Leveraging SoTL to Improve Teaching and Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Trent W. Maurer

Georgia Southern University

Received: 24 August 2021; Accepted: 5 October 2021

The COVID-19 pandemic necessitated unprecedented changes to teaching and learning in higher education. SoTL-active faculty were uniquely positioned to leverage their knowledge and expertise to improve teaching and learning during the pandemic not only in their own courses, but through a knowledge mobilization approach also in broader contexts (e.g., departmental colleagues, extradepartmental colleagues, etc.). In this piece, I reflect on how I leveraged my SoTL expertise, in conjunction with my disciplinary expertise, to improve teaching and learning in my courses and those of my colleagues, demonstrating the value of SoTL-active faculty as cosmopolitan assets to their institutions.

McKinney (2003) distinguished between *scholarly teaching* and the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* [SoTL]. Scholarly teaching involves using evidence from the scholarly literature about teaching and learning to improve one's own teaching practice and one's own students' learning. SoTL involves producing and publicly sharing evidence about teaching and learning. Scholarly teaching is thus more consumption oriented whereas SoTL is more creation and dissemination oriented. Indeed, SoTL is created to be shared "for critique and use by an appropriate community" (Potter & Kustra, 2011, p. 2), "particularly for use in future teaching and SoTL research" (Maurer & Law, 2016, p. 4). The two are fundamentally intertwined: scholarly teaching draws from SoTL and SoTL is shared to be used in scholarly teaching.

Bernstein (2013) argued that SoTL-active faculty, as "cosmopolitan assets" to their institutions, have the ability to leverage their knowledge and expertise to improve teaching and learning not only in their own courses (as part of a scholarly teaching approach), but also in broader contexts (e.g., departmental colleagues, extradepartmental colleagues, etc.):

> [An] important asset of SoTL-active faculty members is their connection to the world of teaching beyond the boundaries of the campus, and often beyond the boundaries of their own field of study. . .When sharing their teaching work with local colleagues, faculty members can do a great service to a community by serving as an efficient conduit to the best practices, innovations, ideas, and resources outside the immediate campus. . . A cosmopolitan faculty member *can bring such practices to the attention of both colleagues and academic leaders* (pp. 37-38, emphasis added)

In essence, Bernstein argued that SoTL-active faculty are uniquely positioned to promote better scholarly teaching among their colleagues because of their greater familiarity with the scholarly literature on teaching and learning; such faculty are aware of more relevant research and practices that they can disseminate to others. Although Bernstein's piece did not envisage teaching during a global pandemic like COVID-19, it nonetheless established the basic pathway through which SoTL-active faculty could effect meaningful change in both their own teaching and others' during times of critical need.

Recent scholarship connecting SoTL to knowledge mobilization approaches to research further delineates potential pathways through which SoTL-active faculty can leverage their knowledge and expertise (Maurer et al., 2021). Knowledge mobilization is:

> an umbrella term encompassing a wide range of activities relating to the production and use of research results, including knowledge synthesis, dissemination, transfer, exchange, and co-creation or co-production by researchers and knowledge users (Social Science and Humanities Research Council, 2019, para 4).

Specifically, Maurer et al. (2021) identified three pathways for "sharing" the findings of SoTL within a knowledge mobilization framework: dissemination, translation, and co-creation. It is the translation pathway that is of interest here. In this context, translation goes beyond dissemination (e.g., sharing a research article about teaching and learning for the recipient to read, interpret, and apply on their own) and "has an explicit intention to effect change in the context of teaching and learning" (p. 336) beyond the individual. Translation could include activities such as identifying for others the implications of SoTL research as it applies to teaching and learning or suggesting courses of action as a result of that research, like course redesign. Effectively, a knowledge mobilization translation approach empowers SoTL-active faculty to more proactively share the findings of the SoTL literature with colleagues and in ways that colleagues may be more likely to use or adapt those findings to their own teaching than if those colleagues had to interpret those findings or search for those findings in the literature on their own.

What is missing from the SoTL literature is examples of SoTL-active faculty serving their institutions as "cosmopolitan assets" in this specific way: using their knowledge and expertise in SoTL to not only improve their own teaching through a scholarly teaching approach but also improving the teaching of their non-SoTL-active colleagues by translating the findings of SoTL for their use and adaptation. In this piece, I provide one such example. I reflect on how I leveraged my SoTL expertise, in conjunction with my disciplinary expertise, to improve teaching and learning not only in my courses (scholarly teaching) but also those of my institutional colleagues' (knowledge mobilization translation), in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The scope of these efforts thus includes micro (my own teaching), meso (departmental colleagues), and macro (extradepartmental colleagues) contexts (Wuetherick & Yu, 2016), demonstrating the value of SoTL-active faculty as cosmopolitan assets to their institutions.

In the sections that follow, I first provide context for these efforts. Next, I review the SoTL-inspired changes I made at the micro level in redesigning my courses for the remainder of the Spring 2020 term, and the Summer 2020, Fall 2020, and Spring 2021

https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2022.160103

terms (scholarly teaching). Third, I detail my efforts at the meso and macro level translating SoTL for colleagues in my department and other departments at my institution to effect change for the improvement of teaching and learning in courses beyond my own during the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 terms (knowledge mobilization translation). Finally, I conclude with insights gained from this process on opportunities for SoTL-active faculty to further serve as cosmopolitan assets to their institutions.

CONTEXT

SoTL work is highly contextual and requires firm grounding in both scholarly and local contexts (Felten, 2013; Friberg, 2018). The scholarly context will be integrated throughout this piece, but it is important at the outset to describe four local contexts for this work: disciplinary context, personal context, institutional demographics, and institutional pandemic response.

Disciplinary Context

My discipline is family science (National Council on Family Relations, n.d.). Although the existing disciplinary SoTL knowledge base is limited and the number of SoTL-active family scientists is relatively small (DiGregorio et al., 2016; Maurer & Law, 2016; Reinke et al., 2016), family scientists are positioned to make unique contributions to SoTL. Among those contributions is a specific focus on the scholarship of integration—searching and bringing together disparate literatures into a cohesive whole (Hamon & Smith, 2014), a skill of central importance in SoTL. Additionally, family scientists are uniquely qualified to speak to the intersection of SoTL and family science disciplinary scholarship (e.g., work-life issues, parenting, child care, etc.) that became acutely important during the pandemic (e.g., Hall & Zygmunt, 2021).

Personal Context

I am a tenured Full Professor and the senior faculty member in my program. I am a white, cisgender, heterosexual man. This positionality gives me extraordinary privilege. I am also married to an essential health care worker, and the parent of two children under the age of five. The childcare center that both my children attended temporarily closed in response to the pandemic in March 2020 and postponed reopening four times, frequently on short notice, ultimately leaving us without childcare for over four consecutive months. As Ahmad (2020) has noted, in the interests of public health the primary efforts of spouses or partners of essential healthcare workers needed to be directed at supporting them to help combat the pandemic, which included taking on additional responsibilities for child care. From mid-March through July 2020, I had to transition from the primary caregiver outside of childcare to a round-the-clock caregiver in addition to my professional responsibilities. This limited my ability to reach beyond the micro context of my own courses to help my colleagues until our childcare reopened.

Institutional Demographics

My institution is a southeastern American public R2 university (Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity) with a very high undergraduate enrollment profile in the Carnegie classification system. The student enrollment is approximately 27,000 across three campuses. Almost 60% of students are women, almost 60% are White, and over 25% are Black or African American. The undergraduate acceptance rate is over 90% with a composite average SAT score of 1077. The institution employs approximately 1,250 total instructional faculty, approximately 57% of whom are tenured or tenure-track.

INSTITUTIONAL PANDEMIC RESPONSE

The institution's pandemic response was heavily constrained by both the state university system's governing board and state government mandates. In March 2020, two days before the beginning of the week-long spring midterm break, the university abruptly announced that all in-person instruction was cancelled beginning with the break for the next two weeks. This effectively eliminated one week of instructional time from the semester. Several days later, the university announced that all courses would be "transitioned to online teaching" for the duration of the spring semester and students were directed to move out of university housing and return home. The university campuses were effectively closed. All faculty were expected to finish the delivery of their spring courses through the online Learning Management System [LMS] or other virtual means (e.g., Zoom). Over the next month, the university repeatedly issued new expectations for course delivery during the summer terms, sometimes reversing or contradicting prior decisions, but ultimately mandating online delivery for all summer term courses with severe restrictions on any off-campus learning experiences (e.g., internships).

Over the course of the summer months, university guidance and directives for the fall semester were constantly changing. By late June, it was clear that the university would be reopening for face-to-face [F2F] classes in the fall semester, though with masking and social distancing. The need to socially distance while in class, combined with the paucity of larger classrooms in which this could be accomplished led to the decision to split many classes into subsections, where only some of the enrolled students attended in person on each day and the rest joined the class remotely via Zoom. Instructors would be responsible for simultaneously teaching both groups from the classroom. Although the university generally resisted converting courses to online asynchronous or online synchronous (i.e., Zoom) modalities, a small number of courses were approved for such delivery. In early July, all instructors were also told to design their courses, regardless of approved delivery modality, such that a student could continue learning in the event they had to serve a 14-day quarantine as a result of exposure to COVID-19. This effectively required all instructors to add either a synchronous Zoom option or an asynchronous option to their F2F courses. In late July, instructors were strongly discouraged from having any required attendance policies. A number of faculty had their course assignments changed as a result of their own—or their colleagues'—disability-related work accommodations, creating new teaching preparations on short notice. In some cases, instructors saw the delivery modalities of their fall courses changed multiple times over the course of the summer, necessitating additional repreparation. In other cases, instructors were not informed of the delivery modalities of their fall courses until several days before they had to have their courses ready to begin. Similar issues of changing guidance, directives, and expectations affected courses in the spring 2021 semester, introducing substantial uncertainty and need for additional preparation to the teaching and learning context.

MICRO LEVEL: SOTL-INSPIRED CHANGES IN MY COURSES

Spring 2020

Before explaining the SoTL-inspired changes that I made to my courses the Spring 2020 semester, I will provide additional context for those changes and how they are "SoTL-inspired" in three sections below: a) my relevant background SoTL knowledge, b) professional development on teaching and learning that I undertook during this critical period, and c) the guiding principles I used when designing changes to my courses.

Background SoTL Knowledge

As a SoTL scholar, I was already familiar with a great deal of scholarship on teaching and learning before the pandemic began. I have contributed to that literature for almost 20 years including recent work focused on teaching students more effective learning strategies (Maurer & Shipp, in press; Maurer & Shipp, 2021) and it guides my pedagogy. This familiarity allowed me to immediately draw upon this literature in totally redesigning my courses in the span of just a few days after the university announced that we were transitioning all courses to emergency remote teaching for the remainder of the Spring 2020 semester (six weeks' worth of content, out of 15). Three areas of the literature immediately came to mind as I began: a) Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 2016), b) the effect of stress on learning (e.g., Vogel et al., 2018), and c) SoTL scholarship specifically addressing emergency remote teaching (Day, 2015).

Cognitive Load Theory

Substantial research on Cognitive Load Theory (e.g., Sweller, 2016) has established that it is more difficult for students to learn as the cognitive load required of them in the learning environment increases. Of particular relevance to this situation—trying to learn in the midst of a global pandemic while potentially sheltering in place with one's family of origin—is the cognitive load required from split or divided attention. Students who are trying to learn while dividing their attention among other tasks (e.g., caring for younger siblings whose schools or childcares are closed, watching the faces of dozens of peers on a Zoom call), are going to have far fewer cognitive resources available to learn course material. Thus, I knew I had to "trim down" the delivery of course material to only the most intrinsically relevant presentation, eliminating as much extraneous cognitive load as possible.

Effect of Stress on Learning

Similarly, extensive literature has documented a strong negative effect of stress on the ability to learn (e.g., Vogel et al., 2018). Here, stressors exceeded the "typical" for students (e.g., scoring well on a graded assessment), and became much more significant (e.g., inability to gather with friends and family, lack of reliable internet access to engage in remote learning) and even existential (e.g., illness of self, illness or death of friends or family, financial instability, food insecurity, etc.). Additionally, my disciplinary expertise made me aware that the conditions of the pandemic were likely to exacerbate existing work-life stressors (e.g., time strain, role conflict, role overload), especially for women (Hall & Zygmunt, 2021). Over 90% of my students are women. This knowledge only reinforced what I knew from Cognitive Load Theory about the importance of "trimming down" during redesign to try to make the task of learning manageable for students who suddenly found themselves in extraordinarily difficult circumstances.

Emergency Remote Teaching.

There was little literature on emergency remote teaching at the start of the pandemic, but I recalled reading a piece in *Teaching and Learning Inquiry* that specifically investigated it from a SoTL perspective (Day, 2015). The case study described in that piece was significantly different from my situation: it was only a one-week absence; the instructor had more time to plan; it was at a community college; and students attended in the regular F2F classroom where a dedicated technology coordinator facilitated the instructor conducting class over Skype. Nonetheless, it provided an examination of the effect of internet-based technology when students expected F2F delivery. The results revealed that students were divided on whether the approach worked, with the majority ambivalent about it. Overall, student learning appeared to be unaffected, but this was only a one-week interruption and students still attended F2F in their regular classroom. In general, the author reported reduced student engagement and was skeptical how long even that reduced level could have been maintained in the event of a prolonged absence. This work was extremely helpful in centering for me the importance of not expecting high levels of student engagement for the rest of the semester, especially in light of the findings from the prior two areas of the literature, and in redesigning the course to reflect those expectations.

Professional Development

Despite only having a few days to plan and execute the redesign of my courses, and communicate those changes succinctly to students, I still attempted to complete additional reading and professional development to aid me in this process (which continued throughout the year and even now). I knew from the SoTL literature (Felten, 2013) that the most appropriate venue for "going public" with SoTL is not always a traditional scholarly journal, so I continued to search the academic literature, but also read extensively beyond it (e.g., social media groups, blogs, LMS training documentation, etc.). Two just-released documents about emergency remote teaching (Chick et al., 2020; Hodges et al., 2020) were especially helpful in guiding my redesign decisions. I also found a piece in *Inside Higher Ed* (Imad, 2020) and a Twitter thread (Bayne, 2020) helpful in crafting language for communicating with my students.

Guiding Principles

In making choices about how to redesign my courses for emergency remote teaching, I relied not only on my background SoTL knowledge and recent professional development, but also two guiding principles: a) a pedagogy of care approach, and b) a SoTL social justice perspective.

Pedagogy of Care Approach

A pedagogy of care approach recognizes the humanity of both teacher and student and centers their connection at the human-human level, rather than the teacher-student level (MacNeil & Evans, 2005). A key component of this approach is transparency in instructional design, explaining to students what the teacher's guiding principles are and why they have made the pedagogical choices and decisions that they have made (Walker & Gleaves, 2016). In the midst of an unprecedented global pandemic, taking a pedagogy of care approach to my teaching that centered on the humanity of both the teacher and student and explained the reasons for my pedagogical choices seemed an obvious choice.

It was also consistent with my existing approach to teaching, with the approaches recommended in the recent resources (Bayne, 2020; Imad, 2020), and could help to address some of the issues identified in the Background SoTL Knowledge section.

SoTL Social Justice Perspective

SoTL can also be a vehicle to social justice, especially in and through education (Liston & Rahimi, 2017). From the outset of the transition to emergency remote teaching, many faculty at my institution were concerned that the pandemic would exacerbate existing inequalities among students (and faculty) and would do so in ways that would make it disproportionately more difficult for some students to complete—or even access—courses now delivered through online modalities. Many students were sheltering in place with their families of origin and had younger siblings at home who needed to complete their own k-12 coursework synchronously, not to mention parents working from home. With a limited number of computers, internet bandwidth, and rooms in the home to share, expectations for online access and participation, especially of a time-limited or synchronous nature, could be particularly problematic. A social justice perspective would leverage best practices from the SoTL literature to minimize the impact of these structural inequalities on students' ability to continue with their courses and would prioritize fairness in assessment of learning.

Both of these guiding principles can also be seen in a post to the ISSOTL blog by Chick (2020, para 2) in the early days of the pandemic:

> A SoTL perspective is deeply concerned with what's going on with students right now. How are they experiencing learning in the context of the extraordinary cognitive, emotional, physical, socioeconomic, familial, political, geographical, racial, interpersonal, and historical uniqueness of this moment? A SoTL perspective is also deeply concerned with what's going on with teaching faculty and staff right now. How are we experiencing teaching in the context of the extraordinary cognitive, emotional, physical, socioeconomic, familial, political, geographical, racial, interpersonal, and historical uniqueness of this moment? And how are students and their teachers experiencing each other?

SoTL-Inspired Changes

I made numerous changes to my Spring 2020 courses that were inspired by SoTL, eight of which I will discuss in this section. The largest and most significant change was in the transition to an online modality. Faculty at my institution were given some flexibility in how to adapt their courses to an online environment and I chose an online asynchronous modality. This allowed students to progress in the course without having to attend at a set Zoom time, reducing the impact of economic inequality, cognitive load, the effect of stress on learning, etc. However, I also chose not to record video lectures or narrated PowerPoint presentations, instead converting all remaining lectures in the courses to Word and PDF documents, with critical points and explanations detailed in writing. I did this to massively reduce the demand for bandwidth and internet access that would be required to access course material. Instead of needing to be able to watch recorded lectures, students needed only to be able to download or print documents. Second, in a related vein, I also chose to compile all the lecture material for the entire unit into a single document. Different topics were clearly identified in the document, but by condensing all the material into a single document, I further reduced the amount of time and resources necessary to locate and download or print the relevant course material.

Third, as part of this approach, I also provided students with all of the remaining material in the course on the first day that classes "restarted" in the online environment, so that students could best work around their schedules and study the material as they had time. Fourth, I redesigned the graded assessments in the course, shifting quizzes and exams to open book/open note and focusing even more heavily on application-focused exam questions to assess the most critical learning objectives. Fifth, I gave students multi-day windows in which they could take the assessments and more than double the time to complete them than they would have had in the classroom, again allowing for greater flexibility for students to plan around access issues, other obligations, etc. Sixth, I used consistent weekly deadlines and only once weekly announcements to prevent constantly bombarding students with information and reduce the added difficulty of learning in an online modality for students with executive functioning issues (Roscigno, 2020). Seventh, in one of my courses, I collaborated with my students as partners to design an entirely new final exam for the course to replace the planned exam that would not be possible in an online modality. This partnership was an example of knowledge mobilization as co-creation with students, working with students to design an authentic assessment (Maurer et al., 2021).

Finally, and most importantly, throughout the remainder of the term I was transparent with my students about what my guiding principles and reasons for making these decisions were, consistent with a pedagogy of care approach. For example, this was part of the announcement to the students in my courses once we learned that the remainder of the semester would be conducted online:

> This course was never designed to be delivered online—much less converted to an online format on extremely short notice—and none of you signed up to take it online. I grieve what we have lost in the rest of our face-to-face course that cannot be replicated online. It's ok if you are sad or upset about it, too. I've already heard as much from many of you and I know many more of you feel that way. I will not pretend that this will be the same course, just moved online. I also won't pretend that you will be getting a high-quality online course experience—you won't. Quality online education takes significant time and resources to develop—it isn't done in a day (or week). This is pedagogical triage—trying to do the best we can to save as much as we can of the course while making it accessible to as many students as possible in the time allotted. There will be a lot of sacrifices and tradeoffs, but my guiding principle will be to maximize the number of students who will be able to complete the course, even if they lack technological resources.

I also created and posted a Frequently Asked Questions [FAQ] document for students that outlined each of the major changes in the course and my reasons for making each of those changes. In both this document, and other announcements, I was transparent with students about my own situation (i.e., sheltering in place with two young children), both because of the relevance to course content and its connection to the pandemic, and

because it was consistent with a pedagogy of care approach and the recommendations of the literature (Imad, 2020).

Overall, I received very little feedback from students about any of these changes, but given the realities and stressors of those early months of the pandemic, that was hardly surprising. What little feedback I did receive about the changes came mostly from end of course student evaluations of teaching and it was almost universally positive. For example, one student said, "The transition to online among the Covid-19 pandemic was flawless and he did everything in his power to make it as easy as possible on his students." Another remarked, "When transitioned to online, extended deadlines and more review assignments helped to stay on track easier with realistic expectations." Finally, a colleague shared an email she had received from one of my students that term where the student wrote, "The first class I took when I changed my major to CHFD was with [Author] and he showed us so much care and grace last semester when the world turned upside down!"

Summer 2020

In the two months between when the university transitioned to emergency remote teaching for the Spring 2020 semester and the start of the first Summer 2020 term, the university changed its guidance for summer courses repeatedly, ultimately mandating online delivery for all courses. I taught an off-campus capstone internship course in Summer 2020 and most of the content was already designed to be delivered online. However, the culminating assessment in this course is for students to return to campus from their internship sites and deliver an in-person presentation about their internship experience to the program faculty and their peers. With the university requirement that all courses be delivered entirely online, this assessment had to change. In the Spring 2020 semester, the course instructor had chosen to have students deliver their presentations over Zoom, but I was concerned about social justice issues with access to reliable internet with that approach, as well as the impact of the stress of that situation on student learning and the cognitive load of trying to navigate new technology while presenting. Instead, I created and shared with my students instructions on how to pre-record their presentations as narrated PowerPoints, which I had them upload to a shared Google Drive folder where they could be viewed asynchronously both by their peers and the program faculty (which also allowed program faculty additional flexibility to view the presentations). I still scheduled a Zoom session, but it was brief, and the purpose was to give program faculty the opportunity to ask students questions about their recorded presentations, similarly to the way it had been done in person. This format overcame problems with low bandwidth issues that would have made synchronous Zoom presentations nearly impossible for some students and also allowed them to learn a valuable new technical skill in recording presentations. Again, student feedback about these changes was extremely limited, but what little feedback I did receive about them was universally positive. In particular, a number of students appreciated the change to pre-recorded presentations because they had unreliable internet.

Fall 2020 and Spring 2021

For both the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters, university administrative decisions severely delayed the determination of my final teaching assignments. For both semesters, a significant amount of time, planning, and work was lost when administrative decisions about which courses I would be teaching—and the modalities in which they would be delivered—were repeatedly changed. For the Fall 2020 semester, my courses and modalities were not settled until three working days before the courses had to be ready. For the Spring 2021 semester, it was just two working days. This necessarily limited my ability to engage in intentional planning and design. In this section, I will first outline additional professional development on teaching and learning that I undertook in preparation for teaching in these semesters and then explain the SoTL-inspired changes I made to my courses.

Professional Development

Between the time my institution transitioned to emergency remote teaching in March 2020 and the start of the Fall 2020 semester in August, I did extensive reading on teaching and learning to prepare me for the coming academic year. In addition to my regular reading (e.g., SoTL journals, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Ed*), I also read the book *Small Teaching Online* and daily read posts in multiple social media teaching groups (e.g., Pandemic Pedagogy, Higher Education Learning Collective). From these sources, I downloaded nearly 100 items for reference and use in my course preparation.

SoTL-Inspired Changes

In both semesters, I was assigned to teach two different courses entirely over Zoom (i.e., "remote synchronous" with no assigned classroom) and a third course in a F2F classroom. In addition to keeping some of the SoTL-inspired changes I had made from the Spring 2020 semester (e.g., long time windows for online exams), I also made nine SoTL-inspired changes in the fall and spring semesters.

First, for my F2F course, I chose to allow all students the option of attending via Zoom for any class period. The university required faculty to provide a way for students to continue in their courses in the event they had to serve a 14-day quarantine as a result of exposure to COVID-19 and I had decided to allow for Zoom participation, so extending this option to all students for all class periods spoke to some of the social justice issues involved, as well as the impact of stress on learning (e.g., some students had a Zoom class right before mine and could not get from home to campus in the 15 minute passing period).

Second, I considered how using Zoom can contribute to classism, racism, implicit bias, and other issues (Jackson, 2020). I decided on course policies like requiring student cameras to be off at all times because doing so best promoted social justice (e.g., allowing students with low bandwidth to be better able to access the course, preventing peers from seeing their living conditions, etc.), even though doing so made teaching the course far more difficult and draining for me as the instructor (e.g., I couldn't read students' facial expressions for cues if they were confused, I couldn't monitor that students were paying attention). In addition to being consistent with a pedagogy of care approach—especially because I shared this reasoning with students—this gave me the opportunity to model to my students how to use education and SoTL to center social justice issues and promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. This also reduced the cognitive load for students because they did not have to monitor the faces of their classmates and could instead focus on fewer (more relevant) things at once.

Third, I created a document for the course LMS with information for students about how to join Zoom for class sessions.

This included step-by-step screenshots for where to go in the LMS to log in to Zoom, how to join a course Zoom session from LMS, information on how to configure their university Zoom account, and expectations for behavior during Zoom sessions (e.g., cameras off). By providing such transparent instructions, I reduced the cognitive load required for students to figure out how to access the course.

Fourth, I allowed for students to participate in class discussions and to ask questions via the Zoom chat function instead of requiring that they unmute themselves. Again, although this created substantial additional challenges for me as an instructor (having to simultaneously monitor and manage speaking students, comments/questions appearing in the chat, plus all the other elements of running the Zoom and teaching the class), it allowed ways for students to participate that were less reliant on access. For example, multiple students joined the Zoom from a device that did not have a microphone, so it was not possible for them to participate orally. As with the prior issues, this decision was informed by considerations of social justice, the effect of stress on learning, and a pedagogy of care approach.

Fifth, I decided to record all course Zoom sessions. I did this not only for students who may have had to miss a session because of illness, quarantine, internet outage, etc., but also because of concern that the modality may have be difficult for some students to learn from and wanted to give them the option to review the recordings asynchronously if needed. This was also informed by a pedagogy of care approach. I posted clear links to each class session's recording on the LMS along with both the date and topic, and monitored access to the recordings (so I could see if students who had missed a live session had viewed the recording). Additionally, I created a document for the course LMS with tips for students about viewing the recordings. I integrated into these tips suggestions from the SoTL literature (e.g., reduce cognitive load by removing distractions from the environment, don't procrastinate or engage in massed viewing but try to view a missed session as soon as possible after the class, etc.)

The remaining four changes were all inspired by a pedagogy of care approach. Sixth, I chose to conduct all of my office hours virtually via Zoom. This allowed students access to me that did not require physical presence on campus and was potentially easier to schedule. I also created a document for the course LMS with a link to my Zoom office hours, information about the meeting ID and passcode, expectations for behavior, etc., to reduce the cognitive load of accessing my office hours.

Seventh, consistent with the recommendations of the SoTL literature (Chick, 2020), I started a new practice of asking my students at the start of every class period how they were doing. Without visual cues (because cameras were off) and without the ability to speak with students before and after class in the classroom, I felt that I needed some other way to establish immediacy with my students and communicate to them that I cared about them. This proved remarkably effective at creating rapport and helping me to identify struggling students and subsequently reach out to them and provide them resources. Of all the SoTL-inspired changes I made during the pandemic, this one by far resulted in the most feedback from students. I received multiple emails from students where they expressed not only appreciation for this, but stated that I was their only instructor who did so. For example, "You were my only professor that ever asked how we were doing,and I will not forget that." Another stated, "No other professor I had this semester took as much time as you did to make sure everyone was still doing okay and understanding the material."

Eighth, I made a point to reach out to every student who I knew had contracted COVID-19 or was quarantining after being exposed. In each case, I emailed the student individually to let them know I had received notification from the university (or to respond to their self-disclosure), inform them of university resources, and help them manage staying caught up with the course. In nearly every case, I received a reply from the student expressing appreciation for contacting them and working with them to stay caught up.

Ninth, for my remote synchronous courses at the end of week 4 and week 10 of the semester, I individually emailed every student in the course who had missed more than 2 live Zoom sessions (and hadn't subsequently watched the recordings on the LMS) or who had missed multiple graded assessments in the course, or both to reach out and see if they were ok and if there were anything I could do to better support their learning in the course. This also resulted in significant student feedback, both to the emails directly (e.g., "Thank you so much for checking in. . . I can't explain how much this means, you are one professor who consistently shows his care.") and on student evaluations of teaching (e.g., "He really cares about his students as well and would even sent wellness checks to students who have been absent or are struggling to stay on top of the course.").

MESO AND MACRO LEVEL: TRANSLATING SOTL FOR INSTITUTIONAL COLLEAGUES

During the summer of 2020, as preparation for the 2020-2021 academic year was underway, I undertook a knowledge mobilization approach focusing on translation to leverage my SoTL expertise to assist my institutional colleagues in improving the teaching and learning environment in their courses, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The scope of these efforts included both meso (departmental colleagues) and macro (extradepartmental institutional colleagues) contexts (Wuetherick & Yu, 2016). In focusing on translating the results of SoTL for my colleagues, it was important to go beyond simply sharing the findings of the SoTL literature (i.e., dissemination) and give them "user ready" materials and examples for their courses that were derived from the findings of this literature. Additionally, it was critical to explain the connection between the products and the literature (i.e., the "why" behind them) not only to illustrate how the products were grounded in literature, but also to highlight the underlying principles and concepts reflected in the literature so that faculty could extend them in their other course design decisions.

To that end, I created a Google Drive folder into which I uploaded multiple documents and shared that folder with the faculty in my department as well as numerous other colleagues across the institution. Each document contained not only sample language from materials that I had created for my own courses, but information on the SoTL basis guiding that language, and suggestions for how that language might be adapted to different teaching and learning contexts. To keep the amount of SoTL information presented manageable, I limited most of the connections to three main areas: a) the influence of cognitive load, b) the influence of stress on learning, and c) social justice issues. I did encour-

age colleagues to explicitly share their reasoning behind whatever approaches and policies they developed with their students as part of a pedagogy of care approach, but that was ancillary to the main focus.

The first document I created was sample language for a course syllabus that incorporated all new information that the university had mandated we include. However, in addition to that required information (e.g., masking and social distancing policies, references to university policies and resources for COVID-19 testing and quarantining, etc.), I also included language on attendance for F2F courses from my own syllabus where I explained that I gave all students the option of joining remotely via Zoom, and I explained why this was grounded in SoTL (e.g., social justice issues, the impact of stress on learning, etc.). As many faculty had anticipated, we discovered shortly after the Fall 2020 semester began that because of the subsectioning of classes, many students had back-to-back classes where they were expected to be physically present in one of them on a given day, but attend the other remotely via Zoom on the same day, and it was not logistically possible for them to do so. Allowing these students to join classes remotely instead of requiring physical attendance significantly reduced the stress of the situation for them.

Next, I shared a series of documents to be shared with students outlining information, tips, and policies with respect to the use of Zoom. Like the syllabus language, these were adapted from materials I had created for my own courses, but I added information about the SoTL basis behind the decisions and suggestions for how to adapt the materials to different courses. I shared the document for the course LMS with information for students about how to join Zoom for class sessions, the document with tips for viewing recordings of class Zoom sessions, and the document with information for virtual Zoom office hours. In each case, these materials provided not only practically helpful resources to my colleagues (e.g., screenshots of step-by-step instructions of how to join Zoom from the course LMS for class sessions), but also SoTL-inspired policies (e.g., cameras off) along with the SoTL-based justification for those policies (e.g., social justice, cognitive load).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SOTL-ACTIVE FACULTY TO SERVE AS COSMOPOLITAN ASSETS

In reflecting on how I attempted to leverage my SoTL expertise to improve teaching and learning not only in my courses (scholarly teaching) but also those of my institutional colleagues' (knowledge mobilization translation), in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, I came to see much stronger connections between my own scholarly teaching, my pedagogy of care approach, and my role as a SoTL-active faculty member in translating SoTL for others. The SoTL literature informed most of the changes to my courses for four semesters (scholarly teaching). Whenever possible, I explicitly shared with my students the reasons behind those decisions and how they were based on the SoTL literature (pedagogy of care). From there, taking the materials that I had created, along with the explanations for them, and translating them for my colleagues to use and adapt (knowledge mobilization translation) was relatively little work. After all, those materials were almost "user ready" in the sense that I was using them in my courses and only minor changes would need to be made to them to adopt them (e.g., change the name of the course, references to assessments, etc.). The connections to the SoTL literature weren't always in those materials in writing because I often explained them orally to my students but adding written explanations and citations for my colleagues was not particularly time-consuming. As Maurer et al. (2021) noted, faculty who take a scholarly teaching approach that is informed by the SoTL literature need to put forth only minimal additional effort to explicitly articulate the reasoning for their pedagogical decisions to students; in this piece, I have shown that similar minimal effort is required to go from that step to sharing those same materials with colleagues for use in their courses. For example, consider the length of the section in this paper on translating SoTL for institutional colleagues with the length of the section on SoTL-inspired changes in my courses: the bulk of the verbiage (and time in writing) was on explaining the changes and their basis in the literature with far less required to explain the translation step. As such, translating the findings of SoTL for non-SoTL-active faculty colleagues represents a sort of "low-hanging fruit" for SoTL-active faculty in their ability to improve the teaching and learning context at their institution beyond their own courses.

Following this suggestion, SoTL-active faculty could share any such relevant materials they have created with appropriate colleagues (departmental, institutional, and outside the institution). Such sharing could prove particularly useful in contexts where those materials are more likely to be adapted, such as in different sections of the same course taught by both the SoTL-active faculty and a colleague, or for faculty new to the institution who may be facing more extreme time pressures to prepare their courses. Because the SoTL basis behind the materials is explicitly connected and cited, it would also be relatively easy for any non-SoTL-active faculty who used those materials to explain that basis in their own teaching materials, evaluation materials, promotion and tenure documents, etc. Over time, this could even promote a more SoTL-based scholarly teaching culture within a unit.

Additionally, SoTL-active faculty could play important roles at the meso (departmental) and macro (institutional) levels in the years to come as institutions grapple with how to evaluate faculty teaching fairly in the wake of COVID-19. Such faculty are more likely to be aware of important SoTL work identifying emergency remote teaching as distinct from traditional online education (Hodges et al., 2020; Chick et al., 2020) and the inappropriateness of evaluating it as though it were traditional online education. For example, such faculty are more likely to be aware that the transition to emergency remote teaching in 2020 was negatively evaluated by students (Garris & Fleck, 2020) and that such transitions typically are accompanied by declines in student engagement (Day, 2015). In these ways, SoTL-active faculty could meaningfully add to the value that they bring to their institutions as cosmopolitan assets.

FOR SOTL SCHOLARS AT GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

During the review process for this piece, I was invited by the Editors of the journal to consider articulating a few "next steps" in helping SoTL-active faculty at Georgia Southern University to be more engaging as cosmopolitan assets to our institution (and beyond). It is my privilege to do so. To my Georgia Southern University SoTL colleagues, I encourage you first to consider all

the suggestions I just identified in the previous two paragraphs. Your departments, and our institution, could benefit greatly from your sharing of your SoTL expertise, and our students more than anyone would stand to benefit from those actions. Given the new focus of our University System on "student success" in evaluating faculty, there is a unique opportunity for SoTL-active faculty to leverage our knowledge and expertise to help our departments and our institution navigate this change.

More importantly—keep SoTLing! Over the past 15 years, we have built a culture of SoTL at Georgia Southern University (Botnaru et al., 2022). It has not been without its challenges and setbacks, but in that time our institution has established an international reputation as a center for SoTL scholarship and SoTL-active faculty, unique among public universities in the United States (Jackson & MacMillan, 2019). As the COVID-19 pandemic revealed, unanticipated situations can arise for which SoTL-active faculty are uniquely positioned—as cosmopolitan assets—to leverage their knowledge and expertise to assist their institutions and further their missions. SoTL work is important, impactful, transformational, and as SoTL scholars we are called to translate it for others in both familiar and new contexts to effect positive change in teaching and learning.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, A. S. (2020, March 26). *Why you should ignore all that coronavirus-inspired productivity pressure.* The Chronicle of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/article/why-you-should-ignore-all-that-coronavirus-inspired-productivity-pressure/

Bayne, B. [@brandonbayne]. (2020, March 15). *I've been taking in wonderful insights and recommendations from colleagues the last few days about transitioning to remote teaching*[Tweet]. Twitter. https://twitter.com/brandonbayne/status/1239336664176250880

Bernstein, D. (2013). How SoTL-active faculty members can be cosmopolitan assets to an institution. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1*(1), 35-40. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.35

Botnaru, D., Maurer, T.W., & Langdon, J. (2022). SoTL at Georgia Southern: Perceptions, engagement and impact. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 15*(3), article 3.

Chick, N. (2020, April 13). Higher education's emergency response to the pandemic: An interview with a professor of emergency management. *ISSOTL*. https://issotl.com/2020/04/13/higher-educations-emergency-response-to-the-pandemic-an-interview-with-a-professor-of-emergency-management/?fbclid=IwAR2ZNNyJaY-DU2CgqYKngj9bl5gaRUKTydAqdGhICRFAKqmnZOzTtE-hx9XQg

Chick, N., Friberg, J., & Bessette, L. S. (2020, March 20). *What the research tells us about higher education's temporary shift to remote teaching: What the public needs to know, from the SoTL Community*. Retrieved May 24, 2021 from https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CWTjYYU7zWJKWsNfUvw-jMBKGkUf_6oed6L3Zy1ANIZU/edit

Day, T. (2015). Academic continuity: Staying true to teaching values and objectives in the face of course interruptions. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 3*(1), 75-89. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.3.1.75

DiGregorio, N., Maurer, T.W., & Pattanaik, S. (2016). Documentation of SoTL trends at NCFR, 2006-2015. *Family Science Review, 21*(2), 54-73. https://doi.org/10.26536/FSR.2016.21.02.03

Felten, P. (2013). Principles of good practice in SoTL. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1* (1), 121-125. https://doi.org/10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.121

Friberg, J. (2018, November 27). SoTL, ER, and DBER: Thoughts inspired by a twitter conversation. *The SoTL Advocate*. https://illinoisstateuniversitysotl.wordpress.com/2018/11/27/sotl-er-and-dber-thoughts-inspired-by-a-twitter-conversation/

Garris, C. P., & Fleck, B. (2020). Student evaluations of transitioned-online courses during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000229

Hall, S. S., & Zygmunt, E. (2021). Dislocated college students and the pandemic: Back home under extraordinary circumstances. *Family Relations, 70* (3), 689-704. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12544

Hamon, R. R., & Smith, S. R. (2014). The discipline of family science and the continuing need for innovation. *Family Relations, 63*, 309-322. https://doi: 10.1111/fare.12068

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020, March 27). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*. Retrieved May 24, 2021 from https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning

Imad, M. (2020, March 17). *Hope matters*. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/03/17/10-strategies-support-students-and-help-them-learn-during-coronavirus-crisis

Jackson, T. (2020, March 27). *COVID-19 and videoclassism: Implicit bias, videojudgment, and why I'm terrified to have you look over my shoulder.* Linkedin. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/covid-19-videoclassism-implicit-bias-videojudgment-why-jackson

Jackson, B., & MacMillan, M. (2019). Where do presenters at ISSOTL come from and what can this tell us about SoTL? Part Two: A closer look at the ISSOTL maps. *ISSOTL Blog.* Retrieved from: https://issotl.com/2019/09/30/where-do-presenters-at-issotl-come-from-and-what-can-this-tell-us-about-sotl-part-two-a-closer-look-at-the-issotl-maps/

Liston, D. D., & Rahimi, R., Eds. (2017). *Promoting Social Justice through the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Indiana University Press.

MacNeil, M. S., & Evans, M. (2005). The pedagogy of caring in nursing education. *International Journal for Human Caring, 9*(4), 45–51. https://doi.org/10.20467/1091-5710.9.4.45.

Maurer, T.W., & Law. D. (2016). The scholarship of teaching & learning in family science. *Family Science Review, 21*(2), 2-17. https://doi.org/10.26536/FSR.2016.21.02.01

Maurer, T.W., & Shipp, C. (in press). *Strategies to promote reading compliance and student learning in an introductory child development course*. In K. Manarin, (Ed.), *Reading across the Disciplines: Studies in SoTL*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Maurer, T.W., & Shipp, C. (2021). Challenges of shaping student study strategies for success. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 9*(1). https://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.9.1.16

Maurer, T.W., Woolmer, C., Powell, N., Sisson, C., Snelling, C., Stalheim, O., & Turner, I. (2021). Sharing SoTL findings with students: An intentional knowledge mobilization strategy. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry, 9*(1). https://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.9.1.22

McKinney, K. (2003). What is the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) in higher education? *Teaching/Learning Matters*, *33*(1), 6–7.

McKinney, K. (2007). *Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning: The challenges and joys of juggling*. Jossey-Bass.

National Council on Family Relations. (n.d.). *We are family science*. Retrieved May 27, 2021 from https://family.science/

Potter, M. K., & Kustra, E. D. H. (2011) The relationship between scholarly teaching and SoTL: Models, distinctions, and clarifications. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 5*(1), Article 23. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2011.050123

Reinke, J., Muraco, J., & Maurer, T.W. (2016). The state of the scholarship of teaching and learning in family science. *Family Science Review*, *21*(2), 18-53. https://doi.org/10.26536/FSR.2016.21.02.02

Roscigno, R. (2020, March 26). *Covid 19, online teaching and ADHD*. [Link post]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?id=139088889437506&story_fbid=321475084520461 3

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. (2019, June 17). *Guidelines for effective knowledge mobilization*. Retrieved August 26, 2020 from https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/policies-politiques/knowledge_mobilisation-mobilisation_des_connaissances-eng.aspx.

Sweller, J. (2016). Working memory, long-term memory, and instructional design. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 5*(4), 360-367. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2015.12.002

Vogel, S., Kluen, L. M., Fernandez, G., & Schwabe, L. (2018). Stress affects the neural ensemble for integrating new information and prior knowledge. Neuroimage, 173, 176-187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.02.038

Walker, C. & Gleaves, A. (2016). Constructing the caring higher education teacher: A theoretical framework. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 54*, 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.013.

Wuetherick, B., & Yu, S. (2016). The Canadian teaching commons: The scholarship of teaching and learning in Canadian higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2016* (146), 23–30. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20183