

Finding Your Place in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Dan Bernstein

University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas, USA
djb@ku.edu

One thing is abundantly clear about the emerging communities of scholarship in teaching and learning. Many, many instructors in higher education throughout the world are paying close attention to their students' learning, reflecting on their own contributions to that learning, and making their thoughts and their work visible to others. An attitude of inquiry about teaching and learning is no longer limited to faculty members who specialize in education research; the best instructors in all fields are those who read what others are doing, evaluate their own successes, and refine their teaching through careful consideration of the evidence before them. For students, faculty members, institutions, and society alike, this emerging professional practice is a very good development.

There is confusion, however, about how we talk about this work and how we value it. Some people argue strongly that this is an important area of research, and it should have its place as an equal partner with other research enterprises in academic life. I have attended conferences in England, Australia, and Hong Kong in which this was the majority view of participants, and it was also very common among participants and leaders in various events and programs sponsored by the U.S.-based Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). Other people view this work as a version of excellence in teaching, comparable to the goal of reflective practice found in many professions, so we should use this work as a model or high standard for preparing instructors and evaluating the effectiveness of college instruction. I have heard the latter view at CASTL events and conferences in the U.S., and it was also commonly promoted by participants in a project on peer review of teaching sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE).

There are even differences in how we make reference to the scholar metaphor at the heart of our communities. Some insist that "scholarship" of teaching and learning refers only to intellectually rigorous research found in a conventional publication venue. Work that is informed by research and is based on evidence from practice is often labeled "scholarly" teaching to distinguish it from the research category of scholarship. All variations on these perspectives can be found each year among participants in the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ISSoTL) conference, which has been held in the U.S., Australia, and Canada and is scheduled for the U.K. next fall. As noted by [Woodhouse < http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstol/v4n1/essays_about_sotl/Woodhouse/index.html >](http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstol/v4n1/essays_about_sotl/Woodhouse/index.html) (2010) in an insightful essay on this tension, some of the confusion arose as the term SoTL evolved through use by influential writers. She argues that early references to SoTL among leaders of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching made it distinct from discovery research, while later references implied that SoTL should include research evidence rigorous enough to influence the practices of others.

Much of the energy behind these conversations is due to the practical matters of life as a faculty member; institutions vary in what they value in personnel decisions, and the distribution of our time and energy is greatly influenced by those local priorities and policies.

I want to suggest that continuing to make this distinction is not a good use of our intellectual energy, even as I acknowledge that I understand the case being made for it. We are scholars who teach with varying degrees of intellectual engagement, and I think it is most important for each person to identify her or his appropriate place on a continuum from classroom inquiry to rigorous educational research. Each of us can find a form of inquiry and an audience for our work that matches our individual time, research skills, and professional responsibilities.

Research and Reflective Practice

The case for distinguishing formal research from informed, reflective teaching is a simple one. Educational research typically adopts a social science framework, including creation of systematic comparisons among various methods of teaching and learning and use of quantitative methods to describe and evaluate results. This work has long been the backbone of research among education faculty members, and in the last several decades similar work has appeared in the U.S. and the U.K. within many fields of study, notably including composition studies, second language instruction, physics, chemistry, mathematics, psychology, biology, geography, and sociology (along with others). Across these fields the conventions of research methods, evidence, and argument have become broader, and they are appropriately matched to the intellectual contexts of the fields in which the research is conducted. In many of these fields the work counts as research because it has the essential properties of research. The investigators follow conventions of evidence appropriate to the field, peers review the work for quality, and printed public versions emerge as respected products that are recognizable as scholarship in the conventional sense.

In contrast, systematic analyses of student work in ongoing classes often lack matched courses for comparison and include multiple innovations added to a single offering. They look more like case studies, albeit often with rich evidence of students' understanding (or lack of it). In the best cases, there are course portfolios that track a relatively constant assignment across multiple offerings of a single course; it can be argued that continuous and/or sustained improvement in critical indicators of understanding make it unlikely that the gains resulted from an anomalous cohort of students or other coincidental variables. And in the end, the whole point of the enterprise is to generate broad achievement of deep understanding, so an encouraging result itself is worth documenting even if the precise source cannot be definitively identified. There are a number of sites (mostly in the U.S.) that make such examples of systematic inquiry visible for colleagues, often in conjunction with formal peer review of the quality of the work (the Visible Knowledge Project, the Knowledge Media Laboratory, or the [Peer Review of Teaching Project](http://www.courseportfolio.org/peer/pages/index.jsp) < <http://www.courseportfolio.org/peer/pages/index.jsp> > . Typically these reports can be distinguished from collections of teaching tips by the presentation and formal analysis of student work as evidence of effect, sometimes in comparison with prior offerings of the same course. Neither the design of the inquiry nor the format of the reporting resembles typical research in education or in the fields being taught, so this work does not immediately qualify with colleagues or institutions as either research or scholarship.

Participating in a Community of Scholars

Despite the obvious differences in the two kinds of inquiry described above, I believe both of them (and the many hybrid efforts that have some features of each) can be considered examples of scholarship, in its most honored sense. As noted frequently (e.g., [Bernstein & Bass](#) < <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2005/JA/Feat/bern.htm> >, 2005; Woodhouse, 2010), Boyer's (1990) landmark book challenged the assumption that the term scholarship is simply a synonym for research. He identified research as scholarship of discovery, the process of adding new knowledge through inquiry and investigation, but he argued we should also recognize other activities as parallel forms of scholarship. Some scholars integrate others' discoveries and synthesize new forms of understanding, while other scholars engage external communities by examining and refining academic ideas and practices through their use in addressing pressing challenges. Boyer also argued that instruction is another arena for scholarship, and being a separate category meant it was a kind of scholarship distinct from the practices of discovery researchers. If this designated community would not merely replicate discovery, what exactly would such scholarship look like?

Recognizing that simply declaring teaching to be scholarship was not a sufficient analysis, Boyer undertook a second major project to describe the defining features of scholarship, but he died before it was completed. Fortunately his colleagues at the Carnegie Foundation completed that work and brought forward a careful analysis of the intellectual habits of communities of scholars (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997). Based on extensive interviews with scholars of many kinds, they concluded that scholarly communities share six common characteristics: scholars have clear goals, prepare through knowledge of other scholars' work, use shared methods, gather evidence, engage in reflective critique of findings, and make their work publicly visible. Using this analysis in the second book, Glassick et al. suggested that teaching *can be* scholarship, but only if the teacher engages in the shared intellectual habits of a community of scholars of teaching.

There are two important implications that come from this analysis. First, not all teaching qualifies as scholarship. A teacher can be professionally competent by conscientious delivery of courses using traditional delivery methods and measures typical of higher education. That instruction becomes scholarship when the instructor reads widely on contemporary practices, evaluates understanding with a range of student performances, reflects on student learning to refine the course learning activities, and engages colleagues in public discussion of those conclusions and refinements. Second, not all communities share the same procedures for measurement and for analysis. In a community working to maximize learning by the students currently enrolled, the conventions of evidence and analysis would favor immediate feedback on practices that match the resources available to the faculty members. In a community working to maximize what is learned about general models of learning, the conventions would instead favor systematic design of interventions that allow for separating the effects of different innovations on specific aspects of student performance, yielding more generalizable findings.

Both of these communities of scholars are doing work at a much more sophisticated level than the competent teacher described above who carefully but privately delivers a conventional course. Each community engages in public scholarly discourse about what is learned and how it moves their understanding forward, but they operate under different shared goals and methods. Both communities make important and complementary contributions to the mission of their institutions, and they co-exist nicely. The problems

arise when institutional policies categorize the activities and give them differential weights. When the community of *teaching* scholars claim their work to be scholarship, some colleagues say it does not meet the standards of *discovery* scholars, even though it was never intended to do so. It was intended to produce the best teaching and learning possible within the constraints of institutional resources and human capital. It is at this point that the fully elaborated version of Boyer's model can be useful; scholarship of discovery and scholarship of teaching are in fact different enterprises, but they share common characteristics that distinguish them as scholarship. One is outstanding discovery and the other is outstanding instruction, and both are accomplished within a community of scholars with shared goals, methods, and forms of public discourse.

An Inclusive Category Will Increase Participation and Enhance Learning

I think we need to navigate a sane path through the tension between the nature of our work as scholars and the values and priorities of our profession. I would offer one observation that I do not hear made very often: relatively few regular faculty members actually can follow the discovery path typically packaged as scholarship of teaching. It is very demanding in both time and research skill, and as noted by Woodhouse (2010) it is difficult to meet the professional standards of the education research community. Those faculty members with the greatest teaching responsibilities have the fewest discretionary hours to spend on research protocols that would be added on top of course delivery. While social science faculty members have some advantage in research methods, all of us who are not in schools of education have a lot to learn about rigorous research on teaching and learning. It would be very presumptuous to assume that a humanities or natural science professor can attend a two week workshop on SoTL and then conduct high quality inquiry into instruction. In a discovery community your work is compared with someone who has a Ph.D. in educational research and many years of experience conducting social science studies. In an important way, it is not a very welcoming invitation to join the real discovery enterprise in teaching.

On the other hand, I think there is a much more welcome invitation to a community of scholars who focus on improving their own practices and the understanding demonstrated by their own students. Local reading groups and teaching centers provide opportunities to read about evidence-based innovations, often within your own field. By paying attention to key features of your students' work, you can see if some critical aspects of their understanding are sensitive to the enhancements you have tried. We are already skilled at methods of evidence and argument within our own fields, and we are reasonably expert judges of the quality of students' work. By using those existing skills to focus on the teaching you will do anyway, you can turn a course you need to teach often into an intellectually interesting ongoing inquiry. By using readily available forms of online representation and sharing, a community of scholars can emerge around even a local body of such teaching. When that community is well informed by research, public with evidence of student work, and open to comment and critique, it constitutes a community of scholars of the practice of teaching.

For me, the goal of SoTL is to have every teacher treat every course as an opportunity to learn how to create better learning environments and generate richer educational experiences. Woodhouse (2010) points out that getting faculty members to change their teaching practices is challenging, and evidence suggests that informal, interactive ways of learning about colleagues' work yield more change in practice than formally published

research on general principles of teaching and learning. Making our teaching and our students' understanding visible as practice (not as research) may be an optimal way to influence the quality of teaching and learning in scholarly communities, and it is a low cost (and relatively low stress) form of engagement in our own professional lives (Bernstein, Burnett, Goodburn, & Savory, 2006). It may not convince a dean that you are a fast-track researcher, but it may well demonstrate your excellence as a teacher and encourage colleagues to follow your scholarly example.

Choose a Form of Fcholarship That Fits

All of this conversation and our personal decisions take place in a social context, heavily influenced by the values of our colleagues. In places where the SoTL leaders come from schools and colleges of education, there is typically a rejection of the informal scholarship framework, despite its sharing the major characteristics of a community of scholars (Glassick et al., 1997). In my personal experience, this is more often the case in the U.K, Australia and Canada. In the U.S. there are more SoTL leaders who do not have credentials as educational researchers, but even here there is a strong voice insisting that intellectual achievements appear as published research. For me, this response represents institutional narrowness on criteria for professional advancement, but those committees are made up of us, the professoriate. Perhaps this is a time when we should re-assert the inherent value of teaching as a mission of the university; effective teaching should be rewarded and honored because it is important, not because it resembles discovery research. We could follow Boyer's original intent and declare that discovery research is only one of several ways that a community of scholars can make important contributions. If SoTL is to serve the ultimate goal of improving student success, we as a community cannot limit the definition of scholarship to discovery and require our colleagues to divert their teaching energies into research on education to gain professional standing.

Each faculty member can examine the time, resources, skills, and energy available for the teaching assignments presented. From such a realistic assessment, instructors will situate their own work on a continuum from systematic and intentional delivery through intellectual consideration of evidence of learning to rigorous identification of effective educational practices. The work can be shared with colleagues, evidence and reflections can be posted on line, or articles can be submitted to various forms of peer-reviewed publications. I would suggest that any combination of points on those two continua can meet the criteria for scholarship of teaching as Boyer (1990) intended, as long as it is informed by the work of others, evidence-based, and public, as outlined in the second part of Boyer's argument (Glassick et al., 1997). As institutions we might better improve the learning of our students by making the faculty's intellectual work in teaching visible for discussion and collaboration than by inviting our colleagues to discover new frontiers in educational practice or theory. I am pleased that so many professors do engage in serious discovery research in education, as that benefits us all. I just think there are also communities of genuine scholarship that have other purposes, and we need people doing that work as well.

References

Bernstein, D. and Bass, R. (2005). The scholarship of teaching and learning. *Academe*, 91(4), 37-43.

Bernstein, D., Burnett, A.N., Goodburn, A. and Savory, P. (2006). *Making teaching and learning visible: Course portfolios and the peer review of teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker (now Jossey-Bass).

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., and Maeroff, G.I. (1997) *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Woodhouse, R. (2010). Hype or hope: Can the scholarship of teaching and learning fulfill its promise? *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 4(1).

Copyright of International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning is the property of Georgia Southern University and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.