

## SECTION 4.

# GRADUATE TASHIP PROGRAM PROFILES

**Kathryn Lambrecht**

Arizona State University

Being a graduate student TA is difficult work and designing the programs that help them succeed is no different. While supporting TA development constitutes part of our daily lives, our hubs of learning are scattered about the country, sometimes creating a feeling that our work is independent, out-of-network, or solitary in its challenges and complexities. The following program profiles are meant to highlight, among other things, that we are not alone. While our programs are often not extended the resources commensurate with the complex work of TA development, these program profiles show that we always have a resource in each other. Though this collection articulates many of the problems we think should inspire change within programs, these profiles highlight ways we can move our programs forward, outlining options for change and celebrating the great work that programs are doing to support their students. The weight of departmental history may make us sometimes feel like there is no room for new ideas, theories, or practices, but our hope is that these profiles act as examples that spark new ideas.

These profiles act as snapshots in the history of the RCTAship, both celebrating those who have built successful programs and inviting incoming members of the field to look back at what programs looked like in a particular moment.

These profiles are divided into three sections, from program design, to revision and then assessment: 1) Designing Roles and Relationships; 2) Revising and Innovating; 3) Highlighting Student Voices.

1. In the first section, Designing Roles and Relationships, program profiles discuss both the theory and practice of structuring programs and outlining roles for graduate students. Providing a comprehensive overview of their GAsip programs, Laura Hardin Marshall discusses the various roles of graduate student teachers at Saint Louis University, including specific responsibilities and descriptions for how this work is accomplished. Using a similar level of detail, Bilingsley et al. from The University of Alabama outline the development and theory behind one specific role: the graduate student administrator position, and how this position relates to others in the department to build professionalization. Writing studies program director at American University Lacey Wootton offers a comprehensive overview of

- their program design and the philosophy behind treating their students as colleagues in order to help them prepare for the job market. Focusing on designing a model that incorporates mentorship, Emily Jo Schwaller at the University of Arizona outlines how offering research and professionalization opportunities can strengthen the development of students in our field.
2. TAs<sub>hip</sub> programs are living beings, constantly involving, innovating, and expanding. In *Revising and Innovating*, three programs are highlighted that focus on the process of trying something new. Starting off this section, Sue Hum et al. discuss the effort made at the University of Texas at San Antonio to pilot a program based on holistic mentoring to better serve their students. Malmström and Gustafsson at Chalmers University of Technology in Sweden discuss the development of a physics writing initiative to expand disciplinary literacy for their doctoral students. William Repetto invites us to reconceive what we mean by professional development, using the University of Delaware as an example of how a focus on student identity helped achieve these goals during the pandemic.
  3. In the final section, *Highlighting Student Voices* focuses on the experience of students who have been on the front lines teaching and learning in the programs designed for their development. The program profile from Chapman University offers an overview of the design and structure of their program developed in 2015 and incorporates narratives from students conducting their own research as part of their program. San Jose State University contributors highlight how their program prepares teachers to work with diverse student populations and asks them to reflect on professional development within the program. Finally, Bowling Green State University authors share “A Tale of Two Program Revisions” incorporating doctoral student and faculty experiences with the transition and looking towards future evolutions of their work.

We invite the readers of this collection to imagine these program profiles as constituting a narrative arc of the work of TAs<sub>hip</sub> design and programming to support them, starting with the nuts and bolts, and working through to revision and assessment for those working within the programs themselves—the graduate students who will define the future of the field. Alternatively, readers might look to specific sections within these profiles for inspiration, to spark ideas for their own program development whether they are in the design, redesign, or program assessment phase of their work in program development. Most importantly, we hope our readers approach these program profiles looking for solidarity and shared experience and walk away with inspiration.