SoTL at Georgia Southern: perceptions, engagement and impact

Diana Botnaru
Georgia Southern University, dbotnaru@georgiasouthern.edu

Trent W. Maurer
Georgia Southern University

Jody Langdon
Georgia Southern

SoTL at Georgia Southern: perceptions, engagement and impact

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the state of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) at our institution, including SoTL perceptions, engagement and impact. A link to an online anonymous survey (31 questions) in Qualtrics was distributed to all academic units. The final sample consisted of 90 faculty and administrators from a population of 1,327, reflecting a response rate of almost 7%. Over half of the participants engaged in SoTL research. More often they presented their work at conferences than in publications. Perceptions of support at departmental and Faculty Center levels were positive, but negative at the institutional level. Qualitative data indicated the legitimacy of SoTL and lack of support as major barriers to SoTL research. There was strong agreement among participants that SoTL positively impacted course design, types of assessments used, personal expectations and quality of student learning.

Keywords

perceptions, engagement, impact, institutional initiative

Creative Commons License

SoTL at Georgia Southern: Perceptions, Engagement and Impact

Diana Botnaru, Trent W. Maurer, and Jody Langdon

Georgia Southern University

The purpose of this study was to investigate the state of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) at our institution, including SoTL perceptions, engagement and impact. A link to an online anonymous survey (31 questions) in Qualtrics was distributed to all academic units. The final sample consisted of 90 faculty and administrators from a population of 1,327, reflecting a response rate of almost 7%. Over half of the participants engaged in SoTL research. More often they presented their work at conferences than in publications. Perceptions of support at departmental and Faculty Center levels were positive, but negative at the institutional level. Qualitative data indicated the legitimacy of SoTL and lack of support as major barriers to SoTL research. There was strong agreement among participants that SoTL positively impacted course design, types of assessments used, personal expectations and quality of student learning.

PURPOSE

Scholarhsip of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) programming at Georgia Southern University (GS) started about 14 years ago, yet no systematic study of the state of SoTL was conducted at our institution. The purpose of this study was to provide an overview of the SoTL Initiative and its rezults and to investigate the current perceptions about various issues related to SoTL, engagement in SoTL, and impact of SoTL activities among faculty and administrators at our institution.

BACKGROUND

A study of the current status of SoTL at GS would be incomplete without a discussion about the origin, development and evolution of SoTL activities and the role that different constituents played in laying the foundation for SoTL programming at our instituion. The history of SoTL at GS is also important for other institutions that might be looking to start or expand SoTL activities on their own campuses and may benefit from the lessons learned at GS. Finally, it provides the context for the special edition of the *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning* - a journal "born" from the SoTL Initiative at our institution that promotes SoTL nationally and internationally.

SoTL initiative at GS

In the fall and winter of academic year 2007-2008, the Faculty Learning Community (FLC) for SoTL, in collaboration with Alan Altany, the director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching (CET; since renamed The Faculty Center) at GS, developed a university-wide initiative, "Scholarship of Teaching & Learning at Georgia Southern," or simply, "SoTL at Georgia Southern." The FLC had seven members (six Assistant and one Associate professors), representing four colleges: Science and Mathematics (COSM) - 2, Health and Human Sciences (CHHS) - 3, Engineering (CE) - 1, and Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (JPHCOPH) - 1. The CET Advisory Council members were invited to serve as reviewers of the proposal by the CET director based on their interest in teaching and their participation in CET's workshops. They suggested revisions and provided support for the purpose and basic features of the proposal. The Council had 11 members (one full professor, three associate professors, two assistant professors, and five administrators) representing seven colleges at the time: Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS) - 3, CHHS- 2, Informa-tion Technology (CIT) - 2, Business (COBA) - 1, Education (COE) - 1, JPHCOPH - 1 and Library - 1.

The SoTL at GS Initiative proposed to recognize, sustain, expand, and promote SoTL, not only as a legitimate form of scholarship (as already established in the Quality Enhancement Plan at the time), but as the best Evidence-Based Decision Making method for retaining and improving the culture of engagement for which GS is well recognized. Key Activities of the initiative included three major areas with 11 specific goals (SoTL Initiative, 2007):

1. **Collaborations**
   - Continue the development of the CET's Faculty Learning Communities program
   - Continue each semester's CET Reading Roundtables (faculty book discussion groups)
   - Create a SoTL Research & Writing Circle sponsored by the CET
   - Establish a SoTL Mentor program where experienced SoTL scholars are available to assist colleagues in the creation and development of SoTL projects
   - Apply to join the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning's (CASTL) Affiliates Program in order to learn how other institutions are investigating teaching and learning, and to collaborate with those institutions.

2. **Community of Inquiry**
   - Create a SoTL Leadership Team to guide, assess and foster the initiative, and to
   - promote the recognition and rewarding of SoTL;
   - Continue CET's SoTL Commons Conference to provide exposure of SoTL to GS faculty, with GS faculty continuing to give presentations and to serve as concurrent session chairs
   - Continue CET's International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (IJ-SoTL) with GS faculty on the Review Board and encouraged to submit manuscripts

3. **Culture of Learning**
   - Develop a blog for the dissemination of SoTL ideas and projects by GS faculty

- Create an annual SoTL Poster Day for GS faculty (and possibly their students) to display SoTL projects
- Establish a "SoTL at Georgia Southern" web page on the GS website as a repository of SoTL work by GS faculty, and others, as a compendium of SoTL resources, and as a nexus for SoTL collaborations, conversations, and news.

Most of the proposed goals from the initiative have proved successful in the last 15 years and stayed active. Out of the 11 specific goals proposed, seven were implemented from the beginning of the initiative, although the extent of implementation has changed over time. As of the writing of this manuscript, five are still being carried out fully, one - in a limited capacity and two new goals were added. All SoTL related events are posted on a "SoTL at Georgia Southern" web page, housed by the Faculty Center that can be accessed at https://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/sotlgsu/

Some of the most successful elements of the initiative have been the SoTL Commons Conference (SoTL Commons) and the International Journal for SoT (IJ-SoTL). Georgia Southern is unique in this respect, as it houses both an international conference and a journal. Prior to 2013, both were fully managed by the Faculty Center, but subsequently transitioned to faculty, who became responsible for the academic part, while the Faculty Center supported the administrative part. The SoTL Commons started in 2007 on the Statesboro campus of Georgia Southern and was later transitioned to Savannah, where it is held annually (in 2021 it was cancelled in response to the COVID-19 pandemic). With an average attendance of 200 participants (176 to 230), representing approximately 60 national and international universities, the conference has consistently encouraged participation from GS faculty (40 out of 230 participants in 2020) and introduced a separate track for student presenters (13 out of 230 participants in 2020). The latter was in response to Peter Felten's publication "Principles of Good Practice in SoTL" that outlined the importance of student partnerships. One of the clear indications that the conference is known in the SoTL circles is the references found in various publications. The conference (and the IJ-SoTL) were mentioned among venues to "give SoTL a wider audience and to enhance the visibility and credibility of pedagogical research" as a way to run interference and catalyze SoTL (Gurung & Schwartz, 2010). It was also compared to the Sherwood Forest where participants are akin to Robin Hood "I pocketed ideas and practices for my own work with calculus students. And so we thieves share, trade, and steal across disciplines, across states and nations, across institutional types—more gently described by Huber and Morreale as a "trading zone" (2002, p. 21), but I prefer the metaphor of Robin Hood because…..the legendary thief of Sherwood Forest emphasizes the passion to enrich others with an educational bounty at any cost. At the conference's close, we bring our full sacks back to our campuses" (Premadasa, 2014).

The International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning is an open-access, double-blind peer reviewed electronic journal published twice a year by the Faculty Center at Georgia Southern University. It is included in five indexing sources and is an international forum for information and research about SoTL and its implications for higher/tertiary education. Since 2013, the journal has been managed by several editors who are faculty members at GS.

The Faculty Center at Georgia Southern has also been successful in harvesting faculty's passion for SoTL when it established the SoTL Leadership Team in 2009. Initially, the team was composed of eight members (four members from the CET Advisory Council described above, and four At-Large members) selected for their interest in and knowledge of SoTL and their willingness to serve on the Leadership Team. Over time, the composition changed and currently the team has eleven members representing five colleges and two campuses. The Leadership Team includes faculty members who are SoTL scholars and serves as an advisory group to the Faculty Center on all SoTL related issues. The members are responsible for reviewing the applications for SoTL fellowship and the SoTL Scholar award, both supported by the center, as well as serving on the review board for SoTL Commons and IJ-SoTL. In addition, multiple team members served as mentors for fellowship winners, thus providing a semi-formal mentorship program identified in the SoTL initiative.

The Faculty Center started an FLC Program in 2007 and initially supported multiple FLCs on different topics selected by faculty. As a result of staffing constraints and budgetary issues, the only FLC offered consistently was focused on SoTL. In 2019-2020, the FLC was co-led by two faculty members as part of the Chancellor Learning Scholar program supported by the University System of Georgia.

Several SoTL related activities were not included in the original initiative, but evolved from the SoTL activities led by the Faculty Center. They include the establishment of the SoTL award in 2010, now called the Outstanding SoTL Scholar, and the SoTL Fellowship started in 2012. The SoTL Fellows Program was designed to foster faculty engagement and leadership in SoTL. It supports up to two faculty each year in their advancement and completion of quality, innovative SoTL research projects. The fellows receive $1,000 in faculty development funding through the Faculty Center and work with a mentor from the SoTL Leadership Team. Since 2012, twenty six faculty members have participated in the program. See Table 1 for college distribution of awardees. The Outstanding SoTL Scholar recognizes a faculty member for a body of work of outstanding contributions to SoTL. The Scholar receives a stipend from the Faculty Center upon fulfillment of expectations and is nominated for the USG Regents' SoTL Awards in the following academic year. Since its inception, fourteen faculty members have received the award. Of them, six were awarded the University System of Georgia SoTL award and one received the system's award for excellence in teaching. Despite the relatively long history of the SoTL initiative at our institution, no systematic examination of the state of SoTL has been carried out to date. As the SoTL Initiative is approaching its 15th year mark in 2022, the authors looked to examine the impact of the initiative at the institutional level.

THE STATE OF SOTL IN OTHER CONTEXTS

Several previous studies explored the state of SoTL in different contexts: in academic disciplines like family science (Reinke et al., 2016) and psychology (Gurung et al., 2008); at the institution (Wuetherick et al., 2016) or country-wide professional associations levels (Wuetherick et al., 2016).

Gurung et al. (2008) examined the state of SoTL in psychology to ascertain the degree to which psychology departments and institutions enacted SoTL based on a sample of 142 participants.

Table 1: Distribution of SoTL Fellowship and awards by college			
College	SoTL Fellowship (2012-2021)	SoTL Award/ Outstanding Scholar (2010-2021)	University System of Georgia SoTL/ teaching award
Behavioral and Social Sciences	2	1	
Education	7	2	
Engineering and Computing	1	1	
Science and Mathematics	7	3	3
Health and Human Sciences*	4	4**	3**
Liberal Arts and Social Sciences***	3	2	
Business	1	1	1
Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health	1		
Total	26	14	7

Note. Membership is representative of existing college structure at the time of award/fellowship.
*Renamed Waters College of Health Professions
**One member's department since moved to College of Behavioral and Social Studies
***College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences was split into College of Arts and Humanities and College of Behavioral and Social Studies

They found that many respondents failed to endorse prevailing sentiments of support for SoTL at the department or institutional level. However, they pointed out that awareness of SoTL among psychologists and psychology departments was better than it is in many other academic disciplines.

Reinke et al. (2016) recruited through National Council on Family Relations [NCFR] section email listservs and the Family Science Association membership email listserv, yielding 51 participants. The majority of their participants were female, white, non-Hispanic, predominantly associate and full professors with a mean teaching experience of 16 years. Most participants indicated that their department supports SoTL research and encourages involvement in SoTL, and a majority (63%) were doing SoTL and disseminating their work through teaching and learning outlets, although their endeavours mostly seemed solitary.

Wuetherick et al. (2016) at University of Saskatchewan did a snowball sampling of known SoTL-active people at the institution that yielded a population of 284 individuals (of ~1,000 faculty at the institution). Their final sample consisted of 198 respondents (70% response rate) with almost equal numbers of assistant/associate/full and distributed across all disciplinary groups. The snapshot indicated that the majority engaged in primary forms of SoTL by reflecting on their teaching and reading SoTL literature. The primary barrier reported by respondents was SoTL legitimacy (most comments) and lack of SoTL recognition for promotion and tenure purposes. Less than half of the SoTL projects were multidisciplinary projects and about 1/3 of faculty engaged in collaborative projects.

Wuetherick and Yu (2016) examined the state of SoTL and perceptions of Canadian SoTL scholars at the individual, departmental, institutional, and mega levels. The survey was administered to the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education membership in Canada. A total of 140 responses were obtained with representation from all provinces, a relatively balanced representation of academic ranks, types of institutions, genders, and

ages, but not by discipline (with social sciences and humanities forming the majority of the sample). The results at the department level were mixed. A large number of participants also reported that their departmental colleagues find their work on SoTL to be problematic (54%) and were almost evenly split on whether departmental norms encourage participation in SoTL. Although a sizable group agreed that their involvement in SoTL strengthened their case for hiring (48%), merit raise (45%), tenure (53%) and promotion to full (57%), a large group (35%, 55%, 34% and 39% respectively) was uncertain of how SoTL contributed to these decisions. The perception of support for SoTL was less positive at the institutional level with high levels of agreement that there is a "lack of administrative leadership in championing SoTL". A couple of major obstacles identified by participants included the tension between demands for research productivity and SoTL and faculty colleagues who were still unclear as to what constitutes SoTL. However, overall, participants reported a positive impact on their perceptions of, and practices of teaching and student learning as result of engagement with SoTL.

These studies most directly influenced this study's methodology, which is explained in the following section.

METHODOLOGY

Georgia Southern University is a public undergraduate institution with a designated R2 status (Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity) in the Carnegie classification system. It is the largest center of higher education within the southern half of the state of Georgia. The institution has a combined enrollment of ~27,000 students across three campuses and 1,327 faculty and administrators (total population from which we sampled). Less than 60% of faculty are tenured or tenure-track.

Recruitment

The IRB at the university approved the study. A link to an online anonymous survey in Qualtrics was distributed via email to associate deans of all academic units of the institution (eight colleges and the libraries) with a request for distribution in their respective colleges. Seven confirmation emails were received that the survey was forwarded to college faculty members. The email with the link was sent in the second week of April 2021 and the survey remained open until May 6, 2021.

Survey

Our measures were adapted from those used in similar previous studies: Wuetherick and Yu (2016), and Reinke et al. (2016). Both studies used modified versions of the original Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning survey that Cox et al. (2005, as cited by Huber & Hutchings, 2005) developed.

For our study the questionnaire consisted of 31 questions. We organized the survey in five broad dimensions: (a) level of support for SoTL at the departmental level, (b) level of support for SoTL at the institutional level, (c) level of support for SoTL at both the departmental and institutional levels, (d) the role of the Faculty center in supporting SoTL, and (e) participants' experiences with conducting SoTL research. We also included ten demographic questions and two open-ended questions: obstacles at both departmental and institutional levels in doing SoTL, and what insights or comments participants had about SoTL (See Appendix).

To facilitate comparisons, in our study, we used the definition of SoTL that Reinke et al. (2016) used. SoTL involves the

systematic study of teaching and learning, which uses established or validated criteria of scholarship to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviours, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning. In addition, SoTL helps to develop a more accurate understanding of learning thatresuls in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community (Potter & Kustra, 2011, p. 2).

Participants

We received 113 responses to the survey. Twenty-three of those responses answered only the first few questions on the survey and were dropped from analyses because of missing data. The remaining sample was 90 university faculty members and administrators from a population of 1,327, reflecting a response rate of almost 7%. The majority of participants (51%) identified as female, with 38% identifying as male, 2% identifying as genderqueer or non-binary, 7% selecting "prefer not to answer", and 2% leaving the question blank.

In terms of participants' race, participants could select all that applied: 86% identified as White, 7% as Asian, 3% as Black or African American, 1% as American Indian or Alaska Native, and 4% left the question blank. Four percent identified their ethnicity as Hispanic or Latino/Latina. The participants' ages ranged from 18 to 73 years. Four percent of respondents did not answer the question. 18 years was the default age on the slider bar for this question and likely represents participant error rather than accurate data (e.g., the next lowest age selected was 30 years), so the two participants who answered 18 had their answers re-coded as missing. The final average age was $M = 48.77$, $SD = 10.36$.

The majority of participants were tenured (61%), with roughly equal numbers of the remaining participants tenure-track (19%) and non-tenure track (20%). The teaching rank of the participants was disproportionately senior faculty: Full Professor (28%), Associate Professor (37%), Assistant Professor (16%), Senior Lecturer (6%), Lecturer (11%), Professor Emeritus/Emerita (1%), Other (Clinical Instructor, 1%), and 1% who did not answer the question. Teaching experience among the participants ranged from 0 to 50 years ($M = 16.59$, $SD = 9.95$).

Eighteen percent of participants indicated that they held an administrative role at the institution: one Associate Dean, one Dean, six Department Chairs, one Associate Department Chair, one Assistant Department Chair, one Director, one Coordinator, and one Honors Coordinator. Participants' colleges were: 20% Science and Mathematics, 19% Behavioral and Social Sciences, 18% Arts and Humanities, 12% Parer College of Business, 11% Waters College of Health Professions, 8% Education, 7% Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing, 3% JianPing Hsu College of Public Health, and 2% did not answer the question.

On average, participants reported being expected to teach 0% - 90% of their time ($M = 50.98$, $SD = 19.05$), engage in schol-

arship 0% - 60% of their time ($M = 22.37$, $SD = 14.56$), participate in service 0% - 75% of their time ($M = 17.42$, $SD = 11.48$), and serve in an administrative role 0% - 90% of their time ($M = 9.22$, $SD = 21.21$).

RESULTS[1]
Quantitative

Departmental Support for SoTL

Participants estimated the percentage of their departmental colleagues who are involved with SoTL from 0% to 91%, with a mean of 27.09% ($SD = 21.69$). Results indicated support for SoTL at the departmental level was potentially strong, but greatly varied, as shown in Table 2. The role of SoTL in departmental personnel decisions was less clear with many participants indicating either that they were unsure of the role SoTL played in their department's most recent decisions or that the candidate did not submit any evidence of SoTL activity. (See Table 3.) Additionally, significant numbers of participants did not answer these questions (ranging from 6-24% of participants). Still, the number of participants indicating that SoTL strengthened the candidate's case substantially outnumbered the number indicating that SoTL weakened the candidate's case.

Table 2. Percentage of Responses to Items Referring to Departmental Support of SoTL				
Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My department chair has actively encouraged involvement in SoTL	8.9%	25.6%	44.4%	20.0%
When hiring new faculty, my department regards applicants' interest in SoTL favorably	12.2%	31.1%	43.3%	12.2%
Other departments provide more support for SoTL than my department does	8.9%	51.1%	26.7%	11.1%
Faculty members in other departments at my institution are actively involved in SoTL	3.3%	16.7%	58.9%	18.9%
Note. N = 90. Because of missing data and rounding, rows may not total to 100%.				

Almost half of participants (46.7%) indicated SoTL was not explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in their department's evaluation guidelines; 12.2% reported SoTL is considered only as a teaching activity, 3.3% reported SoTL is viewed as only a research activity, and 35.6% reported SoTL counts towards both teaching and research activity requirements. Two participants (2.2%) indicated "other" and responded that the language was very vague or that the recognition depends on the type of faculty appoint-

Table 3. Percentage of Responses to Items Referring to Departmental Personnel Decisions Related to SoTL					
Item	No evidence of activity in SoTL submitted	Unsure of role played	Weakened the case	Had no impact	Strengthened the case
What role did the candidate(s)' level of activity in SoTL play in…					
…your department's most recent hiring decision?	21.1%	26.7%	2.2%	24.4%	15.6%
…your department's most recent tenure decision?	16.7%	24.4%	3.3%	22.2%	27.8%
…your department's most recent promotion decision?	15.6%	24.4%	3.3%	17.8%	32.2%
…your department's most recent merit pay decision?	8.9%	36.7%	1.1%	18.9%	10.0%
…your department's most recent post-tenure review decision?	15.2%	39.2%	3.8%	16.5%	25.3%
Note. N = 90. Because of missing data and rounding, rows may not total to 100%.					

Table 4. Departmental and Institutional Support: A Comparison								
Item	Department Support				Institutional Support			
	SD	D	A	SA	SD	D	A	SA
Other faculty members are actively involved in SoTL	11.1	17.8	52.2	16.7	0	22.2	63.3	10.0
Norms encourage participation in SoTL	12.6	33.3	47.1	6.9	6.7	37.8	44.4	4.4
Some of my colleagues find work in SoTL problematic	7.8	36.4	40.9	14.8	3.3	38.9	43.3	10.0
The criteria for teaching awards are consistent with the principles of SoTL	7.8	26.7	50.0	12.2	5.6	26.7	48.9	12.2
The criteria for promotion decisions reflect the principles of SoTL	12.2	41.1	34.4	6.7	10.0	43.3	33.3	4.4
The criteria for tenure decisions reflect the principles of SoTL	14.4	41.1	34.4	5.6	11.1	43.3	32.2	4.4
Faculty members have received tenure based at least in part on SoTL	18.9	27.8	40.0	10.0	11.1	30.0	46.7	6.7
Within the past 5 years, we have reexamined our approach to rewarding SoTL	22.2	51.1	21.1	3.3	15.6	48.9	27.8	1.1
Within the past 5 years, we have broadened the criteria for assessing teaching performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL	20.0	44.4	30.0	2.2	15.5	47.6	33.3	3.6
Within the past 5 years, we have broadened the criteria for assessing research performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL	22.2	44.4	30.0	1.1	17.8	47.8	24.4	3.3

Note: N = 90. Because of missing data and rounding, rows may not total to 100%. SD = strongly disagree, D = disagree, A = agree, SA = strongly agree. All numbers are percentages.

ment (e.g., lecturer vs. tenure track). Additional questions about departmental culture and history revealed less support for and integration of SoTL. (See Table 4.)

Institutional Support for SoTL

Participants' perceptions of institutional support for SoTL also varied substantially, but were generally more negative than perceptions of departmental support. (See Table 5.) Interestingly, there was significant disagreement among participants as to whether SoTL is explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in the institution's evaluation guidelines. The majority of respondents (54.4%) said "no", with 13.3% reporting that it was recognized as teaching only, 1.1% reporting that it was recognized as research only, 27.8% reporting that it was recognized as both teaching and research, and 2.2% reporting that they didn't know.

Participants estimated the percentage of their institutional colleagues who are actively involved in SoTL from 0% to 91%, with a mean of 27.63 (SD = 19.38). Additional questions about institutional culture and history that paralleled the questions about departmental culture and history revealed even less support for and integration of SoTL at the institutional level. (See Table 4.)

Faculty Center (Formerly the Center for Excellence in Teaching) Support for SoTL

Participants were extremely positive in their appraisals of the efforts of the institutional Faculty Center to support SoTL. See Table 6.

In terms of participants' involvement in SoTL events supported by Faculty Center (participants could check all that applied): 34.4% had attended the SoTL Commons Conference, 25.6% had presented at the SoTL Commons Conference, 16.7%

had reviewed a submission to the SoTL Commons Conference, 40.0% had participated in a Faculty Learning Community [FLC] on SoTL, 10.0% had applied for a university SoTL Fellowship, 6.7% had received a university SoTL Fellowship, 5.6% had been nominated for a university SoTL award, 3.3% had received a university SoTL award, 4.4% had served on the university SoTL Leadership Team, 32.2% had attended a university SoTL professional development activity, 5.6% had submitted a manuscript to IJ-SoTL, 2.2% had published in IJ-SoTL, and 7.8% had reviewed a manuscript for IJ-SoTL.

When asked to what extent the Faculty Center activities played an important role in advancing participants' involvement in SoTL at the institution, significant differences emerged by the type of activity: 36.7% of participants reported the SoTL Commons Conference to be somewhat or very important, 24.4% found IJ-SoTL to be important, 26.7% identified the SoTL Fellowship as important, 25.5% reported the SoTL Award/Scholar to be important, 72.2% identified professional development activities to be important, 64.4% identified the center's staff to be important, 41.1% reported support from SoTL mentors important, 37.8% identified the SoTL Leadership Team as important, and 38.9% reported the SoTL FLC to be important.

Participants' Experiences with Conducting SoTL Research

Using Potter and Kustra's (2011) definition of SoTL, we asked participants if they had conducted SoTL research. Over half of the participants (56.7%) reported yes. Of them, they reported having done SoTL for one to 30 years, with a mean of 10.85 years (SD = 8.29). When asked to estimate the percentage of their scholarly

Table 5. Percentage of Responses to Items Referring to Institutional Support of SoTL				
Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Top-level academic leaders at my institution have taken significant steps to support SoTL	14.4%	40.0%	34.4%	7.8%
Faculty members in formal leaderships roles (senate, president, department chair, and so on) have actively supported SoTL	10.0%	34.4%	38.9%	12.2%
Support for SoTL at my institution is widespread	13.5%	52.8%	29.2%	4.5%
SoTL is integrated into other institution priorities and initiatives	13.3%	42.2%	35.6%	2.2%
There are adequate campus-level funding opportunities for SoTL projects at my institution	15.6%	42.2%	32.2%	4.4%

Note. N = 90. Because of missing data and rounding, rows may not total to 100%.

Table 6. Percentage of Responses to Items Referring to Center for Teaching Excellence Support of SoTL

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
CTE has taken significant steps to support SoTL	3.3%	8.9%	47.8%	40.0%
SoTL is integrated into CTE's priorities and initiatives	2.2%	8.9%	47.8%	40.0%
CTE has actively encouraged faculty participation in SoTL	2.2%	8.9%	50.0%	38.9%
CTE has adequate opportunities for faculty to get engaged in SoTL activities at my institution	3.3%	23.3%	46.7%	25.6%
CTE provides adequate financial support for faculty to engage in SoTL	13.3%	32.2%	36.7%	14.4%
Note. N = 90. Because of missing data and rounding, rows may not total to 100%.				

work in SoTL research, these participants' responses ranged from 1% to 100%, with a mean of 39.02% (*SD* = 33.02%).

Most SoTL-active participants (82.3%) disseminated their research by discussing it with colleagues in their department, discipline, or the institution. Two-thirds presented their work at a teaching and learning conference and 62.7% presented their work at a disciplinary conference. Other fairly common methods of dissemination included publishing findings in a refereed teaching and learning publication (49.0%), or publishing findings in a refereed disciplinary publication (47.1%). Fewer participants reported dissemination via posting content to a blog, website, or social media account(s) [e.g., Twitter] (13.7%); publishing in a non-refereed teaching and learning publication (11.8%); publishing in a non-refereed disciplinary publication (3.9%); or writing a peer-reviewed book or publishing in a peer-reviewed edited volume (13.7%).

With respect to collaboration, 27.5% of SoTL-active participants indicated that they never or rarely collaborated with others on SoTL research. The plurality (41.1%) collaborated between less than half of the time and more than half of the time, with 25.5% collaborating almost always or always. Nearly two-thirds (64.7%) of participants collaborated with faculty from their own department, although 39.2% collaborated with faculty from other disciplines at the institution, 31.4% collaborated with faculty from their discipline at other institutions, and 11.8% collaborated with faculty from other disciplines at other institutions. A minority (17.6%) reported collaborating with undergraduate students and with graduate students.

Influence of SoTL on Teaching and Learning

Participants who reported conducting SoTL research were also asked about the influence of their involvement with SoTL on their own and others' teaching and learning. Results varied by question, but overall very strong influences were reported. See Table 7.

Qualitative

Participants in the survey received two qualitative questions to explore opinions on the barriers to doing SoTL at departmental and institutional levels and an open-ended question for general insights/comments about SoTL. Statements were entered into an Excel spreadsheet and analyzed for common themes, which were then organized into categories. If a statement held true for different categories, it was placed into multiple categories. The qualitative analyses included overall demographic information for participants providing the statements (gender, age, tenure status, years of teaching, rank and college affiliation), as well as the total number of statements in each category. The results are presented below by question.

Qualitative question 1 asked "Thinking about both your departmental and institutional levels, what obstacles--if any--are there for faculty who want to do SoTL research?"

Participants representing six colleges (CAH-2, COSM-9, COE-3, CBSS-6, PCOB-4, PCEC-4) provided twenty eight responses to this question. Of them, 14 identified themselves as females, 11 as males, one as genderqueer and two preferred not to answer. The average age was 50 (age span 32 to 65), average teaching experience - 18 years (experience span 2 to 30), most

Table 7. Percentage of Responses to Items Referring to Influence on Teaching and Learning

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have changed the design of my courses since becoming involved in SoTL	5.9%	7.8%	52.9%	25.5%
I have changed the kinds of assessments I use in my courses as a result of my participation in SoTL	3.9%	15.7%	51.0%	21.6%
Becoming involved in SoTL has contributed to my excitement about teaching	3.9%	15.7%	47.1%	27.5%
My expectations for my own teaching have changed since my involvement in SoTL	3.9%	5.9%	52.9%	29.4%
My expectations for my students' learning have changed since I became involved in SoTL	2.0%	11.8%	54.9%	23.5%
The quality of my students' learning has changed since my involvement in SoTL.	2.0%	7.8%	60.8%	23.5%
I have documented improvements in my students' learning since participating in SoTL	5.9%	21.6%	49.0%	17.6%
More of my students achieve high standards of work since I became involved in SoTL	3.9%	27.5%	51.0%	9.8%
My work in SoTL has had a positive influence on teaching in my department beyond my own practice	9.8%	23.5%	43.1%	15.7%
My involvement in SoTL is visible to my departmental colleagues	5.9%	25.5%	47.1%	13.7%
My work in the scholarship of teaching and learning has influenced colleagues at my institution outside my department.	15.7%	23.5%	41.2%	11.8%
My involvement in SoTL has heightened my interest in reading research on teaching and learning.	5.9%	17.6%	54.9%	17.6%
Note. N = 51. Because of missing data and rounding, rows may not total to 100%.				

were tenured (25) and had the rank of full (10) and associate (9) professor, with assistant professors (5), lecturers (3) and emerita (1) in the minority.

Most answers (13 statements) identified the l**egitimacy of SoTL** as one of the major barriers. Statements included:

- "There is a prevailing sentiment that SoTL is not real research. Reportedly this was a sentiment even shared by the Provost. Having awards and recognition apart from typical scholarship recognition feed into this sentiment, and even give it credence"
- "Stigma that is is not "real" research"
- "It is considered second tier research at best"
- "It is not valued as an equivalent of "real" research"

The second most frequent category (10 statements) discussed **overall support issues** for SoTL as a major barrier. Statements included:

- "Funding and support from colleagues/promotion and tenure committees"
- "Collecting data. Applying for IRB, Analyzing data. They are time consuming"
- "I think that our support of SOTL has dramatically diminished over the last 5 years due to a lack of priority and resources devoted to it"

It is interesting that specific lack of support for SoTL in **promotion and tenure decisions** (7 statements) was mentioned separately.

- "Some stigma remains toward SOTL research, as evidenced by comments devaluing such work in college promotion/tenure committees"
- "My Department Tenure and promotion committee DOES NOT support SOTL as research. I was actually discouraged. That's not serious research, so I never applied for the IRB nor the SoTL award…"
- "Acceptance of SoTL research as scholarship achievements for promotion and tenure"
- "It is not valued as an equivalent of "real" research. It has created obstacles, biases, and resistance by departmental faculty for tenure and promotion decisions"

Two statements identified barriers that were **discipline-specific** and came from faculty in arts & humanities and engineering.

- "The social sciences model for studies and publications that currently dominates the SoTL field leaves little room for work in the arts and humanities. Most of my colleagues are unfamiliar with the processes involved in setting up a study and analyzing the data from it. So when they change their instructional techniques, they may do so because they're motivated by previous SoTL research and findings, but they do not document those changes, and share them only informally with other members of the department"
- "The pressure to bring external funding (which is mainly in non SoTL in engineering) discourages engineering faculty. The failed college (CEC) policy of giving excessive reduced-teaching to new tenure-track faculty has resulted in no SoTL activities by new faculty (and VERY LITTLE AND POOR results in scholarship in general). A whole cohort of young faculty with very poor teaching skills (and no interest in it) has resulted"

The other category included two statements of which one indicated that "SoTL is very well supported and encouraged by my department chair."

Qualitative question 2 asked "In the space provided below, please share any additional insights or comments you have about SoTL."

Participants representing seven colleges (CAH-2, COSM-5, COE-2, CBSS-4, CEC-4, PH-1, WCHP-3) provided twenty six responses to this question. Of them, nine identified themselves as females, 12 as males, one as genderqueer and four preferred not to answer. The average age was 49 (age span 30 to 61), average teaching experience - 18 years (experience span 3 to 32), most were tenured (23) and had the rank of full (11) and associate (7) professors, with assistant professors (6), lecturers (1) and emerita (1) in the minority.

The largest category of statements (eight statements) mirrored the answers from the previous question and included **negative views of SoTL**, with SoTL not being valued and stigmatized as a form of research. Statements included:

- "SoTL is pathetic, a complete waste of time and resources. SoTL is a way to make administration look like you are doing something productive while wasting your colleagues time. SoTL "research" is what you do when you are not a real researcher"
- "Many people think that SoTL is merely publishing about your teaching, and it is often discounted as "real" research"
- "SoTL is weak when compared to high-quality education research and that weak SoTL research should not be rewarded or encouraged. Look at the SoTL-focused journals -- most are not highly ranked"
- "Parker College has a Journal List, where faculty are encouraged to submit their research. There are very, very few Teaching Journals on that list. As such, teaching research is NOT conducted by the vast majority of Parker faculty"

The second category consisted of statements (seven) that reflected **a positive experience with SoTL** and the valuable contribution that SoTL brings to the teaching and learning process. Statements included:

- "Even though I am not involved in SoTL activities, I have many colleagues who are involved in SoTL and I have learned a lot from them with respect to improving how I deliver information, engage students in the learning process, and assess students' learning"
- "I have positive memories from my involvement with SoTL. They teach you good research techniques and should continue to do so. Their effort is a great service to faculty who want to improve their teaching and research agenda"
- "I think SoTL is a strength of this university but being really driven from the faculty's own interests and passion for it"
- "SoTL needs to be more fully recognized as a scholarship. Doing so would benefit the quality of teaching across the institution"

Four statements addressed specifically the **efforts of the Faculty Center** (formerly Center for Teaching Excellence - CTE) in connection to SoTL. Statements included:

- CTE seems to spend a lot of energy proselytizing about SOTL, as though the goal was to turn every faculty member into a scholar of teaching and learning. That is not the goal of every faculty member; it would be helpful if some sessions focused on distilling insights from SOTL about best practices into immediately applicable techniques that can be put to use in the classroom. I'm happy to integrate results gleaned from others' scholarship into how students learn most effectively, but I'm not interested in making that one of my own areas of research.
- CTE support is valuable. Greater opportunity for university awards and sharing opportunities would be valuable.
- In my experience thus far FLC's have been very effective.
- sotl has faded recently, don't hear much about it like I used to 5 years ago.

The last two categories included four statements about the structure of the survey and an other category (3 statements) with some examples provided below:

- "It was extremely difficult to answer most of the survey questions so I had to leave many questions blank. I am not aware of what research my colleagues conduct and what is included in the scholarship activity performance review at Georgia Southern"
- "This survey could have benefited from an N/A option for many questions"
- "I even don't know what SoTL is"

CONCLUSIONS

In examining the history, initiatives, and current perspectives of faculty at GS, SoTL is alive and well, although areas for growth are certainly present. Hutchings et al. (2011) noted that key practices for supporting SoTL include integrating SoTL into institutional culture and monitoring progress as well as recognizing that institutionalization is a long-term process. It is clear that in the SoTL sphere, GS is well known for producing quality scholarship that drives improvement in teaching and learning. As this review concludes, we take time to highlight trends, summarize what has gone well, and identify areas of growth for the future of SoTL within the institution.

Comparing the demographic characteristics of participants to published institutional demographic data about faculty and administrators (Georgia Southern University, 2021), our sample was a fairly accurate representation of the gender distribution at the institution, but overrepresented White and underrepresented Black or African American and Asian faculty and administrators. In addition, tenured faculty were overrepresented while non-tenure track faculty were underrepresented. Full Professors, Associate Professors, and Lecturers/Senior Lecturers were overrepresented; instructors, temporary, and part-time faculty were underrepresented. Further, administrators were overrepresented by nearly three times their share of the faculty. The age distribution of participants was similar to that of the faculty population, but the years of teaching experience and college of appointment could not be compared because of differences in how that data was collected and recorded by the institution.

Similar to what was reported in Reinke et al. (2016), these demographics certainly uncover the fact that on-campus initiatives to include more faculty in SoTL work requires the attention of leaders to consider the diversity of individuals that could engage in SoTL, but do not for various reasons. While there are a variety of reasons why individuals may not engage in SoTL, the survey results indicate that SoTL is not equally supported across the colleges. This was also evidenced in the lack of SoTL being mentioned in official college documentation, including promotion and tenure requirements. Indeed, the colleges that tend to have this direct support in documentation also have the majority of faculty winning awards, fellowships, and other forms of recognition for SoTL. Based on the authors' experience and observation, faculty in these colleges are able to merit promotion and tenure through their work in SoTL alone, although many have various other scholarly activities to report. We assert that faculty within some colleges may not have full college support because there is a lack of clear language on SoTL in the University Faculty Handbook, although there is a system-wide policy within the larger University System of Georgia [USG]:

> USG institutions will support and reward faculty who participate in significant efforts to improve teaching and learning in USG institutions through decisions in promotion and tenure, pre-tenure and post-tenure review, annual review and merit pay, workload, recognition, allocation of resources, and other rewards (Georgia Board of Regents, 2021).

As with many policies in hierarchies such as the University System, sometimes alignment with upper level policies is not always considered. Based on the survey results received, this USG policy is not clearly delineated in the University Faculty Handbook, which is used, in part, to develop policies at the college and department levels. There does seem to be stronger departmental support for SoTL work, but this does not appear to be directly affecting college-level decisions about the value of SoTL as scholarly activity.

To be considered SoTL work, data must be shared through public avenues, including scholarly presentations and publications. It is important to note, however, that public dissemination of research findings is closely tied to who the best audience for consumption is. In effect, Felten (2013) illustrates this by saying, "Because SoTL inquiry typically is iterative and highly contextual, the most appropriate ways to go public should capture and reflect the evolving nature of this form of research. In many cases, that is not possible in a traditional scholarly journal." (p. 123). Data from the survey suggests that those active in SoTL at Georgia Southern University tend to present their work at SoTL and discipline-specific conferences more often than in manuscript format. We believe that this is occurring for a variety of reasons, including the fact that presentations provide a quicker, more discussion provoking examination at teaching and learning practices than manuscripts. In essence, more time is spent sharing information in conference presentations where direct and impactful feedback can be given. The number of presentations given over publications also hints to the possibility that SoTL scholars have greater opportunities to share their work in oral formats. Indeed, there are few outlets for SoTL work in publication format, especially in specific disciplines compared to discipline specific scholarly work. Survey responses also hint at the fact that SoTL research is disparaged in some colleges as "less rigorous" than other types of scholarly activity, thus more time could be spent on manuscripts that are that are discipline-specific because they carry more weight in the tenure and promotion process..

It is refreshing to see that although the general attitude toward SoTL on campus tends to be negative, faculty are still pursuing research in SoTL. This demonstrates faculty members' passion for teaching and learning at the institution and finding the most effective ways to help students be successful learners. In colleges where it is highly supported by administrators and policies, the impact on the teaching and learning process is felt more greatly. This is evidenced in the survey responses tied to how SoTL has influenced teaching among respondents. Of note, the majority of responses indicate agreement or strong agreement with the fact that SoTL has influenced how faculty change the design of their courses, the assessments they use, and their personal expectations. Perceptions of the quality of learning has also changed as a result. While there is still work to be done on examining the impact of SoTL on student achievement and influencing other faculty in the department, it is evident that SoTL work has benefitted faculty in ways beyond just pursuing scholarly interests.

A review of the initiatives and survey results indicates that as a whole, Georgia Southern University's Faculty Center does an excellent job of supporting the SoTL initiative and faculty through learning communities, conferences, fellowships, and award programs. Among other universities, we are well known as a leader in SoTL work, even though it is not well recognized by the university itself. This leadership role is noted in Jackson and MacMillan's (2019) blog on the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning's trends in conference presenters. Colleges with documented support for SoTL have greater involvement in the initiatives that have been outlined. Perhaps the greatest success of SoTL at Georgia Southern has been the level of interdisciplinary collaboration within the university and beyond. Faculty are able to bridge understanding of the teaching and learning process regardless of discipline, resulting in long-standing, supportive relationships across campus.

As with any survey-based research, this study does have a variety of limitations that warrant discussing. First, the survey results were based on self-report through an online platform, which could be limited by individual interpretations of question meaning. In addition, those who participated in the survey self-selected to do so. It is possible that others who did not respond to the survey request may have had different experiences than those that did respond. This could include an overabundance of responses from those who actively engage in SoTL on campus. We did also notice similar trends to Reinke et al. (2016) concerning small sample size in addition to a large representation of those in senior faculty or administrator positions. It is possible that those at the senior faculty levels may have more time to devote to SoTL work even if it is not highly regarded within their college.

With these achievements and limitations notwithstanding, taking an objective look at SoTL at Georgia Southern leaves us with the following areas for growth: better acceptance and understanding of SoTL on campus, better translating research into practice, and developing clear university level policies towards acceptance of SoTL as legitimate and rigorous scholarship. As mentioned in the qualitative comments of the survey, some faculty want to learn from SoTL findings, but not engage in SoTL themselves. Indeed, many of the initiatives on campus favor development of scholarly activity. It would be appropriate to continue to disseminate work in a way that can help those faculty who want to improve teaching and learning, but not engage in the research

themselves. In doing so, this "putting research into practice" could help a larger body of instructors who are interested in applying what has been learned through rigorous research. More importantly, we assert that this could happen with greater administrative support from the college- and university-levels.

One recently identified pathway to facilitate putting SoTL findings into practice to enhance teaching and learning is through translating those findings as an act of knowledge mobilization (Maurer et al., 2021). In this approach, faculty *and students* are engaged not only as end users of the information (learning how to use SoTL findings to improve their own learning) but also in partnership as *knowledge brokers*, facilitating access to the knowledge to others (e.g., for faculty to their students and to other faculty, for students to other students, etc.). Such an approach could utilize professional development sessions for faculty focused on teaching them not just relevant findings from the SoTL literature, but specifically methods to translate those findings to other faculty colleagues and to students to exponentially increase their proliferation and adoption (Maurer, 2021). Importantly, such an approach would not be limited to efforts at Georgia Southern, but could be potentially undertaken at any institution.

As we reflect on the efforts expended in the last 14 years to grow and nurture SoTL at Georgia Southern, we conclude that they have been largely successful. Although there is a long way to go, the experience and opportunities provided to faculty have been widely successful and meaningful to those who have taken part. We hope that the next chapter of the initiative helps to grow SoTL at the institution that much more, making it as recognized locally as it is globally.

NOTES

1. It should be noted that the authors, who are highly productive in SoTL research, did not respond to the survey. Therefore, the results presented might be somewhat underestimated.

REFERENCES

CASTL survey (2004). Developed by the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Program. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved from: http://archive.carnegiefoundation.org/publications/pdfs/tools-sharing/CASTL_survey.pdf

Felten, P. (2013). Principles of good practice in SoTL. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, *1*(1), 121–125. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.121

Georgia Board of Regents. (2021). USG Policy Manual, section 8.3.14 Enhancing Teaching and Learning in K-12 Schools and USG Institutions. Retrieved from: https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.14_enhancing_teaching_and_learning_in_k_12_schools_and_usg_institutions

Georgia Southern University. (2021, March 19). *2020-2021 Fact Book*. Georgia Southern University. Retrieved from: www.georgiasouthern.edu/factbook

Gurung, R. A., Ansburg, P. I., Alexander, P. A., Lawrence, N. K., & Johnson, D. E. (2008). The state of the scholarship of teaching and learning in psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, *35*, 249-261.

Gurung, R. A. R., & Schwartz, B. M. (2010) Riding the Third Wave of SoTL. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *4*(2), Article 5. https://doi.org/10.20429/IJSoTL.2010.040205

Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teachingcommons*. Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, P., Huber, M. T., & Ciccone A. (2011). *The scholarship of teaching and learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact*. Jossey-Bass.

Jackson, B., & MacMillan, M. (2019, September 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. *ISSOTL Blog.* https://issotl.com/2019/09/30/where-do-pre-senters-at-issotl-come-from-and-what-can-this-tell-us-about-sotl-part-two-a-closer-look-at-the-issotl-maps/

Maurer, T.W. (2021, October). *Translating SoTL findings to students to effect learning: Sustainability through knowledge mobilization*. Virtual paper presented at the ISSOTL Conference, Perth, Australia.

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). http://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.9.1.22

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. http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol5/iss1/23

Premadasa, K. (2014). SoTL as Sherwood Forest: A Review of the SoTL Commons Conference 2014. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry, 2* (2), 115–116.

Reinke, J.S., Muraco, J.A., & Maurer, T.W. (2016) The state of scholarship of teaching and learning in family science. *Family Science Review, 21*(2) 18-37. https://doi.org/10.26536/FSR.2016.21.02.02

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.. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20183

Wuetherick, B., Yu, S., & Greer, J. (2016). Exploring the SoTL landscape at the University of Saskatchewan. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2016* (146), 63-70. https://doi.org/0.1002/tl.20188.

APPENDIX A
SoTL at Georgia Southern Questionnaire

Please keep the following definition of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) in mind as you answer the questions: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) involves "the systematic study of teaching and learning, using established or validated criteria of scholarship, to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviours, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning, and/or develop a more accurate understanding of learning, resulting in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community." (Potter & Kustra, 2011, p. 2).

The questions in this section are concerned with the level of support for SoTL at the <u>departmental level (or equivalent, e.g., school)</u>.

1. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below.
Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree

- My department chair has actively encouraged involvement in SoTL.
- When hiring new faculty, my department regards applicants' interest in SoTL favorably.
- Other departments provide more support for SoTL than my department does.
- Faculty members in other departments at my institution are actively involved in SoTL.

2. For this section, please consider the role of SoTL in personnel decisions within your department. What role did the candidate(s)' level of activity in SoTL play in…
No evidence of activity in SoTL submitted; Unsure of role played; Weakened the case; Had no impact on case; Strengthened the case; Not applicable

- Your department's most recent hiring decision?
- Your department's most recent tenure decision?
- Your department's most recent promotion decision?
- Your department's most recent merit pay decision?
- Your department's most recent post-tenure review decision?

3. Is SoTL explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in your department's evaluation guidelines?

- Yes, as teaching only
- Yes, as research only
- Yes, as both teaching and research
- Yes, Other (please describe):
- No

4. Please estimate the percentage of your departmental colleagues who are actively involved in SoTL.
10   20   30   40   50   60   70   80   90   100

The questions in this section are concerned with the level of support for SoTL at the <u>institutional level</u>.

5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below.
Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree.

- Top-level academic leaders at my institution have taken significant steps to support SoTL.
- Faculty members in formal leadership roles (senate president, department chair, and so on) have actively supported SoTL.
- Support for SoTL at my institution is widespread.
- SoTL is integrated into other institution priorities and initiatives.
- There are adequate campus-level funding opportunities for SoTL projects at my institution

6. Is SoTL explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in your institution's evaluation guidelines?

- Yes, as teaching only
- Yes, as research only
- Yes, as both teaching and research
- Yes, Other (please describe):
- No

7. Please estimate the percentage of your institutional colleagues who are actively involved in SoTL

10   20   30   40   50   60   70   80   90   100

The questions in this section are concerned with the level of support for SoTL at <u>both the departmental and institutional levels.</u>

8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below for your department and your institution.
Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree

Departmental Level   Institutional Level

- Other faculty members are actively involved in SoTL.
- Norms encourage participation in SoTL.
- Some of my colleagues find work in SoTL problematic
- The criteria for teaching awards are consistent with the principles of SoTL.
- The criteria for promotion decisions reflect the principles of SoTL.
- The criteria for tenure decisions reflect the principles of SoTL.
- Faculty members have received tenure based at least in part on SoTL.
- Within the past 5 years, we have reexamined our approach to rewarding SoTL.
- Within the past 5 years, we have broadened the criteria for assessing teaching performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL.
- Within the past 5 years, we have broadened the criteria for assessing research performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL

The questions in this section are concerned with the role of the University Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) in SoTL.

9. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below.
Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly Agree

- CTE has taken significant steps to support SoTL.
- SoTL is integrated into CTE's priorities and initiatives.
- CTE has actively encouraged faculty participation in SoTL
- CTE has adequate opportunities for faculty to get engaged in SoTL activities at my institution.
- CTE provides adequate financial support for faculty to engage in SoTL

10. Which of the following events supported by the CTE have you participated in? Indicate all that apply.
- attended the SoTL Commons conference
- presented at SoTL Commons
- reviewed a submission to the SoTL Commons conference
- participated in a Faculty Learning Community on SoTL
- led a Faculty Learning Community on SoTL
- applied for the SoTL fellowship
- received the SoTL fellowship
- was nominated for the SoTL award
- received the SoTL award
- served on the SoTL leadership team
- attended a SoTL professional development activity
- submitted a manuscript to *IJSoTL*
- published in *IJSoTL*
- reviewed a manuscript for *IJSoTL*
- other

11. To what extent has each of the following CTE activities played an important role in advancing your involvement in SoTL at Georgia Southern?
Not important; Somewhat unimportant; Somewhat important; Very important

- SoTL Commons Conference
- *IJSoTL*
- SoTL Fellowship
- SoTL Award/Scholar
- Professional development activities at CTE
- CTE staff
- Support from SoTL mentors
- SoTL Leadership Team
- SoTL FLC

For this questionnaire, we have defined the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) as "the systematic study of teaching and learning, using established or validated criteria of scholarship, to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviours, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning, and/or develop a more accurate understanding of learning, resulting in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community." (Potter & Kustra, 2011, p. 2).

12. Using that definition of SoTL, have you conducted SoTL research?

- Yes
- No

Skip To: Q20 If 12. Using that definition of SoTL, have you conducted SoTL research? = No

13. The questions in this section are concerned with your SoTL research. If you are not engaged in SoTL research, please skip to question 21.

14. For how many years have you been engaged in SoTL research?
10   20   30   40   50   60   70   80   90   100

15. How have you disseminated your SoTL research? Please read all of the items and indicate all that apply.

- I discussed it with colleagues in my department, discipline, or institution.
- I posted content to my blog, website, or social media account(s) [e.g., Twitter].
- I published my findings in a non-refereed teaching and learning publication.
- I published my findings in a non-refereed disciplinary publication.
- I published my findings in a refereed teaching and learning publication.
- I published my findings in a refereed disciplinary publication.
- I published my findings by writing a peer-reviewed book or publishing in a peer-reviewed edited volume.
- I presented my work at a disciplinary conference.
- I presented my work at a teaching and learning conference.

16. How often do you collaborate on SoTL research?

- Never
- Rarely
- Less than half of the time
- About half of the time
- More than half of the time
- Almost always
- Always

17. If you collaborate on SoTL research, who are your collaborators? Indicate all that apply.
- Faculty from my own department
- Faculty from other disciplines at my institution
- Faculty from my discipline at other institutions
- Faculty from other disciplines at other institutions
- Undergraduate students
- Graduate students

18. In your opinion, what percentage of your scholarly work is SoTL research?

| 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

These questions are aimed at understanding the consequences of your involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning

19. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below.
Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

- I have changed the design of my courses since becoming involved in SoTL
- I have changed the kinds of assessments I use in my courses as a result of my participation in SoTL
- Becoming involved in SoTL has contributed to my excitement about teaching
- My expectations for my own teaching have changed since my involvement in soTL
- My expectations for my students' learning have changed since I became involved in SoTL
- The quality of my students' learning has changed since my involvement in SoTL.
- I have documented improvements in my students' learning since participating in SoTL
- More of my students achieve high standards of work since I became involved in SoTL
- My work in SoTL has had a positive influence on teaching in my department beyond my own practice
- My involvement in SoTL is visible to my departmental colleagues
- My work in the scholarship of teaching and learning has influenced colleagues at my institution outside my department.
- My involvement in SoTL has heightened my interest in reading research on teaching and learning

20. Thinking about both your departmental and institutional levels, what obstacles--if any--are there for faculty who want to do SoTL research?

21. In your role, what percentage of your time are you expected to do the following?

- Teaching : _____
- Scholarship : _____
- Service : _____
- Administration : _____
- Total : _____

22. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Genderqueer or non-binary
- Prefer not to answer
- A better description not specified above

23. Please indicate your race (check all that apply):

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

24. Please indicate your ethnicity.

- Hispanic or Latino/Latina
- Not Hispanic or Latino/Latina

25. What is your age?(years)

26. Which of the following best describes your position?

- Tenure-track
- Tenured
- Non-tenure track
- Other

27. Which of the following best describes your rank?

- Visiting professor
- Affiliate/adjunct professor
- Assistant professor
- Associate professor
- Full professor
- Professor emeritus/emerita
- Lecturer
- Senior Lecturer
- Principal Lecturer
- Other (please describe):

28. How many years have you been teaching in higher education?
10   20   30   40   50   60   70   80   90   100

29. What is your college?

- Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing (PCEC)
- College of Arts and Humanities (CAH)
- College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (CBSS)
- College of Education (COE)
- College of Science and Mathematics (COSM)
- Honors College
- Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies
- Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (JPHCOPH)
- Parker College of Business (PCOB)
- University Libraries
- Waters College of Health Professions (WCHP)

30. Do you have an administrative role at the university (e.g., department chair, dean, etc.)?

- Yes (please indicate your role):
- No

31. In the space provided below, please share any additional insights or comments you have about SoTL.