

Rapid #: -19530671

CROSS REF ID: **169633**

LENDER: **CCO :: Main Library**

BORROWER: **ZWU :: Main Library**

TYPE: Article CC:CCG

JOURNAL TITLE: College teaching

USER JOURNAL TITLE: College Teaching

ARTICLE TITLE: Teaching a Seminar on How to Teach Seminars in Psychology

ARTICLE AUTHOR: Jones, Tucker, et. al.

VOLUME: Online

ISSUE:

MONTH: August

YEAR: 2022

PAGES: 1-9

ISSN: 1930-8299

OCLC #:

Processed by RapidX: 9/14/2022 11:17:37 AM

This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code)



Teaching a Seminar on How to Teach Seminars in Psychology

Donald A. Saucier, Tucker L. Jones, Tiffany J. Lawless, Amanda L. Martens, Conor J. O'Dea, Svyatoslav Prokhorets & Evelyn Stratmoen

To cite this article: Donald A. Saucier, Tucker L. Jones, Tiffany J. Lawless, Amanda L. Martens, Conor J. O'Dea, Svyatoslav Prokhorets & Evelyn Stratmoen (2022): Teaching a Seminar on How to Teach Seminars in Psychology, *College Teaching*, DOI: [10.1080/87567555.2022.2106470](https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2022.2106470)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2022.2106470>



Published online: 01 Aug 2022.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 38




[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



Teaching a Seminar on How to Teach Seminars in Psychology

Donald A. Saucier^a, Tucker L. Jones^b, Tiffany J. Lawless^a, Amanda L. Martens^c, Conor J. O’Dea^d , Svyatoslav Prokhorets^a and Evelyn Stratmoen^a

^aKansas State University; ^bWashburn University; ^cSimpson College; ^dUnion College

ABSTRACT

Teaching is a skill that can and should be taught in graduate education. Fortunately, many departments offer some teacher training for their graduate students to prepare them to teach introductory and other survey courses. What is apparently still lacking is training for graduate students to teach upper-level seminar-style classes. Therefore, we designed and implemented a graduate-level seminar on teaching seminars in psychology wherein course-takers developed tangible resources (e.g., syllabi) to empower them to effectively (and autonomously) teach seminar-style courses. We believe our course provides an excellent model for departments interested in further enhancing the teacher training of their graduate students.

KEYWORDS

Graduate education;
professional development;
seminar-style courses;
teacher training

Many instructors find themselves in the midst of teaching despite having had no formal training to do so. It is often the case that instructors learn to teach by trial and error, without having had intentional training or mentoring in the process, exposure to best practices in pedagogy (e.g., active learning techniques), safe practice with feedback, or even a venue in which to share ideas. Thankfully, the field of psychology has recognized this issue, at least to some degree. For instance, teacher training in psychology graduate programs has become increasingly common, with emphasis being especially placed on offering opportunities for training and recognition for excellence by psychology departments (Buskist, 2013). Indeed, such trainings most commonly include having psychology teaching assistants (TAs) observe faculty members teach, attend teaching-related orientations or workshops, be observed by faculty members within their department, record and observe their own teaching practices, and enroll in teaching-related seminars (e.g., Chiu & Corrigan, 2019; Mueller et al., 1997).

Although there is variability in the amount and type of trainings being offered by psychology departments (Meyers & Prieto, 2000), such trainings have shown to considerably enhance psychology TAs’ sense of self-efficacy toward teaching (Boman, 2013; Chiu & Corrigan, 2019; Prieto & Meyers, 1999) as well as

decrease their fear of public speaking (Boman, 2013). Furthermore, teaching-oriented trainings have also shown to help improve TAs’ teaching ability by helping them to become more student focused (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004), enhance their pedagogical skills (Koehler et al., 2007), increase their ability to create effective learning environments (Langdon et al., 2017), increase their use of evidence-based teaching practices (Becker et al., 2017), and reduce their anxieties about teaching while simultaneously increasing their confidence in their own teaching abilities (Pelton, 2014). Put simply, these trainings positively impact participants’ teaching abilities. Despite the evidence concerning the effectiveness of such trainings, which tend to be brief and voluntary, more formal trainings (e.g., pedagogically-related graduate courses) and their subsequent effects on graduate student instructors have received little attention in the scholarship of teaching and learning literature (O’Loughlin et al., 2017).

What is apparently also still lacking is training for psychology graduate students to teach seminar-style classes, such as those that would be taught on special topics in psychology at the upper-level of the undergraduate curriculum or in the graduate curriculum. Although the pedagogical fundamentals (e.g., generating a syllabus, developing student learning outcomes, topic organization) are similar for seminar-style and

CONTACT Tucker L. Jones  tucker.jones@washburn.edu  Washburn University

¹Despite not having had completed the first two components of our TAP at the time this seminar was offered, the one graduate student, having previously taught in high school settings and served as a TA for multiple college courses, demonstrated having a general understanding of the pedagogical fundamentals that were addressed in our TAP sequence. However, since the semester in which this seminar was offered, this student has successfully completed the first two components of our TAP and has been selected to teach several undergraduate courses within our department.

content-area courses, the specialization of seminar courses as well as their emphasis on student discussion present a unique challenge that few instructors have been formally prepared to address. Further, it is rare for graduate students to have had the opportunity to teach seminar-style courses during their graduate training, or even to have explicitly considered how they would approach teaching them. Although literature detailing the exact courses typically taught by psychology graduate students is sparse, there is some evidence suggesting that these individuals typically teach introductory courses (Lumsden et al., 1988) or a variety of survey courses that may (or may not) be in the graduate students' areas of expertise (Kuther, 2003), especially at research-oriented institutions (Hailstorks et al., 2019). Fortunately, teaching introductory and content-area courses positively affects graduate students' employability following graduate school, with many institutions frequently looking for applicants with excellent research *and* teaching experience (Austin, 2002; Marshall et al., 2009). However, because such institutions are also likely to expect new faculty members to teach various survey courses as well as upper-level special-topics seminars, we believe that graduate students who have experience and training in developing seminar-style courses are especially likely to stand out during the application process.

Teaching seminar-style courses presents different issues and challenges than teaching introductory psychology courses or other content courses in the psychology curriculum (e.g., cognitive psychology, social psychology, developmental psychology). Compared to such survey courses, seminar-style courses are often smaller in size, with more focus on enhancing students' academic and professional development at higher levels (e.g., improving their critical thinking, writing, and peer review skills). Further, seminar-style courses can be high-impact learning experiences for students because of their increased focus on active learning, discussion, and participation, which emphasize the students' communication skills and the building of a classroom community (Casteel & Bridges, 2007; Kelly, 2012). Seminar-style courses often focus on special topics for which textbooks are not readily available, creating more reliance on primary source material both for student assignments and class preparation. Although these features certainly vary across seminar-style courses, and may be true of other types of courses (depending on the topic and instructor), we believe it is valuable to create a graduate course that teaches graduate students how to design and teach seminar-style courses in order to further enhance their teacher training.

Context for our seminar on teaching seminars

Our purpose was to design and teach a seminar for graduate students in our doctoral program in psychological sciences on how to teach seminar-style courses at the upper-level of the undergraduate curriculum or in the graduate curriculum and, in doing so, supplement the teacher training that we offer to our graduate students. More specifically, we have provided a "Teaching Apprenticeship Program" (TAP) to our graduate students for approximately the past two decades. This optional program has consisted of three components. First, apprentices take a graduate-level course on the principles of college teaching offered through our College of Education and taught by the staff of our campus's Teaching & Learning Center. Second, apprentices independently teach a relatively small (i.e., approximately 25 students) section of introductory psychology while also taking a weekly seminar offered by our Psychological Sciences Department and co-directed by two award-winning teaching faculty. These co-directors lead discussions on teaching practices, student issues, etc., and invite other excellent teachers (from within and beyond the department) to share their teaching philosophies and practices. The co-directors also observe the apprentices in the classroom and provide feedback on their teaching style and practices, as well as on their course policies, assignments, etc. Third, upon successful completion of the first two components, apprentices are eligible to teach other courses in the curriculum (e.g., larger sections of introductory psychology, low- and mid-level elective courses such as social psychology and psychology of women).

The TAP is a robust program in our department, and many of our apprentices not only demonstrate their teaching excellence as graduate students, but go on to successful teaching careers upon completion of our graduate program. What is lacking in our TAP, however, is any focused attention to the issues of teaching seminar-style classes. We believe our TAP would be substantially enhanced by a component that emphasized teaching classes of this type.

The previous principles of college teaching course

To provide better context for how our new seminar on teaching seminars would reinforce and extend the graduate students' learning from their previous experiences, we will discuss the first component in our TAP in greater detail. As we stated above, graduate students in

our TAP take a principles of college teaching course as the first component of our TAP. The principles of college teaching course, according to its syllabus, “is designed to help you think about teaching and learning at the college and university level.” It further discusses that students “will have the opportunity to develop or enhance teaching skills as a result of your work in the class, although the development of particular teaching skills is not the exclusive aim of the course.” The course goals listed for the principles of college teaching course (listed in Table 1) show that the course is designed to provide a broad overview of college teaching. The topics are appropriately general and the course is designed to service students from across the many departments of our large state research university. The majority of students who enroll in the course will or do teach large introductory lecture courses or lab courses. Perhaps as a result, the principles of college teaching course did not devote much (if any) discussion of topics that would be essential to the design and teaching of seminar courses, such as selecting a seminar topic, selecting primary source content for courses, active learning techniques (including discussion facilitation), and dealing with student problem behaviors. Further, the principles of college teaching course did not explicitly discuss syllabus design and focused more on general principles that would apply to teaching broadly than on the development of the students’ own individual teaching philosophies. Accordingly, we designed our seminar on teaching seminars to build on that the general foundation in more individualized ways for our students in the development of their personal teaching philosophies and creation of their own individualized seminars.

Overarching objective of our new seminar on teaching seminars

We developed our seminar on teaching seminars with the overarching objective to provide the opportunity

for graduate students to develop skills (e.g., design of syllabi for seminar courses, discussion facilitation) that would increase their ability to design and teach seminar-style courses at the upper-level of the undergraduate curriculum and in the graduate curriculum. In doing so, we provided the opportunity for graduate students to design all components of a seminar-style course that they would be prepared to teach in the future. Our focus in pursuing this objective was on the individualized professional development of the graduate course-takers.

Design of our new seminar on teaching seminars

We designed our seminar on teaching seminars to provide our graduate students with the training that would help them develop and teach excellent seminar courses. We developed the student learning outcomes of our course to achieve that objective (see Table 2) and we will discuss our rationale for including each of these student learning outcomes (SLOs). The first SLO extended beyond the general overview provided in the principles of college teaching course by allowing our graduate students to further consider and personalize their teaching philosophy. The second, third, and fourth SLOs allowed our students to apply their learning directly to the design of their own seminar courses through the selection of their seminar topic, the design of their seminar-specific SLOs, and the design of the assignments and assessments for their own seminar, respectively. The fifth SLO was included to provide students training and practice in infusing lectures (a traditionally passive learning strategy; Michel et al., 2009; Roberts, 2019) with active learning techniques (for a review on active learning, see Prince, 2004). We included this SLO for two reasons. First, we noted that this was not a topic explicitly included in the principles of college teaching course, and acknowledged that our students may teach lecture courses in their teaching

Table 1. Course goals for the principles of college teaching course.

-
1. Recognize the real responsibilities that come with teaching college and university students.
 2. Incorporate learning principles relevant to planning learning experiences for college students.
 3. Integrate concepts of individual learning styles into instructional planning.
 4. Recognize the opportunities and challenges of online learning environments.
 5. Realize both the value and the limitations of using student learning outcomes.
 6. Be aware of differences in learning styles and classroom participation in the diverse cultures represented by today's college students.
 7. Consider a variety of teaching strategies for different learning tasks – facts, skills, concepts, attitudes, creative problem-solving, etc.
 8. Understand the importance of evaluation in the teaching/learning process.
 9. Plan evaluation activities to help students learn.
 10. Concentrate upon important aspects of instruction when observing others teach or when viewing videos of your own teaching.
 11. Analyze the effects of instructional techniques or strategies when observing instructional situations.
 12. Identify your own strengths and weaknesses as a teacher and make effective decisions about how best to enhance and improve your teaching skills.
 13. Integrate technology with teaching pedagogy to effectively and efficiently facilitate your students' learning.
-

Table 2. Student learning outcomes for the seminar on how to teach seminars.

Upon successful completion of this course, you will be able to:

1. Articulate a clear, effective, and compelling statement of your teaching experiences, philosophy, and goals.
2. Select a theoretically and practically interesting topic for your own upper-level seminar course.
3. List appropriate and measurable student learning outcomes for your own seminar course.
4. Devise accompanying assignments and assessments, with appropriate grading schemes and rubrics for your own seminar.
5. Prepare and deliver interactive lectures that appropriately include active learning techniques.
6. Respond effectively to problem student behaviors that arise while leading and facilitating discussions in your own seminar.
7. Demonstrate the ability to select, read, and facilitate students' understanding of primary source materials for your own seminar.
8. Demonstrate the ability to lead and facilitate a discussion over sophisticated content.
9. Develop a complete syllabus for a seminar of your own creation.
10. Expand your teaching network by seeking mentoring from excellent teachers.
11. Demonstrate the overall skills to be an excellent seminar instructor.

careers (see also Kuther, 2003; Lumsden et al., 1988). Second, and more importantly, we acknowledge that it may be necessary, even in a seminar course, for teachers to provide overviews of content (either by design or spontaneously) as foundations for further discussions and decided some attention to the topic of engaging, interactive, dynamic lecturing would be worthwhile (Harrington & Zakrajsek, 2017). The sixth SLO regarding how to respond to problem student behavior was included because the principles of college teaching course did not explicitly address this topic and because seminar discussions provide situations in which certain problem student behaviors (e.g., inappropriate comments, lack of preparation, disengagement) may not only be frequent, but be particularly detrimental to the goals of the course (e.g., have civil discussion about a controversial topic). The seventh SLO was included so that we could guide our students in the selection of the primary source content that (in lieu of traditional textbooks) would provide the background reading for their seminar discussions that they learned to facilitate in the pursuit of our eighth SLO. The ninth SLO allowed our students the opportunity to combine their efforts throughout the course into a complete syllabus for a seminar of their own individualized creation. The tenth SLO was included to facilitate their future professional development in teaching by expanding their network of teaching colleagues. The eleventh SLO was a succinct summary of the entire course experience that by accomplishing, our students would demonstrate the overall skills to be an excellent seminar instructor.

To achieve these SLOs, we designed activities and assignments that loosely fit into three categories. The first category of activities and assignments, *Refining Teaching Philosophies*, provided the foundation for approximately the first four weeks of the course. Throughout this section of the course, we discussed our experiences with “good” and “bad” teachers; our individual teaching personas and philosophies; and how to articulate our teaching personas, philosophies, and practices in the form of written teaching statements and short videos. This section of the course

extended the foundation provided by the prior principles of college teaching course and we contextualized the discussion of these topics in terms of teaching seminars. The second category of activities and assignments, *Acquiring Resources and Knowledge*, provided the foundation for approximately the next four weeks of the course. Throughout this section, we discussed how to access the literature on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) that discussed topics related to teaching seminars; retrieved, read, and presented SoTL research that reported on topics related to teaching seminars; and created a network of teaching colleagues. The third category of activities and assignments, *Developing Their Individual Seminars*, provided the foundation for approximately the remaining seven weeks of the course. Throughout this section, our focus was on supporting the course-takers' efforts to create a seminar-style course of their own design that they intended to teach in the future. Because our goal was to prepare them to actually teach this course, time was devoted to every part of their individual course design process. More specifically, the course-takers started with selecting a topic for a seminar-style course and creating student learning outcomes. After accomplishing these important goals, the course-takers then focused on designing assignments, building the course point structure, writing course policies, setting the course schedule and progression of topics, and building a reading list of primary sources. A list of noteworthy assignments for each of these categories is provided in Table 3. For each assignment, the instructor and the other course-takers used class time to provide feedback about the general approaches to completing these components in the context of designing and teaching seminars in general as well as about the specific choices made by the course-taker.

Course structure

Our seminar on teaching seminars met for 75 minutes twice each week over the course of the fifteen-week semester (not including student breaks). Six graduate

Table 3. Noteworthy activities and assignments.**Developing Teaching Philosophies:**

Informal factor analyses of characteristics of “good” and “bad” teachers
Peer review of and recommendations for creating teaching statements
Teaching statements (documents and video presentations)

Acquiring Resources and Knowledge:

Networking reports about meetings with instructors located around campus

Literature searches through the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)

“Show and Tell” presentations and discussions of published SoTL articles (e.g., from *Teaching of Psychology*) that apply specifically to the context of teaching seminars

Teaching demonstrations of active learning with student role-playing

Discussion Facilitation:

Discussion facilitation

Use of active learning techniques in leading a seminar discussion

Addressing problem behaviors as they occur (via role play) during a seminar discussion

Developing Their Individual Seminars:

Choosing seminar titles and topics

Creating seminar reading lists with annotated bibliographies

Creating seminar student learning outcomes

Creating seminar assignment lists, point structures, and grading policies

Compiling and finalizing complete syllabi for their individual seminars

Creating and presenting seminar “pitch” presentations

students in our doctoral program in social-personality psychology took the seminar. All had prior teaching experience, and five had completed the first two components of our TAP.¹

Key course activities and products

One of the skills that our course emphasized is discussion leading and facilitation by the graduate students taking our seminar on teaching seminars. Accordingly, our seminar on teaching seminars provided the opportunity for each student to lead a 30- to 40-minute seminar-style discussion on a topic of their choice from their own individual seminar course. Students assigned reading to the other students prior to leading their discussion. Their discussions featured an active learning technique in the discussion they led and submitted a written summary of the active learning technique they used with references. During the discussions, the students who did not lead the discussions were given “conduct cards” (e.g., send text messages during class, pretend you did not do the reading) to introduce students’ problem behaviors that the discussion leaders would have to address while leading their seminar discussion. Indeed, prior research has shown that such role-playing activities are a robust teaching tool (e.g., Joyner & Young, 2006; Rao, 2011, Paschall & Wustenhagen, 2012) and are likely to better involve students in the learning process (DeNeve & Heppner, 1997; Rao & Stupans, 2012). As such, these role-playing activities were used to further prepare our course takers to teach their own seminars.

After each discussion, we debriefed with the students about their preparation for and facilitation of the discussion, and discussed strategies for addressing the students’ problem behaviors from the role-playing activity.

During the course of the seminar, course-takers not only advanced their professional development, but also created products to serve them in the future. In particular, course-takers completed three products with special value. Of primary importance, the course-takers designed a complete syllabus for their special topics seminars. Not only does this make the course-takers more informed about how to design courses generally, but the course-takers now have courses prepared to teach at the upper-level undergraduate or graduate level. Course-takers were free to select their own special topic for their seminar as long as it was relevant to the field of psychology. As such, the course-takers prepared seminars to teach the psychology of sex and gender, the psychology of LGBTQA+, the psychology of power and group dynamics, the psychology of social exclusion, the psychology of intergroup humor, and the psychology of social media. Having these syllabi, student learning outcomes, reading lists, etc., will reduce the time needed to prepare their teaching loads as faculty upon their hire at academic institutions. Each student successfully produced a complete syllabus that fully described their own individual seminars. These syllabi contained one-paragraph course descriptions that intended to both inform and inspire students who would take their courses. The syllabi contained lists of SLOs specific to the topic of the individual seminar that were written to connect course goals to student assessments and products using active language (e.g., using words like “describe”, “create”, and “explain”); complete descriptions of the course point structure, assignments, assessment, and products; complete descriptions of course policies (e.g., late policies, participation expectations); complete course schedules and scaffolding topic lists for a 16-week seminar course; and complete primary source reading lists to support the students’ learning for each week of the seminar course. The complete syllabi that each student created for the full foundation for their individual seminar courses provide the most direct evidence of student learning in our seminar on teaching seminars. Each student successfully demonstrated that they developed the skills to allow them to design a new seminar course.

Each course-taker also prepared and delivered a presentation to propose their seminar to an evaluating audience. At our university, new courses are subjected to an approval process by which teachers must

propose their new course. This proposal includes a description of what the course will offer students (e.g., SLOs, personal and professional development benefits) and how the course will fit within and enhance the existing curriculum. This proposal includes a full syllabus for the course and the instructor will propose the course to their home academic department for their approval before the course is advanced to their college's (e.g., College of Arts & Sciences) course and curriculum committee and to other university evaluators (e.g., Faculty Senate). Accordingly, we introduced our students to this process and provided them with the opportunity to prepare and deliver a proposal presentation for their seminar in our seminar on teaching seminars. The goal of this presentation was to:

“... describe your seminar course in a way that would not only get it approved by your colleagues, but would also excite them to have it as an opportunity for their students and a permanent addition to their curriculum. You will provide an overview of the course's purpose, content, outcomes, and assignments. You will also provide a discussion of what the course offers to students in terms of both academic and professional development, the target student population, any intersections and/or overlaps/conflicts with other disciplines.”

This presentation, and the question session that followed, in which the instructor and other course-takers acted as “committee members” evaluating the course for approval, helped course-takers to understand the placement of their proposed courses within the broader curriculum as well as to consider who may take their courses and the marketability of their courses. Doing so provided course-takers with a broader view of curricular development and issues that are considered by faculty and administration when evaluating newly proposed courses and developed a persuasive pitch for the value of their individual seminar course.

Course-taker feedback

At the end of the course, course-takers rated their progress toward each of the student learning outcomes for the course from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). These ratings are provided in Table 4, and show that course-takers believed that they made excellent progress in achieving the course student learning outcomes. All course-takers provided the highest rating to their achievement of selecting their seminar topics and in developing a complete syllabus for a seminar of their own creation. This latter outcome was a driving purpose for this course and resulted in

Table 4. Perceptions of progress toward student learning outcomes (SLOs).

Student Learning Outcome	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>
1. Articulate Your Teaching Statement	4.67	0.52	4-5
2. Select Seminar Topic	5.00	0.00	5-5
3. List Seminar SLOs	4.67	0.52	4-5
4. Devise Assignments and Rubrics	4.50	0.55	4-5
5. Deliver Interactive Lectures with Active Learning	4.00	0.63	3-5
6. Respond to Problem Student Behavior	4.17	0.75	3-5
7. Facilitate Understanding of Primary Sources	3.67	0.52	3-4
8. Lead and Facilitate Discussion	4.50	0.55	4-5
9. Develop a Complete Syllabus	5.00	0.00	5-5
10. Expand Your Teaching Network	4.67	0.82	3-5
11. Demonstrate Skills of Excellent Seminar Instructor	4.50	0.55	4-5

Note. Students rated how well they achieved these student learning outcomes from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*).

tangible products for course-takers that aided their professional development and preparation. Students also reported especially high ratings (≥ 4.50) for their abilities to develop other individual components of their individual seminar course syllabus (e.g., creating SLOs and assignments), leading and facilitating seminar discussions, and demonstrating their skills as an excellent seminar instructor. Informal content analysis of the student narrative feedback suggested that the course could be improved by having more time be devoted to teaching demonstrations, methods for dealing with students' problem behavior, and developing assignment rubrics. Course-takers reported that the things they liked best about the course were the teaching demonstrations, the time spent on feedback for their developing seminars, and having designed a syllabus and reading list for a seminar on their topic of interest. We acknowledge that this small sample of student perception data does not provide direct evidence that our students did actually achieve the SLOs for our seminar on teaching seminars, but these data do supplement the more direct evidence provided by the course products our students completed that we discussed above that our students were prepared by our seminar to design and teach their own individual seminars.

Discussion

Our seminar on teaching seminars is a valuable addition to the efforts currently being made to train graduate students to be college-level teachers. However, whereas many of these trainings tend to focus on helping students develop a pedagogical foundation (e.g., Becker et al., 2017; Boman, 2013; Langdon et al., 2017), they do not typically prepare graduate student instructors to teach seminar-style courses.

Although there is overlap among how survey-style and seminar-style courses are designed in taught, there is a large difference in the breadth and depth of these types of courses. Survey-style courses are broader and less deep, and consequently instructors teach a lot of different topics in less detail. Seminar-style courses are narrower and deeper, and consequently instructors must be more expert in a specific content area in order to be able to facilitate meaningful discussions. Indeed, our seminar not only helps to provide graduate student instructors with information on pedagogical fundamentals, but also teaches them about the course design aspects that are unique to seminar-style classes. The students in our course learned to develop all components of a seminar course, from the selection of the title and topic, to the development of a scaffolding course topic schedule, to the selection of primary source readings (in lieu of traditional textbooks), to the compilation and complete development of a full syllabus to describe an individual seminar course of their own design. The students in our course also learned and practice discussion facilitation skills, to use active learning strategies to lead those discussions (Prince, 2004), and to address students' problem behaviors in those discussions. The activities and products the students produced in our course, along with their perceptions of their achievement of our course SLOs, support our conclusion that our seminar on teaching seminars successfully taught our students to design and teach their own individual seminars. Whether implemented by itself, or as part of a broader training curriculum, our course provides graduate students instructors with the tools they need to be successful in teaching seminar-style courses.

Our evaluation of our course is not without its limitations. It is important to recognize that the overall evaluation of the effectiveness of the seminar was assessed using the products our students produced in our seminar on teaching seminars, and were supplemented by the course-takers' self-rated progress, which, admittedly, came from a small sample. Future investigations on the effectiveness of such seminars should seek to use more comprehensive evaluation designs in additional cohorts of students. Despite this limitation, however, each course-taker completed the semester with the tangible resources (e.g., list of SLOs, complete syllabus, list of assignments and corresponding assessment strategies, a thorough catalog of primary source readings) they would need to effectively (and autonomously) teach a seminar-style course. The course-takers also made excellent recommendations about how this course could be improved (e.g.,

spending more time on teaching demonstrations). Such recommendations can be used to further develop our seminar as well as better inform future professional development opportunities.

Our seminar on teaching seminars was a pilot course at the graduate level that included a small number of students. As such we provide a template that would allow others to create a similar course to teach their students to teach seminar-style courses. It should be noted that adapting our course template to a larger cohort of students may change the dynamics of and opportunities for discussion, as well as the employment of active learning strategies, that we enjoyed in our course. Having students with more variable or markedly less teaching experience than our cohort may mean that instructors will need to adapt their course structure and learning outcomes to provide more of the basic foundations of teaching than we did in this course. So while we provide this template for a seminar course to teach seminars, we acknowledge this template will need to be adapted to fit the teaching philosophies, needs, and contexts of individual instructors. We also acknowledge the engagement of each individual student in active learning strategies, and in particular the contribution to and reflection on the cohort's perspectives and experiences in class discussions, may be more challenging and less investing as the class size increases. Further, we have reviewed our own experiences in this pilot course for possible revisions for this course in the future. Overall, we believe our course structure, activities, assignments, and learning outcomes supported and achieved our overarching goal to successfully prepare graduate students to teach seminar courses of their own design. We expect to offer this course periodically in our graduate curriculum to support the professional development of our graduate students as teachers. As we stated above, and is common for seminar-style courses in general, we allow that we may need to revise and adapt our course to the changing needs of our students.

We believe that that our seminar on teaching seminars could serve as a model to help support the professional development of emerging teachers (e.g., graduate students, new instructors) by training them specifically to teach seminars. We recognize that not every academic department has graduate programs and relatively few faculty members are responsible for training graduate students for their instructional responsibilities. However, it is likely that many academic departments offer some form of seminar-style instruction and also likely that the instructors of these courses have received little (to

no) training in how to prepare for these types of courses. Using our course as a model, we believe that any academic department can implement some form of professional development that helps to prepare instructors to teach seminar-style courses by providing an environment that discusses the selection of specific special topics, the development of excellent student learning outcomes, the formation of discussion-based assessments, the selection of appropriate primary sources, the leading and facilitation of discussions in seminar settings, and addressing students' problem behaviors in seminar settings. Such professional development opportunities could quickly and efficiently supplement the teaching skill sets of faculty and graduate students, alike. Similarly, recent research also suggests that such professional development opportunities could help to enhance the subjective experiences of faculty and graduate students in the classroom which, in turn, could enhance the subjective experiences of their students as well as improve students' performance on assessments (Saucier et al., 2022).

In sum, we believe that our course, as well as the feedback provided by our course-takers, provides an excellent model for academic departments interested in further enhancing the teacher training of their graduate students (and/or instructors in general). We recognize and appreciate the excellent teaching strategies and teacher training efforts currently being used by many academic departments (see Mueller et al., 1997). However, we believe that further emphasizing the development of our graduate students' abilities to teach upper-level undergraduate and/or graduate-level special-topics seminars will not only increase their marketability, but will prepare them to succeed as teaching faculty. This training may be provided alongside other professional development efforts that focus on teaching more generally (Saucier et al., 2021). We believe that this training to specifically design and teach seminars will supplement and extend the general teacher training that many graduate students already receive in unique and essential ways.

ORCID

Conor J. O'Dea  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9727-1779>

References

- Becker, E. A., Easion, E. J., Potter, S. C., Guzman-Alvarez, A., Spear, J. M., Facciotti, M. T., Igo, M. M., Singer, M., & Pagliarulo, C. (2017). The effects of practice-based training on graduate teaching assistants' classroom practices. *CBE – Life Sciences Education*, 58(16), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.16-05-0162>
- Boman, J. S. (2013). Graduate student teaching development: Evaluating the effectiveness of training in relation to graduate student characteristics. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 43(1), 100–114. <https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v43i1.2072>
- Buskist, W. (2013). Preparing the new psychology professoriate to teach: Past, present, and future. *Teaching of Psychology*, 40(4), 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628313501047>
- Casteel, M. A., & Bridges, K. R. (2007). Goodbye lecture: A student-led seminar approach for teaching upper division courses. *Teaching of Psychology*, 34(2), 107–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280701293123>
- Chiu, P. H. P., & Corrigan, P. (2019). A study of graduate teaching assistants' self-efficacy in teaching: Fits and starts in the first triennium of teaching. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1579964. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1579964>
- DeNeve, K. M., & Heppner, M. J. (1997). Role play simulations: The assessment of an active learning technique and comparisons with traditional lectures. *Innovative Higher Education*, 21(3), 231–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01243718>
- Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachings on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching, and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5(1), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787404040463>
- Hailstorks, R., Stamm, K. E., Norcross, J. C., Pfund, R. A., & Christidis, P. (2019). 2016 undergraduate study in psychology: Faculty characteristics and online teaching. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 5(1), 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000134>
- Harrington, C., & Zakrajsek, T. D. (2017). *Dynamic lecturing: Research-based strategies to enhance lecture effectiveness*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Joyner, B., & Young, L. (2006). Teaching medical students using role play: Twelve tips for successful role plays. *Medical Teacher*, 28(3), 225–229.
- Kelly, R. (2012). *Implementing high-impact learning across the institution*. Faculty Focus: Academic Leadership. <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/academic-leadership/implementing-high-impact-learning-across-the-institution/>
- Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., & Yahya, K. (2007). Tracing the development of teacher knowledge in a design seminar: Integrating content, pedagogy, and technology. *Computers & Education*, 49(3), 740–762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2005.11.012>
- Kuther, T. L. (2003). Teaching the teacher: Ethical issues in graduate student teaching. *College Student Journal*, 37(2), 219–221.
- Langdon, J. L., Schlote, R., Melton, B., & Tessier, D. (2017). Effectiveness of a need supportive teaching training program on the developmental change process of graduate teaching assistants' created motivational climate. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 28, 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.09.008>
- Lumsden, E. A., Grosslight, J. H., Loveland, E. H., & Williams, J. E. (1988). Preparation of graduate students as classroom teachers and supervisors in applied and research settings. *Teaching of Psychology*, 15(1), 5–9. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top1501_1

- Marshall, J. C., Buttars, P., Callahan, T., Dennehy, J. J., Harris, D. J., Lunt, B., Mika, M., & Shupe, R. (2009). In the academic job market, will you be competitive? A case study in ecology and evolutionary biology. *Israel Journal of Ecology and Evolution*, 55(4), 381–392. <https://doi.org/10.1560/IJEE.55.4.381>
- Meyers, S. A., & Prieto, L. R. (2000). Training in the teaching of psychology: What is done and examining the differences. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27(4), 258–261. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328023TOP2704_03
- Michel, N., Cater, J. J., & Varela, O. (2009). Active versus passive teaching styles: An empirical study of student learning outcomes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 20(4), 397–418. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq>
- Mueller, A., Perlman, B., McCann, L. I., & McFadden, S. H. (1997). A faculty perspective on teaching assistant training. *Teaching of Psychology*, 24(3), 167–171. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top2403_3
- O'Loughlin, V. D., Kearns, K., Sherwood-Laughlin, C., & Robinson, J. M. (2017). How do we train our future faculty to teach? A multidisciplinary comparison of graduate-level pedagogy courses offered at a large Midwestern university. *College Teaching*, 65(4), 172–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2017.1333081>
- Paschall, M., & Wustenhagen, R. (2012). More than a game: Learning about climate change through role-play. *Journal of Management Education*, 36, 210–543.
- Pelton, J. A. (2014). Assessing graduate teacher training programs: Can a teaching seminar reduce anxiety and increase confidence? *Teaching Sociology*, 42(1), 40–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X13500029>
- Prieto, S. A., & Meyers, S. A. (1999). Effects of training and supervision on the self-efficacy of psychology graduate teaching assistants. *Teaching of Psychology*, 26(4), 264–266. <https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328023TOP260404>
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x>
- Rao, D. (2011). Skills development using role-play in a first-year pharmacy practice course. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 75(5), 84–10. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe75584>
- Rao, D., & Stupans, I. (2012). Exploring the potential of role play in higher education: Development of a typology and teacher guidelines. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 49(4), 427–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.728879>
- Roberts, D. (2019). Higher education lectures: From passive to active learning via imagery? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 20(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417731198>
- Saucier, D. A., Jones, T. L., Renken, N. D., & Schiffer, A. A. (2021). Engage the sages: A model for offering professional development to faculty and graduate students in teaching. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 13, 3–16.
- Saucier, D. A., Miller, S. S., Jones, T. L., & Martens, A. L. (2022). Trickle down engagement: Effects of perceived teacher and student engagement on learning outcomes. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 33(2), 168–179.