Research Article

You Were Selected for Your Lived Experience: A Love-Centered Evaluation from the Perspective of Teaching Assistants in an IPE Course in Higher Education

Joshua Yusuf[1], MSc; Arezoo Mojbafan [1], MSc; and ivan beck, MScOT, MScRS[1]

[1] Faculty of Health, Dalhousie University

Please direct correspondence to: ivan beck at ivan.beck@dal.ca

Note: Authors are listed in no particular order.

Abstract

Introduction. While teaching assistants with diverse backgrounds are subject to biased evaluations and perceptions of capacity due to race and gender, academic perspectives and emotional and psychological impacts of teaching on diverse teaching assistants is lacking. **Objective**. Applying post-qualitative methods of writing and autoethnography, three PhD level teaching assistants applied a love-centered program evaluation to assess whether they have what they need to facilitate an online asynchronous IPE on allyship. **Methods**. Over the course of five weeks, the teaching assistants met to discuss a need for this work, designed, and completed the program evaluation. Core evaluation activities included writing a series of self-addressed love letters and meeting for group reflections on the teaching experience and the content of the love letters. **What Emerged.** Systemic barriers to engaging left the teaching assistants feeling less effective than they had desired. The lack of training and ongoing support systems led to experiences of unanticipated harm. **Conclusion**. This evaluation aligns with research that suggests that structurally marginalized teaching assistants may require additional support to do their work without harm. Hiring and fairly compensating a small group of teaching assistants to design and deliver a curriculum that aligns with their values and is structured according to realistic learning outcomes may be one way to reduce the harm experienced by teaching assistants facilitating an allyship course.

Keywords: post-secondary, writing as method, post-structural, program evaluation, allyship

It is impossible to teach without the courage to love, without the courage to try a thousand times before giving in. In short it is impossible to teach without a forged, invented, and well-thought-out capacity to love.

- Paulo Freire, Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those who Dare to Teach, 1998

Introduction and Background

Most often, teaching assistants (TAs [plural]; TA [singular]) are themselves graduate students in need of additional sources of income and teaching experience to build their academic resumes "yet their academic perspectives are underrepresented in current literature" (Tindell et al., 2016, p. 158), with existing evaluations of TA experiences lacking "a deep understanding of individual experiences and contextual factors" (Xu, Lei, & Sexaki, 2024, p 4092). While teaching can be a rewarding learning experience, the majority of literature exploring TAs' experiences focuses on understanding the connections between training and performance with little exploration of the psychological or emotional impacts of teaching (McDonald et al., 2023). With a "consistent bias toward instructors based on race and gender", graduate-level TAs from BIPOC and LGBTQAI groups are at increased risk of harm and/or unfounded negative evaluations from their students while performing their teaching duties (Guffin, 2024, p. 14). For instance, it has been noted that students may perceive TAs teaching social justice courses "who hold minoritized identities as having an agenda to advocate for their own groups," which may introduce an unfair bias towards TAs, leading to their teaching being disregarded (Guffin, 2024, p. 23). Considered to be a different relationship than friendship or intergroup/shared identity relations, allies have been defined as an individual from a dominant group who "work to end prejudice" and group-based privilege in their personal and professional lives by supporting individuals from non-dominant groups (Brown, 2014, p. 713). To the authors' knowledge, the experiences of TAs who may need an ally (e.g., being from a non-dominant group) while simultaneously teaching an interprofessional education (IPE) course on allyship, have not been explored.

IPE is a term used to describe a learning environment where students from two or more professions engage in learning with, from, and about each other (Ford & Gray, 2021; Rutherford-Hemming & Lioce, 2018). Shared goals of improving the quality of care and services to enhance patient outcomes and experiences guide learning situations designed to prepare students to engage in interprofessional collaborative practice (Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative, 2024; Khalili et al., 2021). The design, implementation, evaluation, and intended goals of an IPE experience must consider the available resources at the organization, faculty, and learner levels.

With a lengthy history of IPE, Dalhousie University provides accredited training for over 20 health professions across the faculties of Health, Medicine, and Dentistry. While the quantity and diversity of programs are fertile ground for the designing and delivering of IPE across the continuum of care, it also presents challenges ensuring those delivering IPE curriculum are well supported and have access to necessary training and resources to meet varied accreditation standards (MacKenzie, Sponagle, & Sibbald, 2024a). A recently released Open Educational Resource at Dalhousie outlines the need to plan for evaluation of IPE experiences. Despite TAs being frequently tasked with overseeing the implementation of the IPE curriculum, the need to include teaching assistants in the evaluation plan is not mentioned (MacKenzie, Sponagle, & Sibbald, 2024b).

To centre the internal psychological and emotional experiences of diverse TAs teaching an IPE on allyship in a way that recognized the inherent difficulties of being a TA, three PhD-level TAs completed a love-centered program evaluation drawing on autoethnographic writing methods in a post-qualitative paradigm. Thus, the purpose of this evaluation is to assess whether 3 PhD-level TAs

selected in part due to their markers of diversity (e.g., skin colour, sexual orientation, gender), have what they need to facilitate an online asynchronous IPE on allyship. Resting on the premise that not only is it impossible to teach without the courage to love, but to do so, one requires a well-thought-out-capacity (hooks, 1994), the evaluation question "Do we have what we need to be a TA in an online asynchronous IPE on allyship?" is an evocative one. Rooted in care for the self, the evaluation question prompts reflections deeper than logistics, trainings, and self-efficacy to get at the emotional and psychological needs and thus the well-being of structurally marginalized PhD students tasked with teaching how to work towards allyship.

Guiding Theories and Methodology

Grounded in the post-qualitative paradigm, this program evaluation uses autoethnography and Richardson's and St Pierre's 'writing as a method of inquiry' (2000) to assist the TAs in reflecting on and thinking through their experiences. Inquiry in a post-qualitative paradigm resists well-known qualitative methodologies of data collection (e.g., focus groups, interviews, observations), analysis (e.g., coding, generating themes), validity (e.g., member checking, objectivity) and field (e.g., participant observation, ethnography) (St. Pierre, 2021; 2023). Typically undertaken by researchers trained in qualitative research who recognize when their training may not align with the questions they are invested in, the post-qualitative paradigm is not another version of qualitative research.

As a method and form of research that aims to be evocative and personal, autoethnography uses writing to "draw upon the experience of the author/researcher to extend sociological understanding" of a concept or phenomenon (Denshire, 2014, p. 832). Thus, in autoethnography, the researcher and participant are the same person and employing 'writing as a method of inquiry' is one way for the researcher to disrupt an established way of writing common in and thus move beyond a qualitative paradigm (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2000).

The 3 PhD Teaching Assistants

Born Canadian, raised Australian, with Guyanese heritage - a daily sentence alongside "the accent is Australian". I am Joshua (he/him), not Joseph. Ambiguously racialized and large, for the longest time my sense of belonging was fractured by my daily interactions. I'm on a long journey of learning and resisting the anecdotal positive correlation between age and mental rigidity.

My name is Arezoo, and I see myself as someone who lives in the in-between spaces where identity, culture, and experience come together in ways that don't always fit into labels. As a woman and an international student from Iran, my journey has been exploring new places, learning, and growing. When people ask who I am, I'm a curious thinker who wants to make healthcare fairer and more inclusive, especially for those whose voices are often overlooked. My view of the world is shaped by feminism, and I'm committed to being an ally by listening, learning, and staying open to change. I use she/her pronouns and welcome moments that help others think about language and identity. My journey is to understand myself and my place in the world, guided by my hope for a kinder, more compassionate world.

"I like to think of myself as a testosterone addicted lesbian which would I guess, by default, place me into the category of trans. In answer to the question 'gender?' I say, 'oh no, none for me thanks' and claim the sought after status of a mentally ill, chronically pained, queer killjoy feminist living with the invisible disablement of gendered and sexual trauma" says ivan. In recognition of others' need for language and thus, pronouns, ivan leaves that choice up to the speaker in hopes it serves as an opportunity for the other to examine their choices. It is a gentle, ongoing process.

Description of IPE: Setting and Expectations

The purpose of the IPE allyship course is to assist students with a future working in health and health-related fields in learning about what it takes to be a good ally. The course takes the form of an online, asynchronous 3-week course, where each week covered a different module introducing the students to concepts they were asked to critically reflect on. Students were tasked with reading a curated list of materials and engaging in discussions using online discussion board posts in response to learning materials and to each other. As TAs, we were tasked with setting up groups and monitoring the student engagement. Tracking the number of discussion posts and checking whether students had opened/clicked on material in the online portal were the main measures of accountability that TAs were tasked with collecting to ensure students were completing the work. Student groups in the IPE were kept to 4-5 members to maximize engagement.

The initial meeting amongst the TAs and the main supervisor for the course provided an overview of the online portal along with an explanation of expected tasks and responsibilities. The main responsibilities tasked to the TAs were monitoring student interactions in a discussion forum intended to support engagement with a pre-existing curriculum on allyship. The supervisor articulated how the TAs had been curated as part of a roster of teaching assistants with "lived experiences about the topics at hand." It was noted by the supervisor that historically, comments that perpetuated racism, ableism, sexism, classism, or other stigmas, 'isms' or 'obias' were not observed in this course, but should something come up, the TA could bring it to the supervisor's attention for discussion and/or action. Training such as the provision of examples or case studies that might help the TAs identify such comments as opposed to general education to support the development of an ally were not offered. Lacking were strategies or resources on how the TAs, members of equity seeking groups themselves, might care for themselves should comments touch on past negative experiences or trauma were also not offered. The idea for this evaluation emerged after this introductory meeting.

Designing a Love-Centered Program Evaluation

As a program evaluation, research ethics board approval was not required (Dalhousie Research Ethics, 2024). A love ethic in teaching is rooted in the pedagogical praxis of Paulo Freire (1970) and bell hooks (2000) and, for the purposes of this program evaluation, can best be understood as (1) finding "the strength, faith, and humility to establish solidarity and struggle together to transform the oppressive ideologies and practices of public education" (Darder, 2002 p. 91); and (2) acknowledging that to engage in the work of loving others we must, as a first task, do the work needed to love oneself (hooks, 1994). This understanding was used to design an evaluation process that uses the act of love letter writing intended to identify unmet needs, assist with communicating such needs, and evaluate the experience of TAs recruited to teach an IPE course on allyship. To account for the varying level of familiarity that each TA has with engaging in a love ethic as a pedagogical practice, a semi-structured letter-writing guide was developed in advance (Appendix A). The intention is to focus writings on what the TA might have needed to feel supported to do their work. The letter-writing guide served as a reminder for TA to extend the practice of love inwards and, in the face of multiple demands, avoid a situation where the evaluation might be reduced to another task on a long list of 'to dos.' Whatever the TA was able to articulate in the letter would be considered sufficient for the purposes of the evaluation and the exercise itself was noted as a powerful starting point to learn to live differently and perhaps, how to love (Lorde, 1997). Table 1 summarizes the evaluation design.

After the first meeting with the course supervisor, the three TAs met two additional times to discuss initial challenges and offer each other support. During these two meetings, the TAs: decided

to design a program evaluation, outlined the framework for the evaluation, and set up future meeting times to collectively complete the work. The group decided that they would write at least two love letters each: One prior to the start of the course to assess what it was that they might have needed at that time and one at the end/completion of the three-week course that would allow for the TAs to reflect on whether their pre-course needs were met while reflecting on their experience overall. A timepoint for a third letter during the second week of the course was discussed as a midpoint check-in after TAs would have met all students and engaged with their week 1 responses and was identified as optional, being based on the needs and capacity of the TAs. Strict adherence to the letter template was not required and the aim was to make this process generative and supportive. There was no limit on the number of letters that they could write. As TAs were not expected to know what their needs were in advance of writing (consistent with 'writing as a method of inquiry'), permission was given during the writing process to allow meaning to emerge. To remove any fear of judgement, there were no expectations of sharing the contents of our letters. This meant that the analysis would be primarily done orally, in group discussions, allowing each TA to share as much or as little as they felt able to. Discussions were centered around (a) the process of the program evaluation and the experience of writing love letters as a way to evaluate a program and (b) the content of the letters themselves by way of reflecting on the question "Do we have what we need to be a TA in an online asynchronous IPE on allyship?" Each TA took a turn sharing. The two listening TAs took notes during this time. Point form notes were then put into a shared document and used to structure the writing of the results.

Table 1.
Evaluation Design

Pre-Course	During Course	Post-Course
First meeting with course supervisor	Optional love letter	Writing at least one love letter each
Two 90-minute meetings amongst 3 TAs	Weekly email check-in from ivan and reminder to reflect and/or write a letter	Three 90-minute meetings amongst 3 TAs to discuss and write results
Writing at least one love letter each		Email communication and live document sharing to write results

Recognizing our place in a hierarchical institution, certain methodological decisions were collectively made amongst the three PhD TAs in advance of the evaluation to create a situation where vulnerability and honesty could be first had in private without any forced sharing as such. Thus, letters written to oneself were determined to be first our inner workings, a journey on the page and second-data. The decision to conduct this evaluation independent of the TAs' supervisors was done to maximize privacy and confidentiality of the TAs who could be sharing vulnerable and personal information about their experiences. The intention was to invite the course supervisors to read/engage with this program evaluation as a starting point for further discussion about potential change. Such an approach values relationships and differs from evaluations that may provide recommendations from a position of expert. The TAs acknowledge that providing recommendations for change in a program or an aspect of a program may be insufficient but nonetheless, is a place to begin.

What Emerged

Table 2 summarizes the number of letters each TA wrote per week/time-period and throughout the course. Collectively, the three TAs wrote 8 letters and reached the goal of two letters each at the pre-determined pre/post time points.

Table 2.
Number of Letters per TA per week

	Pre oct 14	Week 1 oct 14-20	Week 2 oct 21-27	Week 3 oct 28-nov 3	Total per TA
ivan	1	1	1	1	4
Arezoo	1	0	0	1	2
Joshua	1	0	0	1	2
Total per week	3	1	1	3	8

On the Process of Love Letter Writing as Program Evaluation
What did the letters allow us to do? How did they do it?

Collectively, the TAs noted that none of them had prior experience engaging in a love letter writing process to evaluate a program or to assess their experience as a TA. Joshua shared how his past experiences with meditation had often left him feeling less grounded or frustrated, but with the additional prompts to ground the reflection process in a praxis of love, he noticed a sense of peace and a slight reduction in tension and stress with the activities. Arezoo appreciated the opportunity to write in a kind manner, to herself, in a way that created space to not just consider but validate her needs and experiences. She found the process to be open and honest.

Holding a regular writing practice, ivan felt at ease with the process of writing love letters and was surprised at how many letters they felt compelled to write throughout the course, taking this as an indication that the course had a stronger, more negative impact on their well-being than ivan had ever thought it might. For ivan, love letter writing with the prompts in the writing guide was structured enough to settle into a letter without dictating what emerged from their writing or what types of things they had to write about. As such, writing the letters allowed pre-existing feelings of despair and helplessness that would have otherwise been dissociated from or perhaps not asked about, to surface.

Through an embodied, love-centred praxis, writing the letters helped the TAs to sit with difficult emotions and experiences during the course long enough to be able to identify and name structural aspects of the course that made it challenging for them to engage as a TA. While questions that might get at what the TAs would change or do differently may also evoke similar responses, a love praxis validates the real emotional impact that asking 'what could be done differently' approach does not necessarily invite into the reflection.

On Whether we Felt Our Needs were Met
What did a love-centred program evaluation reveal about our needs as TA? What did it reveal about the course?

Overall, the TAs acknowledged that the concept of allyship and who was/was not or who could/could not be an ally was difficult to define. While it was understood that the process of 'working towards allyship' could not be standardized or achieved in a static, all-or-none fashion, no training was provided to the TAs before the course to help them understand the concept of allyship within the course. The TAs felt as though it was assumed, by the course coordinators, that, based on their structurally marginalized identities, they would have a working knowledge of what would be required of an ally and thus were best positioned to act as a TA for this course. The positioning of the TAs as lived experts in discrimination and thus knowledge holders of what is required of someone to be an ally contradicted with the lack of agency the TAs felt in the course. Overall, the TAs did not have an opportunity to structure the course or design the curriculum and noted situations where the practice of allyship could not be realized within the course itself. That students were not required to engage with or respond to TA comments meant that students did not have to do so to pass the course.

This lack of requirement led to it being TAs who were typing into the void, limiting the influence of the TAs to one of monitoring and surveillance to ensure that students completed the pre-determined number of engagements (e.g., posts and responses to others' posts), and did not say anything offensive. What was considered offensive or could be determined as requiring deeper engagement with a student was, like the concept of allyship, not defined or discussed in advance of the course. The simultaneous acknowledgement of lived expertise of what it is like to be discriminated against on account of structural marginalization was positioned as sufficient training to deliver a course on allyship. In a sense, this love-centred program evaluation emerged in response to a series of unmet needs revealing that recruiting TAs based on social identities may lead to additional harms, even if unintentional.

For the Teaching Assistants
For Joshua

A hexadecimal colour code, #C9A38F, is the title of my first love letter and reflects a sense of value prescribed to me in an initial meeting about the course. Similar to how the Eye Dropper extension on an internet browser assigns a value to an area of a picture, the eye of the instructors assigned a value to the teaching assistants. Knowing that the teaching assistants had been purposefully selected based on our appearances or outward identity markers, not necessarily what it is we could do, I was left with mixed feelings. I was left with a sense of having a certain level of lived expertise while also carrying a burden of not knowing all there is to know about allyship, exactly what my limits were and how this mix might lead to potential harm.

While I wrote two reflections, I spent much more time thinking about the course, how it operated, and whether my needs were met so that I could participate as a TA in this course. The reflections acted as a protected time for me to assess my capacities in general. Sitting down to reflect, I found that I "mapped out" all the extra labour that felt necessary for me to fit in, be valued, and producing enough to feel secure. This mapping helped me think about how my role as a TA in this course felt like another extra, something that was not in line with my interests, desires, skills, experiences, or needs but that I took on because I felt I had to or else I would lose out in the future.

As the course progressed, I began to question how the germination process of supporting the growth of healthcare professionals who value allyship was sown. The short time frame of three weeks may have unintentionally simplified the concept of allyship, and the linear nature of the course made me question the potential harm of valuing quantity over depth and meaningful engagement. Engaging in reflexive letter writing provided an avenue of expression for whether I thought my needs were being met and how the course may be influencing interprofessional learning on allyship. Existing alongside an increasing sense of burnout and fatigue, these deliberate reflections prompted broader investigation into the commitments and roles I had assumed during the academic term.

For Arezoo

Through this love-centered program evaluation, I found it challenging to articulate what I needed to effectively support student learning. For example, the concept of "privilege" was new to me, and while the materials provided an introduction, I struggled to fully understand its meaning and implications within the context of the course. I felt I needed more in-depth training to confidently moderate discussions and engage with the topic empathetically, which left me feeling less effective in supporting students than I had hoped. The short three-week duration of the course further compounded this, making it difficult to grasp complex concepts like privilege and allyship. I came to realize that allyship is not just a task to check off but a continuous process of learning and engagement, yet the course structure did not fully support this perspective, leaving me uncertain about how to navigate these challenges.

One example of this disconnect was the mandatory video introductions, which offered no alternatives for students who felt uncomfortable participating in this way. This lack of accommodation seemed at odds with the principles of allyship and left me disappointed that I didn't have the tools or agency to better support students in finding approaches that worked for them. It felt counterintuitive to require participation in ways that didn't meet all students' needs, and as a TA, I wished for more opportunities to foster genuine connections and co-learning. By the end of the course, I still felt unclear about how to meaningfully define and teach concepts like privilege and allyship. Moving forward, I believe that more preparation, training, and structural changes in the course would better equip TAs and students to engage deeply and meaningfully with these important topics.

For ivan

Re-visiting my love letters, I noticed an evolution of emotion that shifted throughout my experience of being a TA in this course. Before the start of the course, I was uncertain about how my role might surpass that of tallying student responses and remained open to the possibility that I might be able to draw from some of the expertise that I had been told I was recruited for (first letter). As I continued to engage with the material and student responses to it, feelings of deception and anger surfaced in my second and third letters. I felt deceived about the reason for my recruitment and started to wonder if it was the inclusion of my own structurally marginalized identity, not me, that became a marker of allyship, of a well-run course. I pinpointed the anger as coming from a feeling of being used in primarily two ways. First, I felt as though my identity had been positioned as a level of lived expertise that served to demonstrate the institution's commitment to allyship while second, this positioning could absolve the institution's need to offer training and support in the concept of allyship and/or what might be a problematic viewpoint and how to deal with it. It was my third love letter, during the second week of the course where I came to understand that the course was structured in a way that actually discouraged students from engaging with my comments. Because I would be commenting at the end of a week, once students had completed a module, and they were only required to engage with their peers, not the TA, students would have to complete additional, non-required labour by returning to a completed week to interact with my comments after other requirements were complete.

A re-emerging contradiction was the lack of pre-course training and assurance that students are generally respectful left me unprepared for the level of discomfort that I experienced at the student responses. Regardless of a student's experience or the program they were in, they were tasked with engaging with and responding to the same materials. Course material pointed students towards reflecting on their social location and privileges before evoking reflections on what it means to be an ally. In addition to this structure supporting a thinking that to be a professional means you are inherently privileged, markers of identity became aligned with a lack of privilege suggesting that to be disabled or to be queer (for example) is to suffer and that a well-meaning ally can avoid further harm. That it is systems of domination and oppression that, through assigning value to certain types of humans or ways of being, create inequities and bestow privileges was not a focus of discussion. And so, while true, no one outwardly used slurs or made jokes at the expense of any one group, that students were encouraged to think about how they could, through individual, short-term (e.g., one-on-one client) interactions not continue to benefit from their privileges or how this might excuse them from solidarity work to enact material changes to the lives of people they will be working with filled me with sadness. That I was unable to engage with these students in meaningful conversations about these dynamics led to despair. Without having reached out to the other two TAs to debrief and engage in a shared experience of love letter writing, the harm I encountered from this experience would have been worsened by isolation.

Conclusion

In some ways, this program evaluation emerged as an opportunity for the TAs to create a circle of care while also engaging in a real-time experience of allyship that dismantles misconceptions that allies must always or most often come from positions of privilege. By engaging in a love-centered program evaluation, three TAs tasked with facilitating an asynchronous online course on allyship were afforded an opportunity to reflect on whether the course curriculum and structure aligned with their values and met their needs. Such reflections can help understand and encourage program evaluation metrics that extend beyond learning outcomes to include unintended consequences such as harm to those expected to teach.

In courses on concepts of allyship where the courses rest on an assumption that structurally marginalized folks are subjected to higher levels of inequity, through the sharing of unmet needs by the TAs this evaluation suggests that it may not be fair to expect that such negative experiences dissipate once a person enters the role of TA or other position deemed to be one of privilege. Current teaching structures may be inadequate to meet the needs of diverse TAs selected in part due to their markers of diversity. Hiring and fairly compensating a small group of TAs to design and deliver a curriculum that aligns with their values and is structured according to realistic learning outcomes may be one way to reduce the harm experienced by TAs facilitating an allyship course. Such a move would offer the TAs more agency, value their lived expertise through action, not just words, and establish a circle of support amongst the TAs as they navigate topics of discussion that may evoke feelings of discomfort or cause harm to learners and educators alike. Fostering less reactive spaces that allow for practicing skills of conflict resolution and critical thinking about our role in systems of oppression and domination are noble roles that academic institutions can play.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Funding Statement

References

Brown, K. T. (2015). Perceiving allies from the perspective of non-dominant group members: Comparisons to friends and activists. *Current Psychology*, *34*, 713-722.

Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative. (2024). CIHC Competency Framework for Advancing Collaboration 2024. www.cihc-cpis.com

Dalhousie Research Ethics. (2024). Guidelines for differentiating among research, program evaluation and quality improvement. Dalhousie University.

Darder, A. (2002). Teaching as an act of love: The classroom and critical praxis. In A. Darder, *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*, 91-149. Westview Press.

Denshire, S. (2014). On auto-ethnography. *Current Sociology*, *62*(6), 831-850.

Ford, J. & Gray, R. (2021). Interprofessional education handbook: For educators and practitioners incorporating integrated care and values-based practice, Centre for Advancement of Interprofessional Education. https://www.caipe.org/resources/publications/caipe-publications/caipe-2021-a-new-caipe-interprofessional-education-handbook-2021-ipe-incorporating-values-based-practice-ford-j-gray-r

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Penguin Books.

Guffin, J. (2024). Experiencing a Safe Classroom: A Critical Phenomenological Study of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Counselor Education who Teach Diversity and Social Justice Courses.

hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress. Routledge.

hooks, b. (2000). All about love: New visions. William Morrow.

Khalili, H., Gilbert, J., Lising, D., MacMillan, K. M., Xyrichis, A. (2021). Proposed lexicon for the interprofessional field. A reprint publication by InterprofessionalResearch.Global (ISBN: 978-1-7366963-1-6) https://interprofessionalresearch.global/

Lorde, A. (1997). The cancer journals. San Francisco: aunt lute books.

MacKenzie, D., Sponagle, M., & Sibbald, K. (2024a). Introduction. Interprofessional Education: A Resource for Educators. https://caul-cbua.pressbooks.pub/ipe/front-matter/introduction/

MacKenzie, D., Sponagle, M., & Sibbald, K. (2024b). What are your evaluation plans. Interprofessional Education: A Resource for Educators. https://caul-cbua.pressbooks.pub/ipe/part/what-are-your-evaluation-plans/

McDonald, E., Arevalo, G., Ahmed, S., Akhmetov, I., & Demmans Epp, C. (2023, July). Managing TAs at scale: Investigating the experiences of teaching assistants in introductory Computer Science. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM Conference on Learning@ Scale* (pp. 120-131).

Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed., pp. 959–978). SAGE Publications.

Rutherford-Hemming, T., & Lioce, L. (2018). State of interprofessional education in nursing: A systematic review. Nurse Educator, 43(1), 9-13.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2021). Post qualitative inquiry, the refusal of method, and the risk of the new. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *27*(1), 3–9. 10.1177/1077800419863005

St. Pierre, E. A. (2023). Poststructuralism and post qualitative inquiry: What can and must be thought. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *29*(1), 20–32. 10.1177/10778004221122282

Tindell, S., Young, L., O'Rear, E., & Morris, P. (2016). Teaching assistant perspectives on a diversity and social justice education course for collegiate agriculture students. *NACTA Journal*, *60*(2), 158-166.

Xu, Y., Lei, Y., & Sezaki, H. (2024). Impact of educational development programs on teaching self-efficacy in graduate students: A systematic literature review. *Procedia Computer Science*, *246*, 4084-4093.

Appendices

Appendix A: Letter Writing Guide

Please take a moment to begin with a short meditation that can look like one of the following:

1. Engage in a meditation practice that you might already have
2. Choose one of the following guided meditations from Rhonda V Magee
3. Listen to one of these songs by renowned Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar, writer and artist, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson
4. Read some of your favourite poetry
5. Engage in a breath meditation either using an app or from the list offered by The Free Mindfulness Project

Take a moment and reflect on bell hooks' definition of love. Were any of the components missing from your experience of being a TA? For instance, were there times that you did not feel cared for or like there was a lack of respect or responsibility towards you? If so, can you identify (a) how you knew this/what brought your attention to this lack and (b) what you may have needed instead?

Definition of love

bell hooks defines love as a: combination of care, commitment, trust, knowledge, respect, and responsibility, must inform the act of extending "oneself for the purpose of nurturing one's own or another's spiritual growth" (hooks, 2001, p. 6).

Component	Brief Description
Care	Does not equate to love, can exist without love. It is the act of doing what one can to meet the needs of another person.
Commitment	Consistency in showing up, being present, being honest; including communicating when your capacity to commit shifts.
Trust	Essential for justice and intimacy, trust requires a degree of vulnerability and courage.
Knowledge	Learning about and with the self and others. This type of knowledge is a way of knowing, a form of recognition and an acknowledgement of the self and others.
Responsibility	A way to hold ourselves and others to account without blame, shame, or judgement. Also essential to justice, we pledge to do what we can to steward our connections to ourselves and others.
Respect	An honouring of our own inherent dignity and humanity and that of others. A relinquishing of all that serves to humiliate.

Letter Writing

You may write a love letter to yourself (e.g., a letter of self-compassion, link to example) or to someone else (e.g., the author of a post, the TA supervisor, Dalhousie as a whole) articulating what brought your attention to a 'lack' or a difficult experience and what you may have needed in that moment. Please know that this letter can take whatever form you wish. Handwritten, typed, an audio

journal, a series of bullet points, a poem, a drawing, a collage, a series of photographs. Please let it be as easy as possible. It should not add burden or distress to your day.

Question reminder: "do we have what we need to be a TA in an online asynchronous IPE on allyship?"