TEACHING MATHEMATICS GRADUATE STUDENTS HOW TO TEACH

by Solomon Friedberg

True or false: "The primary task of a mathematics graduate student is to learn, and ultimately to create, mathematics." Most graduate school faculty, including this author, would heartily agree. But such an individual, upon graduation, will be asked to teach his or her own course in the academy, or to work as part of a group in industry. It is natural to expect such a student to develop the skills necessary to do so while in graduate school. In this article I focus on some novel ways for mathematics departments to promote the development of teaching (and communication) skills, consistent with the primary focus on subject matter mastery noted above.

Before discussing teaching, it seems appropriate to acknowledge that there was a time not long ago when teaching skills were of little importance to many institutions. (See for example the discussion of the Princeton math department in the 1950s in Sylvia Nasar's *A Beautiful Mind*.) Several factors are contributing to a change in this regard. The United States is a nation at risk in terms of pre-collegiate mathematics education, but if we do not succeed in teaching mathematics to the undergraduate students we get, even if these students are not all highly-motivated and not all well-prepared, then our nation will not be able to train the scientific workforce it needs. At the same time, college tuition is large and growing, and consumers rightly expect that the product they purchase will be worth the cost. And it is not a given that as math faculty retire they will be replaced by new faculty; if we can not succeed at the teaching of mathematics to undergraduates then the pressure to have others do so in our place will increase. In the long run, then, mathematics will do better if the next generation of mathematicians on university faculties are excellent teachers. The topic of this article should thus be of genuine importance to the entire math community.

Lofty principles and long-term perspectives are fine, but most of us live day-to-day. Graduate students serve as teaching assistants (TAs), getting exposure to teaching and helping us do the job of educating our students. TAs do different tasks at different institutions—some run recitation sections, some teach their own class under the supervision of a senior faculty member, some are handed the syllabus their first day on the job and told to go to it. In all cases, good TAs are a benefit to a mathematics department,

---

Solomon Friedberg is professor of mathematics at Boston College. His email address is `friedber@bc.edu`.
Prof. Friedberg's research during the preparation of this article was supported by NSF grant DMS-0353964.

both in the actual teaching of mathematics to undergraduates and in relations with other departments and the administration. Bad TAs, as measured by student complaints, are a liability. To address this, many institutions offer TA-training (a better phrase might be TA-development) programs. It might surprise some to learn not that this TA-training exists, but that it comes in a great variety of formats at different institutions. Formats include an intensive period during orientation week, a summer course, a required semester course, a voluntary semester course, a one-hour per week or per month program during each year, a similar program but only during the first semester of TAing. Some programs involve only new TAs, some involve new and a few experienced TAs, some involve all TAs, some are only for experienced TAs. Besides the diversity in both TA duties and TA-training, there is diversity in how these are coupled, with programs spanning the range from minimal supervision and no follow-up as regards TA-training to carefully integrated and sustained mentoring.

What is in these TA-training programs? Certainly, to teach effectively one needs to be able to use a blackboard and to speak understandably (a foreign accent is fine; some of the best teachers I know speak heavily accented English). Accordingly, almost all programs include practice in explaining problems at the board, critiqued by the other participants or by the instructor. Some institutions videotape. But after developing teaching skills at this basic level, there is no uniform next topic, no canonical way to proceed.

This is not surprising. After all, there is no one right way of teaching, and no one approach to the classroom that is guaranteed to work for all. Good teaching is far from well-defined, and my idea of good pedagogy may be different from yours. So how can one possibly teach someone to teach well?

A crucial part of teaching, of course, is what you say and how you say it. In the rest of this article I would like to focus on two factors that contribute to what good teachers say and how they say it: *experience* and *good judgment*. It may seem surprising that one can speed the acquisition of the former and that one can teach the latter, but I will make the argument below that one can do so, and that doing so is useful to developing strong teaching in mathematics graduate students.

The first of these factors, experience, is an obvious one. Those who have been in the classroom for a few years have seen the range of student responses to our efforts, and have an idea of what works and what doesn't. Graduate students (and some beginning faculty), by contrast, frequently have limited access to experiences with students who are not like themselves—students who study mathematics for different reasons than they did, or even more strongly students who find mathematics frightening or uninteresting. Experience in teaching such students will come in due time, but the parent paying an enormous tuition bill is no more likely to accept this as an excuse for ineffective teaching than the patient who finds out that his surgeon is doing the operation for the very first time but skipped the practice course.

The second factor, good judgment, is something we are well aware of in mathematics research, but perhaps less so in the classroom. In the research setting, the student meets good judgment when the advisor's problem turns out to be solvable and interesting. In the classroom, it is an essential part of excellent teaching. Good judgment manifests itself in

the way that the teacher answers for him or her self and then for the class such questions as: Why is this mathematical concept important? What in the class material is fundamental and what is not? How do we balance conceptual understanding and an appreciation of the big picture with technical details and problem solving? How do we respond in lecture if students are unresponsive and possibly confused? What will motivate the students and engage them intellectually? What assignments will bring out their best? How do we respond to a diversity of levels of preparation? In these and many other questions that we face in the classroom, it is good judgment that makes some people successful and others less effective[1].

The key point is that these two factors are coupled. *The analysis of experience can contribute to good judgment.* A driver who skids on a slippery road once and thinks about it will drive the road more slowly the next time it rains. In an academic context, in the early twentieth century business schools developed a method of teaching based on the the analysis of experience, a method in which key business decisions were described and then analyzed—the case study method. As former Harvard President Lowell stated in the early 1920s, "The case method of business training is deemed the best preparation for business life, because the discussion of questions by the banker, the manufacturer, the merchant or the transporter consists of discerning the essential elements in a situation and applying to them the principles of organization and trade. His most important work consists of solving problems and for this he must have the faculty of rapid analysis and synthesis."[2] The analysis of cases promotes good business judgment.

The use of case studies to promote university teaching was developed extensively by Prof. C. Roland Christensen of the Harvard Business School, beginning in the late 1960s and continuing into the 1990s. His cases describe, in writing, crises in a university classroom, and in Christensen's implementation, each crisis is discussed in detail by a group with a discussion leader. The group members need not agree, but they are led to think deeply, in a Socratic-method approach. Christensen's seminar in the Boston area became renowned[3]. His book (joint with Barnes and Hanson) *Teaching and the Case Method* [1] is still a classic. But the issues and experiences in Christensen's cases are far from the ones of immediate concern to mathematics graduate students.

I first learned of case studies in the mid-1990s, when I was present at a case study discussion for middle and high school mathematics teachers led by Dr. Katherine Merseth of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. I still remember being deeply impressed by the way that the teachers responded to Dr. Merseth's case, and the way that in the course of the discussion they visibly reevaluated their ideas about teaching and began to make new judgments about how to handle teaching issues. It seemed to me that this method had the potential to contribute to the preparation of mathematics graduate students in an important way.

---

[1] As these questions illustrate, good judgment has as a foundation a sophisticated understanding of the subject matter being taught.

[2] As quoted in [1], pg. 41.

[3] A videotape giving the flavor of Christensen's seminar, *The Art of Discussion Leading: A Class with Chris Christensen*, is available the Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning, Harvard University.

During the period 1998–2002 the author led a major effort to develop case studies that would be relevant to mathematics graduate students. The project, dubbed the Boston College Mathematics Case Studies Project[4], had as its goal the development of case studies—depictions of aspects of teaching math to undergraduates, typically involving a difficulty or an important decision—that would supplement mathematics graduate students' experiences and promote the development of good judgment concerning classroom issues. The resulting materials would be evaluated for their effectiveness.

With some relief, the author can report that the effort has been successful. The development team[5] wrote 14 case studies, several with multiple parts or mathematical levels. (One of our case studies, Seeking Points, is included as a sidebar to this article.) The cases were created by an extensive process of writing, feedback from graduate students and faculty, and rewriting. Each of the cases raises a variety of interwoven issues, to be explored through group discussion and analysis (though they can also be read independently of such a discussion). The cases give graduate students the chance to analyze complicated realistic teaching situations (perhaps applying general principles they have formulated or discussed), to think in advance about how to handle teaching crises so that they can deal with them when they arise in real life, to formulate their own approach to teaching, and to view teaching as non-trivial and sometimes ambiguous, and as something to talk about. They supplement TA experiences and contribute to the development of good judgment. Discussion of the cases also contributes to listening and communication skills. Our cases were piloted at diverse institutions, public and private, large and small (around 20 in all). The evaluation[6] and extensive feedback from graduate students and faculty colleagues showed that the cases were in fact an effective way of broadening individuals' experience base and of promoting thought and dialogue about teaching.

To give the flavor of this feedback, here are several verbatim comments made by graduate students who had participated in a case discussion: "It helps me get some of these vague ideas I have about teaching etc. to solidify a little bit and also brings up issues of things I've never considered before." "I had the opportunity to think about some issues that, even though they come up daily as a graduate student, we don't really take the time to think about these issues the way I had time today...The problems these case studies raise are problems that touch me." "It was a really good situation to sit down and talk with different people who had different experiences. There were differences in the level of experience that people had and that made there be a chance for a lot of new ideas and a lot of seasoned ideas." "It's given me a vocabulary to talk and think about teaching that I wouldn't necessarily have just come up with as I'm worrying about writing my dissertation otherwise."

There were several surprises. We had special concern about the appeal of such a method for foreign graduate students, and concern with their ability to be involved in such a

[4]The project was funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

[5]Avner Ash, Elizabeth Brown, Solomon Friedberg, Deborah Hughes Hallett, Reva Kasman, Margaret Kenney, Lisa A. Mantini, William McCallum, Jeremy Teitelbaum, and Lee Zia.

[6]Carried out by independent evaluator Mary Sullivan.

discussion. In fact, it turned out that many foreign graduate students found the cases a useful window on American university culture, and many had deep ideas about teaching that were useful to all. We thought that the cases would work the same with all graduate students, but we found that many beginning graduate students did not have the experience base to discuss all cases, since they had not given any thought to the teaching aspect of their designated profession. Fortunately, it also turned out that this could be addressed by having more experienced peers such as a head TA or two in the case discussion. Most crucially, we learned that leading a case study discussion requires different skills on the part of the faculty leader than lecturing, and that there is a learning curve to leading a successful case study discussion.

To address this last point, we organized two multi-day workshops for faculty interested in our case studies while they were under development, and added extensive materials to the published faculty edition concerning the use of the cases. Since the conclusion of the development project, the author and Dr. Diane Herrmann of the University of Chicago have offered a series of workshops at AMS meetings for faculty interested in learning to lead case discussions (our workshop at the 2005 joint meetings was attended by, among others, participants from 4 non-English-speaking countries[7]). An additional workshop is planned for the 2006 joint meetings.[8]

At this point the case studies we have written and the materials we created to guide their use have been published [4], and they are being used in diverse ways in a significant number of institutions. They have been used as part of a first course in teaching and as the basis for a second course in teaching. They have been used as stand-alone materials and coupled with a book giving advice about how to teach, such as [5]. Just as learning mathematics is facilitated by well-thought-out exercises, our materials serve as a comprehensive set of exercises for teaching.

In concluding, let me observe that the ability to teach and to communicate well is of concern throughout science and engineering. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences's publication "Preparing for the 21st Century: The Education Imperative" reports that "employers do not feel that the current level of education [of Ph.D. graduates in science and engineering] is sufficient in providing skills and abilities...particularly in communications skills (including teaching and mentoring abilities for academic positions),..., [and] teamwork....." Discipline-based efforts seem most likely to be effective in addressing this concern. Fortunately, an increasing number of individuals are now thinking about how to develop teaching strength in mathematics graduate students, and in investigating how mathematics graduate students learn to teach. Other authors have started to share their own successful materials and programs (for example, [2,5,6]). Let us hope that these efforts will lead us to the day when every mathematics graduate student completing a Ph.D. is fully prepared to teach a class independently—and excellently—upon graduation.

[7]For a discussion of the use of case studies internationally, see [3]

[8]These workshops have been supported by a grant awarded to the AMS by the Calculus Consortium for Higher Education, with additional support provided by the AMS through the efforts of AMS Associate Director Jim Maxwell.

References

1. L. B. Barnes, C. R. Christensen, and A. J. Hansen, *Teaching and the Case Method*, Third Edition, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, 1994.
2. M. DeLong and D. Winter, *Learning to Teach and Teaching to Learn Mathematics: Resources for Professional Development*, Mathematical Association of America, Washington, D.C., 2002.
3. S. Friedberg, *Teaching Mathematics Graduate Students to Teach: An International Perspective*, to appear in Proceedings of the First KAIST International Symposium on Enhancing University Mathematics Teaching, Korean Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon, Korea. (Available on-line at: http://math.kaist.ac.kr/2005/proceedings/).
4. S. Friedberg and the BCCase Development Team, *Teaching Mathematics in Colleges and Universities: Case Studies for Today's Classroom*, Issues in Mathematics Education Volume 10, (available in faculty and graduate student editions), American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
5. S. Krantz, *How to Teach Mathematics*, Second Edition, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
6. T. Rishel, *Teaching First: A Guide for New Mathematicians*, Mathematical Association of America, Washington, D.C., 2000.