Teaching and Learning Buzz Podcast

Episode 3: Supporting Student Learning

Special Guest Dr. Susan Blum

Hosts: Drs. Carol Subiño Sullivan and Rebecca Pope-Ruark

Carol Subiño Sullivan:: On this episode of the Teaching Learning Buzz, we talk to Dr. Susan Blum, professor of anthropology at the University of Notre Dame and author of the book that *I Love Learning, I Hate School: An Anthropology of College.*

Carol Subiño Sullivan: Welcome to this episode of the Teaching and Learning Buzz, a monthly podcast from the Center for Teaching and Learning at Georgia Tech. I'm Carol Subiño Sullivan and I host a podcast with my colleague Rebecca Pope-Ruark. Each episode will highlight teaching and learning topics important to the Georgia Tech community. We'll talk to campus and visiting experts as we explore challenging questions related to teaching and learning, and we'll share practical strategies for helping our students learn and thrive at Georgia Tech and beyond.

Rebecca: Hi, listeners! Welcome to the third episode of the Teaching and Learning Buzz podcast! We're recording this in early spring of 2020, and we've got a lot of interesting work happening in the Center for Teaching and Learning. But before we dive in, just a reminder that we post a transcript and show notes for each of our podcast episodes. You can find everything at ctl.gatech.edu/TLBuzz. This is also the place where we will post episodes you can download or play through your browser and you can find us on Soundcloud as well.

Carol: We held one of our big events in January, our biannual GTREET event. GTREET stands for a Georgia Tech Retreat on Exploring Effective Teaching. GTREET is as an opportunity for faculty across campus to come together for an extended workshop session to deal with a specific issue or an opportunity related to teaching and learning. This year, GTREET was held on January 17th, and it gave us time to work together talk to and collaborate with peers that we don't usually talk to or see on campus regularly. And that's one of the features of CTL events that I really appreciate; they're interdisciplinary and they bring people together who are passionate about teaching. We know a lot of folks really appreciate having some time to set aside and share perspectives and strategies about teaching with their fellow faculty.

Rebecca: I agree, Carol. That's one of the things that I love about CTL events too. For this event, we decided to take an approach from design thinking to frame our theme. We started the event with a major "how might we?" question. So our how might we question was "How might we move beyond unhelpful traditional educational structures to build a culture of challenge meaningful experience and academic wellbeing for Georgia Tech students?" We chose this question because it was the way to think about two of the major issues that we've already been talking about in CTL and with other faculty members: grading practices and academic wellbeing. And those are the subjects of our first and second buzz episodes and you can find a link to those in the show notes. The question was also broad enough that it gave our participants room to play and think about the way we and our students do school in general. Using that guiding question, we did a variety of open-end activities that helped participants

rethink some of the traditional teaching practices they use and leave with some concrete things to try in their own classes.

Carol: And to help our participants really get in there and think through this big question, we were so excited to have a guest speaker at GTREET. We hosted Dr. Susan Blum from the University of Notre Dame. Susan is a professor of anthropology whose work has evolved from more traditional anthropological study in China to now focusing her work in the US higher education system. She has touched on topics like plagiarism, learning versus schooling, and alternative grading practices like un-grading. In the conversation that we have in this podcast, she helps us see that there is actually a thread that runs through all of this. Her book *I Love Learning, I Hate School: An Anthropology of College* is a really compelling look at higher education that takes her understanding of the student perspective and really makes us question practices that we commonly use in teaching and learning. I highly recommend it and we include a link to it in our show notes, if you're interested in checking it out. Susan share her journey with us going from a traditional professor who's following the conventions of higher education to one who really now questions those constraints and even sees them as damaging to her students' learning. We talked to her about that journey before GTREET so here is our interview with Dr. Susan Blum.

<div align="center">**Break**</div>

Rebecca: Welcome back, listeners! Today, we're joined by Dr. Susan Blum, professor of anthropology at the University of Notre Dame and this year's keynote speaker at the Georgia Tech retreat on exploring effective teaching or GTREET. Thanks for being here, Susan.

Susan Blum: My pleasure! Thanks for having me.

Carol: Tell us a little bit about yourself.

Susan: Well I'm an anthropologist. I'm trained in cultural and linguistic anthropology, also psychological anthropology, and my work has changed from the study of China to the study of higher education pedagogy which is kind of a strange combination.

Carol: Yeah, can you say a little bit more about that? What made you transition?

Susan: Sure! Each project I do takes me many years and I live it deeply and I think about it deeply and then something always emerges, either as an unanswered question or a little kernel of something. And so I consider myself in my fifth major project and there is a logical connection between one and two, two and three, three and four, four and five. But if you look at one and five, they're not very obvious. My first research was ethnicity and nationalism in China. The majority ethnic group, the Han, said disparaging things about ethnic minorities including the fact that they were simple and honest and that made me curious. What does it mean to be simple and honest and what's bad about that? So how are people thinking about honesty in China? So my next major project was really about truth and deception and how people think about truth and deception. Who is owed truth and what is the function of language and what are you accomplishing and what are the expectations for an interaction? And one of the little teeny pieces in there was about the Chinese civil service examination, which is an examination that lasted for 1400 years and they were played by cheating, and so there were all these incredible measures taken to prevent cheating and people, nevertheless, persisted and cheated.

Susan: And that made me wonder, "Hmm, I've been hearing a lot about cheating here in the US. Do we also have a lot of cheating and plagiarizing?" And so that led me to my third major project which was about how people in the US higher education think about cheating and plagiarizing. What are the ideas of language the speaker and the words? What is the relationship between intention and effect and then how do people think about education in general? What are the students doing there? Why don't they care about what they're writing? And not only you know why are teachers not teaching writing very well but why do students maybe not care? What do they care about? That led me to my fourth project (which is probably what you all know more about), which was really to understand the nature of higher education and what students are doing in school and how they felt about it.

Susan: So I've been interviewing students-- I and a team of undergraduate researchers, really, have been interviewing students-- for about 15 years. I have hundreds of interviews and that's not the only source of my data, but it's one major source. We ask students, you know, "What are you doing here? What's it for? What are you thinking about? What do you like? What do you not like?" And so that's led me to my latest project, which is phase five or something, which is about critical pedagogy. One of the projects is about un-grading, but another one that's in the works is, I don't even know exactly what it is, but I've got 400 pages and I'm going to submit the prospectus, but I'm not entirely sure what angle I'm taking. But it's about this journey I've undertaken, and it's really transformed my life, it's transformed my teaching, and I'm really excited to talk to lots of people.

Carol: That's so exciting and, you know, it's really interesting to hear that arc of how you've come to be thinking about education and about learning the way you are.

Rebecca: And that reminder that our work can make such a difference in our own lives and other people's lives and really make the connections and thinking about what are we doing and what are we contributing and how is that impacting us as well as, you know, we often think maybe "is anyone reading my article?" But you can really feel that in yourself and in a passion that you have.

Susan: Well, teaching takes so much of us as a person. You know, it's not just a job that you do when you go in and you clock your hours and you go out and you do something completely different. I've seen people completely devastated by a bad class or student comments or something that just doesn't work in the classroom over and over. I've lost sleep many nights you know wondering, "why did that class go so badly" or "what did that student mean" or "I should have done this". And I'm sure that lots of people in lots of professions also think really deeply and care deeply. I'm sure if doctors lose patients, God forbid it, they also are really touched by it, but teaching is something that really touches us deeply. And so this has given me a chance to really think about how can I make it work better for my students, of course, but also for me so that I am living out my principles a little bit more.

Rebecca: Those are such good points and one of the things that I've been thinking about over the last year and I've been sharing with my colleagues is this idea that teaching is a very vulnerable place for faculty members. Many of us don't have pedagogical training, maybe particularly don't have particularly good models from their programs as students, most faculty are the one or two percent of a discipline so we think very differently, we think in terms of school, so going into a classroom is not like going into your lab or your research area. You're very confident there you feel an expertise there, but you are in charge of that in ways that you're not necessarily in charge of your teaching because there are students, there are real people, on the other side of that who you can help shape but sometimes we don't necessarily know the best way to do that, and there can be a shame in thinking about how class quote

unquote failed or this particular session was bad or the students didn't do well on the tasks. And it's very difficult not to take that personally for a lot of us.

Susan: Well, I know a lot of faculty and graduate students spend a lot of time talking about the structural problems of teaching and they're worried about tenure or their promotion or they're worried about getting a job--a real job not just an adjunct-job-- and they're worried about precarity and all of that is absolutely real and you have to have the bottom-line security to feel any kind of comfort. But there's also this sense that we are vulnerable because we want to be liked. We want our students to admire us, we want to feel that we're doing a good job, and we don't necessarily have any sort of tools or vocabulary for thinking about what that might mean. And then there's, sometimes the professional conversations aren't really helpful, so people will say, you know, "Don't care about what those 18 year-olds think about you, they don't know anything," and that seems to me to be the wrong kind of relationship. And so, it's been helpful for me to figure out how can I reach the actual people who are there in my room with me so that we all feel that we're getting the right things out of this?

Rebecca: And I think relationship is the key word there, and that's a challenge for a lot of folks on our campus, specifically. You have massive courses and how do you do that and that's a challenge and that kind of feeds in, I think, to some of the things that we also want to talk about in terms of--we know that our campus academic well-being is a really important topic that we're discussing; what faculty roles are in that, how do we understand students and how interacting with their academics impacts them. We're also looking at grading practices and how that's attached to those challenges. So how--if we move into that wellbeing space coming from faculty and thinking about students--how do you define, based on your research and what you've seen, in terms of what well-being means in a student context on a campus?

Susan: Well, the definitions of wellbeing that I see have to do with feeling that you have the tools you need to face a challenge and that you will be okay and our students don't feel that. They feel panicked much of the time. They are too busy, they're doing too many things, they are responding to multiple demands which are all quite different from each other. They are worried about getting jobs, they're worried about the climate, they're worried about the political atmosphere, but they're worried about choosing partners or being lovable to the person that they want to be lovable to, they're worried about how their peers think about them. And, of course, not all students are 18 to 22. Some of them have many, many other pressures on them and they are caring for parents, they're caring for children, they're working three jobs, they themselves have disabilities. There are all kinds of things that our students are carrying around with them and that's kind of the basic societal context for it.

Susan: And then they come to class and one faculty member says, "You don't have to come to class! The lectures are posted and here are my power points," and another person comes to class and another teacher says, "You have to come to class every class because participation is going to be graded and that means you have to be attending." So they're there in body, they're not necessarily there in spirit. And then in one class, they're told, "You have to cite all the sources you've ever thought about looking at," and in another class, they're taught, "Don't bother citing the textbook. Everybody understands that you're using that, so don't bother." In one class, they're told effort comes; in another class, they're told effort doesn't matter. One class says, "We'll throw out your lowest quiz"; another class says everything will be averaged together so they're given a million different standards and they're feeling kind of victimized by all of these rules which are not consistent at all. I had a student say to me once, "Why can't

you-", meaning all faculty, "just get together and agree? Like do you want MLA style or often-dates style? Can't you just figure this out?" And I try to say that actually we aren't the ones who control this; we're giving you training in different fields, but most students are planning to be academic writers so, for them, this is something they have to do. They get an arbitrary set of rules that differs every semester in every class so that is one source.

Susan: Another, of course, is the feeling that students have that grades are going to determine their entire future and they are not entirely wrong but they're also not entirely right. You know that the power of the GPA is often less than students think. The degree in the economic marketplace does matter and so there's all kinds of research about-- there was a book that was published last year, the year before, by an economist who talked about the signaling function of a college degree and crunched the numbers and said basically if you get three and a half years of college and don't finish, it is not a good financial investment because it's the credential that matters, not what you've learned. So if the goal is economic --and that may or may not be the entire goal of college; we could talk about what the goals of college are. But if the goal of college is to get a job, then finishing college is really the critical thing. Only about 30 percent of adults in the US have college degrees so it's still not universal at all. Sixty percent or so start college but only half or so finish with a degree ut if you're getting a job as a middle manager at a corporation, it may not be your GPA that really determines it. I mean, there may be a cutoff you know below which they won't considered you but if you get a 3.9 or a 3.92 or 3.86, that's probably not going to determine your entire future, even though a lot of students, especially high achieving students, have been told since middle school that really the only thing they have to care about is their GPA.

Rebecca: Right. That's the message that we get. And the Georgia Tech degree is highly valued. There's a prestige to earning a degree and certainly our students are hyper-motivated and care deeply about earning that degree and thinking about what's on the other side of that, in terms of positions and jobs, so that does mean a lot to them. And we're also starting to really look at it and recognize that there are certain cut offs for different types of funding for students at certain GPAs, especially international students who might be coming from a different country and have to meet some certain requirement. And if they're in environments where maybe they're using a curve that they haven't experienced before (in terms of the grades) or we're telling students that it will all work out in the curve later in the semester, don't worry about it, "It's okay, you didn't really fail that test," and there's local cultural issues with that as well as broader cultural issues in our diverse community. So grading really has an impact on our psyche, I think, and especially on our students psyche because, as you said, that's what they're trained to shoot for; that's the hoop, that's the goal, not necessarily the intrinsic motivation of learning and bettering themselves, as much as we want that for them, but it's kind of the system that we have unfortunately.

Susan: But you said that the students are very motivated. That could mean two different things: it could mean they really want to learn because they're so driven to understand the way the world works, that's "I'm really motivated", but then it could also mean they're motivated to get the high GPA. And those things are often actually in conflict with each other.

Rebecca: But I think they're are also both there. It's an active conflict within different people. I absolutely want to excel because that's the identity I have for myself and not advance my goals in life and I want to make my family proud or I want to have this great career because that's what I value and

this is what I love to do, hopefully. But it's a tension in the system that structures that we have in higher ed here.

Susan: And that's a problem in high school too. Madeline Levine and Alice Miller, both psychologists, have written about it. Alice Miller wrote a book years ago called *The Drama of the Gifted Child,* where she talked about the pressures that--she's a psycho-analyst--so to earn parents' love, you have to achieve and then Madeline Levine is a psychologist working in Marin County, California and she talks about all these really, greatly suffering students--the kinds of students, I'm sure, that are at Georgia Tech-- whose parents really only talk to them about their grades and what clubs they're are leading them and all of the things that will get them into the high prestige colleges that are the only possible college. And that sense that you are only, you yourself, are only as good as your achievements is a very dangerous position to take.

Rebecca: So what are some of the things that we can do-- we're going to come back and talk about the problems directly with grading--but what are some of the things that you think that we might be able to do structurally, maybe even in our own small context, that can help take some of that pressure off of students, that emphasis in that context?

Susan: Well I don't know that as individuals we can't change the structures. I don't think, I mean, we can push to change the structure, but individuals can't. I can't change the fact that a student from another country's visa will be revoked if she gets a GPA below a cutoff. I can't change that, and I can't comfort her. That would be disingenuous to say don't worry about it because it's real. But I would like to think-- I think there are a lot of tensions at least in the US society and in some of the other societies I know about one of which is China where people are really questioning the dominance of competition and they're really, really wondering is this healthy? Is this necessary? Are there alternatives? So there are some schools in China, in Korea, many in the US, where people are kind of opting out of the national competition and they're doing other kinds of things. So there are movements, at the same time, there is a kind of growing emphasis on earning the credential and getting through the hoops and that's often especially true for students whose families do not have other privileges so for them this may be the only way into a comfortable middle-class livelihood.

Susan: In China, they debate whether the Gaokao, this national college entrance examination, represents meritocracy. I have a student who is from China and she said, "Well, if it weren't for the Gaokao, then I wouldn't be here because my parents were from poor villages and they took this test and because they did well on the test, they moved to the city and because they moved to the city, I got a good education and so I got to go to Notre Dame." And so she has absolute confidence in this test as fair and that was one of the arguments about things like the SATs and the old IQ tests, you know, maybe you would have a poor kid from some rural place with no family privilege who would do well on these tests and then you could identify that student and then give that student opportunities that she or he wouldn't have had otherwise. But that's such the exception.

Rebecca: Right, so let's go I don't shift just a little bit more specifically and talk about grades. Your new projects that you're working on is un-grading, U-N grading. So can you tell us a little bit about what that means and how that type of innovation might play into some of that alleviation of stress or well-being and helping students focus maybe more on intrinsic motivation than actions?

Susan: Sure, and it's an innovation but it's not that much of an innovation; grades are an innovation! Grades have only been around 120 years or something, maybe 100 years. People have been learning as long as we've been people and we haven't had grades. So as an anthropologist, taking a more global perspective grades are not necessary, grades are not universal, grades are not eternal. This is a system that humans have constructed, and we can deconstruct it and I wish we would. But there have been many, many educational systems that have not had grades. Certainly, beginning in the sixties, there have been a lot of what Constance Cappel calls utopian colleges, so places like Hampshire College and the old Santa Cruz and Antioch and Deep Springs and, you know, there are tons of these graves and many of them still exist and they don't have grades. What they have are narrative evaluations where you give feedback and the students often write their own self-evaluation and there is conversation between the faculty and the students and people learn and those are perfectly legitimate systems and their students get into med school.

Susan: I talked to somebody recently who worked at Antioch and she said they would send a 350-page dossier when the students were applying to grad school or med school or something. It was like a set of all their evaluations I reform years and is that meaningful? Absolutely. It's harder to automate; you can't just have an algorithm that will decide who gets in, but you can certainly get the information you need about the student by reading that. So if that's what we want that's possible there's actually a something in the air right now called the...my goodness, I'm sorry, I forgot the name. But it's a really interesting, something transcript consortium, and they are trying to put together an alternative for high schools of a more rounded set of skills and dispositions that students demonstrate with some portfolio materials that then can go to colleges so they've had to work with college admissions departments to say, "O, we're going to pilot this at these 25 or 50 high schools and you're admissions people are going to have to get trained to read the same and they're going to have to make it worth their while." It's very interesting. I talked to the guy who started it and it's this labor intensive for everybody but it's more meaningful.

Susan: For my own teaching, I have struggled for about 15 years to reconcile the tension between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. And I'm sure all the listeners know what those things are but, just in case, you should not feel humiliated if you don't know this because I didn't know this one and I've been teaching a long time not knowing it. But extrinsic motivation is the motivation that comes from outside the activity itself so if you rake leaves, you get paid. If you go to help somebody as part of your job, you get paid. But if you help somebody in your family, you probably don't get paid; you do it because you want to, you do it for intrinsic reasons. So intrinsic motivation is the motivation that comes from the process itself or the product itself and because you have a need or an interest or a desire to do that thing. You could do the same activity for both of those different reasons and much of what we do has a little of each so it's not an absolute distinction. But grades basically are entirely extrinsic motivators because if you learn French, maybe you feel happy you learn French but maybe it also get lets you check off the box for your language requirement and maybe it gives you a B plus or whatever it is. The research for over 50 years has shown that a focus on extrinsic motivation leads to diminishment of intrinsic motivation.

Susan: The behaviorist explanation would be the more extrinsic motives, the better and I believed that for a long time. If I only give enough points, then people will like it but that's not how it works. The more robust research on motivation explains it perfectly because students then fixate on the points, they fixate on the motives, and on the grades, and they don't really have a chance even to tap into their

intrinsic motivation. So I have in my classes--this is the end of my fourth year-- I have not given any grades on any assignments and we talk about only about what people are learning. We communicate, I have students reflect on their own accomplishments, I reflect back. We talk about it mid-semester and at the end of the semester, we meet and talk about how they've done but I don't give them points for things. And I try to make things interesting, so they want to do it. I give them lots of freedom and agency and autonomy and all those things that the research says we should but none of it's for grades.

Rebecca: How does that work that at the end of the semester?

Susan: At the end of the semester, I ask students to go back and look at all their work and talk about what they learned and talk about what they did and to suggest a grade for themselves, which I may or may not accept but I usually do.

Rebecca: And that's one of the structures we can't escape, right? The registrar needs grades at the end of a class for transcripts.

Susan: At least, at the conventional schools where most people teach.

Rebecca: And I think one question that our faculty here would probably have as well as, you know, liberal arts roles versus maybe hard STEM disciplines--how does that scale? And that's just a challenge we need to just start thinking about. There's no easy answer there.

Susan: Right, in the un-grading book, which is coming out in 2020, we have three or four contributors who teach in STEM fields and that they are, because we know that's always one of the questions: how does it scale and how do you do it in STEM fields? And they have each figured out a way to make their classes grade-free but with lots of learning and so it has to do with different kinds of feedback and different kinds of learning opportunities that they've constructed and a lot of reflection and metacognition and all those things that we say are desirable. One of the things about grades is it basically reduces the need for metacognition because students are just passively reacting to what faculty are telling them.

Rebecca: Well, our time is almost up. Thank you so much Susan. If you were to have one key takeaway or even kind of a question that you want faculty at Georgia Tech to think about related to anything that we've talked about today—grades, well-being, kind of covered in the classroom--what may be a piece of advice or a question you might like our listeners to ponder?

Susan: I think the biggest help for me has been really thinking about what I want my students to get out of the class for life. I know that might be different for engineers or people who are programming rockets or something like that but it doesn't matter to me so much anymore if students really remember all the words in the field or if they even get the methods exactly right or, and this is been hard for me to give up, or if they cite things wrong. Really what I want is for them to be able to ask a good question and figure out what would be a credible way of solving it and if we can create situations where students feel empowered to do that, then they will be great learners and doers later on in their lives.

Rebecca: Wonderful, very insightful. Thank you so much for being with us today, Susan.

Susan: Thank you so much for having me. Good luck, colleagues out there!

Rebecca: So I really enjoyed talking to Susan while she was on campus., I think she helped a lot of the participants to think about their own practices through a different lens. You and I both have experience, Carol, playing in this space, right?

Carol: Yeah, I actually feel I've been super privileged to have the opportunity to design teaching experiences, or teaching and learning experiences from the Center for Teaching and Learning, because I'd have a little bit of flexibility to play with structures. For example, one of my first projects when I got to Georgia Tech was designing a TA development program that was a four-credit course, it was a one credit hour course. But because it was training for teaching, we were able to shift the timeline and actually do two-thirds of the hours before the official start of the semester. There were some challenges to overcome. We had to, for example, coordinate with housing about how the graduate students were going to be able to stay on campus before the semester started, things like that, but we were able to overcome those challenges and create a successful program that's been running now for a number of years.

Rebecca: I think it's really important also to remember that play and experimentation doesn't have to be perfect. That's why we play, that's why the experiment with things. At my previous institution, I worked for a few years on an initiative that was based in design thinking. At the time, we were looking at how many things can we break? How many things can we change within the structure about the structure? You know, what about grades and seat time and the idea that you take 4 courses in a semester? What if you just mash all that stuff up and see what happens? So we were able to create a pretty innovative pilot program based in design thinking. But it was really hard to do! It was really challenging for the faculty who were team teaching, for the students themselves because it was just so different than what they were used to. So it was hard but it was also a really interesting experiment. We learned a lot and we know, several years out of the experience, that our students learned a ton that helping them in all the work that they do in their future.

Carol: I agree, Rebecca. You know, when we go off script and we're sort of trying to figure things out from the ground up, that can be really hard but also really exciting because we're really working for something we believe in and one of the most impactful ways that I felt Susan brought this home for me was when thinking about grading and really challenging the traditional approach to grading-- I know that both of us have done some experimentation of our own with grading in different ways. So I taught a graduate course using a mastery-based approach to grading where I set standards that I expected all of them to reach and instead of deducting points along the way, I gave them detailed feedback, the opportunity to iterate until they got it. And there wasn't any partial credit, it was, "No this is the expectation for mastery and I'm going to help you achieve it with feedback."

Rebecca: Right and I did something similar using contract grading in an intro to professional writing course. It was a 200 level at my previous institution. That course, in the past, has been kind of read some chapters, take a test, or write a paper and kind of on and on. So I wanted to play with that a little bit, with this contract idea, so I had five assessments that they needed to meet during the semester, like projects. And I knew what I wanted them to accomplish with those in terms of kind of standards, but I let them play. They were able to pick from different genres, they were able to kind of know, "if I do these four things, it's this grade, if I do six of these things to standard, it's a different grade", and they got to choose what made the most sense for them. If they didn't have enough time to really give it their best, maybe a B was just what they needed at that point and they were good with it. And I also gave

them the opportunity to revise those things as many times they wanted to get up to the standards that I had set for them and it worked really well. The students were confused a lot, you had to kind of talk about it multiple times about what we were doing and they always had the opportunities to suggest something different for the project or play in that sense. So that was really cool because I feel like I gave them more control and once they figured out what I was trying to do, they really got to try some new things.

Carol: That sounds really exciting and those are just a couple of things that Rebecca and I have tried but we'd love to hear from you listeners! What sort of things have you played with? Where are the spaces you found within the structures to be able to really empower students take their learning in ways that they're motivated?

Rebecca: Let's just leave it there even though I'm sure we can go on and on and on in this topic. We want to make sure that we thank Dr. Susan Blum for joining us for GTREET and on the podcast and I also want to remind you that you can find the transcript in show notes for this episode as well as our past episodes on ctl.gatech.edu/TLbuzz.

Carol: Thanks for listening to this episode of the Teaching and Learning Buzz, the podcast of The Center for Teaching and Learning at Georgia Tech. Show notes and a transcript are available at ctl.gatech.edu/TLbuzz.

Rebecca: Check back regularly for new episodes, bonus clips, and more resources. If you have a topic or question that you would like us to explore, we'd love to hear from you. You can reach us at [ctlhelp@gatech.edu.](mailto:ctlhelp@gatech.edu)