Best Practices in Professional Development in Graduate Education

Introduction

Analyses of professional development in political science education have traditionally focused on undergraduate students. However changes in the postgraduate labour market as well as advances in the nature and delivery of postgraduate programs have required faculty to pay greater attention to professional development in graduate education (Listokin and McKeever, 2011).

Studies show that 50 percent of all doctoral graduates in the USA pursue academic careers, yet only 25 percent of academic posts are in research universities (Hoffer et al. 2002; Berger et al. 2001 cited in Gaff et al. 2003). Thus approximately three quarters of doctoral graduates will secure faculty positions in institutions with a different mission from their graduate one (Gaff et al., 2003). These figures are higher in political science where 72% of doctoral graduates become faculty (Nerad and Cerny cited in Ishiyama et al., 2010) and ‘only 26 to 35 per cent of faculty positions in political science are located in doctoral granting departments’ (Ishiyama et al, 2013 p.34)

It is recognized that the approaches, techniques and tools used in the professional development of undergraduate students may not be ‘as well suited for graduate students’ in terms of preparing them for an academic career (Obst et al. 2010 p.571). This chapter explores developments in the professionalization of graduate education with reference to best practices in North America and Europe. It focuses on doctoral education, teacher training, mentoring and mobility and includes a discussion of the role played by professional associations in developing and supporting disciplinary best practice. Finally it concludes with some recommendations for the future of graduate professional development programs. It is
important to note, that this chapter will primarily focus on developing graduates’ professional skills for the academic labour market rather than other forms of employment.

Professional Development in Graduate Education: Preparing graduates for faculty life

A: Doctoral Education

Doctoral training programs have been an important step in the professionalization of the discipline. Such programs are relatively heterogeneous as they reflect institutional and departmental research capacities and expertise. However there is agreement on key criteria and core principles.

The UK’s Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) 2009 report on guidelines for the accreditation of doctoral training centres and doctoral training units in the social sciences emphasizes high quality doctoral training to equip graduates to complete their doctoral research, become effective researchers and ‘pursue other activities subsequently’ (ESRC, 2009 p.4). In terms of program content, it focuses on core social science research methods training (both qualitative and quantitative) and core disciplinary specific training. It also includes advanced training that ‘goes beyond what is considered to be core to an individual training pathway but is deemed necessary for students as their studies develop’ (ESRC, 2009 p.10). In addition it has issued specific guidelines on research development skills training such as: general research skills (bibliographic, ICT, language), teaching and other work experience, networking skills, research management skills and training to maximize the impact of their research (ESRC, 2009).
In its discipline-specific report, the American Political Science Association (APSA) task force on graduate education identifies basic principles that should be incorporated in doctoral programs in the discipline (2004). These principles include, to name but a few intellectual honesty and rigour, training in a variety of research methods, clear communication within the academy and to the wider public, the study of norms and a diversity of subjects (such as the experiences of the marginalized) (APSA, 2004).

The APSA report makes numerous suggestions to enhance graduate education and prepare them for faculty life. In terms of program curriculum it recommends that students are introduced to a wide range of political science approaches and issues in their first years of graduate study and are provided with more in depth training in a specific research area in later years (APSA, 2004). In smaller institutions this may require students to participate in courses run by other departments in the university (e.g. linguistic courses) or the department may have to develop a partnership with a neighbouring University that offers a different range of expertise in the discipline. Denmark’s POLFORSK program, which uses inter-institutional collaboration in the development and delivery of a high quality doctoral training program, provides an excellent example of how a small community of political scientists can ‘ensure that Ph.D. students have access to highly specialised, quality courses that bring them in close dialogue with the leading national and international researchers and help them to form networks with other young research and Ph.D. students in their particular fields of study’ (Lofgren et al., 2010 p.420).

Alternatively students who wish to hone specialist research skills not available in their home institution may do so by attending summer schools in research methods e.g. the ECPR summer schools in Ljubljana, or by participating in the Travelling scholar (US) or Erasmus (EU) mobility programs that offer students the opportunity to study in another institution for a year/six months for credit. The APSA report (2004) also makes some concrete
recommendations on: fellowship packages, diversity strategies, international student support, professional ethics, teaching and research experience, structured evaluations and advising and graduate student associations.

Doctoral training programs play a significant role in socializing graduates in the profession and preparing them for an academic career, particularly as researchers. Mény notes that until recently the lack of training was one of the distinctive differences between the European and American Doctorate, he also speaks of a ‘revolution’ that has taken place at the doctoral level in Europe in the last ten to fifteen years (2010 p.16). The UK has been at the front of this so-called revolution with the establishment of doctoral or graduate schools. This process was further standardized and professionalized with the publication of the ESRC guidelines in 2009. Another example of European good practice includes the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence, which was one of the first institutes in Europe to offer a Ph.D. program. It is Europe’s largest centre for postgraduate research and training in the social sciences with approximately 150 full time doctoral students in its Department of Political and Social Sciences (Mair, 2009 p.144). In the course of the last forty years it has moved from offering a ‘not tightly structured or developed’ (Mair, 2009 p.145) doctoral training program to one that is ‘fully developed and professional’ (ibid).

The doctoral training programs offered in Europe are ‘extremely heterogeneous’ (Mény, 2010 p.17) as some concentrate on training in methods while others focus on theory (Mair, 2009 p.146). In addition this process remains incomplete, as evidenced in the European University Association (EUA) report (2007) which shows that 49 per cent of doctoral programs employ a mix of taught course plus individual supervision; 29 per cent have established doctoral schools and 22 per cent of the programs use only individual supervision (EUA 2007 report cited in Goldsmith and Goldsmith 2010 p.69).

Yet how successful are doctoral training programs in preparing graduates for faculty life?
The days when a good quality PhD was sufficient to secure an academic post are gone. In the current academic labour market a well prepared candidate is ‘likely to have completed a Ph.D. to have one or more publications, particularly in international refereed journals, and to have some teaching and postdoc experience’ (Mair, 2009 p.148). Stefuriuc concurs arguing an academic position requires ‘a combination of a good thesis, a good record of teaching experience and a list of high standard publications’ (2009 p.140).

Thorlakson notes that ‘when we leave the Ph.D. to embark on an academic career, we soon discover that the strategies for success rely on a range of teaching, research, managerial and networking skills that we likely did not develop during our doctoral years’ (2009 p.162). For her part Stefuriuc recognizes that an academic post involves ‘attracting research funds, developing collaborative research, networking, managing research projects, supervising students and complying with a host of administrative demands’ (2009 p.140). These are also not likely to be developed as part of graduate programs and it is argued that doctoral programs do not offer sufficient preparation for academic life, particularly in different types of higher level institutions (Gaff et al., 2003).

This raises some pertinent issues for graduate professional development and highlights the need for an holistic approach to the preparation of graduates for an academic career, one that incorporates teacher training, mobility, and mentoring. This holistic perspective was incorporated in the preparing future faculty program, an American initiative designed to better prepare graduate and postdoctoral students for faculty life in a variety of academic institutions. Although the external funding for the program has expired, it has been embedded in some universities, most notably Duke University’s Graduate School.

It is to these other elements of the holistic approach to graduate professional development that this chapter now turns.
B: Teacher training

In recent times there has been a move to professionalize university teaching, through teacher training courses for faculty that are accredited as either an postgraduate certificate, diploma or MA in higher education, depending on their learning outcomes. Moreover as part of universities’ and departments’ commitment to the professional development of future faculty, teacher training courses have been incorporated in doctoral training programs.

This need to prepare graduates for a teaching career was stressed in the 2004 report of the APSA taskforce on graduate education which called on departments to prepare their students to ‘be not simply political scientists, but also teachers of political science’. Emphasising the need for ‘teacher-scholars’ (Ishiyama et al. 2010 p.516), it calls on departments ‘to set up formal mechanisms to help graduate students become better instructors.’ (2004 p.132).

This is also referred to in the ESRC (2009) guidelines which state:

Students undertaking teaching or other employment-related responsibilities should receive appropriate training and support. The training provided should be indicated in proposals for DTC or DTU accreditation. It is beneficial to research students if they can obtain teaching experience, for example with seminar groups, or any other work that helps develop personal and professional skills. (p.20).
In 1997 only 44% of Ph.D.s who entered the academic labour market had prior teaching experience (Dolan et al. 1997 in Buehler and Marcum 2007) and Ishiyama reckons that ‘this number is likely even smaller now’ (2011 p.3). These participation rates are mirrored to an extent in the provision and uptake of teacher training courses.

Research conducted by Dolan et al (1997) found that ‘of the graduate programs in the United States, only 55% offer a teaching seminar. From that same pool, only 41% of the graduate schools actually require students to attend these courses’ (cited in Buehler and Marcum, 2007 p.22). More recent figures compiled by Ishiyama et al. (2010) found that of the 122 Ph.D. granting political science departments in the US [practitioner programs excluded], 41 had a graduate level course on teaching political science, of these, 28 required that some of the students took the course. For 13 of them participation was optional.

This is a potential problem for the discipline when we consider that up to two thirds of all new jobs in the discipline in the US are teaching positions (Ishiyama, 2010 cited in Obst et al. (2010) p.571).

From the European perspective, Pleschová and Simon find ‘that about half of EU institutions offering Ph.D. programs also provide some form of teacher training’ (2009 p.233). This European trend has been led by Belgium, Ireland, the UK and the Nordic countries (Pleschová and Simon, 2013; Renc Roe and Yarkova, 2013). Pleschová and Simon’s research highlights ‘the positive impact of teacher training on the quality of teaching and learning as well as the positive valuation of training by more than two-thirds of PhD students in our sample’ and concludes that teacher training should be more ‘widely available’ (Pleschová and Simon, 2009 p.233). This is supported by a recent study of a teacher development course offered by the Central European Univeristy’s (CEU) Curriculum Resource Centre. Based in Budapest, Hungary the CEU is a graduate university that offers international programs primarily in the humanities and social sciences (Renc Roe and Yarkova, 2013). An evaluation of
the ‘teaching in higher education’ course offered all to graduate students as part of their doctoral program finds that it ‘manages to develop basic teaching and course design skills and begins the formation of a more confident, self-reflexive teaching persona’ (Renc Roe and Yarkova, 2013 p.31). It should be noted that the graduates participating in these programs are not provided with teaching experience as the CEU does not offer undergraduate programs.

In contrast, other research shows that most graduate programs are not sufficiently preparing their doctoral students for a faculty career and for a career as teachers, in particular (Gaff et al. 2003; Buehler and Marcum, 2007). A study by Gaff et al. (2003 p.3) found that while some graduate programs offer teacher training and teaching experience these experiences aren’t always well structured and do not adequately tackle issues such as ‘assessment, different types of student learning, the pedagogy of the discipline, curricular innovations, the impact of technology on education, or the variety of teaching styles that might be helpful with students from different racial, ethnic, or cultural backgrounds’. In their comparative analysis of graduate’s teaching philosophies and behaviour, Buehler and Marcum (2007) found dissonance in graduate instructors’ knowledge and practise.

Scholars have recommended formal mentoring systems for teacher training and greater evaluation and supervision of graduate instructors (APSA 2004, Buehler and Marcum 2007). According to Buehler and Marcum evaluation should occur in the classrooms of both the Professor and the graduate instructor (2007). APSA also emphasizes apprentice style methods of teacher training ‘serving as a TA/GSI under a fine, experienced undergraduate teacher is an excellent way to learn how to teach, especially when combined with departmental seminars and monitoring practices focused on teaching’ (2004 p.132.)

Mentoring and apprentice style approaches to teacher training have been employed innovatively and successfully in Miami University (Ohio) and Baylor University (Texas)
respectively in a manner that has not placed a ‘strain on resources or faculty time’ (Ishiyama et al. 2010 p.521)

Adopting shadowing and mentoring techniques the Baylor program developed an active teacher training that gives graduate instructors a structured, supported and meaningful teaching experience. As a small University it decided against developing a specific course on teaching in political science and ‘apprenticed’ graduate students to senior faculty instead. The graduate instructors’ levels of responsibility increase as they progress in their studies, for example in year four they are assigned a course to teach. Also the assignments are devised in accordance with the needs of the graduate student and not the faculty/department and they choose their ‘apprenticeship’ course (Ishiyama et al, 2010; Ishiyama et al 2013).

Like Baylor, Miami University does not offer an explicit graduate teacher training course, graduate instructors, as in other departments/universities, work as teaching assistants. However when teaching independent courses, they are required to participate in the College Professor Training Program offered by the University’s teaching and learning centre, thereby using existing campus services (Ishiyama et al, 2010 p.521). The program provided by the centre is quite comprehensive. It includes teacher training, program design and diversity training as well as workshops on recruitment and retention, student life, administration and teaching aids. Unlike the Baylor program, participation is voluntary. (Ishiyama et al., 2010).

The PFF program (PFF4 included APSA and four Ph.D. awarding American political science departments) also endeavoured to enhance teacher training and the preparation of graduates for academic careers particularly at institutions that are primarily focused on teaching (Gaff et al. 2003; Ishiyama et al., 2013). The University of Illinois Chicago serves as an example of best practice in this regard. Its PFF director, Dick Simpson, developed two new courses: ‘introduction to the political science profession’ (required course for all new PhD entrants) and ‘teaching political science’ (required course for teaching assistants) that were embedded in the
doctoral program in political science. These sequential courses were offered through the University’s Council for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) which also awarded a certificate to those who took the ‘teaching political science’ course, participated in three CETL workshops and developed a teaching portfolio (Gaff et al., 2003 p.38).

Developments in the professionalization of teacher training are to be welcomed. Yet have they impacted positively on the academic employment rates of Ph.D. graduates? Research shows some mixed results. In their study of the effects required teacher training courses had on placement rates, Ishiyama et al. found that the courses had ‘little effect on enhancing the placement of graduates, even at political science departments that emphasized teaching over research’ (Ishiyama et al., 2013 p.50). What they did discover, however, was that the research productivity of the graduate’s department ‘still remains the best predictor of job placement’ (Ishiyama et al., 2009 p.7; Ishiyama et al., 2013). They speculate that this might be a consequence of graduates of highly research productive departments having more opportunities to work as research assistants and publish or that it could be due to the ‘hiring’ teaching department basing its judgement on the reputation of the graduate’s Ph.D. department. Hesli et al. (2006) add some clarity to this. Their work shows that graduates ‘employed as a faculty member at a college or university are significantly more likely to have published articles prior to graduating’ (Hesli et al. 2006 p.320).

In the European context, it is difficult to come to such conclusions as further research on graduate placement rates from European doctoral programs is needed. However, it could be speculated that the situation is somewhat similar to that in the US, which is recognized as a leader of professionalization in political science (Mény, 2010).

Ishiyama et al. (2009 p.8) conclude that while a teacher training course may not improve a graduate’s placement chances, that teaching experience is vital as in their view it is ‘a much
better indicator of preparedness for teaching than is one’s course work, and is likely to impact more on a hiring decision than what appears on a transcript’.

Thus if a department’s goal is to ensure graduate placement then it should offer structured teaching experiences as well as prepare and support graduates to publish regularly, particularly in high impact journals. The Academic Publishing office of the London School of Economics (LSE) is an example of good practice in supporting graduate publication. It organizes seminars on getting published for final year doctoral students and provides resources on publishing for LSE staff and students

http://www.lse.ac.uk/researchAndExpertise/academicPublishing/home.aspx. Similarly the Howe Writing Center at Miami University (Ohio) offers summer writing groups and writing boot camps for graduate students and faculty. The writing groups offer participants dedicated time to write as well as meetings to review each other’s work.

http://writingcenter.lib.muohio.edu/?page_id=896. Mentoring can also play an important role.

C: Mentoring

Mentoring has been traditionally used to introduce and socialize new students and faculty to a department and offer them support in successfully navigating their studies or early career development.

It can benefit graduate students by providing them with information and advice on a variety of issues such as teaching, networking, publishing, funding opportunities, tenure, promotion as well as fostering a stronger sense of involvement (Bennion, 2004: Boyle and Boice, 1998: Monroe, 2003). Research on the positive impact of mentoring shows that
graduate instructors found teacher training received through mentoring more effective than that gained from campus seminars or specific departmental training (Jones, 1993 cited in Boyle and Boice 1998). Graduate students that undergo intensive mentoring produce more research output and advance more quickly in their career than those who do not (Girves and Wemmerus, 1998) Also a strong mentoring relationship affects the chances of the graduate student becoming a faculty member (Hesli et al., 2006).

For graduate students, mentoring can play a key part in the successful completion of their doctorate as good mentoring is an effective tool against attrition (Hesli et al., 2003a). Also it has been shown that ‘the single best predictor of level of dissatisfaction with the graduate student experience is whether the graduate student received sufficient encouragement, mentoring, and consultation from faculty’ (Hesli et al., 2003a p.459). This research reveals gendered aspects to the availability of sufficient mentoring with women registering lower levels of satisfaction. This may be partly a consequence of the fact that women graduates’ mentoring relationships are ‘less established and also less likely to be with same sex mentors’ (Heinrich 1991 cited in Hesli et al. 2003b p.801). It is not surprising that the idea for an APSA Task Force on Mentoring came from the Women’s Caucus for Political Science (WCPS). Established in 2002, the task force examined issues of ‘recruitment, retention, and integration of women and people of color in the profession’ (APSA task force on mentoring website) as well as mentoring initiatives for new entrants to the discipline, namely graduate students and early career faculty. It developed APSA’s mentoring program which includes an array of mentoring resources for mentors and ‘mentees’ as well as a mentoring database that gives young scholars access to a mentor outside of their home institution.

Traditional mentoring programs link more experienced political scientists with graduate students usually within the same department and can take a couple of formats. It may be ‘natural, spontaneous mentoring’ or systematic (Boyle and Boice, 1998 p.159). Natural
mentoring tends to benefit those in more privileged positions such as white men while women and racial/ethnic minorities are better supported by systematic mentoring processes (Boyle and Boice, 1998).

There has been a move to develop diverse forms of mentoring relationships and Bennion advises that ‘it is wise for interested young scholars to seek multiple mentoring relationships’ (2004 p.112). Such diverse forms could include mentoring relationships with: more senior faculty members in another field or in the same field but at a different university. Bennion advocates peer mentoring in which peers can ‘explore personal and academic dilemmas as well as a better balance and integration between one’s professional and personal lives’ (2004 p.112). This form of mentoring offers advantages to all political scientists and is of particular importance for women and racial/ethnic minorities (Bennion, 2004 p.112-3).

Another more traditional mentoring relationship is the tutoring role played by graduate students in teaching and supporting undergraduates. There has been little research on this long established scholarly role. However a recent study of a program that assigned undergraduate students a faculty and a graduate student mentor found that ‘everyone’s [undergraduate and graduate students] teaching and learning needs were met simultaneously, effectively, and efficiently’ (Ishiyama, 2011 p.9). It concluded by highlighting ‘the importance of providing graduate students with the opportunity to develop their own teaching and mentoring styles, by providing faculty assistant activities that go beyond the formalistic teacher training that is found at many Ph.D. granting departments.’ This form of mentoring not only enhances the graduate students’ teaching skills but also offers them important service experience in their department.

Mentoring, particularly systematic mentoring has been shown to work and can be organized in a variety of formats to ensure that an excessive burden isn’t placed on faculty members (particularly female and racial/ethnic minority members). Also it is suggested good
practice that graduate students and early career faculty develop a variety of mentoring relationships. Research has shown that all such relationships, if structured properly, can enhance a graduate/early career faculty member’s professional prospects. Professional associations can play an important role in assisting in the development of such systematic forms of mentoring from assisting ‘mentees’ find mentors to resources on how to develop, structure and evaluate a mentoring relationship.

D: Mobility

Recent employment trends in the discipline show that US Ph.D.s are more likely to be employable in both the American and European academic job markets (Stefuriuc, 2009; Mair, 2009). Yet even with this increased migration from the US to Europe, few graduate programs in the US prepare students for a faculty position abroad (Jenne, 2009).

As an American alumni working in Europe, Jenne suggests that graduate student from North American Universities wishing to secure an academic post in Europe would ‘do well to attend European conferences in their field and forge ties with US centres and departments that are already integrated in European scholarly networks’ (2009 p.172). Mobility programs can facilitate this.

Mobility programs have been established in North America and Europe with a view to assisting graduate students and faculty (at all stages in their career) travel to work as a researcher and or teacher in another institution (national or international). They allow graduate and postdoctoral students ‘build a network that will clearly be far more solid than one can hope to achieve by regular conference participation alone’ (Stefuric, 2009 p.141).
Numerous mobility programs are available to graduate and postdoctoral students as well as faculty and give them opportunities to access unique library collections, follow specialized courses of study, work closely with international experts in their discipline, participate in academic life in another institution and network with colleagues elsewhere. In its discussion of doctoral summer schools and other specialized training programs, the APSA taskforce on graduate education (2004) notes that ‘as valuable as such training programs are, a one-week or four-week course is no substitute for working closely with a faculty member on a research project or dissertation over an extended period of time’ (APSA, 2004 p.134).

For graduate students specialising in comparative studies and international relations, in particular, mobility schemes can facilitate essential field work.

Some of the mobility schemes available to graduate students include:

- Marie Curie Fellowships
- The Fulbright Program
- Erasmus Mundus Partnerships
- The Travelling Scholar Program of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC)

Marie Curie Fellowships are EU research grants that are open to researchers regardless of nationality, age, experience or field of research to gain experience abroad and in the private sector, and to complete and or continue their training. They are available to two categories of researchers: early stage researchers (do not have a doctorate and have less than four years of research), and experienced researchers (have a doctorate and at least four years of research experience).

Another internationally renowned scheme is the Fulbright Program (financed by the US State Department). It offers graduate students and young professionals the opportunity to continue their education or professional development abroad. The Fulbright US student
program offers funding for U.S. citizens to study abroad and the Fulbright Foreign student program provides scholarships for students from other countries to study in the US.

The European Union’s Erasmus Mundus program supports partnerships between higher education institutions in Europe and a range of countries around the world. It grants scholarships to students (undergraduate and postgraduate) and staff (administrative and academic) to study, research and or teach in another partner institution.

Finally in the USA the Travelling Scholar Program of the of the CIC allows doctoral students to spend up to a full academic year at another CIC institution to follow a specialized course of study, conduct research in specific library collections or to have access to advanced equipment or laboratories.

Mobility programs can help prepare future faculty by providing training, research and networking opportunities for graduate students. Yet professional associations, in particular their graduate associations can also do the same.

**Role for Professional Associations**

In preparing future faculty, graduate education programs should provide students with opportunities to develop and publish high quality research; offer them structured, supported and evaluated teaching experience; and ‘exposure to and experience with service to the department, campus, community, and discipline’ (Gaff et al., 2003 p.5). In this they can be greatly assisted by professional associations.
More and more political science associations are mindful of the role they can play in the professional development at all levels in their discipline. They recognize their responsibility to prepare the next generation of faculty for professional life. As Gaff et al. (2003 p.46) observe for at least two decades, the humanities and social science disciplinary societies [APSA is one of the societies mentioned] have recognized that supporting and disseminating research is not enough to serve the discipline adequately. Through various mechanisms, each of these societies also emphasizes the importance of teaching and learning, professional and career development of faculty members and graduate students, educational innovations, and knowledge of larger trends affecting higher education and the institutions in which their specializations are practiced.

In political science, APSA, its regional associations, the PSA (Political Studies Association, UK) and the ECPR (the European Consortium for Political Research) lead the field in terms of advancing and supporting the professionalization of the discipline through:

- the provision of summer schools (for example the ECPR summer schools on Social Science Data analysis and methods and techniques in Colchester, and Ljubljana);
- publishing peer reviewed scholarly research;
- organizing conferences. Stefuriuc advises graduate students and early career faculty that it is ‘worthwhile attending panels about the profession, professional development roundtables and the various receptions organized by publishers, graduate and other sub-groups of professional organisations’ (2009 p.142);
- funding for conference attendance – thereby facilitating international mobility and networking that may lead to research collaboration;
• the organization of graduate associations that convene workshops, conferences and facilitate networking. Also they provide an opportunity for professional service through sitting on the graduate association committee, convening the graduate conference and/or editing the graduate association newsletter;

• the development of graduate education and mentoring policies (APSA).

**Conclusion**

This chapter has explored professional development in graduate education with reference to international examples of best practice in doctoral education, teacher training, mentoring and mobility programs. Although it has focused on the individual parts, it recognizes their interdependency and advocates for an holistic approach to graduate education. For example producing quality research may lead to a publication in a high impact journal but it can also enhance teaching, through research led teaching approaches. Also research and teaching may provide service experiences for students through the use of community based research methods and community based (or service) learning.

In terms of best practice this chapter finds in favour of:

• formal taught doctoral programs;

• structured, supported and evaluated teaching experience preferably accompanied by teacher training;

• multiple systematic mentoring relationships;

• international mobility for the development of research skills (particularly true for post doctoral students who have not graduated from a taught doctoral program), access to international expertise and the development of language skills, field work etc;
• active participation in professional associations, through participation in conferences, workshops, summer schools, specialist groups, committees etc.

Recognising their significant contribution to the professionalization of the discipline and their contribution to the professional development of graduate education, this chapter calls on the leading larger professional associations to:

• establish graduate education committees

• organize professional development workshops or ‘cafés’ at their annual conferences;

• survey new academics in the first couple of years of their faculty career on how their graduate program prepared them for academic life and what it lacked;

• replicate Collins et al.’s (2012) study of career preparation for political science undergraduates for graduate students.

Without further research in this area it is difficult to judge the effectiveness of current professional development approaches and determine what more can be done to prepare the next generation of political scientists for academic life.

---

i Accessed 27th June 2013.

ii Accessed 27th June 2013.


vii For an example of service learning in the graduate classroom see Harris, Clodagh (2010),’ Active democratic citizenship and service learning in the postgraduate classroom’, Journal of Political Science Education, 6 (3), 227-244.
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