross-cultural communication, and teaching effectiveness (Bauer & Tanner 1994; Sequeira & Constantino 1989). Of the eleven Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC)¹⁷ universities other than UM, nine require a training program specifically for international graduate students who do not test out of it, but preparation programs are available at all (Cook 2002a). All of these programs include information on the culture of U.S. postsecondary classrooms, as well as pedagogical training. Likewise, twelve major research universities – Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Brown, Dartmouth, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Rutgers, Stanford, Duke, Princeton, and Yale – require training programs specifically for their international graduate students who do not meet appropriate criteria (such as having attended a U.S. university or passing a qualifying test) (Cook 2002b).¹⁸ All of these institutions include cross-cultural and pedagogical training in their programs.

The University of Michigan has had similar testing and training requirements in the past, but the 2002 UM-GEO contract eliminated requirements based on citizenship status, an impermissible factor in determining which prospective GSIs are tested and trained. The purpose of the attached *Task Force Report on Testing and Training Prospective GSIs* is to offer a plan for providing excellent teacher training for all GSIs, including those educated abroad, without the use of any impermissible factors or criteria. The University of Michigan is committed to high-quality professional education of graduate students as well as high-quality undergraduate education, and GSI training is an integral part of ensuring the quality of education for students at all levels.

Bibliography:

Al-Khameis, H. (1996). University Instruction: The Relationship Between International Teachers' Teaching Performance and Communication Competence as Perceived by Students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56 (07), 173.

¹⁷ CIC includes Indiana University, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Penn State University, Purdue University, University of Chicago, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, and University of Wisconsin.

¹⁸ MIT is a notable exception in this group: it makes available, but does not require, training. However, its program does include cross-cultural and pedagogical training.

Arenson, K.W. (1998, April 20). Undergraduate education is lacking, report finds. *New York Times*, A12.

Bauer, G. (1991). Instructional communication concerns of international (non-native English speaking) teaching assistants: A qualitative analysis. In *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach: Selected readings in TA training* (pp. 420-426). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Bauer, G., & M. Tanner, Eds. (1994). *Current approaches to international TA preparation in higher education: A collection of program descriptions*. Center for Instructional Development and Research, International Teaching Assistant Program, University of Washington, Seattle, WA. ERIC Document Accession Number: ED 371 654.

The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. Available: [http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/Pres/boyer.nsf/673918d46fbf653e852565ec0056ff3e/d955b61ffddd590a852565ec005717ae/\\$FILE/boyer.pdf](http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/Pres/boyer.nsf/673918d46fbf653e852565ec0056ff3e/d955b61ffddd590a852565ec005717ae/$FILE/boyer.pdf)

Brown, K.A., P.F. Fishman, & N.L. Jones (1990). Foreign teaching assistant speech tests: Are you breaking the law? *International Educator*, 1(1): 8-12.

Cook, C. (2002a, July 15). Notes taken at CIC teaching center directors meeting (unpublished). Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Cook, C. (2002b, May 16-17). Notes taken at Princeton University teaching center directors meeting (unpublished). Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Kulik, J. (1995). *Using student ratings in evaluating teaching assistants*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.

Lipschutz, S.S., & R. Weisbuch. (1995). *A report on teaching assistant training and development at the University of Michigan*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Nyquist, J., & D.H. Wulff. (2002). Recommendations from national studies on doctoral education. Available: http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/project_resources/national_recommend.html

Rubin, D.L. (1992). Nonlanguage factors affecting undergraduates' judgements of nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(4): 511-31.

Seldin, P. (1990). Academic environments and teaching effectiveness. In *How administrators can improve teaching: Moving from talk to action* (pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sequeira, D.L., & M. Constantino. (1989). Issues in ITA training programs. In *Teaching assistant training in the 1990s (New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 39)* (pp. 79-86). J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, & D.H. Wulff, Eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, R.M., P. Byrd, G.L. Nelson, R.P. Barrett, & J.C. Constantinides. (1992). *Crossing pedagogical oceans: International teaching assistants in U.S. undergraduate education*. ERIC Digest. ERIC Document Accession Number: ED 358 812.

Tice, S.L., J.G.Gaff, & A.S. Pruitt-Logan. (1998, Winter). Building on T.A. development: Preparing future faculty programs. *Liberal Education*, 48-53.

Van Note Chism, N. (1998). Preparing graduate students to teach: Past, present, and future. In *The professional development of graduate teaching assistants* (pp. 1-17). M. Marincovich, J. Prostko, & F. Stout, Eds. Bolton, MA: Anker.

APPENDIX IV. GSI TRAINING AT CIC INSTITUTIONS*

What follows are responses to the following question posed to CIC teaching center directors:

Is special training required for international GSIs at your institution? Does this training include culture and pedagogy, as well as English language competency?

	Required?	Includes “culture” of the classroom?	Includes pedagogy?
<i>Chicago</i>	Yes, in most departments.	Yes, usually.	Yes
Illinois	Yes. Required to show proficiency on SPEAK or TSE.	Yes	Yes
Indiana	No	Yes	Yes
Iowa	Yes	Yes	Yes
Michigan	Yes, unless exempted.	Yes	Yes
Michigan State University	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Minnesota</i>	Yes, unless they test out.	Yes	Yes
Northwestern	Available	Yes	Yes
Ohio State University	Yes, unless they test out.	Yes, but only if they need language preparation.	
<i>Penn State</i>	Yes, unless they test out.	Yes, but incidental.	No
Purdue	Yes, and must also pass SPEAK first.	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin	No	Yes	Yes

* Information gathered by Connie Cook on July 15, 2002, from CIC teaching center directors.

**APPENDIX V. NUMBERS OF GSIs BY SCHOOL AND COLLEGE
FALL 2001 & WINTER 2002**

Schools / Colleges Employing GSIs	Number of International GSIs	Total Number of GSIs
Literature, Science and the Arts	376	1314
Engineering	146	329
Music	20	87
Education	7	79
Natural Resources & Environment	5	64
Architecture & Urban Planning	17	52
Business Administration	17	42
Public Health	8	28
Nursing	2	27
Art & Design	1	18
Public Policy	2	16
Pharmacy	6	11
Information	3	9
Kinesiology	3	8
Social Work	0	5
Schools / Colleges Not Employing GSIs*	Number of International GSIs	Total Number of GSIs
Medicine	2	10
Law	0	0
TOTAL	615	2099

Tables compiled by CRLT based on report of Fall 2001 and Winter 2002 data from the Office of Budget & Planning, 8/27/02, prepared for the GSI Task Force by Ruth Kallio.

Note: GSI counts include anyone holding a GSI appointment during the Fall 2001 or Winter 2002 terms. Individuals holding GSI appointments during both terms are counted only once. Furthermore, the unit in which a student is enrolled is not necessarily the unit in which he or she is teaching. The above figures apply to enrollment rather than teaching.

*Although the Law and Medical Schools employ no GSIs, varying numbers of students in these programs obtain GSI appointments in other schools and colleges each term.

**APPENDIX VI. NUMBERS OF NEW GSIs BY SCHOOL AND COLLEGE
FALL 2001 & WINTER 2002**

Schools / Colleges Employing GSIs	Number of New International GSIs	Total Number of New GSIs
Literature, Science and the Arts	150	492
Engineering	55	116
Music	9	41
Business Administration	7	29
Architecture & Urban Planning	9	21
Education	4	20
Public Health	7	18
Nursing	2	16
Natural Resources & Environment	0	13
Art & Design	1	11
Public Policy	2	11
Pharmacy	3	6
Information	0	5
Kinesiology	0	3
Social Work	0	1
Schools / Colleges Not Employing GSIs*	Number of New International GSIs	Total Number of New GSIs
Medicine	2	5
Law	0	0
TOTAL	251	808

Tables compiled by CRLT based on report of Fall 2001 and Winter 2002 data from the Office of Budget & Planning, 8/27/02, prepared for the GSI Task Force by Ruth Kallio.

Note: GSI counts include anyone holding a GSI appointment during the Fall 2001 or Winter 2002 terms. Individuals holding GSI appointments during both terms are counted only once. Furthermore, the unit in which a student is enrolled is not necessarily the unit in which he or she is teaching. The figures above are based on enrollment rather than teaching.

* Although the Law and Medical Schools employ no GSIs, varying numbers of students in these programs obtain GSI appointments in other schools and colleges each term.

APPENDIX VII. GRADUATE STUDENTS TEACHING IN THEIR FIRST TERM
FALL 2001

The unit in which a student is enrolled is not necessarily the unit in which he or she is teaching. The figures below are based on enrollment rather than teaching. Units not listed did not have first term GSIs in Fall 2001.

School / College	No. of First-Term Grad Students Who Teach	No. of First-Term International Grad Students Who Teach	% of Unit's First-Term Grad Students Who Teach
Engineering	33	13	5
Music	22	7	21
Business	21	0	3*
Public Health	20	5	6
Education	16	2	11
Natural Resources & Environment	9	1	13
Art	6	1	38*
Architecture & Urban Planning	5	4	3
Kinesiology	3	0	17
Nursing	3	1	5
Law	2	0	1*
Social Work	2	0	1*
Public Policy	1	0	1*
Medicine	1	0	1*
TOTAL	144	34	

Literature, Science and the Arts Academic Department	No. of First-Term Grad Students Who Teach	No. of First-Term International Grad Students Who Teach	% of Unit's First-Term Grad Students Who Teach
Chemistry	45	18	80
Biology: MCDB	28	16	85
Physics	21	12	70
Creative Writing	17	0	71*
Mathematics	10	6	59
Statistics	7	6	70
Anthropology	6	3	22
Economics	4	4	13
Applied Statistics	3	1	25*
Communications	3	1	50
German	3	3	75
Geology	2	0	15
American Culture	1	0	14
Asian Studies	1	0	10*
Biology: EEB	1	0	100*
Spanish	1	0	25
TOTAL	153	70	

Table compiled by CRLT based on report of Fall 2001 data from the Office of Budget and Planning, 6/24/02, prepared for the GSI Task Force by Ruth Kallio.

*Note: Number includes Masters students only.

APPENDIX VIII. GSI TRAINING IN THE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES*

School or College	<i>Training Requirements</i>
Art & Design	Required full-day program
Architecture	CRLT program: required for some, recommended for most.
Business	College program required for Ph.D. students; departmental programs for M.A. students
Education	Required course
Engineering	Full-day program
Information	Program starting this year
Kinesiology	Required practice-teaching
LS&A	20 hours required; programs vary departments
Music	Pedagogy taught in performance programs
Natural Resources & Environment	1-1/2 hour program
Nursing	CRLT program recommended
Public Health	CRLT program recommended
Public Policy	Three two-hour workshops
Social Work	CRLT program sometimes recommended

Schools and colleges not listed do not employ GSIs.

*Information compiled by CRLT phone calls to deans' offices: 8/02. The term "training," refers to pedagogical training that develops the professional teaching skills of prospective or current GSIs beyond the immediate content, logistical, safety, and operational needs of a particular course.

APPENDIX IX. EARLY EVALUATIONS FEASIBILITY STUDY

MSA

Michigan Student Assembly

Proposal for the Funding of an Early Evaluations Feasibility Study

Sponsors: Liz Mullane, Treasurer

Sarah Boot, President

Whereas, many MSA representatives have expressed an interest and a need for an early evaluation of classes,

Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of the Graduate Student Instructor Taskforce created by the UM-GEO 2002 contract a desire to create a feasibility study on early evaluations for Graduate Student Instructors,

Whereas, the early evaluations would be comprised of 8-10 questions written by the Center of Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT), the answers to which will remain confidential and used only as a tool to help GSI's,

Whereas, MSA will add an additional two questions stating, "Do you find an early evaluation helpful in evaluating your classroom experience?" and "Would you like to see a continuation of these evaluations in all of your classes in the future?"

Whereas, the results of these early evaluations will be seen only by the Head Faculty member of each class, the Graduate Student Instructor and The Center of Research on Learning and Teaching,

Whereas, CRLT has offered to assist any GSI who would like to review their evaluations and administer any guidance that may be necessary,

Whereas, the early evaluations will be administered in six different classes, ME211, Political Science 160, EECS 203 & 206, Econ 100 & 200, Chemistry 125 and Biology 162,

Whereas, every Department Chair, GSI and head faculty member will receive an email prior to the study to explain the program,

Whereas, all of the GSI's that were a part of the study will be consulted at the end of the semester to see if they found the feasibility study an asset in evaluating their classes,

Whereas, the office of CRLT will provide MSA with a summary of the outcome of the feasibility study and how useful it was for Graduate Student Instructors,

Whereas, the early evaluations will be administered during the middle of the term, beginning during the week of October 2nd-October 9th with the results being distributed back to the GSI's, head faculty members and CRLT during the week of October 9th-October 16th

Whereas, MSA Treasurer, Liz Mullane will send out emails to each of the participants in the study and will keep MSA informed about the progress and results of the feasibility study throughout its duration,

Whereas, the early evaluations will be administered in 195 sections across six departments, evaluating 78 Graduate Student Instructors and taken by over 5530 students

Therefore be it finally resolved, MSA authorizes the disbursement of \$1,600 from Committee Discretionary to the Office of Exams and Evaluations for the creation, distributing, and reporting costs of funding the feasibility study on early evaluations.

-- Resolution adopted by unanimous consent of MSA on September 24, 2002

APPENDIX IX. (continued) MSA's EARLY EVALUATIONS FEASIBILITY STUDY

(QUESTIONS SELECTED BY CRLT*)

1. Overall, this is an excellent discussion section/laboratory/course.
2. Overall, this GSI is an excellent instructor/discussion instructor/lab instructor.
3. I had a strong desire to take this course.
4. The GSI seems well prepared for each class.
5. The GSI puts material across in an interesting way.
6. The GSI presents material clearly.
7. The GSI makes good use of examples and illustrations.
8. The GSI stresses important points in lectures/discussions/lab.
9. The GSI treats students with respect.
10. The GSI provides helpful comments on exams, assignments, lab experiments, etc.
11. Grades are assigned fairly and impartially.

Two criteria were most important in selecting questions 4 - 10. The statements represent characteristics of good teaching that have been identified as important by faculty and researchers. They also identify specific behaviors or attitudes that the GSI can modify.

* MSA will add two questions about the value of the early evaluation process.

APPENDIX X. RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR USING INITIAL EXEMPTION CRITERIA

What follows are the procedures for implementing Task Force Recommendation III: Without discriminating on the basis of citizenship, identify which graduate students require testing and training of English language classroom competency.

1. Rackham Graduate School should review the applications of all matriculated graduate students to determine whether the criteria set forth in the Task Force **Recommendation III. A** are met.

*This review should result in a determination of which graduate students are exempt from English language testing and training, for the department's use when making GSI appointments. Rackham should communicate this information to the admitting departments. (See proposed **Form A** on the following pages.)*

2. Departments offering GSI appointments should prepare a list for their dean of their prospective GSIs (including those from other departments) that indicates those who have not been exempted from English language testing and training based on Rackham's initial review.

*Departments should provide this list the dean, who will send it to to ELI, for further review. Departments should also provide additional information about the background of students who have not been exempted but might qualify for exemption. (See proposed **Instruction Sheet and Forms B and C** on the following pages.)*

3. ELI should determine the course of testing and training for non-exempt prospective GSIs.

Students should be able to request reconsideration of a decision about non-exemption from testing or training, as in the past.

4. ELI should make recommendations to the departments about the testing or training to be required of each prospective GSI whom they review, based on documentation provided by departments (see 2, above) and other information that may become available (such as test scores).

For schools and colleges which currently test and train prospective GSIs for English language classroom competency, ELI should use existing procedures. For schools and colleges which have not yet established procedures for testing and training prospective GSIs for English language classroom competency, ELI should develop procedures.

5. While departments can override ELI recommendations about the testing and training of prospective GSIs, if they choose, they should make every effort to abide by the ELI recommendations.

APPENDIX X. (continued) INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR DEPARTMENTS

The Rackham Graduate School has responsibility for initial review of graduate students to determine the following background information:

- 1) U.S. college/university undergraduate degree
OR
- 2) Undergraduate degree from another institution in which English was the primary medium of instruction.

Based on this determination, Rackham should use Form A to identify for the departments which of their graduate students need to be reviewed by ELI to qualify for a GSI appointment, and which are exempted from further ELI review.

Instructions for Departments

1. For all prospective GSIs, departments should record Rackham's assessment from Form A onto Form B adding the appropriate contact information. Departments should provide this information for all of their prospective GSIs, including those who are enrolled in other departments or schools.
2. For each prospective GSI who is not exempted from ELI review, the department should fill out Form C, in order to provide ELI with any additional background information that might be relevant to its review.
3. The department chair or associate chair should sign Form B.
4. Form B should be sent to the dean who should forward all of the school's Form B's to ELI.
5. ELI should notify each student under review of the student's option to request exemption from English language classroom competency testing and training. Student-initiated exemption requests will go to the department for consideration before being forwarded to ELI. The ELI Workshop Training Coordinator is responsible for review of exemption requests.
6. ELI should notify the departments of training that may be required before a graduate student under review can receive a GSI appointment.
7. Departments should make the final determination about testing and training of their prospective GSIs but should abide by ELI's decisions whenever possible.

APPENDIX X. (continued) FORM A.

ELI Review for English Language Classroom Competency
Requirements for Incoming Graduate Students

**SUMMARY OF RACKHAM REVIEW OF BACKGROUND
FOR DEPARTMENTAL FILES**

Department _____ Term _____ 20_____

Undergraduate educational experience¹

Name of Graduate Student	U.S.	English as language of instruction	ELI Review NOT Required ²	ELI Review IS Required ³
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
TOTAL				

¹ Place a check mark to indicate undergraduate educational experience: U.S. undergraduate degree or English as language of instruction for undergraduate degree.

² If EITHER of the undergraduate educational experiences is met, check here.

³ If NEITHER of the undergraduate educational experiences is met, check here.

Rackham reviewer (please print)

Date

APPENDIX X. (continued) FORM C.

**DEPARTMENTAL DOCUMENTATION TO ASSIST
ELI REVIEW OF PROSPECTIVE GSIs**

1. Name of prospective GSI _____ Department _____
- 2a. Nature of anticipated GSI appointment: _____
(e.g., discussion section, lab, grader, etc.)
- 2b. Level of anticipated GSI appointment: _____
(e.g., 100, 200, 300, 400, graduate)
3. Number of terms that this student has been in graduate school at the UM, if any (circle one):
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 more

Checklist of
Documentation Enclosed
for ELI Review of Prospective GSI

Check any documentation attached.

This documentation is not required, only suggested

Relevant English Language Experience

- ___ 1. Test scores: _____
- ___ 2. Completed high school education instruction in English
- ___ 3. Classroom language experience comparable to that of a student with a U.S. undergraduate or high school degree
- ___ 4. Previous TA training or experience at a U.S. university (Document successful teaching)
- ___ 5. Other instruction or training
- ___ 6. Other: _____