

**Maximizing the Role of Undergraduate Teaching Assistants (UTAs) to  
Match Signature Pedagogies in Leadership Education**

- Author Information: Lindsay J. Hastings, Ph.D.
  - Clifton Professor in Mentoring Research, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
  - Research Director, NHRI Leadership Mentoring
  - 402-472-8739; [lhastings2@unl.edu](mailto:lhastings2@unl.edu)
- Author Information: Hannah M. Sunderman, Ph.D.
  - Assistant Professor, Virginia Tech
  - 605-228-5753; [hsunderman@vt.edu](mailto:hsunderman@vt.edu)
- Author Information: Nick Knopik, M.S.
  - Doctoral Research Assistant, NHRI Leadership Mentoring
  - Doctoral Student, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- Acknowledgement: Kaitlyn Forsythe
  - We would like to acknowledge Kaitlyn Forsythe for her contribution to helping us update our UTA manual to address academic integrity and for curating some literature related to UTAs.

**Abstract**

Teaching methods that emphasize cooperative and team-based learning in small groups are an increasing focus of education literature (Haidet et al., 2014) and have well-researched outcomes for students (Michaelson et al., 2014; Pai et al., 2015; Roberson & Franchini, 2014). Considering leadership education's heavy usage of discussion-based pedagogies in both large and small group contexts (Jenkins, 2012), reconsidering the role of undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs) in leadership education is paramount. The purpose of the current application paper is to integrate previous literature with recent results from practitioners on effective practices for utilizing small

groups in the leadership classroom. We use these integrated findings to innovate practice on maximizing the role of UTAs by matching their tasks to signature pedagogies in leadership education.

## **Introduction**

Expectations of higher education have evolved over time for college students as well as employers hiring recent graduates. For example, current employers of college graduates expect students to have a wide range of skills, abilities, and attitudes, such as a positive view toward diversity, as well as an ability to work in teams and communicate (Jones et al., 2017; Michaelson et al., 2014). The expectation of “soft skill” development has led to an increase in the use of pedagogical approaches that promote student participation and collaboration, such as utilizing small groups in the classroom (Haidet et al., 2014). Further, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U), NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, ACPA: College Student Educators International, disciplinary accreditor members of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), and the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) all propose student learning outcomes related to the development of team-based skills and interpersonal, collaborative competencies (Adelman et al., 2011; AAC&U & NLC, 2007; CAS, 2015; Dreschsler Sharp et al., 2011; NASPA/ACPA, 2004; NACE, 2019).

Starting in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, higher education instructors began shifting away from overwhelmingly lecture-based instruction to a menu of teaching methods in which students were active participants in the learning process (Davidson et al., 2014). One of the predominant teaching methods that arose during this time was cooperative learning, defined as “students

working together in a group small enough that everyone can participate on a collective task that has been clearly assigned” (Cohen, 1994, p. 3). Teaching methods that emphasize participation in small groups have demonstrated positive outcomes for students including enhanced knowledge acquisition and critical thinking (Haidet et al., 2014; Roberson & Franchini, 2014; Webb, 2008), participation and engagement (Clark et al., 2008), and teamwork (Bou Akl et al., 2012). Additional research indicates that students who participate in team-based learning experience increased learning transfer (Pai et al., 2015) and self-management (Michaelson et al., 2014). While these results provide evidence of the value of small group and team-based learning, students tend to describe frustrations with group work, particularly regarding social loafing (Hall & Buzwell, 2013).

Jenkins’ (2012) exploration of signature pedagogies in undergraduate leadership education revealed the following as the most frequently used instructional strategies: (a) class discussion, (b) interactive lecture and discussion, (c) small group discussions, and (d) group projects and presentations. Overall, Jenkins (2012) summarized that discussion-based pedagogies were the most frequently utilized pedagogy among the sampled leadership educators (N = 303) in a national study. Considering leadership education’s heavy usage of discussion-based teaching methods in large and small group contexts, reconsidering the role of undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs) in leadership education is paramount. Only utilizing one or two UTAs for grading and course logistics management is mismatched with leadership education’s signature pedagogies.

The positive outcomes associated with small group and team-based learning encourage leadership educators to reflect on effective uses of small groups in the classroom and reconsider the role of UTAs to purport effective small group experiences (e.g., small group experiences that

avoid social loafing). The purpose of this paper is to innovate practices for maximizing the role of UTAs in leadership education by synthesizing and integrating previous literature and recent research results on best practices for utilizing small groups in the leadership classroom.

### **Organization of Current Paper**

The current application manuscript is organized non-traditionally as data collection and analytic procedures were conducted a priori to inform the content presented related to maximizing the role of UTAs in leadership education. Qualitative data were collected via focus groups in the 2019 Association of Leadership Educators Conference Roundtable Discussions. The goal of the discussion roundtable was to provide participants the opportunity to discuss best practices for utilizing small groups in the leadership classroom. Discussion questions included the following:

- What have you learned from attempts at utilizing small groups in the leadership classroom? What strategies have been successful?
- How do we as leadership educators create conditions for small groups to work effectively and independently?
- How do you provide feedback to small groups in the classroom?

Three rounds of focus groups were conducted with five to ten participants in each session. While discussion questions created a structure for each focus group, leads presented by the participants were followed. Each roundtable was recorded via voice memo, and field notes and observations were recorded by one of the researchers. IRB approval was obtained to certify ethical conduct in the data collection and analytic process. Data analysis followed basic qualitative analytic procedures as outlined by Creswell and Poth (2018): (a) preparing and organizing the data for

analysis, (b) reducing data into themes via coding and code reduction, and (c) representing the data in a thematic discussion.

In response to the analytic process, the following sections offer synthesized and integrated themes from previous literature alongside the focus group results. Each theme begins with a short introduction, previous literature follows, then each theme closes with results from the focus groups. The paper concludes with reflections and recommendations for applying and implementing the innovative practice themes.

### **Innovative Practice Theme 1: Match UTAs to Pedagogical Approach**

Considering signature pedagogies in leadership education largely involve discussion in large and small group contexts (Jenkins, 2012), utilizing UTAs to match that pedagogical approach perhaps requires reframed thinking. For example, course infrastructure design in leadership education may need to evolve to support large UTA cohort models whereby each UTA facilitates one intact small group throughout an entire leadership course or program. This large UTA cohort model requires a paradigmatic shift from UTA as “instructor helper” to UTA as “co-facilitator of leadership learning.”

#### ***Previous Literature***

Peers play an important role in student learning and student motivation (Bovill, 2013; De Volder et al., 1985; Fingerson & Culley, 2001; Goff & Lahme, 2003; Marvell et al., 2013; Moust & Schmidt, 1994; Moust et al., 1989; Yew & Yong, 2014), as well as in the development of leader identity and leadership learning outcomes (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Haber, 2011; Komives et al., 2009). Peer facilitation strategies can help generate innovative ideas, motivate students to participate actively in the discussions, and provide an atmosphere for involvement and commitment (Baran & Correia, 2009). De Volder et al.’s (1985) comparative study of

student progress via small group discussions revealed that student-led group discussions are as effective as instructor-led discussions in retaining course material. Fingerson and Culley (2001) concluded from their study of active learning models among UTA-supported undergraduate classrooms that students are more active in the classroom when UTAs are present and are more confident in seeking help when they lack understanding of the material. Goff and Lahme's (2003) comparative study of undergraduate math students with ( $n = 218$ ) and without ( $n = 218$ ) a UTA indicated that students with UTAs spent more time on mathematics outside of class, had more contact with their instructor, felt more supported, and enjoyed their mathematics classes more than students without UTAs.

UTAs in a small group experience can positively affect a student's ability to develop mental schemas through which new knowledge can be acquired (Kwok et al., 2002). Face-to-face interaction with peers is especially important in leadership education, as Mitchell and Daugherty's (2019) perception study of students and alumni ( $N = 130$ ) from an academic leadership minor program revealed that students felt, as leaders, they benefitted most in courses where they could interact with their peers in person.

### ***Roundtable Results***

Focus group participants, overall, recognized UTAs as important to creating the necessary conditions for small groups to work effectively and independently. All three roundtable sessions highlighted the value of using UTAs for small group work. Repeated field notes from participant comments indicated that small groups create a better environment for students to feel comfortable enough to share openly and that UTAs are important to creating team-based accountability. Regarding pedagogical matching mentioned earlier, one participant highlighted the importance of ensuring that small group work ties back to the learning objectives.

## **Innovative Practice Theme 2: Small Groups by Design**

Small group experience does not necessarily assume that student learning will be enhanced. Johnson and Johnson (2008, 2009) emphasize the role of the teacher in ensuring effective small group use and providing the foundation for cooperative learning in the classroom.

### ***Previous Literature***

Instructors play an important role in influencing student cooperation in small groups (Webb, 2008). Johnson and Johnson (2008) suggest that the teacher's role is to: (a) strategically form small groups; (b) organize times for the groups to meet regularly; (c) provide concrete tasks that establish a routine for the groups; (d) ensure students periodically process the effectiveness of their small groups; and (e) confirm that students implement the five basic elements of effective cooperative groups, namely positive interdependence, promotive interaction, individual accountability and personal responsibility, appropriate use of social skills, and group processing. These elements have been researched and validated using social interdependence theory and are critical for effective small group cooperation (Johnson & Johnson, 2008). Student frustrations with group work that warrant instructor recognition include social loafing, free-riding, and differing work styles within groups (Hall & Buzwell, 2013). Instructors who utilize small groups effectively tend to involve students in the learning process (Gillies, 2008) and create conditions in which small groups can work effectively and independently (Michaelson et al., 2014).

Team-based learning (TBL) emphasizes that the teacher's role is to generate tasks that provoke intellectual frustration or dissonance in students, which promotes critical thinking (Roberson & Franchini, 2014). TBL requires larger groups than cooperative learning, so students are rarely resource-deficient when facing challenging decision-based tasks during TBL (Michaelson et al., 2014). Roberson and Franchini (2014) suggest that educators using TBL

should ensure that students interact frequently and make decisions that generate consequences in order to provide frequent and timely feedback loop opportunities.

### ***Roundtable Results***

Regarding strategic small group selection, there was no universal agreement among focus group participants. Some participants advocated for intentional small group assignment from the instructor, while other participants advocated for random assignment. For example, one participant maximized the cognitive diversity of teams using the Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory (KAI; see <https://kaicentre.com/>) while another participant used a series of personality assessments. Participants who advocated random group assignment supported the idea of using assessments upon group formation like the StrengthsFinder to help the team analyze their existing makeup. One participant advocated for role assignment sharing in which students are assigned a different unique role each class session.

Focus group participants offered several insights as to effective small group interaction. All three focus groups offered suggestions related to the idea that effective small group interaction is intentional by design; it is not a haphazard outcome of bringing students together. Agreement was expressed broadly in one focus group when a participant advocated for making groups early and having the same groups work together all semester. A follow-up sentiment was offered to indicate that the longer groups are together, the more they warm up to working in groups. Several participants across multiple focus groups advocated for clear team objectives at group formation and frequent check-ins and formative assessments on group functioning. Suggestions offered included establishing team contracts, goals, timelines, norms, and processes for how they will evaluate each other at the start of group work. Regarding mid-semester checkpoints, suggestions offered by participants included mid-semester check-ins on team



processes and progress with teams presenting on milestones they feel they have reached as a team. As per evaluation, one participant's comment about removing grades for group success/failure received broad support in one focus group, expressing that the important part is to have group members reflect on their function/dysfunction. Another participant advocated for having teams work on small projects first and evaluate their group performance before working on the larger project that bears the higher-stakes grade.

### **Innovative Practice Theme 3: Training and Reflection Practice for UTAs**

The selection and the dynamics of the teaching team (i.e., instructor and UTAs) are also important considerations for maximizing the role of UTAs. Course material can be enhanced through multiple perspectives and applications; thus, intentional diversity within a group of UTAs can impact student success (Felten et al., 2013). Additionally, training, preparation, and reflection are critical for effective UTA use (Farrell et al., 2010; Rubie-Davies et al., 2010; Sargent et al., 2009; Webster et al., 2012).

#### ***Previous Literature***

Trained and supported UTAs tend to have the greatest success impacting the progress of students, especially when given clear objectives (Cremin et al.; Farrell et al., 2010). To increase UTA effectiveness, meaningful time for preparation before lessons as well as time for feedback and reflection after lessons with the lead instructor are considered essential (Rubie-Davies et al., 2010). Webster et al.'s (2012) evaluation of alternative UTA strategies highlights the importance of reflection as results revealed that utilizing review, reflection, and action among UTA teams with the lead instructor allowed for positive change in classroom effectiveness.

Primary benefits of the UTA experience include increased teaching ability, improved public speaking ability, increased ability to work with people, gained confidence and insight into

self, enhanced communication and leadership skills, gained knowledge about how students learn and behave, and preparation for graduate school (Schalk et al., 2009; Weidert et al., 2012). In leadership education, major skills that can be enhanced from UTA experiences include communication, active listening, mentoring, responsibility, followership, professionalism, and collaboration (Odom et al., 2015). The multitude of possible benefits and skill enhancements from the UTA experience accentuates the importance of instructor facilitation of the UTA experience to enhance students' professional development. Spending extended time on UTA training and assigning developmental activities (i.e., writing exam questions, holding review sessions) can help to strengthen the cohesiveness among the teaching team and develop a deeper understanding of what it means to be a teacher, which can ultimately impact student outcomes (Sargent et al., 2009). For example, UTA training may include a discussion of learning objectives for students and UTAs, reflection on personal experiences previously in the course, and facilitation techniques (e.g., asking effective questions).

### ***Roundtable Results***

As one participant pointed out, instructors should intentionally have cognitive diversity within groups while recognizing that UTAs can also promote social cohesion. For example, one participant highlighted the importance of doing social activities (e.g., get-to-know-you activities) in small groups early in the course. Another participant discussed having groups engage in experiential activities. Two participants across two focus groups brought up the dual importance of teaching both content and process, ensuring that processing the small group dynamics is as much a part of the learning as the content. Notably, one participant highlighted the importance of UTAs being trained to use growth mindset language (e.g., "I see you working hard...") as opposed to evaluative language (e.g., "Good job..."). Two focus group participants discussed

student attitudes toward groups, acknowledging that UTAs and instructors must learn to anticipate negative student attitudes toward group work. One participant specifically reported that students in an online environment tend to be particularly apprehensive about working in small groups. The roundtable results confirmed previous literature, underscoring the significance of intentional UTA training to facilitate effective small group interactions.

### **Reflections and Recommendations**

The synthesized and integrated literature review and focus group analysis led to the refinement of existing UTA practices as well as the development of new practices. For example, we developed a new UTA training agenda and training objectives (see Figure 1). Additionally, we refined our UTA Handbook (see Figure 2 for a Table of Contents). Our UTA Handbook and weekly UTA training and reflection meetings include facilitation guides (see Figure 3). We also developed a new rubric to evaluate UTA performance both formatively and summatively (see Figure 4). The UTA infrastructure we employ now involves the following processes and procedures:

- UTA cohorts are intentionally selected by the previous year's UTAs and instructor(s) based on course performance, demonstrated talent for engaging in small group discussions, and positive contributions to small group culture.
- Upon selection, the UTA cohort engages in a one-hour orientation (see Figure 1).
- Each member of the UTA cohort receives a comprehensive UTA Handbook that includes basic training in small group facilitation and weekly summaries of the lesson plan along with facilitation guides for small group activities (see Appendices B and C).

- The instructor(s) and UTAs meet each week to (a) reflect on the previous week's content, learning, and small group progress, (b) discuss student growth and challenges, and (c) process and prepare for the following week.
- Throughout the semester, UTAs are offered the opportunity to engage in reflections on their UTA experience (e.g., in person or via writing) and offer “keep, start, stop” recommendations for the course.
- During the semester and at the end of the semester, UTAs are offered feedback on their performance (see Figure 4).
- At the end of the semester, UTAs and the lead instructor engage in a summative reflective discussion on overarching personal growth from the UTA experience.

### *Challenges*

This paper addressed the many benefits associated with involving UTAs in leadership classrooms; however, challenges exist, particularly for instructors who utilize large UTA cohort models in their classrooms. First, navigating compensation can be difficult. Instructors can compensate UTAs for their contributions to the classroom with stipends, work-study (if students are eligible), course credit, or volunteer hours (Begely et al., 2019). Instructors who pay UTAs should recognize that the stipend amount sends a clear message to students about the importance of their work, so stipends should be commensurate with the role's demands (Prieto, 2003).

Our UTAs can receive course credit for their work that counts towards a leadership major or minor. In a for-credit model, while instructors do not need to secure additional funding for a team of UTAs, they may need to consider the demands on their time that managing a teaching team requires. We recruit and select UTAs, prepare and update UTA handbooks, provide an orientation for UTAs, meet weekly as a teaching team, offer feedback on UTA reflection

assignments during the semester, and facilitate a reflective discussion to provide UTAs feedback on their performance at the end of the course. Each procedure demands instructor time and should be considered when incorporating UTAs in the leadership education classroom.

An additional challenge exists for instructors who utilize UTAs for grading student work. In this UTA grading model, instructors are responsible for ensuring that grading is consistent across the teaching team. A popular model for grading alignment involves organizing a group grading session, or a “grading party” (Felder, 1997), where instructors and UTAs grade as a group. Grading parties have several benefits (Drake, 2001), including (a) consistent grading; (b) immediate feedback for the instructor; (c) graders staying on task; and (d) timeliness. Providing an incentive, like a meal, for UTAs to attend grading parties tends to produce grading outputs greater than the effort and cost (Mirza et al., 2019). Notably, some institutions do not allow UTAs to grade undergraduate students’ work because of their peer status. It will be important to understand institutional policy and adjust UTA work accordingly (e.g., using a moderated system in which UTAs provide feedback that the instructor reviews and accepts or edits).

### ***Limitations and Recommendations***

While the stated purpose of this application paper was intentionally limited in scope (integrating previous literature with recent results from practitioners on effective practices for utilizing small groups in the leadership classroom) to reflect the limitations of the data collected, it will be important to acknowledge specifically that focus group data were only collected from 2019 Association of Leadership Educators conference attendees and only from those attendees who elected to attend the roundtable, likely due to an inherent interest in the roundtable discussion topic. As a result, there may have been some missing perspectives that would have provided disconfirming evidence to the surfaced themes or that would have challenged the

prevailing support of using UTAs to support small groups in leadership education classrooms. While the data collected and the data collection approach had inherent limitations and while we recognize that many leadership education classrooms are not supported by UTAs, our goal was to offer these integrated findings with previous literature to innovate practice on maximizing the role of UTAs by matching their tasks to signature pedagogies in leadership education.

Leadership education's reliance upon discussion-based pedagogies in large and small group contexts (Jenkins, 2012) necessitates the field to reconsider the role of UTAs. The synthesized and integrated literature and recent results on best practices for utilizing small groups in the leadership classroom serve to maximize the role of UTAs by matching their tasks to signature pedagogies in leadership education. Scholarly advancements in the utilization of UTAs in leadership education would benefit from examining UTAs' perception of learning by comparing types of institutions and methods of implementation. The integrated themes and literature presented in this paper also serve as direct practitioner recommendations related to (a) intentionally matching UTAs to pedagogical approach so UTAs have an active role in enhancing student development, (b) purposefully designing small group experiences and processes to ensure that discussion-based pedagogies in large and small group contexts meet their intended learning objectives, and (c) providing structured and reflective UTA training experiences to position UTAs for maximum positive influence on student learning outcomes. Leadership education is a fertile environment for challenging historical higher education practices of using UTAs purely for grading and course logistics management. Maximizing the role of UTAs by matching their tasks and training to support signature pedagogies affords leadership education the opportunity to inspire improved practices in teaching and learning broadly within higher education environments.



**Figure 1**

***UTA Training Objectives and Agenda***

By the end of UTA Training, students will be able to:

- Identify the elements of the Student Code of Conduct that pertain to the role of the UTA.
- Describe the expectations of [the UTA course] and how they will be evaluated.
- Describe the role of the UTA in the classroom setting.
- Articulate the importance of UTAs through a review of literature.
- Identify components of an effective UTA.
- Demonstrate effective small group facilitation.
- Demonstrate effective evaluation of students.

**Preparedness:**

- Review the course material to become familiar with concepts and principles.
- Think of ways to improve the experience you had; how can we do a better job of helping our students learn the ideas which we know are so important for being successful?
- Come to UTA meetings prepared, having read the manual and reading assignment; these meetings are designed to prepare us for this week's class.

**Working as a Team:**

- Be on time for our UTA meetings and for each class session.
- Meetings serve as a time for preparation before lessons, and for feedback and reflection after lessons to improve effectiveness among the team.
- It is important that the teaching team is collaborative and members are able to contribute ideas to make the group more cohesive yet represent a wide variety of perspectives

**Additional Comments:**

- Students build deeper relationships with UTAs and look to them for advice on the course, as well as their extracurricular activities and other commitments
- UTAs are viewed as less intimidating to approach than the professor, which helps students become more confident in seeking help when they do not understand the material. Your role is very important in the learning experience!
- Remember the influence that you can have on your students: challenge your students and supporting them, not giving them the option of taking the easy way out.
- Consider the influence of "symbols" that might create a barrier between you and the students (e.g., Greek letters, religious symbols, etc.)



## Figure 2

### *Table of Contents for UTA Handbook*

- I. Student Code of Conduct
  - a. Procedures for Reporting Academic Dishonesty
  - b. Help Prevent Academic Dishonesty
- II. UTA Training Learning Objectives
- III. [UTA Course] Syllabus and Rubric
- IV. Review of Literature
- V. Guidelines for Being an Effective UTA, Small Group Facilitation, and Evaluating
- VI. Session 1 Agenda; Facilitation Guide (FG): Name Activity
- VII. Session 2 Agenda: Difference Makers, Listening (Intro), and Hot Buttons; FGs: “Annie Williams” and Hot Button One-to-One
- VIII. Session 3 Agenda: Listening; FGs: Irritating Listening Habits Checklist, Proxemics
- IX. Session 4 Agenda: Locus of Control; FG: Coat of Arms
- X. Session 5 Agenda: Self-Fulfilling Prophecy and Strengths (Intro); FGs: Strengths Bulls eye, Strengths and Significant People
- XI. Session 6 Agenda: Strengths and Goals; FG: Goal Setting
- XII. Session 7 Agenda: Empathy; FG: Empathy Exercise
- XIII. Session 8 Agenda: Values; FG: Symbol Exercise, “What I Value Most”
- XIV. Session 9 Agenda: Eye of the Beholder; FG: Island Exercise
- XV. Session 10 Agenda: Conflict, Time, and Stress; FGs: Hazards of Change, Ten Things I Like to Do
- XVI. Session 11 Agenda: Living in a Global Society; FGs: Stereotyping Exercise
- XVII. Session 12 Agenda: Synergistics; FGs: Deelie Bobbers, Power and Influence
- XVIII. Session 13 Agenda: Investment Relationships; FG: Sticker Exercise

**Figure 3**

***Example Facilitation Guide: Hazards of Change***

**Purpose:**

Changes in one's life, either positive or negative, can have a significant impact on stress level and overall health. Too many changes occurring too closely together can have a significant impact on one's health and well-being. The purpose of this exercise is for students to examine the extent of change in their life and to analyze the impact of those changes.

**Procedure:**

Each student will identify changes that have occurred within the past year and assign a value to each of those changes based on the corresponding worksheet. The values should be summed and then analyzed against feelings of good health and well-being.

**Procedure with Students:**

*Context*

- We learned earlier that eustress occurs when our body responds to a stressor in a way that promotes heightened performance, but that distress is when our body is chronically going through the stress response.
- We often assume that distress occurs when we respond to negative stimuli or are overwhelmed by negative stimuli.
- Dr. Thomas Holmes, a psychiatrist at the University of Washington, discovered that too many changes (even pleasant changes), coming too closely together, can result in significant health problems.
- Dr. Holmes devised a "scoring system" to assess changes that significantly effect people.
- He assigned an arbitrary value of "50" to the life change of "getting married," then asked research subjects to rank other life changes in relation to getting married.
- Dr. Holmes discovered a significant correlation between scores greater than 300 and health ailments.

*Direction Set*

- Take 5 minutes to read the front page, then look through the scoring values on the back.
- Think through the life change events that have happened over the past year and sum the values of those changes.

*Processing*

- What was most surprising? What did we learn about change and stress?
- What can we do to alter the stress levels in our lives, so we can respond to environmental stimuli as eustress as opposed to distress?

Figure 4

*UTA Evaluation Rubric*

	Excellent "A"	Proficient "B"	Average "C"	Inadequate "D" or "F"
<b>Illustrate mastery of course content through peer instruction and mentoring</b>	Demonstrates mastery level understanding of course content. No misconceptions/errors evident in teaching and mentoring opportunities. All key words, descriptions, pictorial models, and concepts necessary to promote an understanding of course content for students <u>are</u> used and well organized to give added meaning.	Demonstrates proficient understanding of course content. Few misconceptions/errors evident in teaching and mentoring opportunities. Most key words, descriptions, pictorial models, and concepts necessary to promote an understanding of course content for students are covered in a meaningful way and are thoughtfully organized.	Demonstrates basic understanding of course content. Some misunderstandings and misconceptions are evident in teaching and mentoring opportunities. Many key words, descriptions, pictorial models, and concepts necessary to promote an understanding of course content for students <u>are</u> covered and somewhat organized.	Fails to demonstrate basic understanding of course content. Teaching and mentoring opportunities to deliver or reinforce course content are confusing to students. Many key words, descriptions, pictorial models, and concepts necessary to promote an understanding of course content for students <u>are</u> missing.
<b>Demonstrate course principles to students through professionalism and peer leadership</b>	<u>Models</u> exemplary behavior in accordance with class expectations. Appearance, dress, and mannerisms are professional. Mature and professional vocabulary and grammar are used. Exemplary tact and courteousness are displayed toward students and instructor.	<u>Models</u> appropriate behavior as outlined in the expectations associated with the class. Appearance, dress, and mannerisms are suitable. Proficient and appropriate vocabulary and grammar are used. Tact and courteousness are displayed toward students and instructor.	Demonstrates basic behavioral expectations associated with the class. Appearance, dress, and mannerisms meet basic expectations. Appropriate vocabulary and grammar are used. Basic tact and courteousness are displayed toward students and instructor.	Fails to demonstrate behavioral expectations associated with the class. Appearance, dress, and mannerisms are unprofessional. Inappropriate and/or unprofessional vocabulary and grammar are used. Tact and courteousness toward students and instructor are lacking.
<b>Develop activities and assignments for students to integrate course material and personal experience to further student learning</b>	Develops clear purpose statements and objectives for activities and/or assignments. Explicitly provides a logical organization and sequence. Demonstrates exemplary understanding of background knowledge necessary for activities and/or assignments. Uses a variety of teaching methods/aids and thoughtfully selects appropriate methods. Manages classroom behavior well. Asks thought-provoking questions to students and demonstrates exemplary responding skills (praises, listens, focuses, constructively corrects). Masterfully processes activities and/or assignments to ensure student learning.	Develops appropriate purpose statements and objectives for activities and/or assignments. Logical organization and sequence are evident. Demonstrates proficient understanding of necessary background knowledge. Thoughtfully selects appropriate teaching methods. Manages classroom behavior appropriately. Asks meaningful questions to students and demonstrates proficiency in responding skills (praises, listens, focuses, constructively corrects). Demonstrates proficiency in processing activities and/or assignments to ensure student learning.	Develops a basic purpose statement and/or objective for activities and/or assignments. Logical organization and sequence are somewhat evident, but not explicit. Demonstrates basic understanding of necessary background knowledge. Uses appropriate teaching methods. Asks questions to students and makes thoughtful attempts in responding skills (praises, listens, focuses, constructively corrects). Makes a thoughtful attempt to process activities and/or assignments to ensure student learning.	Fails to develop basic purpose statements and/or objectives for activities and/or assignments. Logical organization and sequence are not evident. Basic understanding of background knowledge necessary for activities and/or assignments is lacking. Fails to use appropriate teaching methods. Fails to ask questions to students and/or inappropriately responds to students. Activities and/or assignments are not processed to ensure student learning.
<b>Objectively evaluate student work according to rubric guidelines provided by the instructor, generated by TAs, or created in class</b>	Clearly justifies and can appropriately defend assigned grades using rubrics and/or evaluation guidelines. Provides copious feedback to students to improve performance. Maintains consistency in grading.	Can appropriately justify and defend assigned grades using rubrics and/or evaluation guidelines. Provides moderate feedback to students to improve performance. Demonstrates appropriate consistency in grading.	Rubrics and/or evaluation guidelines were used in evaluation. Provides basic feedback to students to improve performance. Basic consistency in grading is evident.	Fails to use rubrics and/or evaluation guidelines in assigning grades. Fails to offer feedback to students to improve performance. Consistency in grading is lacking.

## References

- Adelman, C., Ewell, P., Gaston, P., & Schneider, C. G. (2011). *The degree qualification profile*. Lumina Foundation.
- Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U), & National Leadership Council (NLC). (2007). *College learning for the new global century: A report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education & America's Promise*. Association of American Colleges & Universities.
- Baran, E., & Correia, A. P. (2009). Student-led facilitation strategies in online discussions. *Distance Education, 30*(3), 339-361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910903236510>
- Begley, G., Berkey, R., Roe, L., & Schuldt, H. (2019). Becoming partners: Faculty come to appreciate undergraduates as teaching partners in a service-learning teaching assistant program. *International Journal for Students as Partners, 3*(1), 89 – 105.
- Bou Akl, I., Ghaddar, F., Sabra, R., Parmelee, D., Simaan, J., Kanafani, Z., & Zgheib, N. (2012). Teaching clinical pharmacology using team-based learning: A comparison between third- and fourth-year medical students. *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 52*, 1806–1814. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091270011428986>
- Bovill, C. (2013). Students and staff co-creating curricula: A new trend or an old idea we never got around to implementing? In C. Rust (Ed.) *Improving student learning through research and scholarship: 20 Years of ISL. Series: Improving student learning (20)* (pp. 96-108). Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.
- Clark, M., Nguyen, H., Bray, C., & Levine, R. (2008). Team-based learning in an undergraduate nursing course. *Journal of Nursing Education, 47*(3):111–117. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20080301-02>

- Cohen, E. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(1), 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543064001001>
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2015). CAS learning and development outcomes. In *CAS professional standards for higher education* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.; pp. 24-28). Author.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Sage Publications Inc.
- Davidson, N., Major, C., & Michaelsen, L. (2014). Small-group learning in higher education - cooperative, collaborative, problem-based, and team-based learning: An introduction by the guest editors. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(3&4), 1-6.
- DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 627-647. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.35.4.zok627>
- De Voider, M. L., De Grave, W. S., & Gijssels, W. H. (1985). Peer teaching: Academic achievement of teacher-led versus student-led discussion groups. *Higher Education*, 14, 643-650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00136502>
- Drake, J. (2001). Grading within a team. Paper presented at the *Proceedings of Midwest Instruction and Computing Symposium*. April 5-7, 2001 at the University of Northern Iowa.
- Dreschsler Sharp, M., Komives, S. R., & Fincher, J. (2011). Learning outcomes in academic disciplines: Identifying common ground. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48, 481 - 504. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.6246>
- Farrell, P., Alborz, A., Howes, A., and Pearson, D. (2010). The impact of teaching assistants on

improving pupils' academic achievement in mainstream schools: A review of the literature. *Educational Review*, 62(4), 435–448.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2010.486476>

Felder, R. (1997). Beating the numbers game: Effective teaching in large classes. Paper presented at the *ASEE Annual Conference*, 15-18 June, 1997 in Milwaukee, WI.

Felten, P., Bagg, J., Bumbry, M., Hill, J., Hornsby, K., Pratt, M., & Weller, S. (2013). A call for expanding inclusive student engagement in SoTL. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 1(2), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.2.63>

Fingerson, L., & Culley, A. B. (2001). Collaborators in teaching and learning: Undergraduate teaching assistants in the classroom. *Teaching Sociology*, 299-315.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/1319189>

Gillies, R. (2008). Teachers' and students' verbal behaviours during cooperative learning. In Gillies, R., Ashman, A., and Terwel, J. (Ed.), *The teacher's role in implementing cooperative learning in the classroom* (Vol. 7, pp. 238-257). Springer.

Goff, C., & Lahme, B. (2003). Benefits of a comprehensive undergraduate teaching assistant program. *Problems, Resources, and Issues in Mathematics Undergraduate Studies*, 13(1), pp. 75-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511970308984047>

Haber, P. (2011). Peer education in student leadership programs: Responding to co-curricular challenges. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2011(133), 65-76.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.385>

Haidet, P., Kubitz, K., & McCormack, W. (2014). Analysis of the team-based learning literature: TBL comes of age. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(3-4), 303-333.

- Hall, D., & Buzwell, S. (2013). The problem of free-riding in group projects: Looking beyond social loafing as a reason for non-contribution. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 14*(1), 37-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412467123>
- Jenkins, D. M. (2012). Exploring signature pedagogies in undergraduate leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education, 11*(1), 1 – 27.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2008). Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning: The teacher's role (pp. 9 - 33). In Gillies, R., Ashman, A., and Terwel, J. (Ed.), *The teacher's role in implementing cooperative learning in the classroom* (Vol. 7). Springer.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher, 38*(5), 365-379. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X0933905>
- Jones, M., Baldi, C., Phillips, C., & Waikar, A. (2017). The hard truth about soft skills: What recruiters look for in business graduates. *College Student Journal, 50*(3), 422-428.
- Komives, S. R., Longerbeam, S. D., Mainella, F., Osteen, L., & Owen, J. E. (2009). Leadership identity development: Challenges in applying a developmental model. *Journal of Leadership Education, 8*(1), 11-47.
- Kwok, R. C. W., Jian, & Vogel, D. R. (2002). Effects of group support systems and content facilitation on knowledge acquisition. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 19*(3), 185-229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2002.11045731>
- Marvell, A., Simm, D., Schaaf, R., & Harper, R. (2013). Students as scholars: Evaluating student-led learning and teaching during fieldwork. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 37*(4), 547–566. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2013.811638>
- Michaelson, L., Davidson, N., & Major, C. (2014). Team-based learning practices and

principles in comparison with cooperative learning and problem-based learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(3&4), 57-84.

Mitchell, T. D., & Daugherty, J. (2019). Learning to lead: Perceptions of undergraduate leadership minor programs. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 18(1), 133-145.

<https://10.12806/V18/I1/R9>

Moust, J. C., & Schmidt, H. G. (1994). Facilitating small-group learning: A comparison of student and staff tutors' behavior. *Instructional Science*, 22(4), 287-301.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00891782>

Moust, J. C., De Volder, M. L., & Nuy, H. J. P. (1989). Peer teaching and higher level cognitive learning outcomes in problem-based learning. *Higher Education*, 18, 737-742.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00155664>

NASPA/ACPA. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and American College Personnel Association (ACPA).

National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2019). *Job outlook 2019*. Retrieved from <https://www.odu.edu/content/dam/odu/offices/cmc/docs/nace/2019-nace-job-outlook-survey.pdf>

Odom, S. F., Ho, S. P., & Moore, L. L. (2015). An examination of the outcomes of the Undergraduate Leadership Teaching Assistant (ULTA) experience as a high-impact practice in leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 14(2), 100 - 117.

Pai, H., Sears, D., & Maeda, Y. (2015). Effects of small-group learning on transfer: A meta analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 27, 79-102.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-014-9260-8>



- Prieto, L. (2003). Teaching assistant development: Research and impressions. In W. Buskist, V. Hevern, & G. W. Hill, IV (Eds.), *Essays from e-xcellence in teaching*, 2002 (Chap. 1). Retrieved January, 2021 from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Web site: <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/index.html>
- Roberson, B., & Franchini, B. (2014). Effective task design for the TBL classroom. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(3&4), 275-302.
- Rubie-Davies, C., Blatchford, P., Webster, R., Koutsoubou, M., & Bassett, P. (2010). Enhancing learning? A comparison of teacher and teaching assistant interactions with pupils. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(4), 429–449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2010.512800>
- Sargent, L. D., Allen, B. C., Frahm, J. A., & Morris, G. (2009). Enhancing the experience of student teams in large classes. *Journal of Management Education*, 33(5), 526-552. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562909334092>
- Schalk, K. A., McGinnis, J. R., Harring, J. R., Hendrickson, A., & Smith, A. C. (2009). The undergraduate teaching assistant experience offers opportunities similar to the undergraduate research experience. *Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education*, 10(1), 32-42. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.v10.97>
- Webb, N. (2008). Teacher practices and small-group dynamics in cooperative learning classrooms. In Gillies, R., Ashman, A., and Terwel, J. (Ed.), *The teacher's role in implementing cooperative learning in the classroom* (Vol. 7, pp. 201-221). Springer.
- Webster, R., Blatchford, P., & Russell, A. (2012). Challenging and changing how schools use teaching assistants: Findings from the Effective Deployment of Teaching Assistants project. *School Leadership & Management*, 33(1), pp. 78-96.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2012.724672>

Weidert, J. M., Wendorf, A. R., Gurung, R. A., & Filz, T. (2012). A survey of graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants. *College Teaching*, 60(3), 95-103.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2011.637250>

Yew, E. H., & Yong, J. J. (2014). Student perceptions of facilitators' social congruence, use of expertise and cognitive congruence in problem-based learning. *Instructional Science*, 42(5), 795-815. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9306-1>