



Attitudes and Opportunities Regarding Teaching and Pedagogical Training during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Jennifer Woodward & David Trowbridge

To cite this article: Jennifer Woodward & David Trowbridge (2023): Attitudes and Opportunities Regarding Teaching and Pedagogical Training during the COVID-19 Pandemic, Journal of Political Science Education, DOI: [10.1080/15512169.2023.2239968](https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2023.2239968)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2023.2239968>



View supplementary material [↗](#)



Published online: 30 Jul 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Attitudes and Opportunities Regarding Teaching and Pedagogical Training during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Jennifer Woodward^{a,b}  and David Trowbridge^a 

^aMiddle Tennessee State University; ^bUniversity at Albany SUNY

ABSTRACT

In 2018, we sought to understand the difference in pedagogical training opportunities and demand within political science departments across the U.S. through surveys of political scientists. Since then, the COVID-19 pandemic forced faculty to rethink the way they do assessment and lectures resulting in stress and burnout. To measure attitudes, resources, and opportunities for teaching and teacher-training in this new environment, we once again surveyed American Political Science Association (APSA) members. Using APSA membership provides a large pool of political scientists, however as a sample it may skew toward more tenure and tenure-track faculty at larger universities. With that caveat, almost all APSA members in our 2021 survey reported that their in-person courses were converted to a remote, hybrid, or web assisted format in the 2020 to 2021 period. While morale and confidence in teaching declined during the pandemic, interest in offering alternative forms of teaching like synchronous remote courses increased. Respondents found pedagogy training more important following the pandemic, despite a decline in participation. Furthermore, interest in this training remained stable between prepandemic and postpandemic periods. These findings suggest that declining participation in these activities is more reflective of a lack of time and institutional rewards rather than less interest in training opportunities. These shifting attitudes call for increased opportunities for pedagogy training. As with prior findings, incentives would encourage political scientists to increase their participation in pedagogy training as many do not feel rewarded for their teaching efforts.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 24 December 2021



Accepted 13 July 2023


KEYWORDS

pandemic; COVID;
pedagogical training;
teaching confidence;
tenure and promotion

Introduction

Studies spanning decades have repeatedly shown a significant percentage of departments across the country lack teacher training opportunities for both graduate students and faculty (Benjamin 1971; Euchner and Jewell 1989; Ishiyama, Miles, and Balarezo 2010; Trowbridge and Woodward 2021). Moreover, with some exceptions (Dolan et al. 1997; Rothgeb, Spadafore, and Burger 2007), we lack specifics of what the quality of that training looks like. In 2018, with the help of American Political Science Association (APSA), we surveyed APSA members and political scientists about what pedagogical training opportunities were available to them, what their demand/interest in training

CONTACT Jennifer Woodward  jennifer.woodward@mtsu.edu  Department of Political Science and International Relations, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN, USA.

 Supplemental data for this article can be accessed online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2023.2239968>.

© 2023 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

was, and what respondents felt might help increase the number of opportunities (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021). One notable limitation to this approach is that APSA membership may underrepresent nontenure track faculty and those teaching at community colleges (Osorio, Parker, and Richards 2022), and those faculty are often more focused on teaching than research. With that caveat in mind, the results indicated that while some interest or demand for training was being met, there were still types of training opportunities that were not. Based on answers to our questions, we suggested that within departments, there may be resource and culture related obstacles to offerings and participation.

Since that publication, the COVID-19 pandemic changed the teaching and learning environment. Many have written about the effects the pandemic has had, including forcing faculty to rethink the way they do assessment and lectures, as well as the effects of stress and burnout (Gewin 2021; Glazier and Strachan 2023; Pandya, Patterson, and Cho 2022; Supiano 2020). Thus, we wanted to find out if the pandemic environment shifted the supply and demand for pedagogical training. Once again, we reached out to APSA who graciously included a set of questions we wrote in their annual membership survey. Based on those results we conclude that the supply and demand has not significantly shifted, but that (perhaps unsurprisingly) confidence in teaching has been shaken and interest in remote or online pedagogy has increased. These findings are perhaps expected, but they also provide us with supportive data to understand the state of pedagogical training in political science.

Expectations of supply and demand

What do we know about the supply and demand of teacher training (Pleschová and Simon 2009) for political science departments in the United States? Collectively, findings across different studies over the last couple of decades suggest that a gap between demand for training and supply of opportunities exists but may be narrowing.

Regarding demand, we know that most political science doctoral degree holders will teach at bachelors' and masters' degree-granting institutions, places where most of their energy and promotion requirements may be focused on teaching (Nerad and Cerny 2003; Nelson and Morreale 2002; Rothgeb, Spadafore, and Burger 2007). Prior to the pandemic, there was already an indication that teaching experience and skills were sought after in the job market (Fox and Keeter 1996; Rothgeb, Spadafore, and Burger 2007) and these skills provided advantages in some institutions for promotion (Rothgeb and Burger 2009).

More recently, as Trepanier (2017, 138) noted, political science departments were "faced with the challenges of demonstrating [political science's] public worth" and "finding employment for its doctoral students..." Much of this had to do with the looming "enrollment cliff" (Kline 2019; Carey 2022) and political pressures (Trepanier 2017, 139). Job opportunities were declining around the Great Recession (APSA 2014; Jaschik 2010) and institutions were looking to cut costs (Editors 2009; Rivard 2013). Since the pandemic and the perceived emergence of the "enrollment cliff," matters have not improved. As APSA reported in 2021 (McGrath and Diaz 2021), job postings continue to decline. This is all to say that the pressure to retain students is quite strong

and one factor, among many, to retaining students may be teaching quality (University of Southern Mississippi 2022).

Regarding supply, we know that there has been a slow but steady increase in training opportunities and quality. In the early 1970s, approximately 25% of graduate departments required teaching for graduate students and just six graduate programs offered pedagogical courses (Benjamin 1971). In the 1980s and early 1990s, the percentage of programs requiring teaching grew to 43% and over 50% had some training opportunity (Euchner and Jewell 1989). Similarly, a 2010 study suggested at best half of graduate programs offered training (Ishiyama, Miles, and Balarezo 2010). Recognizing a gap between supply and demand, the APSA supported “formal mechanisms” in pedagogical training (Beltran et al., 2005) which included sponsoring the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference (APSA 2016).

A problem in measuring the supply of training is an inconsistency of what constitutes training. For example, in one study of graduate students, 88% reported that participants met for just one semester or less (Dolan et al. 1997). In another, Rothgeb, Spadafore, and Burger (2007) found that within Ph.D. granting institutions that offered opportunities to teach, many lack training in specific skills. In a small sample of courses designed to teach pedagogy, Ishiyama, Miles, and Balarezo (2010, 521) found “a wide variety of topics and assignments” including syllabus writing, sample assignments, and peer observation. Yet, there is little frequency or consistency across studies in the *forms* of training (e.g., semester-long; workshops; peer mentoring). Thus, in our study, instead of focusing on the content within the opportunities or asking about opportunities broadly-speaking, we asked about the different forms of training (e.g., lecturing; peer observation; workshops; seminars).

There is also the distinction between examining opportunities in graduate programs and examining opportunities for all faculty. While our study examines both, our sample results are more skewed toward training for current faculty.¹ Our 2018 survey with APSA provided details on the interest from tenure and tenure track faculty, the types of opportunities available to them, and the level of participation in those opportunities. A majority of respondents in our original survey, both faculty and graduate students, had access to some kind of training or teaching activity opportunity (e.g., seminars; teaching online), but there was still unmet demand (e.g., co-teaching; program design). We theorized that the gap might be explained by a lack of incentive and institutional culture that does not reward teaching. While over 50% of respondents reported opportunities for funding related to pedagogy development and research, most reported that incentives such as course load reductions (60%), stipends for participation (72%), or institution-wide teaching requirements for promotion (67%) would help incentivize more offerings and participation.

Since then, there has been important scholarship on the effects of the COVID pandemic on faculty and students. Much of the evidence points to negative outcomes for higher education students and for faculty (Bird et al. 2022; Grieves 2021; Grussendorf 2022), often related to the move to remote learning as well as feelings of stress and isolation. Regarding faculty, Glazier and Strachan (2023) demonstrate through a survey and focus groups that faculty have been greatly strained by the efforts to move to remote and to address the needs of students, especially women faculty members. Those faculty at institutions with more resources and support fared better in their stress. Being

new to teaching online and having more advanced tenure status were also significant predictors of negative attitudes. However, Glazier and Strachan (2023) and others (Enia 2022; Taylor 2022) have also shown that there were silver linings to the move to remote learning including greater empathy toward students, thinking more carefully about assessments, and reconsidering how to deliver information in accessible ways.

Thus, a question for this study is, how much (if at all), did the pandemic change the supply and demand for pedagogical training? To answer this, we once again asked APSA members what types of opportunities are offered (e.g., workshops; seminars; peer mentoring) at their institutions and departments, what respondents' interests are, and what opportunities respondents participate in. We also included questions about respondents' teaching confidence and their transition to online learning.

Based on the previously discussed literature, the results of our previous study, as well as our own anecdotal experiences of both teaching during the pandemic and in pedagogical training, we came up with four different expectations. First, that the pandemic likely hurt the confidence of instructors and, relatedly, that the broken confidence might result in an uptick in interest in pedagogical training where instructors might seek to fill in gaps in their knowledge of remote and online learning. Second, we expected that some of the faculty would embrace online and remote learning and seek to teach in these formats in the future.

Third, in large part due to past findings, we expected that financial incentives and other institutional rewards (such as credit toward tenure and promotion or reduced workloads in other areas) would be more likely to encourage respondents to participate in pedagogy training opportunities. Finally, again because of our past findings, we expected most offerings for pedagogical training would be made at the college or university level, not from within a department.

In other words, based on data from our 2018 study (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021), we expected both cultural and resource related obstacles to offerings and participation. Indeed, we found that not only are pedagogy training opportunities still found primarily at the college and university level, but the pandemic may have simply highlighted the preexisting need for more financial and institutional rewards to encourage participation. Most (60% of 255 responses) APSA members surveyed did not experience an *increased* interest in pedagogical training. Instead, a majority of respondents reported that their interest remained the same, followed by "stronger" interest (31% of 255 responses, see Table 10). This is despite (a) some APSA members feeling less confident in their teaching, (b) a sense that pedagogy training was even more important than before the pandemic, (c) that there were more discussions with others in their institutions about teaching, and (d) that there was an increased interest in teaching in online and remote formats. This indicates that despite the perceived importance of pedagogy training, even in the middle of discussions and more widespread use of nontraditional course formats, the political scientists surveyed still lacked the time and incentives to participate in pedagogy training.

Sample and methods

Seeking to survey political scientists of different ranks and institutions from across the United States, APSA gave us permission to include 17 questions on their Annual

Member Survey.² This survey was distributed by APSA between May 20, 2021 and June 28, 2021. Questions reflected changes to teaching following the COVID-19 pandemic and were designed to follow-up on the findings from the 2018 survey.

Sample

A total of 2112 surveys were completed for the Spring 2021 APSA Annual Member Survey. Of the total members surveyed, 339 completed at least some of our survey questions. According to the AAPOR Response Rate 1, the rate of response was 14.6%. For Response Rate 2, 16.5% (American Association for Public Opinion Research 2023). Our Cooperation Rate 1 was 25.1% and Cooperation Rate 2 was 28.5%. We then eliminated a total of 71 respondents because they had not taught in the last 2 years, which produced a total sample of 268 respondents that answered at least one question. Since not all respondents answered all the questions, we are reporting findings per each question with percentages based upon the number of respondents per a question in line with our previous study.³

Reflective of the status of the profession, the majority of respondents identified as Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American and as cisgender male. A variety of ages were reported, but a majority of participants (58%) were in their 30s or 40s. According to APSA's Membership Dashboard, 61% of APSA members were male-identifying and 39% were female-identifying. 67% of APSA members reported racial or ethnic identities as Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American, while 11% reported as East Asian or Asian American, and 7% reported as Latino or Hispanic American. Another 4.9% identified as Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American (APSA 2022).

In our sample, tenured (47%, 125 individuals) or tenure track faculty (18%, 49 individuals) at a Ph.D. granting institution were the most common respondents, with few graduate assistants, adjuncts, postdocs, or administrators responding to the survey. While diversity has increased among political science faculty in recent years (Fraga, Givens, and Pinderhughes 2011, 39), this sample admittedly underrepresents the faculty most likely to be underrepresented at their institution, which often report lower levels of job satisfaction, experience biases and hostility, and express concerns their work will be undervalued (Fraga, Givens, and Pinderhughes 2011, 39). As acknowledged in the Introduction, a survey of APSA members may also mean underrepresentation of non-tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as community college faculty (Osorio, Parker, and Richards 2022). As such, readers should consider the findings more representative of more traditional faculty, rather than faculty serving in teaching focused institutions and representative of the increased diversity within the profession. For a breakdown of the demographic data for survey participants, see Table 13 in [Supplementary Appendix A](#).⁴

Questions

Although our 2018 agreement with APSA limited us to five questions, in the 2021 survey we were allowed to include seventeen questions. These questions (see [Supplementary Appendix B](#)) focus on the availability of teaching pedagogy training,

interest in this training, and attitudes toward teaching following the start of the pandemic. By focusing on the views of those teaching political science in various institutions throughout the United States, we hope to not only capture any shifts in attitudes, but also ultimately help political science departments and institutions determine the level of interest in training. This may help determine if there might be postpandemic shifts in how political science pedagogy is taught in institutions of higher learning and if current opportunities for training are sufficient to meet any shifts in these modes of teaching. Questions were written to address (a) the supply of teacher training, (b) the potential obstacles to training opportunities and participation, and (c) changes to the demand/interest in training and confidence since the pandemic.⁵

Results

Accommodations during COVID-19

Institutions of higher learning offered several pandemic related accommodations post-February 2020 (Table 1). While tenure delays were common amongst those aware of the option, it was uncommon for student evaluations to be canceled or grants to be available for creating online, remote, or hybrid courses.⁶ Ninety-five percent (235 of the 248) of respondents that answered the question “Did your institution offer any of the following between February 2020 and today?” were able to move to remote office hours and many of their students were able to take advantage of remote defenses of theses and dissertations (74%, 182 of 247 responses), writing center services (60%, 148 of 248 responses), proctoring (52%, 129 of 247 responses), and tutoring (43%, 105 of 247 responses). Yet, we also know that at least some political scientists were reluctant to use tenure delays (Breuning et al. 2021) and most political scientists did not have their student evaluations canceled as they switched to online learning (Table 1).

The accommodations that were available for most political scientists were focused on interactions with students, rather than reducing workloads in research or service or providing grants and other financial incentives for creating remote and online courses. As such, we saw little movement in the types of resources political scientists have said would encourage them to participate in more pedagogical training (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021, Table 2), while institutions provided delays in tenure and promotion review that may have encouraged political scientists to shift their energies away from

Table 1. COVID-19 related accommodations offered by institutions.

Did your institution offer any of the following between February 2020 and today? ^a					
	Yes	No	Don't know/unsure	Total answered	NR
Stop the clock/ tenure delay	143 (58%)	33 (13%)	72 (29%)	248	20
Student evaluations canceled	73 (29%)	157 (63%)	18 (7%)	248	20
Grant or other funding to create online, remote or hybrid/web assisted courses	65 (26%)	118 (47%)	66 (27%)	249	19
Virtual office hours	235 (95%)	7 (3%)	6 (2%)	248	20
Remote exam proctoring services	129 (52%)	49 (20%)	69 (30%)	247	21
Remote tutoring	105 (43%)	27 (11%)	115 (47%)	247	21
Remote writing center services	148 (60%)	20 (8%)	80 (32%)	248	20
Virtual theses/ dissertation defenses	182 (74%)	12 (5%)	53 (21%)	247	21

^aPercentages are based upon number of respondents per a question. NR are nonresponses.

Table 2. Incentives and encouragement to increase participation in pedagogical training.

What would encourage faculty members to participate in more pedagogical training activities? ^a	
Credit toward tenure or promotion	157 (64%)
Increased pay or stipend for participants	156 (64%)
Course load reduction for pedagogy training organizer	133 (54%)
Reduced service responsibilities	130 (53%)
Increased pay or stipend for organizer(s)	86 (35%)
Encouragement from department chair	84 (34%)
Reduced research responsibilities	68 (28%)
Don't know/unsure	18 (7%)
Total answered	245
NR	23

^aParticipants could select multiple responses. NR are nonresponses.

Table 3. Courses moved to alternative teaching formats following COVID-19.

During the summer and fall of 2020, were any of the courses you normally teach in person moved to online/ remote formats (including hybrid or web assisted) due to COVID-19 concerns? ^a				
Yes, all of my classes	Yes, some of my courses were taught remotely, in hybrid, or web assisted format	No, all of my classes were already online	No, all of my classes remained in-person	No, I did not teach these semesters
212 (79%)	29 (11%)	5 (2%)	2 (1%)	20 (7%)

^aPercentages are out of 268 responses received.

research which is the area (reduced research responsibilities) survey participants were least likely to trade for more time to participate in pedagogy training. As respondents indicate below, faculty were just trying to “get through” it all, and our institutions did not provide faculty the resources that would be most likely to increase interest, or the demand for, pedagogical training. It is therefore not surprising that demand did not increase despite the shift in learning modalities during the pandemic.

Future interest in remote and hybrid courses

I actually think (and students confirmed in their evaluation) that Covid-19 induced online teaching has some advantages in terms of student engagement and exercises. I will try to continue some of my courses in an online format after the pandemic is over. (man, research organization or think tank)⁷

Most political scientists surveyed reported that during the summer and fall of 2020, their in-person courses were converted to remote, hybrid, or web assisted formats (Table 3). At least 41% (of 180 responses) expressed interest in teaching in one of these formats in the future, which indicates interest in alternative course offerings and a need for related training in the future. Nevertheless, many respondents preferred in-person courses. One respondent (woman, tenured, Ph.D. granting institution) stated, “teaching online is not enjoyable compared to teaching in person.” Another (male, tenured, institution not specified) explained: “It went better than [I] expected. That said, it is not nearly as satisfying as face-to-face teaching.” Indeed, a third respondent (woman, tenure-track, 4-year institution) called flex learning “an unmitigated disaster for all” and “Horrid.”

Table 4. Interest in teaching online, remote, and hybrid courses in the future.

If given the choice, would you teach in one of the following formats in the future? ^a	
Online	101 (56%)
Remote synchronous	100 (56%)
Hybrid/web assisted	83 (46%)
Remote asynchronous	74 (41%)
Total answered	180
NR	88

^aParticipants could select multiple responses. NR are nonresponses.

Table 5. Confidence in ability to teaching effectively.

How confident are/were you in your ability to teach effectively? ^a						
	Response	Total response	Male	Female	Genderqueer/ other	NR
Prior to February 2020	Very confident	152 (59%)	95 (67%)	48 (48%)	4 (67%)	5 (63%)
	Somewhat or moderately confident	92 (36%)	42 (30%)	45 (45%)	2 (33%)	3 (38%)
	Not very confident	9 (4%)	3 (2%)	6 (6%)	0	0
	Don't know/ unsure	3 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	0	0
	Total answered	256	141	101	6	8
Today	NR	12	7	3	1	1
	Very confident	125 (49%)	80 (57%)	40 (40%)	3 (50%)	2 (25%)
	Somewhat or moderately confident	111 (43%)	53 (38%)	50 (50%)	2 (33%)	6 (75%)
	Not very confident	18 (7%)	7 (5%)	10 (10%)	1 (17%)	0
	Don't know/ unsure	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0	0
	Total answered	256	141	101	6	8
	NR	12	7	3	1	1

^aPercentages are based upon total of respondents by gender identity per a question. NR are nonresponses.

Of the alternative course formats, most interest was in teaching synchronous courses remotely in the future (56%, 100 of 180 responses) an area where little training took place prior to the pandemic and an area ripe for additional opportunities (see Table 4). Online teaching was also of interest to those surveyed, with 56% of respondents (101 of 180 responses) expressing interest in teaching online in the future. Hybrid or web assisted courses were of interest to 46% of respondents (83 of 180 responses) and asynchronous remote courses to 41% (74 of 180 responses). This interest in remote learning beyond the pandemic suggests that colleges and universities will have an opportunity to expand their course offering formats with faculty buy-in. It also suggests, regarding the supply of training, that more opportunities may need to be offered to assist political scientists and other faculty transitioning to online and remote courses on a more permanent basis.

Confidence in ability to teach effectively

Confidence in teaching effectiveness declined in respondents that recall being very confident prior to the pandemic (see Table 5). Women overall reported less confidence in their ability to teach effectively but declines in confidence were felt by all gender identities. This is interesting considering the increased burden women faced during the pandemic, especially for female academics with caregiving responsibilities (Breuning et al. 2021; Deryugina, Shurchkov, and Stearns 2021; Gabster et al. 2020; Okeke-Uzodike and Gamede 2021; Pettit 2020; Power 2020; Shalaby, Allam, and Buttorff 2021). Indeed, one respondent (woman, tenured, 4-year) wrote “It is very hard to care about pedagogy

when you are in triage mode just trying to survive with zero supports and massive caregiving responsibilities.” Although a male participant (tenured, PhD-granting institution) noted too that “childcare commitments during COVID severely limited my ability to participate in professional development including pedagogy; it’s been a year of triage, including with teaching”—demonstrating the extra caregiving commitments may have been felt by faculty regardless of gender.

One way that institutions of higher education might mitigate these concerns is for institutions to pay more attention to the child and elder care responsibilities faculty face and to provide flexibility and incentives to these employees. However, there is some skepticism that academia will be more considerate about the effects of caregiving on scholarship and other academic responsibilities following the COVID-19 pandemic (Breuning et al. 2021, 429, 431). Considering this skepticism, additional opportunities to offer online and remote courses, financial incentives that allow faculty to hire caregivers, or workload reductions in other areas, as well as pedagogy training focused on how to teach more efficiently might help faculty balance caregiving commitments. Pedagogy training may also increase their confidence if it exposes them to fellow faculty facing similar issues. Likewise, mentorship, one of the teaching related opportunities most desired by political scientists surveyed (Table 7), may help boost confidence and provide tailored advice on how to work more efficiently.

Resources available for teaching

Most political scientists surveyed agreed that they used and had the training resources they needed to provide them access to technical support staff, library assistance, and faculty experienced in online, remote, or hybrid learning (see Table 6 and Table 7). They also agreed that training for learning management systems and remote video technology was used and adequate. Over half of those surveyed reported using all the resources asked about, with a little less than half utilizing library support and learning management system training. However, as discussed below, participation in pedagogy training among political scientists declined during the pandemic. Taking advantage of these resources takes time, and as discussed below, time and a lack of incentives meant less demand for pedagogy training at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 6. Resources available for teaching following COVID-19.

Are the following resources available to meet your needs while teaching following COVID-19?^a

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/unsure	Total answered	NR
Faculty with experience in online, remote, hybrid or web assisted learning	50 (20%)	112 (45%)	34 (14%)	31 (12%)	12 (5%)	10 (4%)	249	19
Technology support staff	86 (35%)	120 (49%)	19 (8%)	12 (9%)	4 (2%)	5 (2%)	246	22
Library support for procuring online texts and videos	71 (3%)	112 (46%)	27 (11%)	13 (5%)	3 (1%)	19 (8%)	245	23
Training for learning management systems is adequate	59 (24%)	119 (48%)	25 (10%)	24 (10%)	6 (2%)	13 (5%)	246	22
Training availability for remote video technology is adequate	58 (23%)	123 (50%)	32 (13%)	19 (8%)	6 (2%)	9 (4%)	247	21

^aPercentages are based upon number of respondents per a question. NR are nonresponses.

Table 7. Resources used to adjust to teaching challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Have you utilized the following resources to help you adjust to teaching challenges during the COVID-19 crisis? ^a					
	Yes	No	Don't know/unsure	Total answered	NR
Faculty in my institution with experience in online, remote, hybrid or web assisted learning are available to provide mentorship and assistance.	153 (62%)	83 (34%)	10 (4%)	246	22
Technology support staff are available for questions and/ or digital office hours regarding software and learning management systems.	180 (73%)	57 (23%)	8 (3%)	245	23
There is library support for procuring online texts and videos.	126 (52%)	104 (43%)	14 (6%)	244	24
Training availability for learning management systems such as Blackboard, Canvas, or D2L is adequate.	131 (54%)	98 (40%)	15 (4%)	244	24
Training availability for remote video technology such as Zoom, Loom, or Panopto is adequate.	146 (60%)	89 (36%)	9 (4%)	244	24

^aPercentages are based upon number of respondents per a question. NR are nonresponses.

Table 8. Participation and future interest in teaching related opportunities.

Please select your participation in the following teaching related opportunities that may have been or currently are available at your institution.^a

	Prior to February 2020	After or during February 2020	Did not have access	Interest in participating in the future	Total answered	NR
Mentoring	134 (67%)	111 (56%)	42 (21%)	92 (46%)	200	68
Funding for pedagogy	59 (37%)	33 (21%)	62 (39%)	71 (45%)	159	109
Teaching award	66 (39%)	32 (19%)	61 (36%)	73 (43%)	168	100
Diversity in the classroom	83 (43%)	62 (32%)	54 (28%)	80 (41%)	193	75
Seminar or workshop	143 (70%)	122 (60%)	30 (15%)	81 (40%)	204	64
Guest lecture	84 (48%)	45 (26%)	62 (36%)	69 (40%)	174	94
Peer observation	105 (60%)	48 (27%)	55 (31%)	69 (39%)	175	93
Pedagogy course	42 (27%)	14 (9%)	88 (56%)	48 (30%)	158	110

^aPercentages are based upon number of respondents per a question. NR are nonresponses.

Opportunities and participation in training

As a junior faculty member, the COVID-19 experience has taught us that senior people are also winging it at times. This situation has emphasized the importance of collaborative teaching rather than junior people simply taking workshops with senior people. (man, tenure-track, 4-year institution)

Participation in all training opportunities that we asked about decreased following the pandemic (see Table 8). One respondent (woman, tenured, 2-year institution) noted “The issue for me wasn’t lack of training opportunities. It was lack of time. I had to convert 5 classes in 3 months.” Among the responses received, interest in future participation in the pedagogy training we asked about ranged between 46% of responses for mentorship to 30% of responses for semester long courses on teaching pedagogy. This is consistent with our prior findings that there is more interest in opportunities, like seminars and diversity training, that are focused and require shorter periods of time

(Trowbridge and Woodward 2021, 813) and there was more interest in competing for a teaching award than most of the other opportunities. Mentoring is the most popular form of support wanted both in terms of participation and interest. Other common forms of teaching related opportunities focus on teaching pedagogy via seminars and workshops or having a peer observation in the classroom or via a guest lecture. Together, the data suggests (and is consistent with our 2018 study) that collaboration is sometimes preferable to seminars and workshops, which are the most offered form of pedagogy training. Likewise, outside of interest in funding for pedagogy research and development or any money associated with teaching awards, few institutional resources are needed to meet the demands indicated by our survey participants.

Obtaining or applying for funding to develop or research teaching pedagogy was not common amongst respondents (see Funding for Pedagogy in Table 8). There was more interest in being able to access funding for advancing pedagogy than there were respondents able to apply for this support for pedagogy research and development. This is one area where institutions may want to invest, especially considering the factors used in tenure and promotion decisions and that financial incentives would encourage more participation in pedagogy training (discussed below). The least common and least in demand form of pedagogy training is a semester long course on pedagogy. Yet 30% expressed an interest in participating in a semester long course in pedagogy training in the future indicating a demand for this type of program, albeit a lower demand than for other forms of pedagogy training.

As one participant (woman, tenured, 4-year institution) stated: “The pandemic and the George Floyd protests have moved me to think much more deeply about pedagogy and revise my entire approach to my teaching.” Indeed, 41% (80 of 204 responses) expressed interest in participating in classroom diversity training in the future. Yet, fewer political scientists reported access to this type of training. Twenty-percent (46 of 229 responses) were unable to access this type of training in 2018 (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021), whereas 28% (54 of 204 responses) were unable to access it in 2020. Despite interest in this type of opportunity, current opportunities to receive this training continues to fall below other forms of training. It also remains one of the least likely forms of training for APSA members to participate in with only 34% (66 out of 196 responses) of APSA members participating in 2018 (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021), 43% (83 of 204 responses) participating prior to February 2020, and 32% (62 of 204 responses) between February 2020 and June 2021.

Interest in training

I am expected to [complete] these courses, training, and time intensive quality measures (course shell development, lecture recording/editing, objective alignments, accessibility measures) on top of a 4/4 teaching load with no extra compensation. (woman, visiting professor, Ph.D.-granting institution)

Eighty-nine percent of participants reported that pedagogy training was important (see Table 9) with 54% (137 of 256 responses) reporting that its more important since the pandemic and 36% (92 of 256 responses) considering it as important as it was prior to the COVID-19 crisis. Interest in pedagogy training remained strong throughout the pandemic, as 31% (78 of 255 responses) expressed a stronger interest in pedagogical

Table 9. Increased importance of pedagogical training following COVID-19.

The COVID-19 crisis has made pedagogical training _____ ^a					
More important	Neither more nor less important	Less important	Don't know/ unsure	Total answered	NR
137 (54%)	92 (36%)	6 (2%)	21 (8%)	256	12

^aPercentages are based upon number of respondents per a question. NR are nonresponses.

Table 10. Continued interest in pedagogical training.

Has your personal interest in pedagogical training from prior to February 2020 changed? ^a					
My interests are unchanged	I currently have a stronger interest in pedagogical training	I currently have less interest in pedagogical training	I don't know	Total answered	NR
152 (60%)	78 (31%)	18 (7%)	7 (3%)	255	13

^aPercentages are based upon number of respondents per a question. NR are nonresponses.

training since February 2020. This is not surprising considering interest in most types of pedagogy opportunities we asked about resulted in around 30–46% of participants expressing interest in those opportunities. It is also worth noting that 60% (152 of 255 responses) respondents reported no change in their interest in pedagogical training since the pandemic began (see Table 10).

As prior research (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021) has shown and as one participant (woman, tenured, 4-year institution) noted: “The dept. level is generally not the place where pedagogical training happens at our university. We have a center for teaching and learning and everything is done by them.” Since most training is offered at the institutional level, it is not surprising that 38% (96 of 256 responses) hoped to see this training at the institutional level. Despite the commonality of institutions offering pedagogy training, 29% (74 of 256) reported that they would like their departments to offer the training and 30% (77 of 256 responses) were interested in having APSA or another professional organization provide the training.

Despite faculty prioritizing other responsibilities over participation in teaching pedagogy training during the pandemic, almost all respondents felt they and their colleagues could be encouraged and incentivized to increase participation in more pedagogy training in the future. Indeed, only 11 respondents answered that they do not think anything would encourage increased participation in pedagogy training.⁸ As with prior research (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021), most political scientists are not willing to trade research time for pedagogy training. However, they are willing to participate more if it helps them obtain tenure or a promotion, they are paid for the participation, or if their course load or service requirements are reduced. As one respondent (male, tenure-track, 4-year institution) stated,

As a junior, tenure-track faculty member, my time for such training programs is in short supply. I believe my institution has done its best to offer such opportunities, but, without an additional monetary incentive or course release, I am unlikely to participate in them.

Rewards for teaching and the use of teaching for tenure and promotion

Perhaps indicative of culture and institutional support behind training, one respondent (male, tenured, MA-granting) stated, “it took an enormous amount of time to retrain

for online teaching, and this wasn't recognized by our institution in any formal way." Another (woman, tenure-track, PhD granting) noted the extra demands political scientists and others have faced in the wake of these changes: "there's been a lot of discussion of how much 'more' faculty should be doing, but very little discussion of faculty burnout or the ways in which student demands for increased flexibility (f2f, hybrid, recorded lectures) increase that burnout."

Like this respondent, most survey participants were from Ph.D. granting institutions. Only 37% (56 of 152 responses from the 171 teaching at a Ph.D. granting institution) felt they were rewarded by their department or institution for their teaching efforts.⁹ Among institutions awarding MA degrees, only 36% (9 of the 25 responses from the 26 teaching at a M.A. granting institution) felt rewarded for it. Although the sample was small (8 that all responded to the question), faculty from community colleges were equally divided on whether they felt rewarded at some level for their teaching. Only those in 4-year B.A. granting institutions showed a small majority of those teaching felt rewarded for their efforts 60% (29 of the 48 responses out of 51).¹⁰ This demonstrates a gap between the institutional and department demand for teaching and the sense that the time and energy faculty put into teaching is rewarded.

Half (50%, 122 of 244) of respondents reported they did not feel rewarded for their teaching.¹¹ Women felt less rewarded for their efforts. Of the 148 identified as male, only 56 (38%) did not feel rewarded. Whereas of the 111 identified as female or another identity, 60 (54%) did not feel rewarded.¹² This sentiment was reflected in one participant's (woman, tenured, PhD granting institution) comment that "[s]enior males are often excused from teaching effectiveness while women and juniors carry the load."

Teaching as a part of department culture and tenure and promotion

As a proxy for a sense of department culture around teaching, we asked how often respondents discuss(ed) teaching with peers, graduate students, administrators, and others at their institutions. Most participants reported that they were discussing teaching at least once or twice a semester. This still left a notable number selecting that they rarely or never discussed teaching with others at their institution (see Table 11). We also saw a small increase in those reporting that they rarely discussed teaching doing so more often since the start of the pandemic. Keeping in mind the large representation of Ph.D. granting institutions in our sample, of those that answered rarely or never, 35 were from Ph.D. granting institutions, 6 were from MA granting institutions, 6 were from BA granting institutions, 2 were from other institutions, and only 1 was from a community college. Our qualitative feedback supported these measures:

Table 11. Frequency of discussions on teaching increased following COVID-19.

How often did/do you discuss teaching with others (peers, graduate students, administrators, etc.) at your institution? ^a				
	Prior to February and today	Prior to February 2020	February 2020 to today	Responded to another frequency
Daily/weekly	77 (29%)	30 (11%)	41 (15%)	120 (45%)
Once or twice a semester	60 (22%)	40 (15%)	41 (15%)	127 (47%)
Rarely/never	10 (4%)	24 (9%)	20 (7%)	214 (80%)
Don't know/unsure	5 (2%)	3 (1%)	2 (1%)	258 (96%)

^aPercentages are out of 268 responses.

Table 12. Importance of teaching instruments for hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions.

How important are the following instruments for your department in evaluating teaching for the purposes of hiring, tenure, promotion, merit review, or contract renewal?^a

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not applicable	Total answered	NR
Student evaluations	94 (40%)	103 (43%)	24 (10%)	16 (7%)	237	31
Teaching portfolio	86 (37%)	90 (38%)	29 (12%)	30 (13%)	235	33
Peer review of teaching by other faculty members/ chair/ dean/ other administrators	61 (26%)	84 (36%)	50 (21%)	40 (17%)	235	33
Participation in teacher training activities	18 (8%)	63 (27%)	125 (54%)	26 (11%)	232	36
Recipient of a teaching award	23 (10%)	88 (38%)	94 (40%)	28 (12%)	233	35
Teaches courses that the college or institution requires for graduation	40 (17%)	84 (36%)	83 (36%)	25 (11%)	232	36
Created new courses	20 (9%)	108 (47%)	85 (37%)	18 (8%)	231	37
Sponsored independent studies	13 (6%)	53 (23%)	135 (59%)	29 (13%)	230	38
Supervised theses or dissertations	37 (16%)	92 (40%)	53 (23%)	48 (21%)	230	38

^aPercentages are based upon number of respondents per a question, including those that selected “not applicable.” NR are nonresponses.

I am at an R1. The reality is that time spent being a better teacher is time away from research and only research is reliably rewarded. Moreover, there are biases in student rankings which mean that the most “popular” teachers are not necessarily actually better or spending more time on teaching. (woman, tenured, Ph.D.-granting institution)

It’s been hard, and we had retirement cut, and research is still more important. Women caregivers and disabled faculty are overlooked, and I’m worried about how this cut into research because tenure requirements have not changed. I put my heart and soul into teaching remotely, and all my colleagues talk about is slow publications despite the fact I was caring for elderly parents too. It’s demoralizing. (woman, tenure-track, 4-year institution)

Despite interest in teaching pedagogy training, participation is not considered important for hiring, tenure, promotion, merit review, or contract renewal decisions according to 61% (125 of 206 responses) of the political scientists surveyed (see Table 12). As noted with prior research (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021), student evaluations were the most important factor with 83% (197 of 237 responses) reporting it as either very or somewhat important. Teaching portfolios 75% (176 of 235 responses) and peer review of teaching 62% (145 of 235 responses) were also considered important or somewhat important by over half surveyed. While cancelation of student evaluations was unusual with only 28% (73 of 258 responses) reporting them canceled, peer review of teaching also declined after February 2020 with only 27% (48 of 175 responses, see Table 8) of those surveyed participating in the opportunity. As such, some of the traditional markers for success in teaching used for tenure and promotion considerations were not completed by many political scientists across the field following the start of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Discussion and conclusion

Corroborating what many of this journal’s readers might already conclude, our findings suggest that the COVID-19 pandemic hit faculty hard, across institutional types. Yet, as one participant (male, tenured, MA-granting) noted “it’s been an interesting experience,

with both positive and negative aspects. Support has been good.” Indeed, many APSA members and faculty utilized technological assistance and other resources provided to them during the shift. While almost all faculty moved to alternative forms of teaching and remote office hours with the option to delay the tenure clock, other accommodations like canceled course evaluations, grants, online proctoring, and online tutoring were less common. While faculty invested their time into revising courses and shifting to remote forms of student support, there were fewer political scientists engaging in pedagogy and other activities that can advance their careers. This dovetails with other observations that most political scientists still had their courses evaluated in the normal manner and those on the tenure track, especially women, were reluctant to utilize tenure delays (Breuning et al. 2021).

Over a third of those surveyed indicated interest in alternative forms of teaching after the pandemic, especially for online and synchronous remote courses. This suggests that departments and institutions should consider increasing the opportunities to learn more pedagogy in these formats. However, they also need to consider incentivizing faculty and provide them the time to participate. In the wake of redesigning courses and increasing caregiving commitments, faculty reported triaging their responsibilities, and participation in all areas of pedagogy we asked about declined during the pandemic. Interest in future pedagogy opportunities should be focused on fewer workshops and seminars and more on collaborative opportunities to learn more about teaching. It is also worth noting the interest for training on diversity in the classroom, such as diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) programs commonly found at universities and workplaces, especially following the Black Lives Matters Movement activism which overlapped with the beginning of the pandemic (University of Michigan 2023).

While there was some declining confidence in teaching ability following the pandemic, this mainly points to a need for more research on why women reported lower levels of confidence than men (see Table 5). This is especially important considering surveys of student experiences show students rate women lower in course evaluations (Chávez and Mitchell 2020; Gelber et al. 2022),¹³ that women were also less likely to feel rewarded for their teaching efforts, and the unaccounted-for emotional work they increasingly performed during the pandemic (Glazier and Strachan 2023; Newcomb 2021; Stadnyk and Black 2020). Combined with the decline in research productivity amongst female academics during the pandemic (Cui, Ding, and Zhu 2021; Stadnyk and Black 2020) this decline in confidence may be related to concerns over the long-term consequences of the pandemic for female political scientists seeking tenure and promotion in the future.

When tenure and promotion decisions are made, political scientists do not feel like the time spent on this training is an important factor in these decisions. We found that political scientists are likely to increase their pedagogy knowledge if the participation will count toward their tenure or promotion, if they are compensated for the training, or if they can reduce other teaching or service responsibilities. As such, to increase participation in teaching opportunities and pedagogy training professional organizations, departments, and institutions need to incentivize faculty. Even tenured and tenure track faculty are struggling to participate. Yet, tenured faculty, especially at Ph.D. granting institutions, are in the best position to demand greater investment in teaching. It might

take a collective push by faculty with more seniority and tenure status to advocate for APSA and their institutions of higher learning to provide the release time as well as grants and other forms of funding to incentivize mentorship programs and other forms of pedagogy training. While we acknowledge the reality that in many institutions this will involve a shift in both resources and culture (Trowbridge and Woodward 2021), our findings have demonstrated that political scientists are interested in pedagogy training provided they receive the time and incentives needed to participate.

As one participant (woman, tenured, PhD-granting) stated, “I don’t think universities have any clue what faculty members did to save these students during the long COVID year.” Tenure and promotion and hiring committees need to keep this in mind and acknowledge that reduced participation in these activities following the start of the COVID-19 pandemic is not a sign of waning interest or declined engagement with teaching. Rather, they are a common outcome of the pressures of the pandemic, researched-centered markers of success for tenure and promotion, and the desire of political science faculty to help their students during times of crisis.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the people who took their valuable time to review different aspects of this project. This project would not have been possible without the assistance of the research staff at the American Political Science Association, especially Erin McGrath. While they did not see the manuscript, the following people provided important feedback on our questions: Victor Asal, Wendy Johnston, Wesley Nishiyama, Jessica Pidgeon, Patricia Strach, and Julie Novkov. Panel attendees and discussants at the 2016 Teaching and Learning Conference, the 2019 Southern Political Science Conference, and the 2019 Midwest Political Science Conference provided critical feedback on our 2020 paper that helped us revise the survey for this article.

Notes

1. Tenured (47%, 125 individuals) or tenure track faculty (18%, 49 individuals) at Ph.D. granting institutions were the most common respondents.
2. The survey was administrative and the content posed little risk to human subjects. Participants gave their informed consent to the following statement:
The APSA is sensitive to the accuracy and privacy of the data collected in our surveys and evaluations.

Only aggregate data will be used in reports, except when the groups are sufficiently large to preserve the anonymity of respondents. APSA will not publish information that attributes any data reported in this evaluation to a specific individual.

Participation in this evaluation is voluntary and strongly encouraged to increase the value of the data for our members and in support of the discipline as a whole. Please complete the evaluation to reflect your opinions and experiences as accurately as possible.

ELECTRONIC CONSENT: Please select your choice below. You may print a copy of this page for your records. Clicking on the “I agree” button indicates that:

- You have read the above information
- You voluntarily agree to participate

Participants are anonymous. Researchers using data from the survey also signed a Memorandum of Understanding outlining procedures to address these risks specifically; to secure the transfer and storage of the data, and to have APSA staff review

any results for the possibility of identification of any participants (Erin McGrath, e-mail to the authors, June 12, 2023). APSA members can download data from this survey at <https://www.apsanet.org/RESOURCES/Data-on-the-Profession/Tools-and-Datasets>.

3. This response rate is comparable to our 2018 sample which out of 2000 members surveyed, 318 responded and 236 filled out at least one of our questions. Since there was not a separate 2021 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, we were unable to provide a comparable sample for this survey.
4. See [Supplementary Appendix A](#) for demographic data as asked by APSA. Note on demographic categories: In accordance with APSA reporting, the other race/ethnicity category includes data for those that identified as Middle Eastern or Arab American, other, or two or more racial/ethnic groups due to the small sample sizes (APSA 2020). Asian includes those that identified as East Asian or Asian American and South Asian or Indian American. The other sex/gender category includes those identifying as other and genderqueer. Unknown race/ethnicity and unknown sex/gender categories include those that preferred not to answer. Other for current position includes unemployed, retired, K-12 teacher, research organization or think tank, and lecturer. NA, prefer not to answer, and blank responses were listed as unknown.
5. The following questions and potential responses were similar to those asked in the 2018 survey:
 - Please select your participation in the following teaching related opportunities that may have been or currently are available at your institution. You may select more than one answer.
 - How important are the following instruments for your department in evaluating teaching for purposes of hiring, tenure, promotion, merit review, or contract renewal?
 - In your opinion, what would encourage individual faculty members in your department to participate in more pedagogical training activities?
 - In your opinion, what would encourage graduate assistants in your department to participate in more pedagogical training activities?
 - In your opinion, to what extent would the following factors encourage your department to provide more pedagogical training opportunities?
6. The use of remote and virtual were used interchangeably at the start of the pandemic as reflected in our survey questions. However, the now more commonly used term remote is used to report our results throughout for consistency. Remote courses may provide synchronous learning via Zoom, Microsoft Teams, or other platforms. This differs from online courses which are asynchronous in nature.
7. This quotation and all future quotations from survey participants are in response to the question “Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your teaching experience or opportunities to participate in pedagogy training programs since February 2020?”
8. These respondents included: 1 Full Professor from a Ph.D. granting institution, 3 Associate Professors from Ph.D. granting institutions, 4 Graduate Students from Ph.D. granting institutions, 1 Associate Professor from an MA-granting institution, and 2 Full Professors from 4-year BA granting institutions. In addition to these 11 responses, 1 additional respondent also selected “Don’t Know/Unsure” and 2 other respondents selected multiple other options.
9. Responses from two participants that selected both “Yes, my department rewards my teaching efforts.” and “No, I am not rewarded for my teaching efforts.” were omitted from the total of 154 responses to the question.

10. Responses from one participant that selected both “Yes, my department rewards my teaching efforts.” and “No, I am not rewarded for my teaching efforts.” were omitted from the total of 49 responses to the question.
11. Responses from three participants that selected both “Yes, my department rewards my teaching efforts.” and “No, I am not rewarded for my teaching efforts.” were omitted from the total of 247 responses to the question.
12. Two participants did not identify a gender.
13. This occurs even when courses are identical and online (MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt 2015; Mitchell and Martin 2018).


Notes on contributors

Jennifer Woodward is an Assistant Professor at Middle Tennessee State University and Research Fellow at the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy’s Center for Policy Research. Her scholarship focuses on the development and implementation of civil rights laws in education and employment. By looking at the potential of law, courts, and government agencies to shape and be shaped by society, she evaluates the everyday encounters between individuals and the laws designed to protect them. During her career, Woodward has worked at the College of William and Mary, American Bar Foundation, New York Latino Research and Resources Network, New York State Department of Civil Service, and the University at Albany, State University of New York. Her prior research includes publications on the formation of the National Organization for Women, the implementation of school desegregation in Nashville-Davidson County, TN and bilingual education laws in New York.

David Trowbridge is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Middle Tennessee State University. His research resides at the intersection of law and social movements, particularly in the area of cause lawyering.

ORCID

Jennifer Woodward  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7890-1963>

David Trowbridge  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2548-2002>

References

- American Association for Public Opinion Research. 2023. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. Ann Arbor, MI: American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- American Political Science Association. 2014. *A Longitudinal View of Political Science Doctoral Student Placement, 2009–2013*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- American Political Science Association. 2016. *Attend the Annual Teaching & Learning Conference*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- American Political Science Association. 2020. *Project on Women and Minorities (P-WAM)*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- American Political Science Association. 2022. *Membership Dashboard*. Tableau Software. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Beltran, Cristina, Cathy J. Cohen, David Collier, Edie Goldenberg, Robert Keohane, Kristen Monroe, Michael Wallerstein, Christopher H. Achen, and Rogers M. Smith. 2005. “APSA Task Force on Graduate Education: 2004 Report to the Council.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 38(1):129–135. [10.1017/S1049096505056258](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505056258).
- Benjamin, Gerald. 1971. “On Making Teaching ‘U.’” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 4 (1):41–47. doi: [10.2307/418574](https://doi.org/10.2307/418574).

- Bird, Kelli A. Benjamin L. Castleman, and Gabrielle Lohner. 2022. "Negative Impacts from the Shift to Online Learning during the COVID-19 Crisis: Evidence from a Statewide Community College System." *AERA Open* 8 :233285842210812 [10.1177/23328584221081220](https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584221081220).
- Breuning, Marijke, Christina Fattore, Jennifer Ramos, and Jamie Scalera. 2021. "The Great Equalizer? Gender, Parenting, and Scholarly Productivity during the Global Pandemic." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 54 (3):427–431.
- Carey, Kevin. 2022. "The Incredible Shrinking Future of College." *Vox*, November 14.
- Chávez, Kerry, and Kristian Mitchell. 2020. "Exploring Bias in Student Evaluations: Gender, Race, and Ethnicity." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (2):270–274. doi: [10.1017/S1049096519001744](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096519001744).
- Cui, Ruomeng, and Hao Ding, and Feng Zhu. 2021. "Gender Inequality in Research Productivity during the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. doi: [10.2139/ssrn.3623492](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3623492).
- Deryugina, Tatyana, Olga Shurchkov, and Jenna Stearns. 2021. "COVID-19 Disruptions Disproportionately Affect Female Academics." *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 111:164–168. doi: [10.1257/pandp.20211017](https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20211017).
- Dolan, Julie, Martha E. Kropf, Karen O'Connor, and Marni Ezra. 1997. "The Future of Our Discipline: The Status of Doctoral Students in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 30 (4):751–756. doi: [10.2307/420408](https://doi.org/10.2307/420408).
- Editors. June 19, 2009. "What Colleges Can Cut." *Room for Debate, a New York Times Blog*, June. <http://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/06/19/what-colleges-can-cut/>.
- Enia, Jason. 2022. "Pandemic Pedagogy: Lessons from a Decade of Teaching About Disasters." In *Active Learning in Political Science for a Post-pandemic World: From Triage to Transformation*, ed. Jeffrey S. Lantis. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 95–108.
- Euchner, Jonathan P., and Malcolm E. Jewell. 1989. "A Survey of Teaching by Graduate Students." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 22 (1):73–76. doi: [10.2307/419874](https://doi.org/10.2307/419874).
- Fraga, Luis Ricardo, Terri E. Givens, and Dianne M. Pinderhughes. 2011. *Political Science in the 21st Century: Report of the Task Force on Political Science in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Fox, J. Clifford, and Scott Keeter. 1996. "Improving Teaching and Its Evaluation: A Survey of Political Science Departments." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 29 (2):174–180. doi: [10.2307/420696](https://doi.org/10.2307/420696).
- Gabster, Brooke Person, Kim van Daalen, Roopa Dhatt, and Michele Barry. 2020. "Challenges for the Female Academic during the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Lancet* 395 (10242):1968–1970. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31412-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31412-4).
- Gelber, Katharine, Katie Brennan, David Duriesmith, and Ellyse Fenton. 2022. "Gendered Mundanities: Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching in Political Science." *Australian Journal of Political Science* 57 (2):199–220. doi: [10.1080/10361146.2022.2043241](https://doi.org/10.1080/10361146.2022.2043241).
- Gewin, Virginia. 2021. "Pandemic Burnout is Rampant in Academia." *Nature* 591(7850):489–491. doi: [10.1038/d41586-021-00663-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-00663-2).
- Glazier, Rebecca A., and J. Cherie Strachan. 2023. "The Long-term Effects of COVID-19 on Political Science Teaching." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 56 (3):349–356. doi: [10.1017/S1049096522001391](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096522001391).
- Grieves, Wilfred. 2021. "Youth Anxiety and Pathological Security-Seeking in Turbulent Times." In *Teaching International Relations in a Time of Disruption*, eds. Heather A. Smith and David J. Hornsby. 1st ed. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 143–158.
- Grussendorf, Jeannie. 2022. "Teacher Presence and Engagement: Lessons for Effective Post-pandemic Pedagogy." In *Teaching International Relations in a Time of Disruption*, eds. Heather A. Smith and David J. Hornsby. 1st ed. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 47–61.
- Ishiyama, John, Tom Miles, and Christine Balarezo. 2010. "Training the Next Generation of Teaching Professors: A Comparative Study of Ph.D. Programs in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43 (3):515–522. doi: [10.1017/S1049096510000752](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510000752).
- Jaschik, Scott. 2010. "Where the Jobs Are (and Aren't)." *Inside Higher Ed*, September 3.

- Kline, Missy. Fall 2019. "The Looming Higher Ed Enrollment Cliff." *Higher Education HR Magazine*, <https://www.cupahr.org/issue/feature/higher-ed-enrollment-cliff/>.
- MacNell, Lillian, Adam Driscoll, and Andrea N. Hunt. 2015. "What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching." *Innovative Higher Education* 40 (4):291–303. doi: [10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4).
- McGrath, Erin, and Ana Diaz. 2021. "2020-2021 APSA EJobs Report: The Political Science Job Market." *APSA Preprints*, October 22.
- Mitchell, Kristina M. W., and Jonathan Martin. 2018. "Gender Bias in Student Evaluations." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51 (03):648–652. doi: [10.1017/S104909651800001X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800001X).
- Nelson, Paul D., and Sherwyn P. Morreale. 2002. "Disciplinary Leadership in Preparing Future Faculty: The Humanities and Social Sciences." *Liberal Education* 88 (3):28–33.
- Nerad, Maresi, and Joseph Cerny. 2003. *Career Outcomes of Political Science PhD Recipients: Results from the Ph.D.s Ten Years Later Study*. Center for Research & Innovation in Graduate Education. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.
- Newcomb, Michelle. 2021. "The Emotional Labour of Academia in the Time of a Pandemic: A Feminist Reflection." *Qualitative Social Work: QSW: Research and Practice* 20 (1–2):639–644. doi: [10.1177/1473325020981089](https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325020981089).
- Okeke-Uzodike, Obianuju E., and Vangeli Gamede. 2021. "The Dilemma of Unrelenting Workload Amidst Covid-19 Pandemic: An Agenda for University Female Academics." *Journal of Research in Higher Education* 5 (1):12–46. doi: [10.24193/JRHE.2021.1.1](https://doi.org/10.24193/JRHE.2021.1.1).
- Osorio, Maricruz Ariana, Sara Parker, and Erin Richards. 2022. "A Call to APSA Part 1: Learn about Community College Faculty." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 55 (1):155–159. doi: [10.1017/S104909652100113X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909652100113X).
- Pandya, Bharti, Louise Patterson, and BooYun Cho. 2022. "Pedagogical Transitions Experienced by Higher Education Faculty Members – 'Pre-Covid to Covid'." *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education* 14 (3):987–1006. doi: [10.1108/JARHE-01-2021-0028](https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-01-2021-0028).
- Pettit, Emma. May 26, 2020. "Being a Woman in Academe has its Challenges. A Global Pandemic? Not Helping." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/being-a-woman-in-academe-has-its-challenges-a-global-pandemic-not-helping>.
- Pleschová, Gabriela, and Eszter Simon. 2009. "Teacher Training for Political Science PhD Students in Europe Determinants of a Tool for Enhanced Teaching in Higher Education." *Journal of Political Science Education* 5 (3):233–249. doi: [10.1080/15512160903038116](https://doi.org/10.1080/15512160903038116).
- Power, Kate. 2020. "The COVID-19 Pandemic Has Increased the Care Burden of Women and Families." *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy* 16 (1):67–73. doi: [10.1080/15487733.2020.1776561](https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2020.1776561).
- Rivard, Ry. 2013. "UNC Institution Looking at Cutting Physics, History, Political Science and More | Inside Higher Ed." *Inside Higher Ed*, October 29.
- Rothgeb, John M., and Betsy Burger. 2009. "Tenure Standards in Political Science Departments: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (3):513–519. doi: [10.1017/S1049096509090829](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090829).
- Rothgeb, John M., Annemarie Spadafore, and Betsy Burger. 2007. "Faculty Training in Political Science: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40 (4): 759–763. doi: [10.1017/S104909650707120X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909650707120X).
- Shalaby, Marwa, Nermin Allam, and Gail J. Butterff. 2021. "Leveling the Field: Gender Inequity in Academia during COVID-19." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 54 (4):661–667. doi: [10.1017/S1049096521000615](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096521000615).
- Stadnyk, Tricia, and Kerry Black. 2020. "Lost Ground: Female Academics Face an Uphill Battle in Postpandemic World." *Hydrological Processes* 34 (15):3400–3402. doi: [10.1002/hyp.13803](https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.13803).
- Supiano, Beckie. 2020. "How the Pandemic is P Professors to Improve their Pedagogy." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 28.
- Taylor, Kirsten. 2022. "The Pandemic and Pedagogy Experimentation: The Benefits of Ungrading." In *Active Learning in Political Science for a Post-pandemic World: From Triage to Transformation*, ed. Jeffrey Lantis. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 79–93.

- Trepanier, Lee. 2017. "SoTL as a Subfield for Political Science Graduate Programs." *Journal of Political Science Education* 13(2):138–151. doi: [10.1080/15512169.2016.1227264](https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2016.1227264).
- Trowbridge, David, and Jennifer Woodward. 2021. "Pedagogy Training among Political Scientists: Opportunities, Interest, and Obstacles." *Journal of Political Science Education* 17(sup1):807–824. [10.1080/15512169.2020.1795666](https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2020.1795666).
- University of Michigan. 2023. "Defining DEI." May 13. <https://diversity.umich.edu/about/defining-dei/> (May 13, 2023).
- University of Southern Mississippi. 2022. "New Study Shows Investment in Quality Teaching Leads to Higher Student Retention at The University of Southern Mississippi | The University of Southern Mississippi," February 10. <https://www.usm.edu/news/2022/release/quality-teaching-leads-to-higher-student-retention-at-usm.php> (May 13, 2023).