InSight

A Journal of Scholarly Teaching

VOLUME 8

A Journal of the
Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

PARK UNIVERSITY
CETL
CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

PARK
UNIVERSITY sm

©2013 Park University

"Learning is not attained by chance. It must be sought for with ardor and attended to with diligence."
~ Abigail Adams

"He who dares to teach must never cease to learn."
~ Richard Henry Dann

CONTENTS
VOLUME 8 ● 2013

INTRODUCTION

EDITORIAL

SCHOLARLY ARTICLES

"The true teacher defends his pupils against his own personal influence."
~ Amos Bronson Alcott

INTRODUCTION

About Park University...

Park University (originally Park College) was co-founded by Colonel George S. Park and Dr. John A. McAfee in 1875. An independent, private institution, accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Park University currently enjoys a distinguished position in higher education as a growing institution with 43 campus centers in 21 states including an extensive Online degree program. In 2005, Park University created The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to promote the practice and profession of teaching, including scholarly inquiry into teaching across the disciplines. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, an outreach of the Center's programming, is a refereed academic journal published annually. The editorial staff invites submissions of research and scholarship that support faculty in improving teaching and learning. Open to submissions from all disciplines and institution types, *InSight* articles showcases diverse methods for scholarly inquiry and reflection on classroom teaching.

From the Executive Editor...

In this refereed special edition, we take a unique angle examining faculty and student reflections on the text, *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact.* The lead author of the text, Pat Hutchings, opens with a thought-provoking editorial highlighting the vital role of teachers as learners. Continuing this theme, the remaining articles provide a glimpse into the learning that occurs as a result of embracing SoTL as an integral component of effective college teaching. From faculty reflections on the influence of SoTL on instructional strategies to student perspectives on the impact scholarly teaching on their classroom experience, this volume journeys through the key issues in SoTL from the eyes on both sides of the teaching-learning dynamic.

I sincerely thank the student and faculty authors who contributed to this volume...my hope is that these reflections prompt dialogue in your own classroom about what it means to be both a teacher and a learner.

--B. Jean Mandernach, PhD

"Ideal teachers are those who use themselves as bridges over which they invite their students to cross, then having facilitated their crossing, joyfully collapse, encouraging them to create bridges of their own."
~ Nikos Kazantzakis

"To teach is to learn twice over."
~ Joseph Joubert

Diverse Perspectives, Shared Goals

Pat Hutchings, PhD
Author, _The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered:
Institutional Integration and Impact_

A central, original premise of the scholarship of teaching and learning has always been that good teachers must be learners. And, gradually, over time, we have come to understand more fully the role of learners in this work—"learners," that is, in the broadest sense, meaning teachers and students alike.

This was a theme of growing importance in the work of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, a program I had the privilege to help lead for a dozen years. Early on, a number of our participating campuses stepped forward and created powerful examples of how students could be involved. Their commitment to student voices (Werder and Otis, 2010) was an idea that quickly captured people's imagination, taking hold on all kinds of campuses in the United States and beyond. Today, the idea of students as full-fledged co-inquirers and partners in the scholarship of teaching and learning has been identified as a principle of good practice (Felton, 2013), and a wide variety of models for implementing this idea have been documented internationally (Healey, 2012).

Readers who share this commitment to student engagement in pedagogical scholarship will surely be pleased, as I am, with the collection of essays assembled here—collaborations by faculty who were invited to partner with one of their students to reflect and discuss (independently) a chapter from _The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact_. As one of the co-authors of that volume, along with Mary Taylor Huber and Anthony Ciccone, I naturally find their reflections of special interest; I didn't have to think twice when I was asked to provide a short editorial introduction to the issue. But the significance of these essays is quite independent of their connection with the volume that prompts them. They are powerful, often quite personal statements about the purpose and value of the scholarship of teaching and learning as experienced from diverse points of view.

And diverse they are. We hear from an assistant professor recalling a moment from her first year of teaching when she "questioned everything I knew about teaching"; an undergraduate English education major reflecting on the evaluations to which she will eventually be subjected; a philosophy professor who admits falling into the scholarship of teaching and learning for less than "high-minded" reasons but then finds it a powerful match for his "pedagogical proclivities as a philosopher"; and the director of a campus teaching center who traces her work back through an experience as a junior faculty member in a scholarship of teaching and learning program, and further still to classroom research undertaken as a graduate student.

Given these diverse points of view (and I've mentioned only a sampling from the fuller set), it is no surprise that the themes sounded in these reflections are varied as well—ranging from specific pedagogical strategies, to institutional reward systems, to social change theory, to models for professional development. And yet, what is perhaps more significant, and more striking to me, is how convergent they are.

For instance, most of these authors—teachers and students alike—point in one way or another to the power of the scholarship of teaching and learning to prompt and catalyze greater intentionality about the educational process. For teachers, this often takes the form of a "turn toward learning" (a phrase that my co-authors and I use), and an embrace of various strategies for exploring (as one writer in these pages puts it) "whether I am getting through" to students. There's a

kind of willingness to face up to what is and is not (or might not be) working in the classroom, and to explore those realities. But the move toward intentionality and reflective practice is not reserved for teachers alone. Several students also write about becoming more intentional and self-aware. Learning doesn't just happen, one notes; it requires "conscious effort." And paying attention to how one learns, another tells us, can change one's view of "what it means to be smart." This notion of reflecting on the learning process, of "going meta," (to use different language), has become a kind of staple in the discourse about the scholarship of teaching and learning. As such, it can begin to seem like old hat. The essays here restore it to its freshness and power in ways that readers will, I believe, be grateful for.

A second theme that runs through these essays is what might be termed "positive restlessness" (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, and Whitt, 2005, p. 46). As scholars— again, whether students or teachers—these authors bring curiosity and questions to their academic work; they are not satisfied with easy answers or the status quo. One faculty member writes, for instance, about the difficulty of teaching for deep learning, and how the scholarship of teaching and learning represents a way to "be on the lookout for possible solutions." Several invoke the "narrative of growth" (O'Meara, Terosky, and Neumann, 2008, p. 21) as a positive way of thinking about their quest for better approaches to the problems intrinsic to the complex work of learning and teaching. As a group, it seems safe to say that these authors see experiences of uncertainty as catalysts for growth and learning.

Which brings us to a third theme: transformation and change. Many of the authors in this collection write about changes in themselves and in individual classrooms. But there's a larger vision at play for many of them, as well—a sense of being part of something bigger. One faculty member writes about how engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning allowed her to publicly challenge existing pedagogical norms, and to make a "journey into nonconformity" in spite of disapproval from colleagues and resistance from students. At the same time, we hear from students who have become involved in this work and see themselves, rightly, as agents of change. An advocate for a "SoTL student sector" notes that students "have a stake in their learning and should have a platform" for influencing pedagogical theory and practice within their institutions. She imagines a "reciprocal and circular process between students, faculty, administrators, and the wider academic community," in which new educational ideas and practices are gradually passed along from person to person and generation to generation.

Six different campuses are represented in this volume, but at the end of the day, reading the essays one after another, it's hard not to feel that the authors are part of a larger common enterprise, a teaching commons, if you will (Huber and Hutchings, 2005), and a complex web of changes, as my co-authors and I describe it, which may be slow but is indeed moving—in both senses of that word.

References

Felton, P. (2013). "Principles of good practice in SoTL." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, *1*(1), 121-125.

Healey, M. (2012). "Students as change agents." Retrieved April, 13, 2013 from http://www.mickhealey.co.uk/resources.

Huber, M. T. and Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., and Whitt, E. J. (2005). "Never let it rest: Lessons about student success from high-performing colleges and universities." *Change*, *37*(4), 44-51.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., and Neumann, A. (2008). "Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective." *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *34*(3), 1-221.

Werder, C. and Otis, M. M. (eds.) (2010). *Engaging student voices in the study of Teaching.* VA: Stylus.

Pat Hutchings was a senior scholar and vice president at The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching from 1998-2009. She is now a consulting scholar with Carnegie, senior scholar with the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, and scholar-in-residence at Gonzaga University, in Spokane, Washington, where she lives.

Pat's work has focused on a variety of strategies for creating a campus culture of teaching and learning: student outcomes assessment, the peer collaboration and review of teaching, integrative learning, and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Her most recent book, co-authored with Mary Taylor Huber and Tony Ciccone, is The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact.

Prior to joining Carnegie, Pat was a senior staff member at the American Association for Higher Education, where she directed the AAHE Assessment Forum and the AAHE Teaching Initiative. From 1978-1987 she was a faculty member and chair of the English department at Alverno College. Her Ph.D. is in English literature.

Why Bother with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning?

John Draeger, PhD
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Buffalo State University

This paper argues that the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) matters on at least six interrelated levels. First, SoTL matters because learning matters, and SoTL can help students learn more effectively. Second, it offers professors the tools to more effectively share their disciplinary passions. Third, it offers faculty an avenue for continued intellectual growth. Fourth, SoTL can build strong cross-disciplinary communities that enliven the intellectual climate. Fifth, it can inform institutional policymaking. Finally, SoTL matters even when it does not directly transform institutional policy, because SoTL embodies a spirit of pedagogical innovation that enlivens the quest for learning and reminds us why it is worth pursuing.

I discovered Plato's dialogues in my first semester of college. I quickly became a philosophy major because I was enthralled by the nature of big ideas (e.g., truth, justice, and beauty). I went into academia because I dreamed of long afternoons, hunched over a great book. Although my professional reality is somewhat less glamorous, it is true that I get paid to share my passion for philosophy. My introduction to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) was somewhat less high-minded. A flyer on a bulletin board outside my office announced $3,000 fellowships for those interested in engaging something called 'scholarship of teaching and learning.' Since I was trying to buy a house at the time, I reasoned "I am a scholar. I teach. And I really need the money." Years later, I have the house and I am still doing SoTL, though I confess that I am not always sure why. There is only so much time in the day. My choice to do SoTL means that I am choosing not to do other things. There is no question that my scholarly work in philosophy has been impeded by heavy involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Yet, I continue to do it because as I believe and seek to make the case in this paper, SoTL matters.

The Turn Towards Learning

As a faculty member, I often look out on a classroom full of students and wonder whether I am getting through. They smile, nod, and ask questions, but I never quite know whether they are receiving the message that I am trying to send. The scholarship of teaching and learning offers the prospect of learning more about how students learn. It encourages the ongoing and systematic investigation into student learning in hopes that effective practices might be documented and made publically available (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; Kreber & Cranton, 2000; McKinney, 2007). In short, SoTL has the potential to offer me the resources to share my passion for philosophy more effectively. I am not alone: Most professors are passionate about their subject matter (whatever it may be). Most would welcome the opportunity to become more effective, but few know how this is done. SoTL can provide at least some of the answers. SoTL is worth doing, therefore, if it can improve the lives of both faculty and students.

My evolving views about learning are influenced by my life both as a philosopher and as a SoTL scholar. As a philosopher, I love to explore big ideas that are at once omnipresent in our lives and also rarely considered in any depth. For example, many of our most important values conflict with one another. Promoting economic equality can require curtailing individual liberty, democratically

elected majorities tend to trample minority rights, and loyalty to friends can keep us from being fair to strangers. Philosophy is worth doing, at least in part, because it gives us the resources to reflect on, articulate, explore, and perhaps even navigate such value conflicts. It will come as no surprise that my approach to philosophy influences my approach to teaching. Students in my introductory ethics courses, for example, often come into class believing that the course is about certain types of content (e.g., the pros and cons of abortion, euthanasia, hate-speech, or famine relief). In my view, however, the course is about learning the skills associated with articulating and evaluating conflicts between important ethical values. I hope that students will learn to recognize deep similarity in superficial difference (e.g., recognize the value of liberty across issues). Students can demonstrate their ability to make important connections between big ideas if they can use the philosophical position developed in one "content" debate to answer questions in another (e.g., use the resources found in a discussion of euthanasia to answer questions about hate speech). In this way, I hope that my students will learn how to make connections between important ideas.

As a SoTL scholar, I have come to appreciate the difference between "surface learning" and "deep learning" (Trigwell & Prosser, 1991; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999). On a surface learning model, knowledge is seen as discrete bits of information. Learning involves acquiring as many of these bits as possible within a given content area. Education, in this view, involves the transfer of information from teacher to student. Deep learning, by contrast, encourages students to make connections between seemingly disparate bits of knowledge within and across content areas. It is not simply the ability to identify the trees in the forest, but also to recognize that the trees are in an ecosystem affected by various economic policies and patterns of human consumption. Education, in this view, encourages students to develop expanding networks of conceptual connection.

The deep learning view fits my pedagogical proclivities as a philosopher, but my engagement with SoTL work has refined my practice. For example, deep learning is more likely to occur when instructors provide clear expectations (Trigwell & Prosser, 1991) and when instructors are actively engaged in making conceptual connections in their own work (Prosser, Martin, Trigwell, Ramsden, & Lueckenhausen, 2005; Prosser, Martin, Trigwell, Ramesden, & Middleton, 2008). While I have always tried to be clear with my students and have always hoped that I model good habits of mind, this research reminds me that I need to be intentional about things that I take to be obvious (e.g., the fact that I am trying to model the relevant habits of mind). I find that this is especially true with first-year students. All of us need help learning to make conceptual connections, but SoTL scholars suggest that first-year students are less likely to adopt these strategies on their own (Minasian-Batmanian, Lingard, & Prosser, 2005). Because of my involvement with SoTL, I have been more conscious of the need to scaffold various exercises, especially for first-year students. Such changes have meant that I have had to ease up on "coverage" (Hanstedt, 2012). Because a student's ability to make conceptual connections is more important than any particular bit of content, I am willing to give students additional time to develop these skills even if we don't "get to everything" by the end of the semester. Because of SoTL's influence, my courses now focus on developing the habit of deep learning. If students learn how to learn, then there is some hope that they will continue learning throughout their lives. This is in accord with my broader view of education (Draeger & Price, 2011). Higher education must be dedicated to helping students forge meaningful connections between seemingly disparate fields of inquiry (Cronon, 1998) and promoting lifelong learning (Cropley & Knapper, 1983).

Looking Closely and Critically at Learning: Just-in-Time Teaching

The fact that I am committed to deep learning strategies does not always mean that I know *how* to help students develop integrative habits of mind (Huber, Hutchings, & Gale, 2005). My involvement with SoTL, however, has me on the

lookout for possible solutions. For example, philosophy students (not unlike students in other disciplines) often struggle to understand the basics of a given reading assignment even before they can begin to integrate it into larger wholes. In 2008, a colleague in the philosophy department at Buffalo State, Jason Grinnell, began requiring that students write short (150-word) abstracts of each assigned reading. These assignments help students learn to extract what is most essential from a given text. This understanding (or misunderstanding) structures class discussion. In 2011, I attended a session on Just-in-Time Teaching strategies at the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (Scharff, Rolf, Novotony, & Lee, 2011). On the Monday morning after the conference, I popped my head into Grinnell's office to say, "what you've been doing has a name. It's called 'just-in-time teaching.' How about we look into it together?"

After conducting a literature review, we began investigating the role of just-in-time writing assignments in four philosophy courses with a total of 140 students participating (Draeger & Grinnell, 2012). Grinnell continued to ask students to write abstracts while I began asking students to answer two short questions prior to each day's class. Our data supports previous findings in the literature, namely, that just-in-time teaching increases (a) the likelihood that students will complete assigned readings and (b) the understanding of core course concepts (Howard 2004; Novak, Patterson, Gavrin, & Christian, 1999; Simkins & Maier 2004). We also found that students changed their approach to the reading and class preparation. They were less likely to skim and more likely to focus on the main ideas. As a result, they reported feeling better prepared for class and better able to contribute to class discussion. Moreover, because instructors were able to review student work prior to class, we were better able to clarify particular misunderstandings and tailor class discussion to student interests and needs. Abstracts encourage students to solidify their understanding of the most essential elements of each text. These serve as anchors as class discussions turn to broader conceptual connections. Asking students to answer particular prompts prior to class encourages students to explore conceptual connections on their own, and class time can be devoted to examining these connections in light of the text. Both strategies support integrative habits of mind.

The arc of this story follows what Laurie Richlin (2011) calls "the ongoing cycle of scholarly teaching and scholarship of teaching." Grinnell's initial forays into using student abstracts exemplify reflective teaching. Through our engagement with the literature, we moved into the realm of scholarly teaching. With our subsequent study, we moved into the realm of scholarship of teaching and learning. Engagement with SoTL gave us opportunities for intellectual growth as both teachers and scholars.

Engaging Institutional Priorities

Buffalo State was already one of twelve coordinating institutions within the international Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) leadership program by the time I became part of the campus fellowship program. While the value of the SoTL was not universally recognized on campus at the time, it was a program supported by the highest levels of the administration and a program that fostered a growing community of SoTL scholars. Both the international CASTL program and the campus community served as a *teaching commons* in which ideas could be explored and exchanged (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). Because the campus incorporated Boyer's expanded definition of scholarship (Boyer, 1990) into the campus's formal policy for rewards and promotion (Albers, 2007), those new to SoTL could contribute to the commons while having some assurance that their work would be recognized. It is also the case that Cheryl Albers, the first director of the campus SoTL program, was tirelessly dedicated to mentoring new scholars. Her mentoring work continues even as she has retired and I have become the director of the SoTL program.

Without the flyer on the bulletin board and the formal policy acknowledging the value of SoTL, it is unlikely that I would have made it a part of my research program. Without a supportive mentor and a community of scholars serving as role models, it is unlikely that I would have continued the work. As the current director of the program, I work to increase the presence of SoTL on campus in hopes that colleagues will feel supported in that work. Yet, while a supportive infrastructure increases the likelihood that SoTL will happen, it does not in itself explain why SoTL is worth doing. I have already argued that SoTL matters because it can help students learn more effectively and it can provide faculty with opportunities for intellectual growth, but SoTL can also transform the broader campus community.

Albers (2013) decided early on to engage institutional agendas. For example, when our campus began using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) for purposes of institutional assessment, Albers (then SoTL director) and her advisory committee chose to align SoTL fellowships with the NSSE's major elements (e.g., active and collaborative learning). Because SoTL work focused on institutional priorities, policymakers had some assurance that policy can be informed by data directly relevant to our particular local context. In some ways, SoTL can serve the same function as a vigorous free press. We might think of the community of SoTL scholars as the campus's investigative unit. While not directly related to policymaking and having no explicit policymaking power, SoTL can inform the larger policy conversation. Like a vigorous free press, SoTL matters because it informs the campus community about the challenges and opportunities as well as offers solutions.

In 2009, an attempt to increase student performance on various NSSE indicators became the cornerstone of the institution's formal five-year plan. At the same time, I joined Pixita del Prado Hill, Lisa Hunter, and Ronnie Mahler in forming a cross-disciplinary research group that set out to make sense of one of the areas that the NSSE identified as an area of concern, namely academic rigor.[1] Through surveys and interviews with faculty, our group identified four overlapping dimensions of academic rigor occurring at a variety of levels (Draeger, del Prado Hill, Hunter, & Mahler, 2013). In our view, a context is rigorous if students are actively learning meaningful content with higher-order thinking at the appropriate level of expectation. While neither ubiquitous nor a panacea, this model of academic rigor offers multiple points of relevance (e.g., to faculty, students, and institutional policymakers) and provides the resources with which to meet the institutional mandate to boost academic rigor.

In keeping with the tradition of SoTL on our campus, the academic rigor project operates in a teaching commons in which faculty are encouraged to set aside time to reflect on central aspects of their courses and to be purposeful about their choices. SoTL is valuable because it can frame the conversation. If, for example, academic rigor is defined as actively learning meaningful content within higher-order thinking at the appropriate level of expectation, then professors might use the model to clarify their expectations, explore strategies for active learning, or refine their understanding of higher-order thinking. This might lead them to seek out additional SoTL resources or even conduct and engage in SoTL scholarship. Further, SoTL can inform policymaking. Indeed, policymakers have taken note. At the invitation of the provost, we have presented our findings to the college planning council which sets institutional priorities. At the invitation of deans and department chairs, we have presented at a variety of other venues. It is safe to say that SoTL work on academic rigor has been, at least indirectly, part of a number of policy conversations.

In sum, institutional policies recognizing the value of the scholarship of teaching and learning create space for SoTL scholars to investigate critical

---

Note

[1] It is worth noting that each member of the group had participated in the campus SoTL fellowship program.

institutional initiatives. The study of academic rigor, for example, was prompted by an institutional mandate to promote academic challenge. A series of conversations about the project provided the campus community with an opportunity to come together to reflect on how the community might best realize its core values. SoTL matters, in this case, because it fosters a spirit of innovation among a growing number in the academic community, and because it has the potential to influence institutional policy.

Area of Impact, Promise, Challenge: Faculty Learning

I have argued that the scholarship of teaching and learning offers the prospect of helping students learn more effectively and provides professors opportunities for intellectual growth. The SoTL fellowship program put me in the room with a growing community of scholars looking closely and critically at innovations in learner-centered education. In particular, Albers carefully mentored me through my first project. In those early days, I can remember smiling as we considered how a 'control group' might figure into my 'methodology.' While I was vaguely familiar with these terms, they were foreign to my life as a philosopher. I would later come to realize that social science methodologies are not required to do SoTL work (Chick, 2013). At the time, however, I felt the need to develop a completely new set of research skills. I have even referred to myself as a "two-sport athlete" in an attempt to characterize my two very different forms of scholarship.

My involvement with the broad SoTL community provides me with countless opportunities for the sort of integrative learning that I value for my students. Given that the community tends to be cross-disciplinary, no one can hide behind disciplinary jargon or presuppose that others share the same presuppositions based on knowledge of the same literature. As a result, we try to speak and write in ways that are comprehensible to anyone in academe. Personal intellectual growth is often a by-product of my involvement in this community of scholars. This has been especially true of my engagement with scholars in my various collaborations (e.g., academic rigor and just-in-time teaching).

As the director of the SoTL program on campus, my goal is to help faculty think closely and critically about student learning. This is, at least in part, because students are an ever-changing population. It is quite possible that teaching strategies effective ten years ago may no longer meet student needs. SoTL provides us with the resources to update our practice. In many ways, teaching is just learning in another guise. My approach to faculty development is learner-centered: I encourage faculty to not to think about SoTL as a test of their adequacy as teachers, but as an opportunity to explore how students might learn more effectively. My approach is decidedly "big tent" (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). I am happy to welcome anyone willing to learn a little more about how their students learn, and willing to learn a little more about themselves along the way.

Conclusion

In the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact*, Pat Hutchings, Mary Taylor Huber, and Anthony Ciccone (2011) suggest that:

> Undergraduates, even those who complete degrees, are not learning as much or as well as they should. If students are to be adequately prepared for life, work, and civic participation in the twenty-first century, colleges and universities must pay closer attention to the heart of the educational enterprise. What is it really important for students to know and be able to do? How can higher education institutions and their faculty help students get there? The scholarship of teaching and learning brings powerful new

principles and practices to ground deliberations about these questions in sound evidence and help point the way (pg. 3).

Like any dynamic system, higher education is challenged by an ever-changing world. The scholarship of teaching and learning provides tools for effective and meaningful transformation. In short, SoTL is worth doing because it matters on a variety of interrelated levels.

First and foremost, the scholarship of teaching and learning matters because learning matters. SoTL encourages us to ask questions about how students learn and how they can learn more effectively. Second, most professors are conscientious professionals who love sharing their disciplines with anyone who will listen. SoTL offers these professionals the tools to become more effective at sharing the object of their passion. Third, SoTL matters because professors are lifelong learners. The scholarship of teaching and learning offers another avenue for continued intellectual growth. This can happen as faculty continue to hone their craft as teachers, but also as they move into expanding areas of scholarship. Fourth, SoTL matters because intellectual communities matter. SoTL creates an environment for those interested in enhancing learning environments and provides opportunities for mutual support. Fifth, SoTL matters because policy matters. We all benefit when those in charge of crafting policy are informed by the best evidence available. Like a vigorous free press, SoTL scholars ask tough questions, take the time to gather evidence, and offer informed views. In this way, SoTL can inform policy conversations. Finally, SoTL matters even when it does not directly transform institutional policy, because SoTL reflects a spirit of pedagogical innovation that enlivens the quest for learning and reminds us why it is worth pursuing.

References

Albers, C. (2007). Developing a shared meaning of scholarship to enable the revision of promotion policy. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *1*(1). Retrieved from http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/2007_v1n1.htm

Albers, C. (2013). Growing our own understanding of teaching and learning: Planting the seeds and reaping the harvest. In K. McKinney (ed.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning: In and across the disciplines*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered.* San Francisco, CA: Carnegie Foundation and Jossey-Bass.

Chick, N. (2013). Difference, privilege, and power in the scholarship of teaching and learning: The value of humanities SoTL. In K. McKinney (ed.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning: In and across the disciplines*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Draeger, J., del Prado Hill, P., Hunter, L.R., & Mahler, R. (2013). The anatomy of academic rigor: The story of one institutional journey. *Innovative Higher Education* (forthcoming).

Draeger, J. & Grinnell, J. (2011). Bringing just-in-time-teaching to the humanities presented To International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Milwaukee, WI.

Draeger, J. & Price, L. (2011). Which way to SoTL utopia? *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *5*(1). Retrieved from http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/v5n1.html.

Cronon W. (1998). Only connect…The goals of a liberal education. *The American Scholar*, *67*(4), 73-80.

Cropley, A., & Knapper, C. (1983). Higher education and the promotion of lifelong learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, *8*(1), 15-21.

Hanstedt, P. (2012). *General education essentials: A guide to college faculty.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howard J. (2004). Just-in-time teaching in sociology or how I convinced my Students to actually read the assignment. *Teaching Sociology*, *32*, 385-390.

Huber, M., Hutchings, P. and Gale, R. (2005). Integrative learning for liberal education. *Peer Review, 7*(4), 4-7.

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

Hutchings, P. & Shulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change*, *31*(5), 10-15.

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

Kreber, C. & Cranton, P. A. (2000). Exploring the scholarship of teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(4), 476-495.

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

Minasian-Batmanian, L., Lingard, J., & Prosser, M. (2005). Differences in students' perception of learning compulsory foundation biochemistry in health sciences professions. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, *10*(4), 279-290.

Novak, G., Patterson, E., Gavrin, A., & Christian, W. (1999). *Just-in-time teaching: Blending active learning with web technology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Prosser, M. & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching: The experience in higher education*. Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Prosser, M., Martin, E., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P., & Lueckenhausen, G. (2005). Academics' experience of understanding of their subject matter and the relationship of this to their experiences of teaching and learning. *Teaching in Higher Education, 10*, 251-264.

Prosser, M., Martin, E., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P., & Middleton, H. (2008). University academics' experience of research and its relationship to their experience of teaching. *Instructional Science, 36*, 3-16.

Richlin, L. (2001). Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. In C. Kreber (ed.), *New directions for teaching and learning: no 86. Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching and learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scharff, L., Rolf, J. Novotny, S. & Lee, R. (2011). Factors impacting completion of pre-class assignments (JiTT) in physics, math, and behavioral sciences. In C. Rust (ed.), *Improving student learning: Improving student learning global theories and local practices: Institutional, disciplinary and cultural variations.* Oxford Brookes University, UK.

Simkins S. & Maier M. (2004). Using just-in-time teaching techniques in the principles of economics course. *Social Science Computer Review*, *22*, 444-456.

Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (1991). Improving the quality of student learning: The influence of learning context and student approaches to learning on learning outcomes. *Higher Education, 22*, 251-266.

John Draeger is an Associate Professor of Philosophy and the Director of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at SUNY Buffalo State. He teaches courses in ethics and philosophy of law. His recent work in philosophy has focused on the nature of respect for persons. His recent SoTL work has focused on topics relating to general education.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:
Help for Academic Tour Guides

Rachael Saathoff
BS Candidate
Buffalo State University

The presence of scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), or its absence, has greatly impacted my undergraduate studies. While professors are experts in their subject matter, they do not always know how to reach students. SoTL provides resources to address such disconnects. Just-in-time teaching (JiTT) is one example of a SoTL-informed teaching assignment that can help students learn more effectively. Because SoTL helps professors understand how students learn, it can encourage excellence in the classroom.

Introduction: Why Talk about SoTL?

As an undergraduate, I have not done extensive research into scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Initially, I felt woefully unqualified to write anything about SoTL. What could I possibly have to say about "practices that engage teachers in looking closely and critically at student learning for the purpose of improving their own courses and programs" (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011, p. 7)? Now I realize my learning experiences as a student are essentially the basis for any SoTL research.

Professors have a difficult job. They are responsible for teaching material and serving as role models. Their classrooms are a meeting place of diverse learning styles and a wide spectrum of expectations, skills, motivations, and hopes. In many ways, a professor is much like the guide of a noisy group of tourists. A good guide reveals the interesting parts of the tour to the tourists—something that not all guides do effectively. Guides need training and help to learn how best to show tourists around a city like Rome or Paris. SoTL serves a similar purpose: it helps professors guide their students effectively through subjects like British Literature and European History. SoTL offers a scholarly approach to teaching (Healey, 2010) that encourages excellence in the classroom, bridges the gap in understanding between the teacher and the student, and improves the quality of education.

The Need for SoTL

When I began my college career, I fully expected exclusively lecture-based classes, filled with redundant content from a textbook. Sadly, I was not entirely wrong: I took a number of courses held in large lecture halls that sucked the life out of interesting content. These courses are the equivalent of touring the Metropolitan Museum of Art with the painfully unengaging economics teacher in *Ferris Bueller's Day Off* (1986). This amazing collection of human artwork and culture turns into uninteresting artifacts with no relevance for tourists, as the guide plows through material in a monotone voice, not even bothering to actually show interest.

Fortunately, not all lectures are like this. Some result in an environment that encourages students to engage with the material but, first, students must be responsible for knowing the simple, textbook stuff. For example, if reading Scott Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby*, students should know the main characters' names, the color of the light at the end of Daisy's dock, and what happens plotwise. The professor can then effectively take the roof off of the text by giving students a

deeper understanding of the inner workings of the book. With *The Great Gatsby* it helps to (1) know the historical, political, and societal backgrounds of the time; (2) look closely at the structure of the story; (3) examine the author's use of language to further the narrative, and (4) introduce different literary interpretations of the text. These steps show students what is beneath the roof or surface of a text. Here, the professor is less a tour guide than a coach or teacher training students and encouraging excellence. A good lecture allows a professor to hold students accountable for the reading while still deepening their understanding. Student understanding must move beyond simple regurgitation and memorization to truly achieve the status of excellence in the classroom (Ramsden, 2003). SoTL helps a professor determine how best to lecture effectively and encourage students to excel in class.

Though I cannot deny the evidence claiming straight lecture ultimately does not help students learn best (Healey, 2010), I have developed a preference for professors who primarily lecture, chiefly because some professors use "discussion" to have students repeat what he or she wants to hear. Others use discussions as a cover for lack of preparation or for extended, personal, off-topic rants. Professors can also lose control, finding themselves barely able to rein in off-topic, at times disrespectful, student-led discussions. Thus I concluded two major things: First, discussion-based classes can result in students metaphorically bashing each other over the head with opinions. Second, the lack of structure can allow a class to run away from a professor, not unlike small children loudly fighting with each other while the parents fail to address the inappropriate public behavior. If forced to pick, I prefer a mind-numbing, disorganized lecture to the aimless ramblings of my classmates. Professors who skillfully lead class discussion with awareness of student learning and understanding have learned to bridge the gap.

I have witnessed several well-functioning courses where discussion enhanced my own understanding. One course, Ethnic Minority Literature, taught me how to read a text with certain passages in mind to discuss in class. I knew the reading would allow me to be part of the classroom community created and led by the professor. Subsequently, I really enjoyed class time. In my experience, effective professors encourage student participation, and they are able to navigate and guide discussion in a way that focuses on important course content. Professors would be wise to note relevant literature (Barkley, 2010; McKeachie, 1994; Ramsden, 2003) to improve the quality, enjoyment, and effectiveness of their classes.

I have a great deal of respect for my professors. Teaching is hard. To do it well requires skill, practice, and hard work, just as in any other profession. A professor may have a thorough understanding of a topic, while students do not yet have the tools to tackle the issues. Worse, students often feel overwhelmed and confused. Faculty do not always know how best to address those issues. SoTL helps professors understand how students learn. For example, SoTL work has shown that introducing specific types of assignments can encourage students to come to class prepared to learn from the professor. One such assignment is called Just-in-Time Teaching.

Just-in-Time Teaching (JiTT)

In Spring semester of my first year at Buffalo State University, I encountered just-in-time teaching (JiTT), a SoTL informed method. JiTT is a pedagogical strategy that strives to "help students structure their out-of-class efforts and to get more out of precious in-class student-instructor face time… [allowing] the students to do preparatory work between classes with ample time to reflect, and [giving] the instructor time to prepare lessons with timely student input" (Novak & Patterson, 2010, p. 5). Typically, such strategies are used in courses that require large amounts of reading. Thus far, my impression of primary text-based classes had not been entirely favorable. Class discussion often failed because many students had not done the reading, and professors resorted to

stepping students through an entire text by reading passages aloud and explaining accordingly. Sitting in class while the professor summarized for the students who had not read drove me crazy. I wanted class time to be spent more productively; I wanted to actually learn something.

In my Professional Ethics course I encountered JiTT in the form of abstracts. The professor required us to write abstracts, relatively short in length and capping at 150 words. They were assigned two to three times a week. Eventually I developed a begrudging appreciation for this teaching technique. Now I am convinced it is one of the most effective ways to approach a course that requires vast amounts of scholarly reading. JiTT encourages students to work on evaluation, clarity, conciseness, understanding, and various other skills, depending on the way a professor shapes the assignment. Abstracts are also easily assessed, with the benefits outweighing the extra time spent by the professor. I have seen a wide variety of JiTT assignments, ranging from journals to short essay responses to applicable questions. In particular, abstracts stick out as a unique example of JiTT benefits: They cultivated habits that have served me well in practically every class thereafter. In essence, JiTT is an excellent example of SoTL at work, encouraging student learning.

Short assignments like abstracts forced me to evaluate necessary information as I read texts for class. In Professional Ethics class, there were as many as three articles a week with 10–40 pages in each reading. To condense that much information into 150-word abstracts took attention and work. Then, when it came time to write my abstract, I simply reread the article based on my notes. I would evaluate the article, trying to include what I considered to be the most important parts of the author's argument. At times, I had to pick between examples or phrases, but the process was helpful because I came to class equipped with my own summary and ready to participate

JiTT promoted good reading practices by forcing me to come to terms with the author's argument, but it also improved my writing practices. In particular, JiTT encouraged me to embrace brevity. For someone like me, word counts or page limitations are healthy. By forcing me to summarize content in a clear and concise manner, abstracts gave me the ability to communicate well in fewer words. To get to the point where I could summarize in 150 words, I had to have a full grasp of the concepts and arguments in the article. Then, pulling from synonyms, I translated phrases or words or arguments into shorter, clearer sentences. If an article made eight main points using different grammatical structures, openings, and paragraphs, I restructured the argument so all points supported subject-verb agreement. Such a process helped me to develop an easier-to-follow writing style.

Evaluation and conciseness both require a student to pursue understanding rather than regurgitation. Currently, students like me are saturated in an education system and, for that matter, a culture that encourages, even demands, us to voice our thoughts on matters. We are encouraged to pursue our individual tastes, preferences, goals, and dreams. While these are not necessarily bad things to pursue, they can sometimes come at the cost of true understanding. For example, if a student is assigned a book for a class, his or her automatic response is to read through the lens of personal opinion. Since the purpose of the abstract is ultimately to convey what a text says, not what a student thinks about it, abstracts train students to think differently when reading. Instead of simply reacting to a text, students must respond by explaining what they have digested. Abstracts leave no room for personal opinion. They intentionally aim to have students pursue understanding of the text before voicing opinions or disagreements, leading to much more fruitful class discussions.

Additionally, the frequency of assignments ends up being one of the most helpful aspects of writing these abstracts, which becomes normal, habitual, and much easier as the semester progresses. Students know that they will be required to summarize central arguments of each of the readings. They are expected to read each text carefully and give some thought to how best to present its essential

insights. Before long, this becomes a regular part of the course. Class discussions are more fruitful because students are familiar with the reading. Moreover, because of regular feedback, it is easy to familiarize oneself with a professor's goals. In courses not utilizing JiTT, I have often felt confused about a professor's expectations, and those same professors tend to return assignments far later than projected, or to provide little feedback. The lack of frequency, coupled with the late feedback, results in frustration on my end as I try to figure out the workings of the class. I can imagine that assignments like abstracts might be unappealing to a professor. After all, receiving dozens of abstracts multiple times a week results in mountains of grading. One solution is to grade them at random, giving students credit for turning abstracts in. Overall, feedback on JiTT assignments pays off in student learning.

JiTT: Adaptability and Flexibility

JiTT aids professors invested in helping students learn to use class time productively, increase student skills in evaluation, clarity, and conciseness, and in supporting pursuit of knowledge and helpful habits. These benefits are not confined to abstracts; other forms of JiTT exist. One course, History of Ethics, used questions, due the night before class, to guide student reflection on the reading. This allowed the professor to shape discussion to fit student needs based on the level of comprehension demonstrated. Though they did not require as much evaluation as abstracts since the questions were significantly more relaxed, the questions allowed more reflection and required students to connect dots between different philosophical authors. Journals, another JiTT assignment, can also log student reflections on readings such as short stories or poems. Depending on the professor's guidelines, journals focused on themes or asked students to compare different works. Ideally, they allowed students to respond more freely than an abstract or a guided question. They encouraged student exploration, giving more opportunities to pursue what interested them in the readings. The various forms of JiTT assignments are easily adaptable to meet a professor's needs. They can be altered or adjusted to encourage different skills or habits, such as reflection or comparison. Whatever the form, JiTT can shape the way a student understands content, writes about content, and approaches content through reading. Ultimately, they make students more responsible for learning and help professors address real issues that impede learning.

JiTT has become one of my favorite aspects of my courses. I know many students complain about the frequency of assignments. In fact, I was one of them, but this objection can be shortsighted. In class after class, I have seen how helpful JiTT can be. It helps students to keep up with reading, and it can encourage students to approach a text in different ways depending on the professor's desires and the purpose of the course. JiTT is a great tool for professors. And I am not the only one who seems to think so: "Indeed, one advantage of JiTT is that it encourages students to read course-related material before class, spreading their work more evenly over the semester, often a significant step for students who believe that it is better to wait for the instructor to explain the course material" (Simkins & Maier, 2010, p. xiii). I have seen a wide variety of JiTT, ranging from journals to short essay responses to application questions. Professors altered assignments to suit the needs of the course material. But in each case the JiTT enhanced my learning and made class time more meaningful. It will be up to SoTL to fine-tune and evaluate the various forms of JiTT, but I think as a whole anything that encourages evaluation, conciseness, and understanding will help students and teachers reach that goal of learning. JiTT is SoTL at its finest. Not only does it address the issue of encouraging students to read, but it also gives them a useful skill that will help them beyond the course. It serves the student and the teacher.

Conclusion

From my point of view, the professor's role is somewhere between that of a textbook and an autobiography. Just as tour guides should know more than what is on the travel brochures, professors are expected to know certain things as professionals; those things extend far beyond the scope of one course. If professors only served as textbooks, then an entirely self-taught education becomes believable. This is why autobiography is important. The most effective tour guides have lived in and experienced a city for years; they are a wealth of stories and information. Similarly, professors serve not only as a resource for students but also as mentors and role models at a professional level. The biologist, for example, speaks as an expert in his or her field, and not just as someone who knows things about biology. This is where a professor goes from being a textbook to an autobiography.

As an autobiography, a professor can pull from their professional experiences to aid students. For example, hearing a professor discuss Europe nostalgically as we read British literature made me want to read more on my own. The experience added to what I was reading. Just as the tour guides can advise tourists not to dine at a bad restaurant where they themselves once made the mistake of eating, professors can pull from their autobiographies to warn or encourage students to not make the same mistakes. A well-written autobiography can provide a reader with more than just facts; it may provide experiences and stories that spark a reader's interest and open up a world previously unknown. Autobiographies can captivate us because they give us insight into what it can be like to be another person in another field. This applies to professors, too. A "textbook professor" can recite facts, but an "autobiography professor" has experience in the content area that can ignite passion and enthusiasm for that content.

This is why SoTL matters: Both well-written textbooks and autobiographies have a strong sense of their audience and communicate effectively. SoTL helps professors produce courses that bridge the gap between textbook facts and autobiographical stories. It trains professorial tour guides by showing them how to best reach their audience. Misunderstanding between the professor and students may be due to any number of factors; that is why SoTL is a viable and valuable resource for the professional teacher. It helps the autobiographical (or textbook) teachers to integrate textbook (or autobiographical) content in a meaningful way for students, by giving them the tools or habits to cultivate an environment in which students can flourish, improving their education accordingly. JiTT is only one example of the many resources available to professors. All they have to do is pursue SoTL research, and I think they will find that they can take their "tourists" through the wonders of a course in a way that interests and engages students. Perhaps those tourists will fall in love with the tour and, in turn, become experts themselves.

References

Barkley, E. F. (2010). *Student engagement techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Healey, M. (2010). Developing the scholarship of teaching in higher education: A discipline-based approach. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *19*(2), 169-189.

Hughes, J. (Director). (1986). *Ferris Bueller's Day Off* [Motion Picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures.

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

Novak, G. & Patterson, E. (2010). An introduction to just-in-time teaching (JiTT). In S. Simkins & M.H. Maier (Eds.), *Just-in-time teaching: Across the disciplines, across the academy* (p. 3-23). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Simkins, S. & Maier, M. H. (Eds.). (2010). *Just-in-time teaching: Across the disciplines, across the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Rachael Saathoff, a Buffalo, NY native, plans on graduating from Buffalo State University in Spring 2014 with a B.S. in English Education (7-12) and a minor in philosophy. She is a member of the Muriel A. Howard Honors Program, attending various events and enrolling in honors seminars. Her academic interests include philosophy, literature, character education, pedagogical methods, writing, ethics, and the history of the English language. She received the 2013 Outstanding Minor in Philosophy award from the Department of Philosophy and an Undergraduate Summer Research Fellowship for 2013 to study character ethics and philosophy of education through the Office of Undergraduate Research.

From Lessons Learned the Hard Way
to Lessons Learned the Harder Way

Andria Foote Schwegler, PhD
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling
Texas A&M University - Central Texas

My departure from traditional methods of teaching and assessment (i.e., lecture and close-ended exams) was prompted years ago by a "gut feeling" that has morphed into an explicit examination of my teaching practice and students' reactions to it. The scholarly approach and empirical evidence in "Teachers and Learning" (Hutchings, Huber & Ciccone, 2011, Chapter 2) provided me with the scientific and social support I needed to publically challenge existing norms regarding teaching practices, reevaluate my data collection efforts, and advocate for change based on best practices, not on tradition, both inside my classroom and beyond.

So there I was, less than a year into my first assistant professor position, teaching on a July afternoon in a poorly vented classroom in Texas. I was deeply involved in an animated lecture about an event I had experienced as a public school teacher that beautifully demonstrated a concept for the Educational Psychology course I was teaching, when a student in the front row looked at her watch. At that moment, I questioned everything I knew about teaching.

I froze mid-sentence and stared in disbelief at the students in the room. How could they consider checking the time in the midst of my thoroughly-researched, well-crafted example? How could they be distracted by hunger or heat in the room with such an excellent example of faculty engagement, enthusiasm, and preparation before them? How could they be anticipating the end of class, just 20 minutes away, when there was still so much academic ground to cover?

At that moment I realized that I was the hardest working person in the room, and ironically, the only one who already knew the material. Staring at my class, I knew that I was the only one paid to be there, and logic would dictate that if I am paid to do a job, I should work. But that notion did not ease my confusion. After all, learning is effortful; it requires work. So why were my students not working? I was working as hard as I could at teaching. Why were they not working hard at learning? I mentally compared what I was doing at that moment to how I was taught: dry erase marker, lecture, text and test relevance, real-world application, content expertise. All checked out. So I still could not figure out why my student had looked at her watch, until I realized that I had done the same as an undergraduate student.

The creeping realization that my students were marking time until class was over, just as I had done, made the heat in the room intense. Slowly, it dawned on me that my students were not working because I was not making them work. I was doing it all. Then I realized that my graduate school experiences provided no solutions to the problem that resulted in 25 pairs of eyes bearing quizzically down on me as my students wondered why I had stopped talking for so l-o-n-g. I returned their glassy-eyed, confused stare as I contemplated that tree falling in the forest… If I am teaching in a classroom, but students are not learning, am I really teaching?

Suddenly, being a teacher became less about teaching and more about student learning. Despite all my hard work, preparation, and good intentions, I had missed the mark. Because I had no immediate solution for how to proceed, I abruptly wrapped up class to finish my existential crisis in the privacy of my office. In the silence, I heard unquestioned assumptions and well-intended advice about teaching from my graduate school days rattling off in my head: "Never admit that you do not know the answer." "Do not smile until mid-term." "Take attendance or

no one will come to class." "Use scantrons so the machine will grade it for you." Nothing helped. I could not see why I was having student attention problems in the higher education classroom, when I did not have these problems in the elementary classrooms of my "former life" (i.e., the one before graduate school). Of course, that was a different world. When teaching children, I quickly discovered that I must keep the children actively involved in learning activities and allow them some freedom to pursue their interests, or they will become actively involved in every form of misbehavior imaginable. But university classes just were not conducted in this manner. "If only they were…," I thought.

Thus began my journey into nonconformity. Starting out, I implemented those lessons that I learned the hard way, when the student looked at her watch. I transferred some of the workload I had previously shouldered myself to my students.   This shift was not well received.   Students who had been taught throughout their college careers to depend on the teacher to direct learning, resisted peer input that shaped class content, and were disgruntled when passive listening and sporadic note taking were replaced with more effortful activities requiring active participation.   I was not persuaded by the complaints though, because I felt empowered by the physical evidence of students' learning. Instead of viewing the stacks as simply papers to grade, I saw them as valuable feedback that reflected students' understandings and confusions. Through this feedback-revision process, I had devised a way to improve student learning, helping me withstand their resistance.

Unfortunately, social support for my changes remained sparse until I read *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact*. As a result of their research, Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) acknowledge that "leaders and participants in efforts to improve students' educational experiences and outcomes often feel they are working against the grain" (p. 6). This statement accurately summarized my early experiences. But, having read Hutchings et al. (2011), I am now crafting a new understanding of the modifications I have made to my teaching techniques that aim to improve student learning.   The scientific and social support provided in the text allows me to publically challenge existing norms regarding teaching practices and advocate for change based on best practices, not tradition, both within the boundaries of my classroom and beyond: an arguably daring move for an untenured faculty member in a tenure-track position.

Applying Discipline-Specific Knowledge to Teaching and Learning

Considering the scholarship of teaching and learning as "the intellectual work that faculty do when they use their disciplinary knowledge to investigate a question about their students' learning" (Dewar, 2008, p. 18), I am now more explicitly viewing my teaching role from my discipline of social psychology, and critically examining how I can use what I know there to improve teaching and learning.   When viewed as a social influence process, empirically based research findings regarding group influence can be applied to teaching with useful results.

Connecting the social influence literature to teaching, current methods of classroom instruction can be viewed from a social norms perspective.   Reno, Cialdini, and Kallgren (1993) distinguish between descriptive and injunctive norms. Descriptive norms are those that provide information about how most people behave, and this information suggests how we should behave.   Considering teaching, the oldest and still most widely used technique in university classrooms is lecture (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2011, p. 55).   Thus the descriptive norm indicates that university professors teach via lecture.   Many faculty members may use lecture, thinking it is the appropriate technique, while dismissing counter-normative methods, just as I did when first starting out in higher education.   While initially creating my new identity as a university faculty member, I now realize that I was conforming to the descriptive norm I repeatedly experienced in graduate school. Perhaps realizing that descriptive norms merely indicate what people do, regardless

of whether this is most effective, may help faculty reexamine their own behavior and confront these subtle pressures to conform.

More difficult to address, however, are the social pressures exerted by injunctive norms. These are distinguished from descriptive norms by their element of perceived social pressure, indicating what people *should* do and carrying the weight of social approval or social sanctions (Reno et al., 1993). These norms are made salient when others comment on our teaching practices, especially when these differ from their own practices. My students' complaints after I shifted their workload from passive listening to active writing indicated their disapproval and removal of social support for my actions.

Such social pressure is difficult to withstand, especially when it comes from one's colleagues and supervisors. Though no one would balk at my goal to improve student learning, colleagues are quick to comment on the amount of work I require of my students and myself toward this end. For example, during my presentation at a recent faculty brown bag, my colleagues appeared quite alarmed at the numerous moderated discussion forums I required in an online course and recommended that I consider doing something else. These comments clearly indicated their disapproval of what they initially perceived as a work-intensive technique. Such social sanctions, when coming from groups that we value (i.e., referent groups), exert a powerful influence on our behavior and tend to shift it in the direction preferred by the group (Reno et al., 1993). However, by maintaining a focus on other group norms that support our actions, we can withstand this influence (Kallgren Reno, & Cialdini, 2000). So, as I explained how I used the moderation tool to keep students' submissions hidden until the due date and that this strategy reduced repetition of content and led to more original responses, I thought of the scholars described by Hutchings et al. (2011) who have made much more substantial contributions to student learning. In their eyes, my technique would be status quo, and thinking of this referent group allowed me to face public social disapproval of my tried-and-true teaching technique with confidence and with the patience of a teacher who is welcoming a new set of learners.

Since reading "Teachers and Learning" and applying my discipline-specific knowledge to rethink how I approach teaching, no longer do the same descriptive and injunctive norms prompt my conformity. Instead of looking to tradition and typical behavior (i.e., descriptive norms), I have a more clearly articulated rationale for seeking out empirical evidence to substantiate my teaching techniques, and I am taking a more vocal and direct approach to revise existing injunctive norms for how teaching in the higher education setting should be conducted.

Making Learning Visible through Students' Active Participation

After the shock of the student looking at her watch wore off, one of my early, angry, gut-level reactions to solving the problem was to simply keep the students so busy that they would not have time to look at their watches. Though initially brash, with some tweaking, this turned out to be a really good idea.

Quietly listening to lectures, taking sporadic notes, and asking for an occasional clarification did not provide me with any solid evidence that my students were learning, but it was not until I started teaching online that I had this realization. In preparing for my first fully online course, I was daunted by the fact that I had absolutely no surveillance of my students. Outside of exams and a paper assignment, I had no way to determine if students were reading the materials, taking notes, thinking critically, or doing anything except clicking links in the learning management system. In planning my weekly lessons, I felt as though my ability to monitor student learning in progress had been stripped from my possession. I wanted to retreat to the certainty I felt in my face-to-face courses.

Instead of retreat, my solution to achieving visibility of student learning online was to create a series of recurrent, weekly assignments. I intentionally crafted and sequenced these assignments, requiring students to dig progressively

deeper into course content. Assignments early in the week required comprehension-level paraphrases of important course concepts, providing the foundation for later application of these concepts to personal examples or homework problems. Finally, the unit concluded with analysis and synthesis of concepts in the end-of-the-week essays. This need to "see" student learning in the absence of being able to "see students learning" catapulted my online students into active participation in course content. Such active participation in learning is unfamiliar to most students and requires them to formulate new approaches to coursework (Dringus, 2000).

This shift in teaching strategy provided me with evidence of my students' learning that I never had before. Examining these assignments, I realized that in my face-to-face courses I had few ways to determine if my students were reading the materials, taking notes, thinking critically, or doing anything except making eye contact, nodding, writing unknown content in notebooks, and replying to questions (which, in retrospect, totaled less than one question per class period per student). Certainly, these students' behaviors are reassuring during lecture, but while reading "Teachers and Learning," I was prompted to critically examine this data and ask, "Are these classroom behaviors valid operational definitions of student learning?" As a researcher, had I begun to read a research article with such a loose set of behaviors to operationally define a dependent variable, I would have tossed the article into the recycle bin without further consideration. So, as a teacher, given the same information, why did I feel assured that my students were learning?

The certainty that my students were learning based on my ability to see them in my face-to-face courses crumbled. No longer would I rely on my assumptions and residual positive feelings from interactions with students to convince myself that they were learning. Now, I require that all students, whether online or face-to-face, be active participants by producing and submitting evidence of their learning. I appear to be in good company. Hutchings et al. (2011) admit, "...most of the faculty who have been drawn to the scholarship of teaching and learning have also been drawn to pedagogies that actively engage students" (p. 28). I certainly understand why. If learning is not "visible" (p. 33), how can it be observed and measured? Having students create a product or demonstrate a relevant behavior provides evidence of learning (not merely evidence of polite manners during lecture) that can be measured, constructively criticized, and improved.

Putting a Spin on the Webs of Change

Working in my own classroom to examine and improve student learning has generated opportunities for me to collaborate with colleagues. Very quickly, casual small talk has turned into research projects involving other faculty in the department. For example, after discussing the chronic anxiety students feel toward statistics courses, my colleague and I questioned how we could reduce this anxiety and whether a reduction would lead to improved student learning. After crafting a manipulation to reduce anxiety born out of the attitude-change literature, we are currently collecting data to test our technique. Not only does this collaboration have the potential to remedy a shared problem, but also, after reading Hutchings et al. (2011), I now see beyond my classroom application and can view the larger relevance of this work.

I have come to realize that my research problems originate at the immediate intersection of teacher-learner-content within a particular course, but these proximal concerns may be manifestations of larger, more distal issues that need attention. So, instead of maintaining my current focus on generating data to solve immediate student learning needs in my individual courses, I now realize that I need to consider a broader view of my work. Perhaps the lessons I have learned through my feedback-revision processes with my students are more widely valuable than they are currently being used. Leaving the traditional model of teaching as a "private, often isolated" profession, the social support I have found in "Teachers and

Learning" has enabled me to see a larger audience for my data (Hutchings et al., 2011, p. 35). I have just begun to critically examine its utility to inform issues beyond my classroom.

This new view informs not only my work as a teaching faculty member but also my role as an online coordinator, in which I mentor and facilitate faculty members' efforts to improve teaching effectiveness online. As part of this role, I coordinate peer reviews of online courses and am building working relationships with faculty outside of my department. Serving on these peer reviews has provided a broader group of professionals with diverse perspectives and applications of content with whom to exchange ideas and discuss teaching techniques. This dialogue is creating avenues for interdisciplinary collaboration and validates shared desires to improve learning. Through discovering these shared connections, new groups of individuals are revising injunctive norms regarding what constitutes effective teaching, and these new norms are beginning their creep forward to affect larger-scale normative change.

Supporting this effort, my institution's distance learning office is emerging as a hub for faculty who are interested in holding larger-scale conversations about improving teaching and student learning. Launching distance learning into this role was the addition of required training for faculty who teach online, accompanied by voluntary participation in the peer review process. Word-of-mouth information about the trainings and peer reviews spread rapidly, and faculty members began talking about teaching, both online and face-to-face, in ways not previously heard. Though some faculty members attacked these policies, others saw them as formalized attempts to improve teaching, a process in which they were interested. To contextualize this interest, I leveraged my understanding of *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered*. For example, to recruit faculty to participate in our first brown bag on improving instruction using online tools, I sent an email after a week of low registration rates to the faculty in my school, citing Hutchings et al. (2011) and couching the meeting from a "perspective of growth" and explaining it as a "bottom-up" initiative by faculty who share the common goal of teaching students more effectively. Registration rates for the session increased the following day by 500%. Though the actual frequency of registrants from my school grew from only 0 to 5, linking the meeting to its broader context was favorably received.

And, the momentum is continuing. My institution is currently revising our definition of scholarship to explicitly recognize the scholarship of teaching as legitimate faculty work. I take every opportunity to publically support this revision. And, I use my growing understanding of the scholarship of teaching and learning to craft new ways to approach naysayers to this change. For example, when a colleague told me that conducting research on teaching was "too easy" and dismissed its value, I requested that he show me his data, claiming that I did not find it easy and that he could teach me how it is done. When he admitted that he had no data, only years of experience, I pressed him for an explanation of why he thought research on teaching was easy, whereas research on other topics was not (Macfarlane, 2011). He had none. I reminded him that though lessons learned the hard way through experience were personally poignant, lessons learned the harder way through research were more compelling (c.f. Grove & Meehl, 1996), and I invited him to accompany me on my more illuminated journey of nonconformity.

Now, instead of feeling pressure to conform to tradition or feeling defensive when disagreement escalates to attack, alternative referent groups that include other scholars of teaching and learning can provide support when naysayers exert pressure. It is reassuring to know that I no longer have to face my existential crises about teaching and learning alone in my office. I am now seeking out colleagues and students to hash out ideas and strategies with me. I have new ideas to explore and new resources to which to turn for guidance when I am faced with these harder lessons.

References

Dewar, J. M. (2008). An apology for the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 3*, 17-22.

Dringus, L. P. (2000). Towards active online learning: A dramatic shift in perspective for learners. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(4), 189-195.

Grove, W. M., & Meehl, P. E. (1996). Comparative efficiency of informal (subjective, impressionistic) and formal (mechanical, algorithmic) prediction procedures: The clinical-statistical controversy. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 2*, 293-323.

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

Kallgren, C. A., Reno, R. R, & Cialdini, R. B. (2000). A focus theory of normative conduct: When norms do and do not affect behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 1002-1012.

Macfarlane, B. (2011). Prizes, pedagogic research and teaching professors: Lowering the status of teaching and learning through bifurcation. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16*, 127-130.

Reno, R. R., Cialdini, R. B., & Kallgren, C. A. (1993). The transsituational influence of social norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 104-112.

Svinicki, M., & McKeachie, W. J. (2011). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers* (13th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Dr Andria Foote Schwegler is an Assistant Professor of Psychology and the Online Coordinator for the School of Education at Texas A&M University Central Texas. As the spouse of an active-duty Army soldier with multiple duty stations for over 23 years, her teaching experience is diverse, ranging from public preschool to graduate level statistics. In addition to questions regarding teaching and learning, her research interests include the effects of deployment on soldiers and military families. She is the mother of two rough-and-tumble, wonderful boys, JB (7 years) and JS (4 years).

A Student's Experience and View on College Teaching and Learning

Kristin Atkinson, BS
Texas A&M University – Central Texas

Through my college experience and my reflection on The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered, I have come to recognize several ideas that have greatly impacted me, my views on learning, and my actual learning. My overall experience in college has been beneficial because of the teachers who approached teaching with a more conscious effort and taught me to approach learning and my role as learner in the same way. This essay highlights many of the aspects of the chapter, "Teachers and Learning," that have been beneficial for me throughout my educational career, and a few notes on changes that may have helped.

Entering college, I assumed that my professors were teachers who would pour their vast knowledge and understanding into me, an eager and willing pupil. I entered with expectations of challenging, thought altering course work and stimulating lectures. I envisioned understanding things I could never grasp before. It was not that I was excited just by the idea of learning new information; I was excited also to be taught by experts. However, I had little understanding of the roles faculty members played in the university setting, how learning really occurred, or what teaching even was. I thought that professors were foremost teachers without other professional obligations, that teaching was the dissemination of knowledge, and that learning was a passive affair.

Unfortunately, this ignorance and my actual experience in college classes led me to the erroneous belief that being a college professor must be an easy job: write up a lecture, take a few questions from the textbook, assign a term paper, grade… repeat. I felt this process was the only work many of my teachers were doing. I did not know if I was really learning anything, and I was starting to question the point of a college "education." I could not figure out why the passions my professors had towards their subjects did not translate to amazing, innovative teaching and automatic learning.

I did notice, however, that not all of my professors were merely giving me information and then testing me on it; some were actually teaching me material and processes that I understood, remembered, and used! In fact, these teachers had a much larger impact on me than simply guiding me through my learning in their courses. They helped me realize the more active effort that learning requires and encouraged skills and habits that helped me succeed in all of my classes. I also eventually recognized that professors do more than just teach; they also have research, publishing, and organizational obligations, all requiring time and effort.

Though I now realized that teaching was not my professors' only role within the university, I never would have imagined it was not the most important. I had heard the old saying, "publish or perish"; however, it was not until reading *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered* that I realized the implications this mentality has on teaching at the university level. It stands to reason that when tenure is contingent on publications, this aspect of the job becomes the faculty's priority. Though I am sure teaching is not covertly expressed as unimportant, this seems to be the unintended message sent to students through organizational policies, tradition, and most obviously, ineffective instruction. I never imagined that teachers were not encouraged to approach classes as they approached other aspects of their role as academics. Like every other "truth" that requires research to be supported and publication to be replicated, the effectiveness of teaching should be critically analyzed and empirically tested. This process is what is most admirable about scholars of teaching and learning; they do not take their teaching

methods at face value. Their work seems completely appropriate as the world of academia revolves so much around research and peer reviewed publications where nothing can be assumed, including the presence of effective teaching and learning.

Given the inconsistencies in my learning experiences and the discrepancies between my most and least effective teachers, I am relieved that the importance of the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) is becoming a conversation in so many universities around the country. As a student, I am grateful for professors who seem to genuinely care about student learning and recognize the importance of approaching teaching with a conscious effort. My appreciation is now better articulated after reading *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered* because it prompted me to reflect and examine the role my teachers played in my education throughout my college career. I thought about the teachers I had, the courses I loved, and the ones I hated. I analyzed my favorite assignments and the few that just wasted time. Several topics stood out to me as I compared my experiences with the ideas and changes discussed in the chapter, "Teachers and Learning."

The remainder of this essay highlights the aspects of SoTL that I found the most beneficial for students' overall success, and addresses a few topics that were important in my personal experience. Foremost, the student's active role in learning was missing from the discussion in "Teachers and Learning." And, though student input was mentioned by Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011), allowing learners more participation in SoTL may be beneficial to the organization's goals. Also, the most prominent theme of SoTL, inquiry and analysis into teaching and learning, can be the prominent theme that guides student learning. Finally, I close with some notes on the evidence of learning and what would have helped jumpstart me in the beginning of my academic journey.

Students' Role in Learning

It is interesting that the idea of the "teaching gift" has begun to lose traction, because over the years I have let go of the idea that the ability to learn is a gift (Hutchings et al., 2011, p. 25). It is becoming evident that it takes active and conscious effort not only to become a great teacher but also to become a great learner. When I recognized learning as an acquired skill, I gained much confidence in my ability to learn and succeed in school. Teachers may be able to foster this change in assumption by helping students understand how learning occurs, and encourage their students to approach learning with a conscious effort. Learning should not be seen as a passive event, which is commonly assumed in a lecture-based classroom where the teacher seems to have the only active role. Instead, I believe clear and explicitly stated goals to be active learners and to view learning as a skill can be beneficial. Many students may not have ever heard this information! Course syllabi provide students with information about what they will be learning, but they typically fail to mention the best ways to learn it. Too, critical thinking skills and practices of inquiry and analysis can be applied to discovering students' own learning styles and becoming better learners.

Student receptivity is also a vital piece of the learning process. For instructional methods to be successful, students must be receptive to them. How a student approaches a class is just as important as how a teacher approaches it. Again, explicitly stated goals can help facilitate learning by getting students and faculty to develop a shared understanding of the purpose of classroom activities. Students may see assignments as "busy work" if they do not understand the purpose of the task. Additionally, for students to know why they are doing an assignment or project helps them draw connections from classroom learning to its practical application in the real world.

Encouraging students to become active learners and explaining the processes of learning may also benefit the student-teacher relationship. Students and teachers have opposite roles within the classroom but the same goal of furthering student learning. Instead of students and professors being divided by

differences in the power of their roles, teachers can instead be viewed as facilitators of learning, but this perspective is one that students will need encouragement to take.

Feedback Includes Students in SoTL

Themes expressed throughout the "Teachers and Learning" chapter regarding the SoTL movement are that discourse provides inspiration for change, and collaboration enhances the effort's success. I believe that SoTL success can be furthered by including student involvement and allowing learners to join in this conversation and collaboration. Perhaps the most obvious way to find out what students are learning is to ask them. Student feedback not only provides teachers with helpful information and evaluation of courses, but it also allows the learners an occasion to evaluate their own learning process and what they actually learned. I have been grateful for opportunities to tell my teachers that a writing assignment was particularly helpful, or that an instruction was confusing. Such student feedback requires evaluation and analysis, which are higher level thinking processes, according to Bloom's taxonomy, and are important for learning. For example, through course surveys that target higher level thinking, I have realized how powerful writing is for my understanding of course material, and I have been able to amalgamate all the seemingly disjointed ideas presented in a course into one coherent and solid understanding of the subject. Teacher feedback is incredibly helpful to students; maybe students' feedback can be similarly helpful for teachers.

The Skills and Habits for Success

In the chapter, "Teachers and Learning," the role that inquiry and analysis played in SoTL stood out to me. The scholars of teaching and learning used inquiry and analysis to discover gaps in their knowledge of the teaching and learning process. Specifically, Ciccone's course at the University of Wisconsin aimed to foster these habits in students to create complex thinkers, and the LEAP learning outcomes now represent that same focus (Hutchings et al., 2001). To me, these skills *are* the most valuable practices teachers can encourage in their students because their application and uses are vast and have been paramount in my development as a learner and an independent adult. Fostering these skills within the classroom would not only help students grasp the course material but also give students the skills that will be beneficial in many aspects of life, including learning in general.

In classes where analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are the main components of learning, the lower level processes of knowledge, comprehension, and application are inevitable and more meaningful. For example, questions and projects that require students to synthesize information by creating a plan, or analyze a problem by distinguishing the relationships involved, also require and support the lower level thinking skills such as knowledge and comprehension. To construct a plan or analyze a problem, students have to know the terms and understand the concepts before these can be applied to the task at hand. A traditional lecture is the presentation of knowledge, but it cannot be assumed that students have made a habit of using the higher level thinking skills necessary to really apply, analyze, and synthesize that knowledge. To use these skills, teacher guidance is critical. It makes a difference when teachers are constantly asking questions of their students and providing work that requires different forms of critical thinking. Not only does this repeated engagement force students to think more deeply about the topic, but students also then mirror this inquiry and analysis when working through problems on their own. Through more sophisticated assignments and interactive lecturing, higher level thinking skills become habits and tools that enable students to be successful.

Also, the same self-reflection that SoTL requires of teachers can be applied to students during learning. The simple act of looking back on the information presented can lead students to connect separate ideas. This process can even be applied to learning about learning. For example, reflective analysis may empower students to become actively invested in their profession of learner through awareness of their own learning process.

Evidence of Learning

Evidence of learning is necessary for teachers to assess their teaching methods and for students to track their own progress. Clearly, students are responsible for providing this evidence, but it is important to remember that the evidence students provide is based on what is asked. Students cannot show their rich understanding of a complex topic by answering a few simple questions pertaining to it. The form of the assessment has the ability to change the outward appearance of learning. Also, the assessment type shapes the way in which students prepare for the examination. Shallow test questions encourage superficial learning, whereas more complex and thought-provoking questions promote more meaningful learning of the test material.

Too, it is worth noting that students want to know that they are learning. Students gauge success in a course not merely by the grade received at the end of the semester, but also by the course's value in their overall educational and career goals. Students' ability to apply the knowledge gained in the classroom to the real world provides evidence of learning, and it brings value to that learning. At the end of the college career, students progress from learners to appliers. They want to know the knowledge and skills received through their academic careers as students can be put into motion and used. Teachers bring value to course material when they present it as a valuable addition to everyday life.

Transitioning into College and Beyond

The changes in thinking that have defined me as a learner developed slowly over time through my experience as a student. Several events and teachers led to epiphanies that became my educational mantra. Through this, I realized I needed to stop limiting myself by my preconceived ideas of what it means to be smart and how I measured up to that definition. Instead of thinking in terms of innate ability, I began to think in terms of potential ability. I realized I could learn to be a good learner and through that process become prepared for life after college.

I believe freshman seminars, like those being used at University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, can do a great service for incoming students making the transition into college (Hutchings et al., 2011). In addition to fostering the skills of inquiry and analysis, they can help students learn about learning and understand their active role in their education. Had this been available to me as a freshman, maybe I would not have wandered so aimlessly through my first few semesters, wasting time trying to figure out what I was doing, what my teachers were doing, and how to be successful.

Fortunately, I did craft an understanding of how to get the most out of my college experience, and as a recent graduate, I realize that the processes and skills advocated in this essay for learners are vital to life after college. Higher education should extend beyond the simple transmission of knowledge and aim to produce graduates who have critical thinking skills that can be used in many aspects of life. Learning and decision making through inquiry and analysis will encourage independent thinkers who can effectively consume the information presented to them on a daily basis. Everyday tasks, family and job responsibilities, and social and political beliefs substantiated by critical thinking and evidence can have a powerful impact on the individual and society. Professors who teach students *how* to think, instead of merely *what* to think about, are key to this development.

Finally, I want to stress that it was the teacher, not the subject, school, or delivery method, that made classes interesting and made learning more effective for me. Regardless of teaching styles or preferences, those courses that I finished with a sense of accomplishment and meaningful knowledge were based, more than anything else, on the instructor's engagement with the students. It is absolutely clear to students when they have a teacher who really wants to help them succeed. This support and guidance allows students to thrive and take the risks associated with learning. Thank you, teachers; you absolutely make a difference.

Reference

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

Kristin Atkinson is a lover of learning and a grateful participant in this project. Kristin recently graduated Summa Cum Laude from Texas A&M University –Central Texas with a Bachelors of Science in Psychology and is currently working as a research assistant within the university. She is interested in continuing her education but is choosing to further explore and narrow down her interests within the field of psychology before embarking on the graduate school journey. Kristin presently lives in Washington State with her husband and two young sons who provide her with constant encouragement and new opportunities to learn.

Expanding the Teaching Commons:
Making the Case for a New Perspective on SoTL

Kim A. Case, PhD
Associate Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies
University of Houston-Clear Lake

As a reflection on O'Meara, Terosky, and Neumann's (2011) work on scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) faculty development, this essay describes the benefits of SoTL to individual faculty and university goals. In support and expansion of arguments advanced by O'Meara et al., this work calls for the use of SoTL faculty development to promote the shared teaching commons, active recruitment of new SoTL scholars, institutionalization of SoTL values, and integration of SoTL initiatives in both teaching centers and research-focused development offices.

In their insightful chapter, "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Professional Growth, and Faculty Development," O'Meara, Terosky, and Neumann (2011) outline the benefits of administrative and institutional support for advancing faculty involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). This essay offers a reflection on the invisible benefits that SoTL provides at the individual faculty and institution levels, as well as a new model for advancing faculty development approaches to recruiting and mentoring SoTL scholars. Essentially, the benefit of SoTL lies in its insistence that intellectual discovery extend beyond the isolated classroom investigation and contribute to understanding of learning in the broader pedagogical community. By promoting SoTL benefits, faculty development administrators will aid in moving scholarship on teaching and learning from the background to the forefront in higher education.

Invisible SoTL Benefits for Faculty and Institutions

As O'Meara et al. (2011) articulated in their chapter, SoTL offers a long list of academic benefits that often remain invisible to both faculty and university administrators. Given that administrators admittedly must attend to broader institutional goals such as publishing research and promoting teaching methods to enhance student learning, SoTL provides a productive approach at the intersection of these goals. The traditional "narrative of constraint" represents a remedial approach to faculty development that emphasizes teaching deficits among faculty and fixing problematic teaching strategies. Rather than perpetuate former models emphasizing the narrative of constraint where faculty needed to be "fixed" (Shulman, 2004), faculty developers and teaching center administrators can support faculty reflection for improvement through promotion of SoTL inquiry. In other words,

> By legitimizing the classroom as the source of interesting, consequential questions about teaching and learning, and in recognizing the teacher as the person best suited to formulate and study these questions, the scholarship of teaching and learning reinforces the possibility of the kind of professional growth that comes from within (O'Meara et al., p. 58).

At the same time, faculty engaged in SoTL benefit from the "narrative of growth" that promotes their own reflective inquiry into pedagogical practices and the discovery of approaches that best support student learning. Within the narrative of growth framework for faculty development, SoTL is viewed as supportive guidance to help faculty members work toward their own professional goals of becoming

exceptional teachers. O'Meara et al. (2011) appropriately pointed out that teaching centers promoting SoTL serve university goals by providing spaces for faculty to pursue intrinsic motivations to improve as professional educators. This "internal impetus" (O'Meara et al., p. 48) drives faculty to continue *learning about learning* and growing as professionals, which clearly aligns with the institutional goals and growth.

As an example, the teaching center at my university originated from the faculty out of an internal need to share ideas and improve teaching. The faculty development motto of TLEC (Teaching-Learning Enhancement Center) developed into a resounding "by faculty for faculty" to emphasize the focus on the narrative of growth. Through SoTL programs, speakers, workshops, research groups, and conference travel support, TLEC made it possible for faculty to bring their pedagogical discoveries into the shared teaching commons that Huber and Hutchings (2006) described as essential to the SoTL process. The SoTL skills that faculty develop (e.g., collaboration, collegiality, and reflection for informed action and improvement) all transfer to other areas of research and service. Speaking to the core benefit of SoTL, scholarship of teaching and learning provides systematic methods (often new methods from outside disciplines) to investigate learning, ultimately leading to improved teaching approaches shared with the broader community.

Faculty Development to Promote the Shared Teaching Commons

In recent years, I organized faculty book clubs to read and discuss *The Last Lecture* (Pausch, 2008), *Teaching to Transgress* (hooks, 1994), *What the Best College Teachers Do* (Bain, 2004), and *Teaching for Critical Thinking* (Brookfield, 2012). Faculty often report back to me that they found the particular book we are reading for that semester lacking in some way. Other faculty tell me they approve of my excellent selection. Regardless of whether these comments rate the book in a positive or negative light, my response is the same. My faculty development goals focus on bringing faculty together in a space for pedagogical reflection and sharing. In other words, the book becomes almost irrelevant as it serves as only a catalyst to bolster our teaching commons. In my role as teaching center director and faculty developer, I attempt to encourage a faculty community of learners spanning a wide variety of disciplines for shared discussion of teaching innovations as well as pedagogical scholarship.

In order to move beyond scholarly or thoughtful teaching to openly shared scholarship of teaching (Shulman, 1993), the instructional reflection, methodology, and final outcomes must be shared with other educators (Huber & Hutchings, 2006). Promoting recent work to broaden the impact of SoTL in higher education, O'Meara et al. (2011) called for collaboration and conversation around SoTL "to engage a larger group of faculty…beyond the individual classroom" (p. 63). Although individual faculty may not feel compelled to share their SoTL efforts with the broader academic audience via publication, O'Meara et al. rightly argued that faculty developers can contribute to building the teaching commons by encouraging publication. In my view, the role of teaching center directors includes nurturing "partnerships that raise knowledge about learning from anecdotal to systematic" (O'Meara et al., p. 65) and cultivating a culture of the shared teaching commons across the university.

Faculty Development to Recruit New SoTL Scholars

As a SoTL scholar that became a teaching center administrator, I feel a personal obligation to pass along the benefits of SoTL via my faculty development role. My experience as a Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) Institute scholar introduced me to the importance of sharing pedagogical advancements across disciplinary boundaries and publishing study

findings in not only SoTL journals, but also more traditional research journals that lack a teaching focus. Through development and implementation of teaching center (TLEC) initiatives, I try to cultivate faculty SoTL interest by encouraging a community of faculty learners, organizing interdisciplinary SoTL research teams, and recruiting new SoTL scholars for the mentoring institute (IISSAM, previously CASTL Institute). In other words, I utilize TLEC as an institutional force to establish and maintain a teaching commons for professional growth and SoTL faculty development. For instance, my role as TLEC Director and CASTL Institute and IISSAM planning committee member allowed me to successfully recruit and mentor faculty as new SoTL scholars, fund their travel to the mentoring institutes, and invite them to present their SoTL studies and findings to the campus faculty, thus expanding the teaching commons and pedagogical learning community. For example, previous CASTL Institute scholars from the University of Houston-Clear Lake returned to campus and presented their SoTL projects on a variety of topics: assessing critical thinking; investigating student bias toward out-groups; exploring a project where students create their own nonprofit organization; and understanding the effectiveness of a policy analysis assignment requiring students to apply theory to real-world problems. When new SoTL scholars presented their study findings at TLEC events, their passion for this scholarship spread among colleagues from disciplines that would otherwise never cross paths. Physics professors gained new ideas from psychology and social work SoTL scholars while education faculty found innovative approaches in the SoTL research of a computer engineering faculty member.

When faculty developers provide spaces for groups of faculty to reflect and explore learning, whether through discussions, book clubs, speakers, or other initiatives, disciplinary boundaries often melt away, making room for innovative interdisciplinary collaborations. At a TLEC-sponsored event, speaker Anthony Herman introduced the faculty to the first day interview activity (Hermann & Foster, 2008) and inspired faculty from across three schools and four disciplines (psychology, education, computer science, and women's studies) to conduct a study examining the impact of the class interview on student perceptions of the course and their motivations for learning. This first day activity consists of 1) the instructor interviewing students to discover their expectations for the course, their educational backgrounds, and their needs as learners, and 2) the students interviewing the instructor about his or her approach to the classroom. The resulting SoTL publication (Case et al., 2008) moved this pedagogical inquiry beyond the individual classroom to not only the shared teaching commons within the university, but also into the broader academic teaching commons while serving two institutional goals, research publication and improved teaching.

Faculty developers, whether in teaching centers, SoTL programs, or research offices, help faculty in their own professional growth when they recruit not only junior, but also midcareer and senior faculty into the field of SoTL. My involvement in the SoTL community directly resulted from the friendly and supportive push from the teaching center director. Faculty interested in studying classroom activities, assignment effectiveness, or the best strategies to enhance learning may not be interested in contributing to the teaching commons without the mentoring of faculty developers to encourage them. As center directors, coordinators of programs and initiatives, and administrators, faculty developers must strengthen the marketing of SoTL as transformative learning on the part of faculty scholars.

As O'Meara et al. (2011) pointed out, some universities recently established entire centers or well-developed campus initiatives (e.g., small grants, poster sessions, SoTL certificates) devoted to SoTL. One approach to help recruit scholars at all career stages, comes from the CASTL Institute (now IISSAM) model. Within this weekend institute, experienced SoTL scholars serve as mentors to new SoTL scholars, providing one-on-one mentoring and detailed feedback to advance their developing SoTL projects. Michael et al. (2010) assessed the CASTL Institute's impact on SoTL scholars and faculty development. Surveys and interviews of

former Institute participants revealed the Institute had an impact on individual behaviors and attitudes, approaches in the classroom, learning communities within institutions, and the field through increased SoTL conference presentations and publications. On a smaller scale, TLEC (the UHCL teaching center) recruits new SoTL scholars through workshops on SoTL methods, presentations of faculty SoTL projects, national speakers such as Pew Scholar and Carnegie Fellow Randy Bass, travel funds to attend the mentoring institutes, and interdisciplinary SoTL groups that publish articles. Through these efforts, both the institute SoTL mentoring model and the TLEC initiatives serve to transform institutional culture for greater value of scholarship of teaching and learning and the faculty members engaging in this type of research.

Faculty Development to Change Institutional Culture

In order to further advance SoTL and expand its benefits to the institution, I argue that faculty developers must focus on two main goals: 1) fostering partnerships and collaborations to integrate SoTL into the work of both teaching centers *and* research development offices; and 2) raising awareness of the value of SoTL among administrators.

Although faculty development encompasses a wide range of administrative positions and goals within centers and offices across institutions, faculty share the common goal of providing pathways for faculty professional growth and improvement. For faculty developers working within teaching centers as well as SoTL programs and centers, the development mission emphasizes improved teaching effectiveness to enhance student learning outcomes. For faculty development offices devoted to research and grant support, faculty productivity in writing and securing grants and publishing research findings is of great importance. O'Meara et al. (2011) suggested that these seemingly divergent goals actually share a common purpose at the intersection known as the scholarship of teaching and learning. Although research-focused faculty development offices are charged with identifying grant opportunities and offering seed funds for faculty research projects such as pilot studies, these efforts often neglect the scholarship of teaching and learning (except when working with education faculty).

O'Meara et al. (2011) described Boyer's (1990) argument that teaching requires intellectual and scholarly substance as a call for appropriate recognition of teaching, rather than viewing teaching as somehow inferior to research scholarship. Unfortunately, those false boundaries between teaching and research still carry with them a hierarchical system that privileges research over teaching. In fact, some faculty feel an academic stigma associated with professional focus on teaching, including scholarship about teaching and learning. Giving an invited workshop to faculty on navigating the journey to becoming a SoTL scholar, a chemistry professor expressed that his interest in SoTL did not align with his field's view of SoTL as "not real research." He felt that his location in a field outside psychology and education meant SoTL would never be valued as contributing to the advancement of chemistry. His concerns are valid and must be met with clear articulation of support from university administrators. Without explicit statements of support for SoTL work, faculty will remain unmotivated to publish in a field that they expect will be devalued by promotion and tenure evaluators.

When I speak with junior faculty at both teaching- and research-focused conferences, they often report receiving the clear message from administrators that SoTL publications would not be viewed positively in promotion and tenure evaluations. These examples illustrate that many faculty possess intrinsic motivations to pursue SoTL work, but are quite concerned this work (even if published) will not be counted toward annual reviews or promotion and tenure. Of course, their very real concerns result in moving away from SoTL for fear of negative repercussions for their careers. To prevent this unfortunate avoidance, administrators at the Dean and Provost levels must be clear that scholarship and

publication to advance teaching and learning are truly valued and provide recognized benefits toward institutional growth. Formal faculty handbook policies that include statements of support for SoTL as related to reviews and promotion and tenure, as well as departmental, school, and university mission statements or strategic planning documents that include SoTL, will clarify values and support for SoTL faculty development.

My SoTL Journey

As a graduate student taking a qualitative methodology course, I embarked on a research project to examine the ways White students engage and disengage with course materials addressing race and racism (Case & Hemmings, 2005). That first study of classroom interactions, resistance, and the impact of both on learning led me into a new world of scholarship I had never considered. During my time as a lecturer teaching race and gender courses, I began a series of pre/post-test studies to determine whether students' attitudes changed as a result of taking these courses (Case, 2007a; Case, 2007b; Case & Stewart, 2010a; Case & Stewart, 2010b). Despite these endeavors and intrinsic interests, I had never even heard of the "scholarship of teaching and learning" or "SoTL" and was only introduced to the field when I joined the faculty at UHCL. In reading "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Professional Growth, and Faculty Development" (O'Meara et al., 2011), I repeatedly thought, "They are telling *my* story."

My official SoTL story began with my arrival at UHCL when the teaching center director encouraged my application to become a SoTL scholar at the CASTL Institute, where I received exceptional mentoring from Howard University law professor Alice Thomas, as well as from my peer scholars and conference participants. This interdisciplinary exposure provided methodological and pedagogical insights I simply would not have gathered from professionals in my own field. The faculty development support from the university's TLEC director challenged me to dive into SoTL with not only collegial support, but also essential travel funding and peer mentoring to prepare my project. That experience led to my own enthusiastic recruitment of new SoTL scholars and to my position as Director of TLEC two years later. As O'Meara et al. (2011) pointed out, "the scholarship of teaching and learning has been, and continues to be, a transformative concept in higher education" (p. 45). In support of their argument, the only way that I can accurately describe my professional advancement as an academic is to say that SoTL was transformational in terms of my own career.

My experience and that of the CASTL Institute participants illustrates the need for a new approach to SoTL faculty development. In moving away from the outdated narrative of constraint to a supportive narrative of growth, a new generation of SoTL scholars can be developed to transform the culture that devalues this work. Without access to SoTL mentoring and an institutional culture of SoTL support, I am confident my career would have been much less productive and less rewarding.

Conclusion

In the next phase of SoTL advancement both nationally and internationally, faculty developers can take the lead in expanding scholarship and elevating the value of SoTL in the academy. Through active recruitment of junior, midcareer, and senior faculty into the interdisciplinary world of SoTL, faculty developers will build the next generation of scholars. Offering faculty skills that translate to more traditional research in their disciplines and to service realms, SoTL expertise provides benefits well beyond the classroom. In addition, SoTL scholars contribute to institutional goals of not only improving teaching for quality student learning experiences, but also publishing research and garner institutional recognition in the academic literature. Partnerships between teaching centers and research development offices to introduce or expand SoTL programs, initiatives, and support

will maximize the potential of this intersection of interests and goals. When university research and grant offices begin to take SoTL seriously within the mission and vision of support for faculty development, they may see increases in faculty grant-writing, interdisciplinary scholarship, and academic publishing. Breaking down these socially constructed walls between teaching and research will yield long term benefits for the individual faculty, faculty developers, and the institution itself. The myth that frames research and teaching as mutually exclusive is not only outdated, but also harmful to university goals. Future research documenting the impact of newly integrated SoTL initiatives, administrative views, and efforts to formally institutionalize SoTL on faculty engagement in research to enhance teaching and learning will aid faculty developers in more effective SoTL scholar recruitment.

References

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (2012). *Teaching for critical thinking: Tools and techniques to help students question their assumptions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Case, K. (2007a). Raising male privilege awareness and reducing sexism: An evaluation of diversity courses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31,* 426-435.

Case, K. (2007b). Raising white privilege awareness and reducing racial prejudice: Assessing diversity course effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology, 34,* 231-235.

Case, K., Bartsch, R., McEnery, L., Hall, S. P., Hermann, A., & Foster, D. (2008). Establishing a comfortable classroom from day one: Student perceptions of the reciprocal interview. *College Teaching, 56,* 210-214.

Case, K., & Hemmings, A. (2005). Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and anti-racist curriculum. *Urban Education, 40,* 606-626.

Case, K., & Stewart, B. (2010a). Changes in diversity course student prejudice and attitudes toward heterosexual privilege and gay marriage. *Teaching of Psychology, 37,* 172-177.

Case, K., & Stewart, B. (2010b). Heterosexual privilege awareness, prejudice, and support of gay marriage among diversity course students. *College Teaching, 58,* 3-7.

Hermann, A. D., & Foster, D. (2008). Fostering approachability and classroom participation during the first day of class: Evidence for a reciprocal interview activity. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 9,* 139-151.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Michael, R., Case, K., Danielson, M., Hill, L., Lochbaum, L., McEnery, L., & Perkins, K. (2010). Mentoring new scholars of teaching and learning: The national CASTL Institute model. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning Journal, 3,* 1-15.

O'Meara, K. A., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2011). *The scholarship of teaching and learning, professional growth, and faculty development.* In P. Hutchings, M. T. Huber, & A. Ciccone (Eds.), *Scholarship of teaching and learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact* (p. 45-68). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pausch, R. (2008). *The last lecture.* New York, NY: Hyperion.

Shulman, L. (1993). Teaching as community property: Putting an end to pedagogical solitude. *Change, 25*, 6-7.

Shulman, L. (Ed.) (2004). *Teaching as community property: Essays on higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kim A. Case, PhD is an Associate Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies, Director of the Teaching-Learning Enhancement Center, and Women's Studies Program Director at the University of Houston-Clear Lake. She also directs the Psychology Master's program Applied Social Issues subplan. Her research on prejudice confrontation and ally behavior focuses on dominant group responses to prejudice in social contexts. She also studies strategies for raising awareness of heterosexual, gender-conforming, male, and White privilege in educational and community settings. Her book, Deconstructing Privilege: Teaching and Learning as Allies in the Classroom (2013), focuses on pedagogical strategies for privilege studies.

Improving SoTL Programs: The Impact of a Student Sector

Angela Miller, BS
University of Houston-Clear Lake

*O' Meara, Terosky, and Neumann (2011) revealed a need to integrate faculty
teaching and learning centers with research development programs to further both
individual professors' goals of creating innovative pedagogical practices and
institutional goals for faculty publication and effective decision making regarding
funding allocation. This article suggests that universities implement a scholarship of
teaching and learning (SoTL) or teaching-learning enhancement center (TLEC)
student sector within these integrated faculty development programs. This will
foster more pedagogical ideas and a more democratic institution by giving students
a voice in their education while enriching the knowledge of students, faculty, and
administrators.*

Recently a classmate conveyed to me her desire to publish research with a
professor. Wanting to incorporate an idea learned from a previously studied
discipline (communications) with sociological issues she came across in her
graduate studies, she asked me if I knew who to contact to express her desires to
publish. Unfortunately, my only advice was to speak to her professors, but it
occurred to me there should be a campus organization to pair students and
professors for collaboration and publication within and across disciplines.

Professors' responsibilities include the two often conflicting tasks of
teaching students in the classroom and publishing in their disciplines. To aid
professors in their responsibilities, universities frequently implement professional
growth programs, such as faculty development offices, to assist professors in their
publication endeavors and, less often, scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)
or teaching-learning enhancement centers (TLEC) to assist professors with
discovering, innovating, and improving teaching methods. Although such
pedagogical research benefits students in the classroom and facilitates faculty
members' continued academic growth, students also have the potential to benefit
from and provide benefits to professional development programs. This paper will
demonstrate the need for an enhanced SoTL program that incorporates students,
teachers, administrators, and the academic community at large. A SoTL or TLEC
student sector has the potential to empower students and give them a voice in their
education, expand professors' pedagogical knowledge with student collaboration and
publication, encourage a student-centered administration, and further pedagogical
discourse among all educators.

Current Model of SoTL Programs

Faculty responsibilities of teaching and publishing often create tension
between institutional goals for publication, recognition, and allocation of limited
funds and individual professors' goals to discover effective pedagogical practices to
meet student learning needs (O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2011). These
competing goals take time and resources from the other but share the common goal
of "transforming teaching and learning for the better" (O' Meara et al., 2011, p. 51).
Professional development centers that only focus on evaluating and improving
individuals' teaching methods, without regard to publishing pedagogical research,
tend to foster a "narrative of constraint" (O' Meara et al., 2011, p. 47). A narrative
of constraint model only addresses professors' pedagogical deficits arising from such
external sources as negative student evaluations. Although this model may hold
instructors   accountable,   it   also   constrains   innovative   ideas   as   university

administrators scrutinize professors' work in the classroom, which tends to decrease instructors' autonomy and creativity. Professional development programs that operate in this narrative of constraint model often lead instructors and administrators to see teaching centers only as remedial programs.

In contrast to that limited model, professional development programs that foster a "narrative of growth" (O'Meara et al., 2011, p. 47), where teachers learn from each other by questioning the effectiveness of teaching methods, discussing innovative pedagogical ideas, reflecting on criticism about their ideas, and incorporating and synthesizing ideas from different disciplines and sources, tends to lead to an atmosphere of individual and institutional development rather than restraint.

Proposed Improvement of SoTL Programs

The tension between individual and institutional responsibilities need not be seen as a problem but as an opportunity to further professional growth (O'Meara et al., 2011). To further discourse in teaching and learning in the academic community at large, individual goals to develop innovative pedagogies should be tied to institutional goals for academic research and publishing. Such an alliance serves faculty needs for continued learning by fostering development of innovative pedagogical methods and also serves broader university goals for publication and academic recognition by encouraging faculty-student collaboration in pedagogical research and publishing (O'Meara et al., 2011).

Combination of Faculty Development and SoTL Programs

As evidenced by several universities that have had positive outcomes resulting from integrated professional growth models, combining teaching centers and research development programs into an integrated professional development program would foster a "narrative of growth" (O'Meara et al., 2011, p. 47). The integration of these programs more efficiently facilitates the common goal of improving the quality of instruction. An integrated program can invite teachers with pedagogical ideas to collaborate with other professors to refine and publish their concepts and curriculum designs. While integrated professional development clearly brings advantages to faculty and institutions alike, instituting a third component that includes students can also enhance these integrated professional development programs.

Expanded Focus on Student Involvement

Within SoTL, the physical space of the classroom acts as a student laboratory for faculty to discover better ways to teach, refine their innovative pedagogical methods, and use faculty development programs to research and publish their pedagogical discoveries, but educators often believe the role of students in the professional growth of teachers should go beyond end of term student evaluations. Although universities sometimes offer professional growth for graduate students by implementing pedagogical courses and programs, they are meant for students' and not teachers' professional growth. O' Meara et al. (2011) state these professional growth programs for students will eventually impact universities because these students of education, "with a little luck . . . will 'pay it forward' in their future work as faculty" (p. 62); but these student graduate programs do not have a great impact on the present faculty or institution on their campuses. Just as these programs benefit students as they learn new pedagogical methods, these types of programs can benefit teachers as well. If teachers and administrators view students as consultants rather than passive recipients of information, students will have the potential to offer valuable contributions to pedagogy by informing professors of what helps and hinders their learning.

Lessons Learned

As an undergraduate, I often felt like a passive participant simply producing work thrust upon me. In contrast, as a graduate student, I was afforded by some dedicated and supportive professors the opportunity to become a teaching-, lab-, and research assistant. As a teaching assistant, I was allowed to join the faculty book club, which introduced me to the value of student input and teaching to a diverse student population. I was able to discuss what I learned from the book with various faculty members, providing me with a more in-depth understanding of the pedagogical theory presented in the literature. As a research and lab assistant, I conducted research with professors and other students, furthering my teamwork and leadership skills. As an assistant to the university's Teaching-Learning Enhancement Center (TLEC), I was able to hone my organizational and professional skills while assisting with faculty workshops, lectures on pedagogy, and conferences about the scholarship of teaching and learning. In addition, I co-authored a chapter that detailed a teacher-student collaboration to redesign a graduate class (Case, Miller, & Jackson, 2012), which made me aware of the publication process and the importance of collaboration. Consequently, these research and lab experiences helped me realize the benefits I had networking and collaborating with faculty members outside the classroom, as well as the rarity of my student experiences. These volunteer and paid positions not only increased my confidence and afforded me publication opportunities, but they also gave me an insight into pedagogical theory and practices, as well as a better understanding of the university's SoTL program.

A SoTL or TLEC Student Sector

When I became a TLEC graduate assistant, I had direct contact with the workings of the pedagogical professional development program on campus. This experience furthered my understanding of the goals and necessity of such programs and the extent to which these programs impact student success by facilitating faculty pedagogical knowledge. After delving into the SoTL literature (O'Meara et al, 2011), I realized the importance of the SoTL program in which I became involved and the ways it could benefit all students if they were also involved. Because I am a successful student, faculty took notice of my potential and, therefore, offered me these assistant positions. While I am extremely grateful for these opportunities, I cannot help but feel most students may never enjoy the same benefits I had if faculty members do not recognize them as contributors to the educational process.

The benefits I enjoyed should be extended to all students who would like to become more involved in their learning environment. Regardless of their academic success or educational level, all students have a high stake in their own learning and should have a platform to voice concerns and opinions regarding the way teachers teach them. After seeing the benefits resulting from the integration of faculty professional development programs to further both pedagogical innovation and faculty publication (O'Meara, et al., 2011) and understanding the positive impact professional growth experiences had on my education and professional development, I envision a SoTL student sector or TLEC student branch in an integrated professional development program.

A formal SoTL student sector within SoTL or TLEC programs should be open to all students who are interested. It should be student learning focused, but also a place where faculty and administrators listen and learn from students as well. A SoTL student sector has the potential to incorporate a variety of students' experiences more extensively into pedagogical inquiry beyond the classroom and foster more involvement from students who may develop innovative pedagogical ideas. Rather than pedagogical knowledge flowing only from the top down, by implementing a SoTL student sector or TLEC branch into faculty professional growth

programs, universities will make pedagogical knowledge transformative, reciprocal, and circular between students, faculty, administrators, and the wider academic community.

Benefits to Students

Just as my professional development experiences increased my self-efficacy, introduced me to students and faculty outside my discipline, enhanced my collaboration skills, afforded me opportunities to publish, and furthered my pedagogical knowledge, a SoTL student sector in an integrated professional development program has the potential to extend those benefits to every student interested in taking an active part in their education. Similar to my own undergraduate experience of having work thrust upon me, students often feel like passive participants in their education. A formal SoTL student sector could empower students to take more responsibility for their learning as active participants, rather than just passive subjects in pedagogical experiments. Letting students have a voice in their education empowers them to think of innovative ideas that would aid in their personal understanding of the curriculum, ultimately enhancing the learning environment. In addition, giving a voice to students fosters a more democratic campus. Pedagogical ideas from students, especially those who regularly face learning or social obstacles, may have a better chance of influencing educators' approaches to teaching if students are given a formal platform to voice their experiences and opinions (PR Newswire, 2013). If educators take student ideas seriously, students learn their voice and actions can have an impact and potentially increase student self-efficacy.

In addition, a formal SoTL student sector or TLEC student branch inclusive of the entire student body will bring students of different abilities and disciplines together and introduce them to faculty whom they might not otherwise encounter in the classroom. Expanding student networks furthers employment and post-graduate opportunities as students foster professional relationships whose bonds will likely last past graduation and into the workplace; networking with faculty also helps students find professors who may be interested in co-authoring research with them.

Furthermore, a SoTL student sector will enhance students' critical thinking, collaboration, and communication skills. Following the model of teaching centers that bring faculty together to find support, students in the SoTL student sector working with their fellow students and faculty will learn the importance of team collaboration.   Since collaboration across disciplines fosters ideas from multiple perspectives (O'Meara, et al., 2011), a discipline-diverse SoTL student sector can foster critical thinking skills as students learn to look at problems from different points of view. Also, working with faculty in a SoTL student sector programs will help students learn academic language to more effectively articulate their pedagogical ideas to faculty.

Moreover, just as graduate programs train teaching assistants (O'Meara, et al., 2011), a SoTL student sector can also facilitate events to develop teaching and research assistants. Students interested in becoming teaching assistants can join the SoTL student sector to learn how to create effective learning environments and interact with students both professionally and ethically. Likewise, although students learn research methods and writing skills in the classroom, a SoTL student sector can more extensively hone these skills as faculty, working more intimately with students, show them more efficient ways to write and conduct research, teaching them the "tricks of the trade," so to speak.

Finally, students involved in the SoTL student sector can learn more about university goals and funding issues and how they impact their educations.   If administrators view the SoTL student sector as an open forum where student voices are heard, students can articulate their needs, which may impact administrative decisions. Therefore, a SoTL student sector has the potential to provide students with increased self-efficacy as they convey their own pedagogical ideas, increased

networking opportunities as they meet students and faculty from different disciplines, and a better understanding of pedagogical practices, collaboration, the publication process, and institutional funding decisions.

Benefits to Faculty and Administrators

Not only will a SoTL student sector benefit students, but it will also benefit faculty and administrators. First, a SoTL student sector has the potential to provide a way for faculty to get to know their students professionally outside the classroom. O' Meara et al. (2011) suggested those educators who work most closely with students understand student needs more fully, stating "no one is better situated to conduct the scholarship of teaching than those engaged with students on a regular basis" (p. 59). Getting to know students helps professors better understand their particular students' educational requirements and various learning styles. Students today tend to be more diverse and "sometimes less prepared than in the past" (O'Meara, et al., 2011, p. 52) due to lack of critical thinking skills (Ladson-Billings & Tate IV, 1995), but social media immerses students in a cultural fusion due to their global social interactions, which provides them with multiple and diverse perspectives (Greenhow & Robelia, 2009). Therefore, while many students may be less prepared for college in the past, they also tend to be more sophisticated about different perspectives and cultures than their student predecessors.

Understanding the world in which students live helps foster creative pedagogy. Students in a SoTL student sector have the potential to teach instructors about student culture by familiarizing professors with the rapidly changing technology that younger students tend to use extensively and more frequently than faculty (Owston, 1997), so teachers can learn to use technology students already use to enhance their pedagogical methods. Just as students learn the language of academics, students can also teach educators about the informal language students use, often rooted in social media or pop culture, especially music, which can help faculty understand the terms in which students tend to think and communicate.

In addition, differences in student demographics create different cultures on each campus. Therefore, what works with one student population may not work with another. Collaborating with students outside the classroom in a SoTL student sector would help teachers and administrators alike better understand the needs of their particular student population. Working closely with various students from their campus helps professors to present course materials in innovative ways to reach them; learning about individual students' backgrounds, social identities, multiple perspectives, and divergent learning styles helps teachers relate to students in their own social sphere and create learning activities that are meaningful to students' lives (Green, 1999).

Second, an inclusive SoTL student sector would provide professors with student collaborators who differ in ability, race, ethnicity, gender, background, socioeconomic class, and other social identifiers. According to feminist theory, placing marginalized voices front and center can provide and promote different perspectives in any given subject (Brooks & Hesse-Biber, 2007). Since all students have unique educational experiences, all can contribute to the discourse in pedagogical theory and practice if professors see them, not as passive subjects to be studied, but as co-creators of pedagogical knowledge (O'Meara, et al., 2011). Just as working with other faculty members from different disciplines enhances pedagogical research by extending their repertoire of pedagogical knowledge, working with a diverse student population with multiple perspectives also leads to more effective pedagogies.

Furthermore, because a SoTL student sector might attract those students most interested in professional development, it would widen the pool for faculty to identify potential teaching, research, and TLEC assistants. Assistants can help professors with their responsibilities, thereby freeing professors' time, resources, and efforts to concentrate on more complex teaching and research issues. Teaching

assistants also answer student questions and act as intermediaries between faculty and students, informing professors of potential student problems in the classroom that they may not otherwise recognize because some students may feel intimidated in voicing their criticisms with their teachers. A SoTL student sector may also help faculty and administrators identify TLEC assistants who can help organize meetings, lectures, and other TLEC events. As student assistants learn new skills, faculty members and the institution benefit because professors can produce more work with student help.

Working and collaborating with individual students naturally leads to publication opportunities. A SoTL student sector can provide professors with students, who have the ability to conduct research and write academically, by facilitating student workshops geared toward teaching students effective and professional research methods and writing skills to prepare them for publishing their work. As students learn new skills, teachers can benefit by having more professionally trained students to help conduct pedagogical research and create manuscripts for publication. Therefore, not only do students gain professional skills through collaboration with faculty, but also, collaborating with students for publication furthers professors' goals of creating new, effective pedagogies and institutional goals of publishing for the wider academic world.

Moreover, since those who work with students closely tend to understand their needs (O'Meara et al., 2011), there is the potential to foster a more student-centered administration and encourage sounder funding decisions and faculty development strategic planning. If administrators take a hands-on approach with the SoTL student sector and get to know their students, administrators may consider student input more often to balance university goals and funding with student needs.

Finally, a SoTL student sector can benefit faculty and administrators by helping dispel the myth that universities develop teaching and learning centers only to address pedagogical problems in the classroom, much as students and teachers often perceive campus writing centers as remedial for students with writing deficiencies (O'Meara et al., 2011). However, just as campus writing centers benefit even experienced student writers through discussion and collaboration with a writing tutor, professors benefit from teaching and learning centers if teachers understand the complex nature of teaching involves continued learning as a life-long process. Contrary to perceiving teaching and learning centers as remedial, teachers and administrators should see these professional development centers as safe spaces to discuss, debate, and share ideas to further innovative pedagogies (O'Meara et al., 2011).

To support professors' continued learning, a SoTL student sector can provide professors with a ready-made student population on which to test innovative pedagogical methods before bringing them to the classroom. If professors know they can have access to students outside the classroom for pedagogical research, faculty may come to realize the collaborative nature of teaching and learning centers, instead of seeing them only as problem solving facilities. Also, since teaching and learning centers need renewed enthusiasm (O'Meara et al., 2011), the ready-made student population a SoTL student sector can provide teachers with for pedagogical testing will add the much-needed excitement to professional development programs and a reason for all teachers to become involved with these centers, not just those with pedagogical problems.

Conclusion

A SoTL student sector within an integrated professional development program has the potential to benefit all parties involved in education and foster a more democratic institution through multi-perspective dialogue. Rather than a linear process with a transfer of knowledge from top to bottom, professional development programs should rest on a circular model where students inform faculty and administrators, while students, at the same time, learn about

professorial responsibilities and administration decision-making. A SoTL student sector can formalize students' input and thrust their ideas into the wider academic world through transformative learning without relying on "luck" to hand down ideas in the future. While an integrated SoTL faculty development program serves important functions for professors and administrators, all parties can benefit if universities incorporate students. Therefore, implementing a SoTL student sector or TLEC student branch as a third component of an integrated faculty development program has the potential to foster a "narrative of growth" rather than a "narrative of constraint" (O'Meara et al., 2011, p. 47).

References

Brooks, A., & Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2007). An invitation to feminist research. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. L. Leavy (Eds.), *Feminist research practice* (p. 1-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Case, K., Miller, A., & Jackson, S.B. (2012). "We talk about race too much in this class!" Complicating the essentialized woman through intersectional pedagogy. In C. Banks & S. Pliner (Eds.), *Teaching, learning, and intersecting identities in higher education* (p. 32-48). New York: Peter Lang.

Green, F. E. (1999). Brain and learning research: Implications for meeting the needs of diverse learners. *Education-Indianapolis, 119*, 682-687.

Greenhow, C., & Robelia, B. (2009). Old communication, new literacies: Social network sites as social learning resources. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*, 1130–1161. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01484.x

Ladson-Billings, G. and Tate IV, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory in education. *Teacher's College Record, 7*, 47-68.

O'Meara, K. A., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2011). The scholarship of teaching and learning, professional growth, and faculty development. In P. Hutchings, M. T. Huber, & A. Ciccone (Eds.), *Scholarship of teaching and learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact* (p. 45-68). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Owston, R. D. (1997). The World Wide Web: A technology to enhance teaching and learning? *Educational Researcher, 26*, 27-33. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1176036

PR Newswire. (2013, January 23). New online platform gives college students a voice for change. *Education News Today*. Retrieved from http://education.einnews.com/pr_news/133571534/new-online-platform-gives-college-students-a-voice-for-change.

Angela Miller, BS is a graduate student in the Sociology Master's program with an emphasis on Women's Studies at the University of Houston-Clear Lake. Aspiring to be a sociology professor, she has worked as a teaching assistant for psychology and women's studies courses, a research assistant in the applied social issues lab, an assistant to the Teaching-Learning Enhancement Center, and a former president of the Gamma chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta, the international sociology honor society. Her research includes the intersection of race and gender issues and social privilege. She also examined generational differences in attitudes regarding the transition from childhood to adulthood. Currently she is conducting research for her thesis regarding to what extent the abortion issue played in the 2012 presidential election.

Institutional Assessment and the Intellectual Work of Teaching and Learning in First-Year Composition

Emily Donnelli-Sallee, PhD
Associate Professor of English
Park University

Institutional assessment initiatives can provide opportunities to make the intellectual work of teaching and learning in composition studies more visible. Reciprocally, the scholarship of teaching and learning's situatedness within disciplinary norms and values can enhance institutional assessments, providing a check on the tendency to rely on singular, overly generalized mechanisms for capturing course- or program-level data. This article shares one example of the reciprocal relationship that can occur between disciplinary and institutional assessment initiatives.

Given the role first-year composition courses typically occupy in university general education programs, those of us who direct writing programs are often the first faculty within English departments to be invited to wed our work to institutional assessment. As with any arranged marriage, the "getting to know you" phase can prove quite awkward, and with good reason. Composition's emphasis on writing-as-process translates into assessments that privilege the qualitative and local, and that often (actively) resist the quantitative and generalizable.

My own experience integrating the portfolio assessment used in my program's first-year writing seminar courses into the University's new learning outcomes manager software was no different than the above characterization – I was deeply skeptical about the happily ever after, about reaping an instructional or intellectual return on investment that would have meaning for the writing program. However, in spite of my skepticism, I found that institutional assessment initiatives can provide valuable opportunities to make the intellectual work of teaching and learning in first-year writing more visible to publics outside of the humanities. Reciprocally, the scholarship of teaching and learning's situatedness within disciplinary norms and values can enhance institutional assessments by providing a check on the tendency to rely on singular, universal mechanisms for capturing course- and program-level data. In this way, my experience bears witness to Huber, Hutchings, and Ciccone's (2011) argument that mutually transformative relationships can occur between the scholarship of teaching and learning and institutional assessment.

Institutional Context

Park University's first-year writing program consists of two seminar courses, EN 105: Critical Reading, Writing, and Thinking across Contexts, and EN 106: Academic Research and Writing. Both courses are requirements in the University's general education program, and both are taught across all four of the institution's instructional modalities: 16-week face-to-face, eight-week face-to-face, eight-week online, and eight-week blended (where a portion of the instruction, not to exceed 50%, occurs online). Given the multimodal and geographically distributed nature of teaching and learning at Park University, comprising 40 campus centers and a large online program, comparing learner outcomes across instructional modes is key to ensuring curriculum consistency. The use of common course learning objectives, a common summative assessment (for first-year composition, the writing portfolio) and rubric, and common textbooks lends consistency without closing off opportunities for academic freedom. While setting

the tone and general expectations for a process-oriented writing course, however, these input measures alone cannot adequately answer questions about the comparability of student learning outcomes across the University system.

The University's assessment pilot for general education provided the opportunity to input the assessment materials for these writing courses (the course objectives, summative portfolio assignment, and accompanying rubric) into an outcomes manager software attached to the University's learning management system. Through this process, the portfolio assignment was codified, as was use of the rubric – which, up until this point, had served primarily by example, identifying dimensions of the writing portfolio instructors could attend to when grading: focus, development, organization, technical skill, adaptation to audience, and rhetorical purpose. Via the outcomes manager, the writing portfolio assignment and the rubric criteria moved from the realm of pedagogical suggestion or best practice model to that of institutional directive, with the Office of Academic Assessment tracking use of the outcomes manager rubric as a tool for recording student performance.

Assessment in First-Year Composition and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

In "English Studies in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning," Salvatori and Donahue (2002) reason that "because of specific historical, economic, and institutional contingencies, composition studies has witnessed a remarkable proliferation of research in writing pedagogy" (p. 70). A significant focus of this inquiry has been in the area of assessment, the resulting scholarship yielding rich and varied results – from research on particular aspects of writing instruction (e.g., Rebecca Moore Howard's work on plagiarism, 2008) to longitudinal studies of the transferability of first-year writing instruction (e.g., Marilyn Sternglass' *Time to Know Them,* 1992) to entirely new paradigms for assessing writing (e.g., Broad's et al. Dynamic Mapping Criteria, 2009). The scholarship of teaching and learning has also invigorated efforts to document and disseminate the intellectual work of teaching (e.g., Amy Goodburn's work, 1997, on the peer review of teaching in English). In short, the scholarship of teaching and learning in composition studies has remained true to its "originating emphasis on students' writing, student writers, students' learning" (Salvatori & Donahue, 2002, p. 83). However, what remains to be seen is whether we have framed our inquiry into student learning, and our philosophies and methods for assessment, in ways that prepare us to make our intellectual work understandable to the audiences outside our writing programs.

When I began exploring how the first-year writing program's guidelines for assigning and assessing the writing portfolio could be adapted for the purposes of institutional assessment, I began to realize that despite a shared vision of promoting student learning, the "shapes that [the] impulse to inquiry takes [in the scholarship of teaching and learning] are sometimes far afield from the kind of work that occupies the institution's office of assessment" (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011, p. 74). Indeed, as Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone observe, the conflicts that arise between these two perspectives – classroom and institution – are largely rhetorical, a matter of audience (p. 69). Whereas the scholarship of teaching and learning is taken up by faculty to investigate self- or disciplinarily-defined questions, with findings disseminated to insider audiences, assessment typically emanates from administrative needs or requirements with results largely used to defend the value and efficacy of an institution's programs to external stakeholders. Not to be underestimated are the epistemological implications posed by these differing audiences – as well as the related potential for new understandings of teaching, learning, and assessment to be generated as diverse audiences are engaged in dialogue.

Mapping Course Assessment to Program Outcomes

The learning objectives and portfolio assessment for our writing program are keyed to disciplinary outcomes, specifically the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) outcomes for first-year composition. Involvement in the University's assessment initiative required alignment of all participating courses with the University's outcomes for general education, called the "literacies" (analytical and critical thinking; community and civic responsibility; scientific inquiry; ethics and values; literary and artistic expression; interdisciplinary and integrative thinking). Mapping the relationships among the objectives of our courses, the WPA outcomes, and the University's literacies forced the program to render in explicit terms how our first-year writing courses directly supported the University's vision of general education (Figure 1, shown on p. 54). In doing so, we uncovered opportunities to revise our learning objectives for the courses in ways that would accentuate the relevance of our discipline (as represented in the WPA outcomes) to the general education aims of the University. The value of our two-course required composition sequence was affirmed, and we were equipped with the language to continue championing the value of our courses. Following Adler-Kassner and O'Neill's admonition, compositionists must position their work "within the larger frames surrounding the academy and education generally... [in order to be] understood as 'legitimate'" (2010, p. 99).

However, we found that participation in the institutional assessment initiative for general education not only clarified the contributions of the first-year writing program to general education but also revealed needed enhancements to our curriculum and faculty development initiatives in the writing program.

Results and Discussion

Approximately 88 adjunct instructors teach in the first-year writing program; assisting these instructors with navigation of the learning outcomes software facilitated conversations that extended beyond the software's technical aspects. Instructors had questions to pose and insights to offer about the course objectives, textbooks, and the writing portfolio assessment itself. For instance, some of the field-specific terminology and criteria present in the rubric for the writing portfolio assumed a level of congruity with the WPA outcomes not evident to all of our adjunct instructors, many of whom were trained to teach literature.

The instructors also expressed concerns about the extent to which students could readily interpret the rubric dimensions and criteria. This dialogue helped make sense of the initial round of data pulled from the learning outcomes manager, which showed little variance in student performance within or across rubric dimensions, with the exception of the "technical skill" category, encompassing grammar, mechanics, and documentation (with an $n=546$ students, this was the only rubric dimension with statistically significant variation). Arguably, most instructors perceived that category as the most objective and the criteria most straightforward in explaining "does not meet," "meets," and "exceeds expectations" rankings. As a result, we are currently revising the rubric and creating professional development materials that will better scaffold instructors' use of the rubric to assess the portfolio and, most importantly, to support students' writing processes.

The University's assessment initiative for general education usefully challenged the vision of assessment often generated by the scholarship of teaching and learning in the discipline of composition studies – intensely qualitative, difficult to scale. Those of us in the writing program gained from the experience of translating our descriptive approach into a more prescriptive and ubiquitous tool, as we made sense of the quantitative data that resulted. At the same time, the experience highlighted the need for a more explicit rendering of the norms and nomenclature of assessment in composition, uncovering an important way that the scholarship of teaching and learning productively informs institutional assessment –

PARK UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM MAP: LIBERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

PROGRAM: Liberal Education
UNIT RESPONSIBLE: Liberal Education Committee
LAST UPDATED: FALL 2012

[I] Literacy Alignment: The literacy is explicitly or implicitly reflected in the course objectives.

[II] Level of Instruction: E = Emphasized, P = Proficient, and A = Advanced

[III] Core Assessment/Rubric: The literacy is explicitly or implicitly reflected in the core assessment of this course

	Park University Liberal Education Competencies																	
	Analytical and Critical Thinking			Community and Civic Responsibility			Scientific Inquiry			Ethics and Values			Literary and Artistic Expression			Interdisciplinary and Integrative Thinking		
	[I] Core Learning Objectives	[II] Level	[III] Core Assessment/Rubric	[I] Core Learning Objectives	[II] Level	[III] Core Assessment/Rubric	[I] Core Learning Objectives	[II] Level	[III] Core Assessment/Rubric	[I] Core Learning Objectives	[II] Level	[III] Core Assessment/Rubric	[I] Core Learning Objectives	[II] Level	[III] Core Assessment/Rubric	[I] Core Learning Objectives	[II] Level	[III] Core Assessment/Rubric
Core Courses																		
LE 100 First Year Student Seminar																		
EN 105 First Year Writing Seminar I	X	P	X	X	E								X	E	X	X	E	X
EN 106 First Year Writing Seminar II	X	P	X	X	E	X										X	E	X
MA 120 Basic Concepts of Statistics, MA 131 College Algebra																		
CA 103 Public Speaking or TH 105 Oral Communication or CA 105 Introduction to Human Communication																		
CS 140 Introduction to Computers or higher																		
Science with a lab																		
LE 300 Seminar in Integrative and Interdisciplinary Thinking																		
Natural Science (3 cr.)																		
BI 214 Personal & Community Health																		
NS 241 Philosophy & History of Science																		
GGP 120 Global Sustainability																		
GO125 Natural Disasters																		

Figure 1: Park University's Curriculum Map for Liberal Education (adapted from "A Roadmap for Curriculum Coherence and Student Achievement," Southern Connecticut State University)

through its fierce attention to disciplinarity: "[D]isciplinary styles empower the scholarship of teaching, not only by giving scholars a ready-made way to image and present their work but also by giving shape to the problems they choose and the methods of inquiry they use" (Huber & Morreale, 2002, p. 32).

One key influence of disciplinarity on the design of writing assessments in composition studies is the importance placed on global or "higher-order" concerns (focus, development, organization) over sentence-level or "lower-order" concerns (grammar, mechanics). At the start of the assessment project, we quickly encountered a conflict between this disciplinary value and the technology of the learning outcomes manager, and we modified the standard template based on a need to apply extra weight to some dimensions—certain skills and competencies—over others. Despite having developed a functional, weighted rubric, however, additional concerns, squarely based on disciplinary style, arose. Most notably, the institutional assessment model of identifying a single instrument – the writing portfolio/rubric – as the primary means of gauging student learning in the first-year composition courses chafed with our beliefs about disciplinary best practice. As expressed in the College Composition and Communication's position statement on the assessment of writing,

> [i]deally, writing ability must be assessed by *more than one piece of writing*, in more than one genre, written on different occasions, for different audiences, and responded to and evaluated by multiple readers as part of a substantial and sustained writing process… Reflection by the writer on her or his own writing processes and performances holds particular promise as a way of generating knowledge about writing and increasing the ability to write successfully. ("Guiding Principle 3," emphasis added)

Although the writing portfolio typically contains, at minimum, five artifacts, including two essays, related evidence demonstrating student writing processes, and a reflective essay, the learning outcomes management rubric was best designed for assessment of a single artifact. Given the importance of student self-reflection to assessment in the discipline, then, we chose to leverage the outcomes manager software to work with the reflective essay. To address the disciplinary privileging of multiple "methods of inquiry" into teaching and learning, we collaboratively devised with our assessment partners a course map that would offer a more detailed, nuanced portrait of assessment in the courses, while still serving to align the courses with the University's general education outcomes. Importantly, the course map makes room for identification and articulation of a discipline-based rationale for multiple course assessments (Figure 2, shown on p. 56).

In order for institutional assessment to complement the scholarship of teaching and learning, both must operate within "a culture of teaching as intellectual work – work that can be theorized, work whose parameters and conditions of possibility can be analyzed and evaluated in accordance with formally articulated standards, work that can be interpreted within a framework of disciplinary knowledge and modes of inquiry" (Salvatori & Donahue, 2002, p. 84). The course assessment map represents a move toward integrating discipline/department and institutional efforts, which holds potential to foster a culture of teaching *and* assessment as intellectual work.

PARK UNIVERSITY COURSE MAP: EN 105 First Year Writing Seminar I

Course Mapping Worksheet

Course:	EN 105 First Year Writing Seminar I: Critical Reading, Writing and Thinking Across Contexts
Unit Responsible:	English Department
Last Updated:	FALL 2012
Course Description:	An introduction to the recursive processes of writing, the course will emphasize discovery and writing-as-thinking. Students will engage various personal and academic genres, with attention to analyzing the audience and purpose for different writing situations. Course readings expose students to a variety of genres and topics from a range of cultural contexts to promote critical thinking and dialogue. Peer response, reflection, and revision are emphasized through a summative course portfolio.3:0:3

Core Learning Outcomes	University Literacies Addressed (including sub-competencies)	Degree Program Competencies Addressed	*Methods of Course Assessment
1. Apply the writing process to the creation of personal and formal essays (pre-writing, revising, editing, proof-reading, and formatting).			
2. Develop a specific theme and focus that controls and informs the paper.			

Figure 2: Park University's Course Map for Liberal Education (adapted from "A Roadmap for Curriculum Coherence and Student Achievement,"

Conclusion

By tracing the shared "DNA" of the scholarship of teaching and learning and institutional assessment, Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) reconcile two initiatives often perceived to be at odds. In reality, both movements "overlap around one deeply generative shared notion: that the experience and learning of college students can and should be a site for investigation; that there are good questions to be asked about what, how, how much, and how deeply students are learning" (p. 74). As the scholarship of teaching and learning foregrounds, how the investigation of student learning proceeds is highly contextualized within the disciplines. And as institutional assessment challenges, the private sphere of the classroom or discipline is necessarily joined and answerable to the institution, accrediting organizations, governmental bodies, and society at large. When placed into dialogue, these two initiatives can inform one another in ways that benefit student learning in the discipline and across the university.

References

Adler-Kassner, L., and O'Neill, P. (2010). *Reframing writing assessment to improve teaching and learning*. Logan: Utah State UP.

Broad, B., Adler-Kassner, L, Alford, B., Detweiler, J., Estrem, H., Harrington, S.,McBride, M., Stalions, E., and Weeden, S. (2009). *Organic writing assessment: Dynamic criteria mapping in action*. Logan: Utah State UP.

College Composition and Communication. (2009). Writing assessment: A position statement. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/writingassessment

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2008). Outcomes statement for first-year composition. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/files/wpa-outcomes-statement.pdf

Goodburn, A. (2002). (Re)viewing teaching as intellectual work in English studies: Insights from a peer review of teaching project. *Reader: Essays in Reader-Oriented Theory, Criticism, and Pedagogy, 47,* 83-108.

Howard, R.M., and Robillard, A.E. (Eds.). (2008). *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Boynton/Cook.

Huber, M.T. and Morreale, S.P. (2002). Situating the scholarship of teaching and learning: A cross-disciplinary conversation. In M.T. Huber and S.P. Morreale (Eds.), *Disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 1-24). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

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

Salvatori, M.R., and Donahue, P. (2002). English studies in the scholarship of teaching. In M.T. Huber and S.P. Morreale (Eds.), *Disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 69-86). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Sternglass, M., (1997). *Time to know them: A longitudinal study of writing and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Author Note

Emily Donnelli-Sallee, PhD, is an Associate Professor of English at Park University. She served as Program Coordinator for First-Year Writing from 2009-2012. Donnelli-Sallee teaches courses in writing and rhetoric, and she serves as editor of Missouri Campus Compact's Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education. Her research examines the ways that public sphere theory can inform civic engagement pedagogies, particularly in first-year writing courses. Her work has appeared in Reflections: A Journal of Public Rhetoric, Civic Writing, and Service Learning; To Improve the Academy; and JAC: A Journal of Rhetoric, Culture, and Politics. Donnelli-Sallee earned her PhD in English from the University of Kansas.

When Rubrics Collide: One Undergraduate Writing Tutor's Experience Negotiating Faculty and Institutional Assessments

Kelli Martin, BA
BSEd Candidate
Park University

This article recounts one undergraduate writing tutor's experience helping a fellow peer navigate an institutional assessment rubric that seemed to contrast the assessment criteria provided by the student's instructor. This article presents a reflection on that experience, framed by Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone's (2011) work on institutional assessment and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

I had just started my shift in the academic support center, and I was waiting for one of my regular students to show up for writing tutoring. Jana had met with me nearly every week since I started working at the University as a peer writing tutor. Normally, Jana brought with her a rough draft for me to read, or a highlighted assignment sheet with notes detailing her ideas for a topic. However, this day was different. As she came plodding in, I questioned where her bubbly personality was hiding and why she looked so grim. She flopped the 11-page assignment sheet on to the table. It had no highlighting, and her only notes were a series of question marks in the left margin. She stared past me through the whites of her eyes. Her forehead rested in the palms of her hands. She nearly cried: "I have no idea what I'm supposed to do." While it was disconcerting to see Jana crumble in the face of an assignment, I remained optimistic and confident. As a tutor for nearly six years, first at the community college and now at the university level, there were few approaches I had not seen. Except this time.

When I glanced down at the assignment sheet, I saw two rubrics, each containing different criteria and language and, at points, seemingly conflicting descriptions. One rubric was a template provided by the institution, and the other was written by Jana's instructor. Although I had often helped mediate student frustration with assignments, I had never before encountered a set of conflicting rubrics for a single assignment. Years of training, both as a writing tutor and preservice secondary education teacher, did not prepare me to understand what I was seeing – a conflict that echoed far outside the confines of the tutoring session.

That day with Jana immediately came to mind when I read Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone's (2011) chapter, "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Meets Assessment," in the collection *Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact.* Jana's experience stands as a perfect example of how institutional assessment and the efforts of individual instructors to document student performance at the course level often collide on the pages of a syllabus, with consequences for students. As the authors observed, "the connection [between the scholarship of teaching and institutional assessment] sometimes feels fragile, and purposes are often different, even at odds" (Schodt, qtd in Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccione, 2011, p. 72).

In Jana's case, neither the instructor nor the institution harbored ill intentions. On the contrary, her instructor's rubric was written for students – to describe and foster self-assessment of their working knowledge of the content. In contrast, the institution's rubric, while it seemed written primarily for faculty and administrative audiences, had an equally laudable goal: to enable the comparison of student outcomes across course sections and modalities, online and face-to-face. The different audiences and uses for the rubrics illustrated the reality that although

[b]oth the scholarship of teaching and learning and assessment are dedicated [to] being more public about the learning that happens (or does not) in college and university classrooms, and to making that learning visible….the publics they have in view can be quite different (Hutchings, et al., 2011, p. 69).

My background as a preservice English teacher has also made me aware of the tensions that exist between classroom and institutional approaches to student learning assessment. My student teaching practicums have exposed me to a diverse array of learners in the high school setting and, ironically, a distinct lack of variety in the summative assessment instruments used to measure their learning. Nowhere is this disconnect more apparent than with the students I primarily work with: English language learners. Often these students have a very good working knowledge of disciplinary content but lack the linguistic skills to read a multiple-choice test or write an essay question. Does a student challenged to express his or her above-average content knowledge, due to poor reading and writing skills, deserve a lower score than the student with exemplary writing skills but only marginal understanding of the content? Assessments which can parse the differences between linguistic skills and academic content knowledge are rare, and certainly not easily adapted to district- or state-wide implementation. While the results of these authentic assessments serve the purposes of classroom teachers, they are difficult to represent on a spreadsheet. As Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) pointed out, "[course assessments] may yield densely qualitative data that do not resolve into neat findings" (p. 74). However, the possibility exists for institutional assessment to strengthen, and be strengthened by, course assessments which seek the kind of nuanced understanding of learners described above. Through collaboration among administrators, faculty, and students, assessments can be devised that generate the numbers needed for large-scale implementation and reporting and still have meaning for instructors and for students like Jana.

Of all I have learned about being a future educator, perhaps the most useful has been the ability to translate standards into measurable objectives, and to then use those objectives to produce an assessment scale. Such assessment training, while not always a part of the education of post-secondary faculty, is valuable: It not only provides a means of untangling "messy" qualitative data, but it also helps teachers find a use for quantitative data in their own instructional and scholarly explorations of student learning. Perhaps this is the crux of the conflict Jana and I witnessed: Where the institution wanted to see definitions and examples of terminology, quantifiable and generalizable, the instructor wanted to measure phenomena far more qualitative. Where the institution wanted to focus on what was perceived as measurable (for instance, the number of sources incorporated into the essay assignment, or the number of grammatical errors crossing the line between "meets" and "does not meet" expectations), the instructor wanted more room for those elements of writing less amenable to quantification. Although faculty "may have a hard time seeing how institutional scores and results relate to their plans for Monday morning's class or for their department's curricular redesign" (p. 73), Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone argue that the challenge of accepting and adapting institutional assessment is worth the work. In the field of education, preservice teachers are taught that these objectives come from standards. Higher education faculty can use this same process to analyze disciplinary standards, develop content objectives, and then work in collaboration with administrators to represent those assessment criteria in ways that serve both internal and external audiences.

In Park University's School for Education, there is a mantra which every student knows well: assessment *for* learning, not *of* learning. This mantra is modeled on the ideas of Stiggins, Arter, Chappuis, and Chappuis (2007), who focused on the importance of formative assessment and the practical use of data

from large-scale assessments. This is where instructors and teachers could gain insight from institutional assessment and its emphasis on reflection and action to "close the loop." For example, nearly every semester I watch collaborating teachers at my internships stress over standardized tests. Then, as soon as the testing is over, they seem to forget about the exam altogether. Months and sometimes years pass before results from such tests come back, and by then the data is history. Arguably, such teachers lack a perspective on the value of summative assessment data in promoting curricular and instructional change. As Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone pointed out, institutional assessment offices can engage with individual faculty to assist in interpreting and acting on data; such partnerships can transform assessment from a top-down mandate to a collaborate effort central to academic quality.

As teachers and tutors, we preach self-reflection, but how often do we follow that model, and how can institutional assessments help keep us honest? Collaboration between faculty and administrators opens up the potential for assessment to be used for wide-scale professional development. Through assessment data, teachers can reflect on what they teach well, and where they need to focus their professional development efforts: "Teachers need a chance to step back from their own practice and see students' work and their own anew, from a different angle and altitude" (Hutchings, et al., 2011, p. 78). I understand that raw data can be the least biased source of feedback I may ever receive as a teacher. Institutional assessments, due to their scale, can demonstrate patterns of student learning that force teachers to review, reflect, and revise their approaches.

Most importantly, Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone reassure that university and faculty, in their course-level assessment, do not have to fight against one another (p. 72). In reality, institutional assessment and the scholarship of teaching and learning can work together when they have common objectives. As a future English teacher, I see the Common Core State Standards Initiative (www.corestandards.org/) as a prime example of the two types of assessment working together. These standards provide the consistent goals that districts crave. For teachers, common core standards are the real-world application, with the greatest potential for measurement, allowing learning to be put into use-oriented terms.

Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone offer collaboration as the essential solution to creating an environment in which the scholarship of teaching and learning works with institutional assessment to achieve harmony and create bridges between internal and external audiences. One exemplar of this collaborative approach which they discuss in detail is the Carnegie Foundation's project *Strengthening Pre-Collegiate Education in Community Colleges.* This group brings a variety of people together to collaborate on goals for student learning and strategies for meeting these goals. Members of this group include administrators, full-time faculty, adjuncts, counselors, and even students. What I appreciate most about this process is the fact that students are not excluded from offering suggestions for goals and strategies. When students are involved in making decisions, assessment is more likely to meet and reflect their needs.

I propose opening participation in such collaborations to peer tutors. Tutors from all disciplines have much to contribute to the conversation on objectives, especially because we often supplement the instruction of teachers or scaffold the information for struggling students. Additionally, these opportunities are important for tutors aspiring to be future classroom educators, as such collaboration builds understanding of learning objectives and the importance of creating connections between classroom and institution. Colleges and universities could create much more effective institutional assessments, without sacrificing accreditation or various other outside pressures, if they could collaborate with a variety of groups to construct learning objectives that satisfy the needs of administrators without imposing on the scholarship of learning. This is necessarily collaborative work.

I often tell the students I work with at the high school and college level, "writing is a process." This principle applies to writing an assessment, too. Just as an essay needs a thesis as a strong foundation, assessments need objectives to maintain focus. Agreement on these objectives makes the evidence and support for an assessment stronger. After the assessment is drafted and tested, it will inevitably need revision based on feedback from diverse stakeholders. Neither instructors nor institutions are capable of constructing a perfect assessment. Everyone, including Jana and me, can contribute to bridging that gap between the scholarship of teaching and learning and institutional assessment.

References

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

Stiggins, R., Arter, J., Chappuis, J., and Chappuis S. (2007). *Classroom assessment for student learning: Doing it right—using it well.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kelli Martin is currently a senior at Park University, double majoring in English Literature and Secondary Education. Martin also works as a peer writing tutor at Park University and Metropolitan Community College – Maple Woods in Kansas City, Missouri. She currently serves as secretary for the Park University chapter of Sigma Tao Delta, the international English honors society as well as secretary of Park University's chapter of ASCD, an organization which develops programs, products, and services for educators and preservice educators.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Transformation and Transgression

Laura Bolf-Beliveau, PhD
Associate Professor, Department of English
University of Central Oklahoma

Chapter Five of The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered (2011) suggests that traditional research scholarship methodology can inform and reform the ways in which we value and evaluate teaching. The authors discuss applying research methodology as way to complete this process. This article suggests that using theoretical frames, often used in qualitative methodology, creates another way to transform perceptions of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Two theoretical frames, transformative learning and critical consciousness, are explored and applied to the author's own teaching experiences and discipline mandates.

The authors of *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered* offer a powerful statement in their fifth chapter: "Cultural change seldom moves easily or evenly through complex systems; it can take years of advocacy, activism, and experience to reach that Gladwellian tipping point" (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011, p. 105). This is particularly true as they discuss ways in which the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) can "work purposefully to bring faculty roles and rewards into alignment with a view of teaching as scholarly work" (p. xx). Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) suggest we craft guidelines for "evaluation, documentation, and peer review that adequately recognize the scholarship of teaching and learning" (p. xx).

There is little dissension on my part. As a teacher educator with over twenty years in the field of English education, I have engaged in teaching that closely relates to the scholarship as described by the authors that suggest this type of work "exhibits clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique" (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011, p. 91). Both teaching and research can use these categories to better understand student learning. Absent from that list, however, was an element of research that I find highly useful as a qualitative researcher: the theoretical frame. Theoretical frames use a particular theory, stance, or philosophy as a guide to the construction of research questions, completion of literature reviews, collection and analysis of data, and summary of findings. That theory also helps to make assumptions and form hypotheses for conclusions and implications. For example, previous research of mine (Bolf-Beliveau, 2007) studied first-year female middle and high school English teachers. The study focused on their emotional responses to difference or disrupting forces in their classrooms. To better understand these women's lived experiences, I read the data from the perspective of feminist post-structuralist theory. My conclusions, therefore, discuss subject position, language, and discourse. A theoretical frame can direct much of this type of research.

This article suggests that theoretical frames can also be useful when teacher-researchers use the philosophical underpinnings of SoTL. In fact, combining theoretical frameworks, such as transformative learning and transgression/critical consciousness, as done below, can help to develop more "elaborate" and "nuanced" (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011, p. 104) understandings of the link between teaching and research. For the purposes of this article, the term "teacher-researcher" will denote college and university level academic positions that require both teaching and scholarship for promotion and tenure. However, this term will also be used to describe faculty who engage in the praxis of teacher as researcher and researcher as teacher. These individuals engage in the scholarship of teaching and the teaching of scholarship. The two

theoretical frames discussed below will show how a philosophical stance can inform,/reform/deform the teacher-researcher. The first frame describes transformative learning, an integral part of my university's mission, as a powerful framework for understanding SoTL. The second focuses on transgression, as defined by bell hooks, as another method to investigate the possibilities and problems of SoTL.

Transformative learning can be used as a theoretical frame to see teaching as "scholarly work" (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011, p. xx). My institution, the University of Central Oklahoma (UCO), has a Center for Excellence in Transformative Teaching and Learning (CETTL) that provides resources for faculty to implement these principles. In the document "What is Transformative Learning? (Pt. 1)," CETTL describes transformative learning from the student's perspective as a disorienting dilemma, an ongoing self-examination, a critical assessment of assumptions, an exploration of options, etc. Then a connection is made to what is valued at our institution:

> At UCO, this is exactly what we aspire to accomplish in students' lives and in their learning. Through exposure to the Central Six tenets, we work to provide the learning environment that makes it more likely students will experience transformations in their thinking than if they went to college at a place which did not—at least consciously and explicitly—attempt to create such opportunities (CETTL, 2012, p. 1).

The Central Six tenets are Discipline Knowledge, Leadership, Problem Solving (Scholarly and Creative Activities), Service Learning/Civic Engagement, Global and Cultural Competencies, and Health and Wellness. In course syllabi, faculty must indicate how each course incorporates these transformative categories.

In another publication, CETTL explains that "You can't 'make' a Transformative Learning experience happen inside students' head, but you can intentionally create the activities and environments within which it is far more likely to occur, then assess how frequently students report having such experiences" (2013, p. 1). Reflection is a "big part" of transformative learning, so using student journals, formative feedback, and student portfolios can help professors collect data and track students over time (CETTL, 2013, p. 2-3). Although the current mandated student evaluation process does not yet align with transformative learning and our Central Six, the university is providing faculty with a lens through which to view and think about our scholarship of teaching and learning. When applied to Exhibit 5.1 in Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone's Chapter Five, we see that UCO's transformative learning theoretical frame and CETTL resources help faculty frame their scholarship of teaching and learning in the areas of Clear Goals, Adequate Preparation, Appropriate Methods, Significant Results, and Reflective Critique (p. 92). Any Effective Presentation would follow as faculty publish the results of their success with transformative learning within tenure and promotion documents and within or without traditional means like presentations, articles, and the like. The framework of transformative learning could provide a way in which teaching and learning is valued and evaluated.

When a university works toward establishing a theoretical framework of teaching and learning, teacher-researchers are provided the opportunity to better their teaching while managing institutional mandates. This is an obvious advantage; individuals are aligned with a philosophical stance that is privileged by the institution, and mirroring such a stance builds efficacy for the teacher-researcher. However, if a teacher-researcher is not in agreement with the university's mission and theoretical stance and does not use it, there are possible negative ramifications such as delays in promotion and tenure. My own work as a teacher-research uses the tenets of transformative learning as described above; however, I combine transformative learning with another theoretical frame, one that has cause contention within my classroom. This additional layer, I believe, is a

powerful tool that accentuates transformative learning. Unfortunately, this theory is much more political in nature and suggests that great care be taken when teacher-researchers use a philosophy that will invite debate.

In *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), bell hooks states:

> The academy is not paradise. But learning is a place where paradise can be created. The classroom with all its limitations remains a location of possibility. In that field of possibility we have the opportunity to labour for freedom, to demand of ourselves and our comrades, an openness of mind and heart that allows us to face reality even as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress. This is education as the practice of freedom (p. 207).

Certainly hooks speaks to Chapter Five in *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered*: valuing teaching and evaluating teaching have the potential for and offer the possibility of freedom for all classroom participants. Boundaries within classrooms shift in multiple ways, and blurring those boundaries offers the greatest potential of valuing and evaluating teaching. The classroom space *should* be one of transformation and transgression.

However, as Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) suggest, "Classroom innovation is always risky" (p. 88). As I describe below, my use of transgression paired with transformative learning was not an easy one. I teach a course entitled Young Adult Literature since 1980, an English department offering for undergraduates and graduate students. Although this course is open to any major, the majority of students are English education majors, and the course focuses on a plethora of young adult titles written for ages 10-18. Students read fourteen books during the semester and the course focuses on these essential questions:

1. How does young adult literature affect identity formation in adolescents?
2. In what ways does this genre inform one's critical literacy?
3. How do individual subject positions affect reading and understanding?
4. Does young adult literature provide opportunities for adolescents to better understand social justice?

My theoretical stance is grounded in UCO's tenets of transformative learning, but is also enhanced by Paulo Friere's *critical consciousness*, a method of transgression. This additional theoretical frame is clearly explored in the first two weeks of the course. Shor (1993) specifies four qualities of critical consciousness: power awareness, critical literacy, desocialization, and self-organization/self-education (p. 32-33). I ask students to think about these concepts from their own perspective and that of the adolescents that read the book. While this stance does indeed meet the imperative of UCO's transformative learning and Central Six, I also push my students to transgress, to move beyond the boundaries of their own experience.

For the purposes of this article, I will focus on how two elements of critical consciousness provide a theoretical frame by which my scholarship of teaching and learning can be assessed. First, I ask students to think about how society and history informs human action, what Shor (1993) calls "knowing who exercises dominant power in society for what ends and how power is currently organized and used in society" (p. 32). I also focus on desocialization, "recognizing and challenging the myths, values, behaviors, and language learned in mass culture; critically examining the regressive values operating in society...which are internalized into consciousness" (Shor, 1993, p. 32). Both of these become contentious when we discuss David Levithan's *Boy Meets Boy*.

Published in 2003, Levithan's work is set in a utopian society where most people accept and celebrate Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgendered/Questioning (LGBTQ) individuals and communities. Paul, the protagonist of the story, was the first openly gay third-grade president and now as a high school sophomore, fits in

with almost everyone at his school. The novel is a love story that mirrors many traditional tropes of young adult romance novels: a love triangle, a misunderstanding that leads to a break up, and the eventual happy ending. What is unique, of course, is that these tropes are applied to nonheterosexual relationships. In addition to reading the novel, students explore several academic articles that discuss the implications of LGBTQ young adult literature for all adolescent readers. We also read about gender performativity and Queer Theory.

One semester I also provided students with Chase and Ressler's (2009) "An LBGT/Queer Glossary." One entry proved quite upsetting to a student.

> **Homophobia**: The irrational fear of LGBT people and those perceived to be LGBT, their sexual relationships, and their gender expressions (p. 24).

This student fixated on the word "irrational" and indicated that she thought homosexuality was morally wrong, but that did not make her irrational. I prompted her to think about the situation from the position of an LGBTQ student. She was not moved by that suggestion. I asked questions that suggested looking at the definition from the perspective of critical consciousness. How does the definition challenge our perceptions? How might it disrupt heteronormativity? The class then reminded me that we were in "the buckle of the Bible Belt." That proved to be enough explanation for the majority of the students who were ready to move to the next subject. Many of the students were not interested in interrogating power structures or challenging myths.

Ironically, the next novel had the same goals of interrogating power structures and challenging myths. The novel's subject, however was much more appealing to the students. The novel was Stork's (2011) *Marcelo in the Real World*, a story about an adolescent boy with an Asperger's-like syndrome. Marcelo's father demands that he work in a law firm one summer, and there Marcelo discovers how different the "real world" is. Marcelo grapples with issues of sexual attraction, bullying, injustice related to poverty, and prejudice. As with *Boy Meets Boy*, students are asked to read supplementary material to extend their understanding of the novel and critical consciousness. One piece, Miller's (2012) "Mythology of the Norm: Disrupting the Culture of Bullying in Schools" states:

> The mythology of the "norm" has direct repercussions for schools, and its ideological reinforcement is the primary cause of bullying today. Though it is difficult to pinpoint an origin for "the norm," the medical model and its systemic structural power is one powerful institution that perpetuates this mythology (p. 107).

Like the definition of homophobia, Miller's piece was used to explore power relationships and accepted myths of our society. Unlike the definition of homophobia, students immediately engaged with Miller's statement and used it to evaluate the effectiveness of the book and its relationship to adolescent identity formation. *Marcelo in the Real World* was listed as a favorite of the semester, and students used it to discuss how the medical model and Disability Theory helped them see the injustices in Marcelo's world. They often selected the book as one that could help adolescents think about the importance of social justice.

Although this example is limited to one teacher-researcher's work with students studying literature, it could be applicable to those of us teaching science and discussing evolution theory. Or, teacher-researchers in the nursing field may face dissonance when discussing end-of-life choices. A theoretical stance, like one of critical consciousness, of transgression, can be, as Shor (1993) suggests, political. Classrooms can become "contact zones" (Pratt, 1991). Sometimes these contact zones produce transformation and transgression. Sometimes neither of these occurs. In either case, those of us who enjoy the praxis of teacher as researcher and researcher as teacher can find great joy in the interplay between

transformation and transgression. While issues of LGBTQ caused dissonance in my literature course, the classroom was a vibrant space for learning. But the political nature of transgression means that the teacher-researcher must be willing to take risks to merge two theoretical frames as I did, and there could be negative implications for those interested in using political theoretical frameworks. While the advantages of using transformational learning by itself include a close alignment with institutional belief systems, the disadvantage of pairing transformative learning with transgression would be producing contact zones that may disengage students or complicate institutional demands like preparing promotion and tenure materials. If student evaluations show anger towards the stance being used by a teacher-researcher, then that data could be used as a way to punish the individual. Transgression as a means of transformation is not a given outcome of joining these two stances.

However, a strength of Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone's discussion of SoTL is that it offers broad recommendations that "must be tailored and adapted to each campus's distinctive mission, history, and culture" (2011, p. xix). Each discipline and college or university setting must establish these based on a variety of imperatives. For example, my work with critical consciousness aligns with that mandated by accreditation standards. The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE) require that I provide data for this standard:

> **Professional Knowledge and Skills**
> VI. *Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions can enhance students' opportunities to learn in English Language Arts.*
> Element 1: Candidates plan and implement English language arts and literacy instruction that promotes social justice and critical engagement with complex issues related to maintaining a diverse, inclusive, equitable society.
> Element 2: Candidates use knowledge of theories and research to plan instruction responsive to students' local, national and international histories, individual identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender expression, age, appearance, ability, spiritual belief, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and community environment), and languages/dialects as they affect students' opportunities to learn in ELA (2012, p. 2).

Therefore, both my teaching and my students' learning must demonstrate knowledge and application of issues related to social justice. My use of critical consciousness in this young adult literature course helps achieve these goals. Other disciplines may have similar requirements for accreditation or governing entities that suggest best practices. The advantage of using my institution's commitment to transformative learning **and** my discipline's commitment to transgression through political theories like social justice is that learning is constructed within larger frameworks, and students can find their place among/between/within these systems.

The strength of SoTL, I believe, lies in its blurring of boundaries, its own transgressive potential. As hooks (1994) states, academic freedom should transgress boundaries. By applying traditional research methodology—including a theoretical frame—to teaching and learning, faculty and students have the opportunity to see academia from a much more holistic perspective. Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) tell us that cultural change is complex and takes many years to achieve; however, their text lays the groundwork for such change, and I believe their arguments help scholars/ researchers/students raise their own critical consciousness of what academic communities can become. We may not be at the Gladwellian tipping point quite yet, but *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered* shows it is within our reach.

References

Bolf-Beliveau, L. (2007). *English/language arts teachers' emotional response to difference: A feminist poststructural analysis*. (Unpublished dissertation). University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK.

Center for Excellence in Transformative Teaching and Learning (CETTL). (2012). "What is Transformative Learning? (Pt. 1)." Retrieved from: http://www.uco.edu/academic-affairs/cettl/TLGuideFiles/2012-03-tl.pdf

Center for Excellence in Transformative Teaching and Learning (CETTL). (2013). "Assessing Transformative Learning (Pt. 2): Doing and Measuring TL." Retrieved from: http://www.uco.edu/academic-affairs/cettl/cettl-files/newsletter-docs/2013-02/2013-02-newsletter.pdf#Page=1

Chase, B., & P. Ressler. (2009). "An LBGT/queer glossary." *English Journal*, *98*(4), 23-24.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress. Education as the practice of freedom*. London: Routledge.

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

Levithan, D. (2003). *Boy meets boy*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Miller, S.J. (2012). "Mythology of the norm: Disrupting the culture of bullying in schools." *English Journal*, *101*(6), 107-109.

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). (2012). "NCTE/NCATE standards for initial preparation of teachers of secondary English language arts, grades 7-12." Retrieved from: http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CEE/NCATE/ApprovedStandards_111212.pdf

Pratt, M.L. (1991). "Arts of the contact zone." *Profession*, 33-40.

Shor, I. (1993). "Education is politics: Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy." In P. McLaren & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter*. (p. 25-35). London: Routledge.

Stork, F.X. (2011). *Marcelo in the real world*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Laura Bolf-Beliveau is an associate professor in the Department of English at the University of Central Oklahoma, where she coordinates the English education program. A former high school teacher, Dr. Bolf-Beliveau's research interests include how teachers' dispositions toward difference affect their literature instruction and how preservice teachers' beliefs about social justice affect their pedagogy. She also studies how popular culture intersects with theory. Most notably, Dr. Bolf-Beliveau has written about HBO's **The Wire** *and its depiction of critical consciousness.*

The Friction between Faculty Evaluations and Rewards: Reconsidering Teaching's Rhetoric and Recognition

Nicole Womack
BAEd Candidate
University of Central Oklahoma

Educators know the reality and the inadequacies of current evaluation systems – there are gaps between what is defined as good teaching, how faculty members are assessed, and how they are rewarded (or not) for their work in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Student evaluations are ineffective tools to assess teachers. Educators must be given the opportunity to show their work and achievements and to develop a rich community of support, but they also must be evaluated in various formats to provide the best learning opportunities for students.

Defining Scholarship

The expectations placed upon educators by administrators and students is a multifaceted beast; Pat Hutchings, first author of *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered*, defines it as follows in the chapter titled "Valuing – and Evaluating – Teaching": "The scholarship of teaching and learning encompasses a broad set of practices that engage teachers in looking closely and critically at student learning in order to improve their own courses and programs, and to share insights with other educators who can evaluate and build on their efforts" (2011, p. xix). Although teaching is often thought of as consisting solely of the interaction between a teacher and students, much more is involved. Teaching well at any level of education requires exorbitant amounts of time, effort, commitment, and personal investment: Teachers must have a proficient knowledge of their subject field, base their lessons on effective teaching methodology, prepare course content, assess student learning, reflect upon past and current lessons taught, research and learn new theories and practices for teaching, and be closely involved in the institution in which he or she is teaching. Educators must do all of this and more, while being subject to formal evaluations from administration and students by which they will reap the consequences or rewards. Hutchings points out, though, that "there remains a troubling gap between rhetoric about teaching's value and the realities of teaching's recognition and reward" (2011, p. 87). The bridge between the gap lies in better defining the true goals of education and how to properly assess whether or not educators are living up to those demands.

Faculty Evaluations: My View as a Student and Future Educator

As an English education major and future educator, I have studied and applied the idea of the scholarship of teaching and learning to the academic and professional aspects of my life – these includes the reality and importance of evaluations to which I will be subject. Where faculty evaluations currently stand, there is a strong emphasis on higher education teachers being recognized and rewarded for outstanding scholarly research, student achievement, and student evaluations. However, Hutchings finds fault with this approach: "The issues of surrounding recognition and reward are complicated by the variety of activities that the scholarship of teaching and learning can involve…think of this work as a continuum, with phases (and products) pertaining to each of the familiar faculty roles in teaching, service (to the institution or profession), and research" (2011, p. 88). The world of teaching encompasses multiple facets that are difficult or impossible to evaluate using the current standards of measurement.

Hutchings cites several common examples of evaluations in use, including personal statements or self-evaluations, peer reviews of teaching materials, and peer evaluations of classroom teaching (2011, p. 99-100). While these methods of assessment could prove to be useful, they do not fully assess an educator's scholarship of teaching and learning as a whole and are therefore inaccurate if the sole basis of evaluation. Hutchings states that "This persistent theme – that teaching evaluation has simply not been up to the job – may reflect faculty dissatisfaction with what many see as an overreliance on the quantified measurements (and distinctions in performance) allowed by student evaluations" (2011, p. 100). More must be done to give educators a better method of evaluation that does not rely on public opinion.

It is true that student evaluations are an inadequate method of assessing a teacher's effectiveness and performance in the classroom, aside from the fact that such evaluations do not address the service and research aspects of the scholarship of teaching and learning discussed by Hutchings et al. These student evaluations can come in various formats, but the types that I have experienced have consisted of surface-level questions addressing various aspects of the professor's teaching, the course, and areas available for student comments and feedback. The first problem with these types of student evaluations is that they are useless when evaluating a professor with tenure. Let me speak from personal experience: the faculty member could have been unorganized, unreliable, biased, and ineffective, but he or she continued to teach the same courses semester after semester, allowing students and the teacher to slip through the system. The same evaluations can reap rewards (if heavily based on student response) for other faculty members in a grossly unbalanced way – the professor who wins the popularity contest with students vs. the less popular, strict professor who requires responsibility and quality work from students. For example, a professor under whom I have studied was promoted; it was well-known among students that this faculty member regularly canceled class, gave open-book group exams, required very little effort from students throughout the course, and yet came highly recommended. On the other hand, professors who have required more effort and responsibility of their students were evaluated harshly simply because students did not desire to produce the work needed to succeed; many of these faculty members remained as adjunct or part-time professors and were not adequately evaluated under this assessment.

What Evaluations Should Do and Become

It is clear that current evaluation systems cannot fully and properly assess the level and continuity of the scholarship of teaching and learning. In fact, Hutchings et al. state that an increasing "desire to represent richer views of teaching than student course evaluations can afford is widespread across U.S. higher education today" (2011, p. 100). But how should these evaluations be constructed in order to more accurately portray this information? The duties of a teacher should be assessed in their entirety according to what he or she is expected to do as a member of the faculty, and not be based solely upon student reviews of classroom performance. The most effective evaluation of a teacher's scholarship of teaching and learning is holistic in its approach: "In other words, work is scholarly to the extent that it exhibits clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique – characteristics that can also be used as guides for documentation and standards for evaluation" (Hutchings et al., 2011, p. 91). With this type of approach, teacher evaluations would gather information pertinent to the wider scope of an educator's performance while still holding specific areas of accountability.

One suggestion offered in the text is that of the "course portfolio," which would be used "to assess student learning and allow faculty to make 'midcourse corrections'" (Hutchings et al., 2011, p. 101). This method of evaluation, described by Hutchins, is an effective way "to create a genre that would allow faculty to

improve their courses based on critique and conversation about the materials with colleagues, learn from each other's experiences in more systematic ways, and provide a platform for further work in the scholarship of teaching and learning" (2011, p. 101). This approach would be similar to certain teacher education course requirements that I have been required to complete as an English education student. In teaching-methods courses, students must provide numerous examples of teaching materials – grading rubrics, unit themes, lesson plans, rationales, etc. – to professors; in turn, the teachers that grade these assignments are able to appropriately and effectively assess student knowledge and application of the given topic. We must prepare lesson plans in many circumstances; our performance and methods are evaluated by the professors. Education majors must also partake in sixty hours of field experience (also known as time inside a real classroom with actual students) before our semester of student teaching; again, we are evaluated by the teacher whose room we have invaded. In addition, in order to obtain our teaching certificates, all education majors must complete an "e-portfolio" – an example of our best and most crucial work involving field-specific artifacts. These examples are not so different from those that professors would be required to complete in the course portfolio.

But what would be the purpose of the course portfolio? It would not only be to ensure that the educator is attempting to do the work that he or she is expected to do, but it would also provide an avenue by which to develop and maintain an enriching community of administrators and fellow faculty members. Through the course portfolio, constructive criticism and thoughtful suggestions or ideas would prove to be beneficial for all parties involved. Hutchings encourages this idea: "Such guidance is critical: the best portfolio in the world will not be useful unless colleagues read it and know how to discern levels of quality in the work" (Hutchings et al., 2011, p. 101). The course portfolio should by no means be the only way by which educators are evaluated, for it provides no opportunity for real-time observations; nor should the importance of the portfolio be placed above the actual scholarship of teaching and learning – it should provide a concise and comprehensive view of a faculty member's work and accomplishments, but it cannot and should not assess every aspect of a teacher's job. The course portfolio would require a significant amount of time and effort on the faculty member's part, and it is possible that the evaluation process could be lengthened with this method of assessment. Much training and staff development would be needed in order for the course portfolio – or any evaluation like it – to be effective and meaningful, but professors must be given a way to show that they know how to properly explain and demonstrate the chosen teaching methods and reflect on whether or not these are useful for maximum student learning. Hutchings (2011) understands both the amount of effort that this method of evaluation would require as well as its degree of importance:

> More important, this approach to evaluation would invite all faculty to regard teaching as an occasion for inquiry into learning, for becoming familiar with the relevant pedagogical literature, for finding colleagues to work with, and for joining a community that can understand, evaluate, and support their contributions. Clearly, though, moving in this direction will require a comprehensive undertaking, one in which all who care about learning in higher education have critical roles to play (p. 104).

The best professors do the above on a regular basis and of their own accord; they surely know the value of such work and reflection and deem it as critical to their practice.

This could be why the English education department at UCO (and I assume many other education departments) becomes a closely-knit group of people – as future educators who have learned numerous methods, theologies, pedagogies, strategies, theories, etc., we often seek new ways of learning or presenting what we have learned. It is not uncommon for education students to frequently rely on

peers to "understand, evaluate, and support" our methods and decisions in the preparation of our lessons and teaching assignments. We constantly seek constructive criticism from others that know the requirements of our field. The majority of education majors fully embrace the fact that each of us can continually work toward becoming a better teacher, simply because we understand that the quality of our teaching directly affects the students in our classrooms for years to come. Why would educators within colleges and universities not desire to do the same? Figuring out an in-depth, comprehensive evaluation for educators is crucial to the ensure the proper, full assessment of faculty members – the students deserve to have the best professors as their teachers and mentors, and the professors deserve to have fair evaluations and rewards.

Solution and Resolution

What is the solution? Administrators and students – anyone in the position of evaluating a teacher – must look at the complete teaching repertoire that includes the three elements of the scholarship of teaching and learning: teaching, service, and research (Hutchings et al., 2011, p. 88). Similar to education majors during student teaching, faculty members must be evaluated in the classroom over the course of the term, and given constructive criticism and opportunities by administrators to improve pedagogical application. This will take time and money, of course, but it must be done. If we require these things of teachers in public education, why should not professors who teach those future educators be held to the same evaluation and performance standards? This is not to say that the entirety of a professor's recognition should come from the classroom – that is only a fraction of what it takes to be a teacher. Evaluators must value teaching and the scholarship that it entails, as well as redefine what it means to become proficient in all areas of the scholarship of teaching, if the worthy educators are to be valued and rewarded as they should be. Those who evaluate the teachers of the world must strive to provide them with adequate support and recognition, for the educators hold the key to a successful future for their students.

Reference

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

Nicole Womack is a senior undergraduate student at the University of Central Oklahoma pursuing a degree in English Education. She has presented at the College of Liberal Arts Symposium in Spring 2012 as well as the 2012 OCTE Fall Conference, both held at UCO. Mrs. Womack grew up in Southern California but has lived in Oklahoma City since 2003. She plans to begin a career as a High School English teacher and hopes to teach 11th grade American Literature.

Utopia University: A Faculty Member Reflects on Recommendations for the Future of SoTL

Krista D. Forrest, PhD
Professor of Psychology
University of Nebraska at Kearney

I am fortunate. I work in a department where the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) is actively pursued and has been for over 20 years. Colleagues have presented at several teaching conferences within the discipline of psychology, and many have published articles on subjects ranging from working with undergraduates in research partnerships to the effects of using different technologies in the classroom. In addition to departmental support, my small midwestern university's promotion and tenure policy has a statement that specifically recognizes peer-reviewed SoTL as counting toward promotion and tenure. This statement includes a web link to the first Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Report, Rethinking What it Means to be a Scholar (Rice, 1990). [2]

This does not mean the fight for SoTL has ceased on my campus. As stated by Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011), sometimes the battle is not with the university, but with individual departments that hold onto the notion that only discipline specific scholarship is worthy of praise. Although I often encouraged faculty who developed new pedagogical techniques to write about these experiences and submit manuscripts to relevant teaching journals in their discipline, they often replied, "Why would I do that, it won't count?" and "It's not real scholarship." It appears the greater concern about the role of SoTL does not come from the university, or even the college, but often starts with each faculty member.

One of the highlights of Hutchings et al. (2011) is the authors' discussion of Utopia University. They describe a campus of the future where faculty members' SoTL has gone on to change departments and as the departments changed, so did the institution. The goal at Utopia U is to assist students in becoming "expert learners" (p. 113). The University does this through first year seminars, capstone courses taken by juniors, and ongoing programs designed to help each student understand the learning process that best works for him or her. Faculty also strive to learn by conducting research in their own classes. These outcomes are then used in changing courses to best respond to current and even future students. Those same faculty feel encouraged to conduct this research because they know that, if published, it will count toward promotion and tenure. The administration at Utopia U is happy to financially support this work because they know that one way to guarantee the accreditation crucial to their existence is to have excellent, productive faculty who inspire their students to perform at their best.

Hutchings et al. (2011) go on to make several recommendations for institutions to follow if they want to integrate SoTL into their climates. The goal of

---

Note

[2] To best understand my reflections, I think it is important for the reader to consider my experience. I have 20 years of teaching experience, with 16 of those at my current university. Over the last 15 years I have published several articles in pedagogy. I have also served as the director of the Center for Teaching Excellence and developed several new programs designed to assist new and existing faculty in developing innovative courses. For me, as for many others, teaching is not just a job or career; it is my life.

---

this paper is to respond to these suggestions for educating a new professoriate from the point of view of an educator, a SoTL researcher, and a former teaching center director.

1. Understand, Communicate, and Promote an Integrated Vision of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

Hutchings et al. (2011) argue that the terminology, "scholarship of teaching and learning," can be its own nemesis. Faculty members disagree over whether research conducted in SoTL is rigorous enough, promotion and tenure committees disagree about its relevance, and administrators disagree over whether it should be funded. The authors go on to argue that knowing when to use the phrase and when to find alternative, acceptable ways of referring to the discipline can determine whether SoTL will be accepted on a campus. I would like to suggest that the issue may be less about the label SoTL and more about its implications.

In order to promote an intelligible vision of teaching and learning scholarship across a campus or campuses, one of the first things faculty need to do is overcome the fear of failure. Not every discipline specific brings its researcher a preferred outcome. When the findings are not significant or the outcome is counterintuitive to the hypothesis, most researchers reevaluate their work and conduct the research again using different variables, controls, or participants. Scholarship in teaching and learning is no different. Each time faculty members evaluate classroom teaching strategies, academic programs, or curricula, they run the risk of discovering that the techniques or courses they thought worked, that they love, do not contribute to student learning. Some of their beloved teaching techniques, assignments, lectures, and courses are not going to pass the test. Instead of seeing a negative outcome as an end-all failure, faculty need to use that opportunity to change what they do and how they do it. Finding out one technique does not work means there is an opening in the course to try something new. As a result, faculty members grow as instructors. It follows that academic majors or programs with such innovative teaching will become more popular with students. Perhaps the proposed confusion about terminology is less about the words and more about the possible consequences of researching and evaluating teaching.

At the programmatic level, institutions need to not only recognize discipline specific research in teaching and learning as scholarship, but also offer faculty the resources to make data-driven changes and the opportunity to share these experiences with others. There are many ways in which universities can support these types of endeavors.

2. Support a Wide Range of Opportunities to Cultivate the Skills and Habits of Inquiry into Teaching and Learning.

As suggested by Hutchings et al. (2011), colleges and universities should provide supportive climates that encourage faculty to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Examples of supportive measures include funding for teaching-related expenses such as conferences, travel, and new materials.

Financial support is very beneficial to faculty, and one of the most efficient ways to use money targeted toward the scholarship and learning is through the development and maintenance of a teaching center. By having a teaching center for the entire campus, faculty regardless of discipline can have access to the resources they need to become better teachers. Whereas funding resources are helpful, access to knowledgeable others can be even more so. Teaching centers can provide faculty members with regular opportunities to interact and discuss teaching issues. If those opportunities are not available, teaching centers can create online discussion threads and repositories of campus-wide pedagogical initiatives so that faculty can see what kind of local energy is being devoted to teaching and learning.

Teaching centers can also be integral in changing the campus climate concerning the scholarship of teaching and learning. Working with faculty in their first year is one of the fastest ways to change the acceptance of and expectation for SoTL. Have faculty who regularly publish in the area of teaching and learning share these experiences with new faculty (Richlin & Cox, 2004). In my experience as a director, newer faculty are more likely to have come from graduate programs which include training in pedagogy; therefore, they tend to be more interested in acquiring new teaching skills. It is harder to convince seasoned faculty that examining teaching and learning issues is worthwhile, because many do not believe they have something new to learn. Yet even those who have been in the classroom for a long time can benefit from dialogue with faculty in their first five years of teaching. New faculty are often more educated in innovative pedagogical strategies, more current in technology, and more familiar with a systematic approach to examining their course strengths and weaknesses because of their recent experiences with pedagogical instruction. One way to encourage novice faculty and their experienced counterparts to talk about teaching is to set up mentoring pairs (McGrath, 2012; Richlin & Cox, 2004; Trask, Marotz-Baden, Settles, Gentry, & Berke, 2009). Experienced faculty share their knowledge of institutional history as well as their thoughts about teaching, and newer faculty ask their questions and share what teaching techniques they have learned.

Often missing from institutional support, regardless of the presence of a teaching center, is more **time** in our hectic schedules. This is why I like Hutchings' and colleagues' suggestion to transform the random teaching workshops into a systematic and integrated faculty-driven research program on teaching and learning. Most universities, like my own, already have a core group of faculty who are interested in or are currently conducting research in teaching issues. Although they are aware of each other, those faculty members may have no idea what their colleagues are currently studying or what issues interest them. Let universities offer faculty members course release time in return for completing a research commitment targeting a course, major, or program.

Another use of release time that could encourage SoTL to encourage faculty is to offer classes, workshops, and mentors in the statistical skills necessary to evaluate curriculum changes or encourage interdisciplinary authorships and publication so that authors' strengths can be recognized and strategies can be shared. According to Dawson, McLaughlin, Carson, and Zadnik (2012), one of the largest barriers to successful completion of such work is faculty members' difficulty in understanding research methodology outside of their specific field. Faculty could also take this time to participate in SoTL oriented certificate programs. One such program is housed at the University of British Columbia (Hubbell & Burt, 2006). There, faculty can learn to define SoTL, conduct research in their area, disseminate their findings and evaluate other SoTL over the course of eight months. Regardless of the format, faculty would learn skills such as how to distinguish SoTL from simple course evaluation and understand the benchmarks associated with good statistical rigor in the field (Wilson-Doenges & Gurung, 2013).

Regardless of the format, once faculty members complete their SoTL projects they can disseminate those findings to other constituencies on campus. If those outcomes are then presented at regional or national venues, the faculty member and campus benefit again. A university sponsored program such as this not only offers time to faculty researchers interested in teaching and learning issues, but also shows that this type of work is a recognized and valued contribution to student learning and success.

3. Connect the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to Larger, Shared Agendas for Student Learning and Success.

One of the most interesting suggestions involves the connection of the scholarship of learning to student learning and success. Specifically, Hutchings et

al. (2011) address how faculty can work together to build or renovate existing programs such as General Studies. Although a valid suggestion, faculty conducting SoTL can also work side by side with other existing departments whose objectives are to increase student success by cocreating new, innovative programming through their involvement with other departments (Schumann, Peters, & Olsen, 2013). Examples from my university include Academic Success and Career Services, The Learning Commons, Disability Services, The First Year Program, etc. Goals for student performance are similar for a teaching center and other departments on campus. All want students to learn and professors to teach well. However, there is more to the collaboration than that. Both parties have information to share with each other. In turn, this faculty–staff collaboration makes each of the programs better (Schumann et al., 2013). Specific to my university are collaborations such as advising as teaching, using technology in the classroom, and flipped learning. None of these programs would have been possible if the teaching center had not partnered with other offices on campus. Because every interaction that a faculty or staff member has with a student is the opportunity for a teaching moment, faculty members engaging in pedagogical work and staff providing support services to students can learn from each other.

The student evaluation process for faculty is another place where SoTL has provided insight into student learning. Galbraith, Merrill, and Kline (2012) examined the teaching evaluations of 116 business classes. Three different analyses failed to demonstrate that student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (SETEs) directly related to teaching effectiveness or student learning. Perhaps in addition to evaluating faculty, students should also be encouraged to evaluate themselves and their accomplishments each semester. Our university's evaluation questions include the degree to which the instructor is stimulating, knowledgeable, enthusiastic, responsive, well-prepared, clear, fair, etc. Changing course evaluations from faculty-centered "what kind of person is he or she" to a student-centered "here is what I learned" could better offer instructors, their department chairs, and other administrators a true gauge of the course's success. This additional evaluation could occur during the regular evaluation process of a course by adding these questions to the standard evaluation form or during academic advising. The latter could use the same form, but students would have a conversation with their faculty advisor concerning their courses and whether these courses meet their expectations. There are many ways to assess a course, and faculty members, departments, and other subdivisions can turn to the department of assessment for assistance with this process.

4. Foster Exchange between the Campus Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Community and Those with Responsibility for Institutional Research and Assessment.

Much dialogue can occur between those searching for *teaching effectiveness* in the classroom and their partners who evaluate some of the larger institutional goals. However, for both conceptual and practical reasons, avoid the trap of merging the scholarship of teaching and learning with assessment, as the two have different but equally important values. Hutchings and colleagues (2011) suggested instructors are often discovering and sharing with their colleagues what aspects of teaching and student learning do not work. In contrast, departments of assessment are often charged to show why the institution is deserving of accreditation. Many institutions see these ventures as identical and have responded by having the same individual, working half-time at each position, direct both positions. Because assessment is required for accreditation and the scholarship of teaching and learning is not, the latter program can often be overshadowed by the first.

Even when programs are presented, the topics may lean toward handling assessment issues and not providing pedagogical information. When a Teaching/ Assessment center focuses primarily on assessment, faculty may interpret this bias as an unwritten message that the education and research associated with teaching as scholarly work is tolerated at best and unimportant or frowned upon at worst.

5. Work Purposefully to Bring Faculty Roles and Rewards into Alignment with a View of Teaching as Scholarly Work.

Many faculty conducting pedagogical research feel stranded on an island and even with a laptop and WiFi feel isolated nonetheless. When the professoriate still believes that scholarship in teaching and learning is either second-rate to subject research or not valued at all, instructors suffer. However, the students suffer the most. They continue to go to the same classes, read from the same books, and take the same exams (Hodges, 2013).

According to Hutchings et al. (2011), one of the best ways to bring faculty roles and rewards into alignment with teaching as scholarly work is to have a strong, viable Teaching Center on campus. As indicated earlier, teaching centers can be the hub of faculty interaction concerning teaching and learning issues. The ability for a professor to say, "I have a problem" and having fellow faculty offer solutions (rather than disdain) contributes greatly to the perception that it is "OK" to talk about teaching.

However, at a time when the scholarship and learning is receiving greater recognition as a discipline of its own and the faculty teaching load is increasing, many colleges and universities are either minimizing or closing their teaching centers (Glenn, 2009). Regardless of whether it is due to budgetary constraints or changes concerning the mission of the institution, this decision is often shortsighted. When faculty fail to evaluate their courses, programs, and curricula beyond the student evaluation and in turn, fail to respond to those evaluations by making changes, enrollment decreases. As a result, the institution stands to lose more money than it would have paid to support the teaching center program

From the perspective of a faculty member, for scholarly work in teaching and learning to increase, then it has to matter to someone other than him- or herself. The work has to matter in the researcher's department, and it has to matter at promotion and tenure time. However, scholarship in teaching and learning will not be counted towards productivity if faculty continue to view it as secondary to work in their own discipline. Colleges and universities can benefit by having faculty representatives travel to other universities or conferences where vibrant teaching and learning scholarship is the norm rather than the exception. Those institutions have already fought the battle of whether this type of research should count toward promotion and research, and how to so convince the campus constituencies.

6. Take Advantage of and Engage with the Larger, Increasingly International Teaching Commons.

Hutchings et al. (2011) suggest having faculty and administrators attend an international conference on teaching and learning, such as the one sponsored by the International Society of Teaching and Learning, in order to be part of a larger community. This suggestion is especially relevant for those faculty members from our "island." When an instructor sees him- or herself as the exception to the rule rather than the rule, an active program in teaching and learning scholarship can become harder to maintain. Having others with similar interests view one's work is a great motivator for continued performance. Also, conferences such as these can spark new ideas, research questions, and collaborations that not only benefit faculty members but also their institutions (MacKenzie & Meyers, 2012). Administrators should attend so they can see the value of teaching and learning scholarship as well as have an idea of the breadth (and depth) of the discipline. Those new to the

discipline should especially consider attending in order to best prepare for the development of a scholarship program such as this on their campus.

7. Develop a Plan and Timeline for Integrating the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning into Campus Culture, and Monitor Process; and 8. Recognize that Institutionalization is a Long-Term Process.

Once the general idea of doing research on teaching and learning has become accepted by a few members of a campus faculty, it becomes time to introduce the plan for integrating the idea into campus culture; however, those constituencies need to remind themselves that institutional change is slow. Two venues where the introduction may take place include the faculty governing body on campus such as the faculty senate, or the institution's teaching center. Faculty members can then work together to develop clear objectives for an eventual acceptance of the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) and specific ways for interested faculty to meet those objectives. Of utmost importance is educating the administration of how SoTL will improve not only the curricula but also the institution itself (Hubball, Pearson, & Clarke, 2013). At the same time, the campus proponents for the acceptance of SoTL as a discipline need to keep in mind that institutionalization is a slow process. I agree with the authors that a top-down approach would only be detrimental to a budding program. Faculty should begin the process, own it, and evaluate the products. However, even when it appears that SoTL has been accepted by the college or university, understand that there are still individuals who will not accept this discipline.

The recommendations proposed by Hutchings et al. (2011) do offer excellent suggestions for taking an existing SoTL program and making it better. Inherent in these recommendations is the assumption that some individuals on campus are doing work in SoTL and if enough faculty interested in the topic band together, they have the ability to change the campus, including institutional requirements for promotion and tenure. I think the information they provide might even assist that group of supporters in turning their campus into one that encourages SoTL. But the recommendations do not suggest what to do with the extreme naysayer and those scattered departments that refuse to accept SoTL as a valid field, even when their university does. Do these few barriers to Utopia University even matter? As long as these individuals or departments serve as the gatekeepers in charge of hiring new faculty (and not promoting or granting tenure to faculty within the department), Utopian University will always be 10 years down the road.

References

Dawson, V., McLaughlin, M., Carson, K. & Zadnik, M. (2012). A pilot program to build research competence in teaching and learning in academics, In *Proceedings of the Australian Conference on Science and Mathematics Education (formerly Uniserve Science Conference)*.

Gailbraith, C. S., Merrill, G. B., & Kline, D. M. (2012). Are student evaluations of teaching effectiveness valid for measuring student learning outcomes in business- related classes? A neural network and Bayesian analyses. *Research in Higher Education*, *53*, 353-374.

Glenn, D. (2009, September 9). Wary of the budget knife, Teaching centers seek to sharpen their role. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *56* (2). Retrieved from http://0-web.ebscohost.com.rosi.unk.edu/ehost/detail?sid=6a135a4a-76c2-418b-b28b-e77cb1dd8b6a%40sessionmgr4&vid=2&hid=11&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=44294845

Hodges, L. C. (2013). Postcards from the edge of SoTL: A view from faculty development. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, *1*, 71-79. doi: 10.1353/iss.2013.0014

Hubball, H., Pearson, M. L., & Clarke, A. C. (2013). SoTL inquiry in broader curricular and institutional contexts: Theoretical underpinnings and emerging trends. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, *1*, 41-57. doi: 10.1353/iss.2013.0009

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

Mackenzie, J. & Meyers, R. A. (2012). International collaboration in SoTL: Current status and future direction. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *6 (1)*, Retrieved from http://eaglescholar.georgiasouthern.edu:8080/jspui/bitstream/10518/4883/1/IJ-SoTLv6n1_IE_MacKenzie%20%26%20Meyers.pdf

McGrath, A. (2012). An early introduction to SoTL and the shaping of an academic career. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *6 (2)*, Retrieved from http://eaglescholar.georgiasouthern.edu:8080/jspui/bitstream/10518/5422/1/Personal%20Reflection_McGrath.pdf

Rice, E. (1990, Winter-Spring). Rethinking what it means to be a scholar. In L. Ekroth (Ed.), *Teaching Excellence: Toward the Best in the Academy.* Stillwater, OK: POD Network.

Richland, L. & Cox, M. D. (2004). Developing scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning through faculty learning communities, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2004*, 127-135. doi: 10.1002/tl.139

Schumann, D. W., Peters, J., & Olsen, T. (2013). Cocreating value in teaching and learning centers [Special Issue]. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2013*, 21-32. doi: 10.1002/tl.20043

Trask, B. S., Marotz-Baden, R., Settles, B., Gentry, D., & Berke D. (2009). Enhancinggraduate education: Promoting a scholarship of teaching and learning through mentoring. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *20 (3)*, Retrieved from http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE20%283%29.pdf#page=132

Wilson-Doenges, G., & Gurung, R. A. R. (2013). Benchmarks for scholarly investigations of teaching and learning. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *65*, 63-70.

Krista D. Forrest is a professor of psychology at the University of Nebraska at Kearney. In addition to her work on jury deliberation and police interrogations, she has published more than 15 articles on pedagogy.

Accepting the Utopian Challenge: A Student Perspective

Breanna R. Carman
BS Candidate
University of Nebraska at Kearney

The scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) allows institutions to achieve the goals required for student learning and success. The purpose of this paper is to address recommendations for the implementation of SoTL that should have relevant input from students. These include, but are not limited to, better communication, evaluation, continuing education, and learning networks. With the proper implementation of these recommendations, professors can effectively teach the next generation of leaders.

While the idea of a perfect university may not be achievable, the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) could be. Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone (2011) state there has been a shift from "a college is an institution that exists to provide instruction" to "a college is an institution that exists to produce learning" (p. 4). This change has been a positive one spurred by accreditation. In addition to this change, the scholarship of teaching and learning should be seen as a program to help achieve the goals required for student learning and success. Throughout their book, Hutchings et al. (2011) provide eight recommendations to help integrate SoTL into institutions. In this paper, I will reflect on those recommendations that should have relevant input from students. Considering each category, I will address why student input is critical.

As a full-time student who has taught a statistics lab as well as worked in a teaching center, I have seen firsthand the importance of communication among faculty members and between faculty members and students. Since I was partially responsible for compiling the university's new faculty orientation, I was also able to see the benefit to faculty when they were encouraged to discuss academic success and their attitudes toward SoTL.

Understand, Communicate, and Promote an Integrated Vision of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Terminology

One must not forget, when promoting an integrated vision of SoTL, that students as well as professors are involved. I believe that, for students, the biggest concern is communication. If students do not have any knowledge of the vision, they are likely to be unknowingly uncooperative. The solution may be as simple as sharing the vision with students each step of the way. Once the vision to be achieved has been introduced to students, they can then understand the process and cooperate as well as give their input. In order to effectively share the vision of SoTL, professors should not focus on the terminology and the difficulty it may present but rather involve students in SoTL by explaining the necessity of their involvement in course and programmatic change.

Two-Way Communication

Communication would be less of an issue if all professors were truly invested in their teaching. It is evident when a professor views his or her role as a career rather than just a job. As a student, I appreciate when professors go out of their way to teach more than what is in the book. Taking an active interest in a student's academic career and giving each student individual attention, regardless

of how much, can make a significant difference in the student's willingness to communicate back to his or her faculty. For example, to some students, professor evaluations at the end of each semester seem pointless. The lack of communication concerning the purpose of said evaluations has given the perception that student input is insignificant.

Evaluation

To overcome this misperception, a proper explanation to students clarifying how the evaluations will be used and what is most helpful for the professor is important. This also allows students to feel that their voices will be heard. It is imperative that the evaluations are not conveyed as a hassle that merely take up class time but instead as a tool for the professors to improve their teaching with in the future. I firmly believe that these simple changes would increase students' willingness to complete evaluations. In addition, it may be useful to include a midterm evaluation so the students have the opportunity to see change during their tenure with the faculty member. It is not uncommon for multiple students to have the same concern, but if none of them feel that their voice will be heard, they remain silent, as do their concerns. Students would appreciate an improvement in communication, in the relationship between faculty and student, and the addition of a midterm course evaluation.

Support a Wide Range of Opportunities to Cultivate the Skills and Habits of Inquiry into Teaching and Learning

Continuing Education for Faculty

It is beneficial not only for professors but also for students for colleges and universities to offer programs for professors to cultivate the skills and habits of inquiry into teaching and learning. Other teaching institutions require continuing education; why not colleges and universities? The student population is constantly changing, as are its corresponding needs. Therefore, it is important for the faculty to stay current with the changes and revamp their teaching styles or structure of their courses as needed. Institutions can encourage faculty to attend classes and workshops or participate in mentoring programs. Meeting with other faculty to discuss different strategies or implementation of certain activities can be refreshing, especially for seasoned professors.

Continuing Education for Students

Students should be given the opportunity to continue their education outside of the classroom as well. One beneficial program would have students meet with their academic advisor to assess under what circumstances they learn well (and not so well) and whether certain topics or academic areas are more difficult for them than others. This would give students the opportunity to engage in metacognition or the understanding of specific strategies that they can use to improve their academic performance. For example, advisors can apply what they know from the scholarship of teaching and learning by showing students that rehearsal is an ineffective tool for learning at the college level. As a result, students may be more likely to use a better strategy such as elaboration. Students often feel more comfortable talking to their advisors about struggling in class if they have an ongoing rapport with them. This is another example of how students can directly benefit from instructors who are willing to educate themselves about the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Connect the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to Larger, Shared Agendas for Student Learning and Success

Connecting Learning Objectives with Life

Students should have the opportunity to participate in out-of-class learning experiences that will increase their learning. For example, some colleges, such as the University of Nebraska at Kearney and University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, have undergraduate research programs where students have the opportunity to work with faculty members on a research topic that interests them (Office for Undergraduate Research, 2012; Office of Graduate Studies & Research, 2012). This gives the students the chance to gain insight and see firsthand how their academic program can be useful in the real world. The students themselves should be a part of measuring their learning and success throughout these department-, program-, and institution-wide resources. Instead of, or along with evaluating their professor, advisor, or program director, students should be asked questions specific to their learning at the end of a course or program. For this reason, professors should be sure to sell the benefit of assignments and exams to students. For example, why is one specific assignment important: What will students learn from it? Why is it important? And how will it stick with them after graduation? To accomplish this, students could meet with a faculty member to discuss the goals or major objectives that were to be accomplished and how well the student achieved them. It is important for faculty members to explain how specific learnings will help students after graduation.

Take Advantage of and Engage with the Larger, Increasingly International Teaching Commons

The Need for Learning Networks

Students are already taking advantage of and engaging in the larger, increasingly international learning commons. Before choosing classes or particular professors, students talk to one another about experiences in the classroom. This can be at the local peer level, such as between friends attending the same institution, or the larger anonymous peer level, such as ratemyprofessor.com. The former allows students to go into more detail about why they are satisfied or concerned with the professor, whereas the latter limits student ratings to how easy, helpful, and clear faculty are in their teaching (MTV Networks, 2012). The problem with talking with close friends about classes is that they often resort to complaints about professors' idiosyncrasies, or events that happened only to them rather than their overall educational climates. On the other hand, ratemyprofessor.com does not require raters to include any personal information. This becomes problematic because students performing differently (A vs. C students), or with different learning styles, majors etc., are likely to rate the same professor in vastly disparate ways. Also, this site encourages students to comment on characteristics of the professors rather than aspects of learning. This would suggest that these students care more about what their professor does in the classroom and less about how the course is structured and how that design might affect their learning (Silva et al., 2008). Another study by Otto, Sanford, and Ross (2008) found that although these ratings may be helpful, it is possible that the validity may be compromised under specific instances. For example, if the ratings reflect popular characteristics of an instructor, instructors may be working to achieve something that is successful to ratings but not conducive to higher education.

Making Local Learning Networks Happen

It would be beneficial if students could meet and discuss academic issues with other students outside of their immediate peer group, yet within the same university. This could occur in one of two ways: First, the university could introduce a resource into the learning commons that allows students to formally discuss professors' teaching style, classroom structure, and student development face-to-face. Second, students belonging to discipline specific extracurricular organizations (e.g., psychology club or biology student organization) could meet before academic advising begins.

Develop a Plan and Time Line for Integrating the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning into Campus Culture, and Monitor Progress

In developing a plan and time line for integrating SoTL into campus culture, one must not forget that students should be actively involved. To be effective, new policies, procedures, and courses – such as portal and capstone courses – should be explained or described in cogent terms. If students do not understand the importance of such implementations, they will be more resistant to the changes. For example, with the implementation of a new general studies program, professors should be sure to explain the importance of these additions and what students will learn from them. In regards to specific courses, professors should have specific learning objectives or goals and explain their purpose as well as how students can accomplish them. Vague learning objectives can lead to confusion and misunderstandings between the professor and student. If students were involved in changes each step of the way, it would be easier to monitor progress and make changes where needed for improvement.

Recognize that Institutionalization is a Long-Term Process

Each Student's Participation

The implementation of SoTL is not an overnight process. Professors must realize that students do not have the same personal investment in institutional change as do they. Students may not see the end result of the process or even the process itself during their time at the college or university. The average time an undergraduate student is in school to obtain their Bachelor's degree is 54 months (College Board, 2013). Institutionalization is a long-term process, and only a small amount may be achieved in that time. Therefore, it is difficult for students to see the big picture.

The Future of the Student

Implementing SoTL would no doubt require more time and energy from faculty members. However, it would be a worthwhile investment. With the goal of an institution to raise college success rates, it is important to keep the students' needs in mind. The student population changes with each incoming class, and it is important to cater to their needs without holding their hands. One approach professors can take in teaching is to think of their students as the next potential leaders in the scholarship of teaching and learning, as the next generation of leaders. With this in mind, faculty can teach students the skills needed upon graduation.

In conclusion, student involvement in the implementation of SoTL is imperative. Without it, success rates may suffer. Several steps could be taken, in addition to those previously mentioned, to include students. For example, institutions could create a student board for their center for teaching excellence departments. The students involved would determine student input and involvement as well as gauge students' reactions and suggestions. Whatever the

case may be, student input is critical to the success of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

References

College Board (2013). Average time to a certificate, an associate degree, or a bachelor's degree: United States. Retrieved from http://completionarch.collegeboard.org/completion/time-to-degree/average-time-to-certificate-an-associate-degree-or-bachelors-degree-us

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

MTV Networks (2012). Rate my professors. Retrieved from http://blog.ratemyprofessors.com/

Silva, K.M., Silva, F.J., Quinn, M.A., Draper, J.M., Cover, K.R., & Munoff, A.A. (2008). Rate my professor: Online evaluations of psychology instructors. *Teaching Of Psychology, 35*(2), 71-80. doi:10.1080/00986280801978434

Office for Undergraduate Research. (2012). *What is undergraduate research?* Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/depts/our/

Office of Graduate Studies & Research. (2012). *Undergraduate research.* Retrieved from http://www.unk.edu/academics/gradstudies.aspx?id=5345

Otto, J., Sanford, D.A. & Ross, D.N. (2008). Does ratemyprofessor.com really rate my professor? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 33*(4), 355-368. doi:10.1080/02602930701293405

Breanna Carman is an undergraduate student working towards her Bachelor's of Science in Psychology with a minor in Sociology at the University of Nebraska at Kearney. She has taught the Behavioral Statistics lab in the Psychology department, is working as the Human Subjects Coordinator, and is also an Undergraduate Research Fellow. Breanna also serves as the president of the Psychology Club and university's chapter of Psi Chi, the international psychology honor society. She plans to continue her education upon graduating but will to take a year to explore her interests in the field of psychology and start a family.

Call for Papers

Volume 9: *Scholarly Teaching and Learning*

InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching welcomes original manuscripts with a focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) from scholars across the disciplines. We seek articles that address the following: methods and practices of scholarly teaching; critical analyses of the scholarship of teaching and learning; theoretical and empirically-based research articles with practical application possibility; case studies; scholarly analyses and reflective accounts of teaching and learning; teaching narratives that promote conversations about SoTL's value as a tool for advancing student learning.

Articles should present practical and informed applications of teaching, and should address specific issues relating to real classroom experience. Theoretical issues should be rooted in practice. Articles that include student voices and responses are especially welcomed.

Suggested topics include the following:

- Challenges/Responses to the SoTL paradigm
- Practical methods of developing institutional and discipline-specific definitions of SoTL
- Status reports of SoTL's role in a particular discipline
- Essays that offer guidance to faculty new to SoTL, or which outline strategies for support of new faculty
- Examples of SoTL projects at the course or discipline-level
- Intersections of SoTL and service-learning, eLearning, learning communities, and other learning initiatives
- Future directions in SoTL
- Cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional collaborations for promoting SoTL
- Innovative critiques that include specific suggestions for implementation of institutional initiatives for SoTL practices.

Submission Requirements

- *STYLE* - All manuscripts must be formatted in APA style.
- *LENGTH* - Manuscripts should be no more than 12-15 pages (including abstract, references or appendices). Authors are encouraged to include appendices that promote application and integration of materials (i.e., assignments, rubrics, examples, etc.).
- *ABSTRACT* - Each manuscript must be summarized in an abstract of 50 to 100 words.
- *AUTHOR* - Each author should provide his/her full name, title and departmental affiliation, campus address, telephone number, and email address. Each author must also include a brief biography (no more than 100 words per author).
- *FORMAT* - All manuscripts must be submitted via email as attachments in Microsoft Word or Rich Text Format. Do not include personal identifiers within the manuscript. Include contact information only on a separate cover sheet. Each manuscript will be assigned a unique identifier for blind review processes. Send submissions to cetl@park.edu.
- *DEADLINE* - All submissions must be received by **4:00pm on March 1, 2014 (CST)** to be considered for inclusion in Volume 8.

Review Procedures

All submissions are initially screened by the editor for suitability to the journal. Relevant manuscripts are then sent to appropriate reviewers and undergo a rigorous blind peer review. Manuscripts are evaluated for relevance, practical

utility, originality, clarity, significance and the extent to which the submission contributes to the goals of the journal and the ongoing development of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The review process for publication takes about three months. Authors are provided feedback from the editor and from reviewers.

The CETL office retains the final authority to accept or reject all submitted manuscripts. The final publication will be distributed both in print and online fall 2013.

Copyright

Manuscript submissions are accepted with the assumption that they neither have been nor will be published elsewhere. Authors and CETL will hold joint copyright to all published manuscripts.

Contact

Please address your inquiries to: cetl@park.edu. For more information, visit the CETL website at www.park.edu/cetl.

QUICK TIPS: PREPARING MANUSCRIPTS FOR *INSIGHT*

The following "Quick Tips" provide suggestions and guidance for preparing manuscripts for potential publication in *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*. *InSight* is a peer-reviewed publication highlighting the scholarly contributions of postsecondary faculty. As is the nature of refereed journals, acceptance and publication of original manuscripts is a competitive process. The goal of the following information is to assist faculty in preparing manuscripts in a manner that maximizes the chances of publication.

Preparing the Manuscript

The organization and style your manuscript will be largely dictated by the type of submission (e.g., theoretical, empirical, critical reflection, case study, classroom innovation, etc.). Thus, while guidelines will follow to assist you in preparing your manuscript, the key to successful submission is clear, effective communication that highlights the significance and implications of your work to post-secondary teaching and learning in relation to the target topic. To prepare and effectively communicate your scholarly work, the American Psychological Association (2010) provides the following general guidelines:

- Present the problem, question or issue early in the manuscript.
- Show how the issue is grounded, shaped, and directed by theory.
- Connect the issue to previous work in a literature review that is pertinent and informative but not exhaustive.
- State explicitly the hypotheses under investigation or the target of the theoretical review.
- Keep the conclusions within the boundaries of the findings and/or scope of the theory.
- Demonstrate how the study or scholarly approach has helped to address the original issue.
- Identify and discuss what theoretical or practical implications can be drawn from this work.

There is no mandatory format for *InSight* articles; rather authors should organize and present information in a manner that promotes communication and understanding of key points. As you write your manuscript, keep the following points in mind:

- <u>Title</u> - Generally speaking, titles should not exceed 15 words and should provide a clear introduction to your article. While it is okay to incorporate "catchy" titles to pique interest, be sure that your title effectively captures the point of your manuscript.
- <u>Abstract</u> - Do not underestimate the importance of your abstract. While the abstract is simply a short summary (50-100 words) of your work, it is often the only aspect of your article that individuals read. The abstract provides the basis from which individuals will decide whether or not to read your article, so be certain that your abstract is "accurate, self-contained, nonevaluative, coherent, and readable" (Calfee & Valencia, 2001).
- <u>Body</u> - Within the body of a manuscript, information should be organized and sub-headed in a structure that facilitates understanding of key issues. There is not a mandatory format for *InSight* articles; rather authors should use professional guidelines within their discipline to present information in a manner that is easily communicated to readers. For example:

- *Empirical investigations* should be organized according to the traditional format that includes introduction (purpose, literature review, hypothesis), method (participants, materials, procedures), results, and discussion (implications). The following links provide general examples of this type of article:
    - http://www.thejeo.com/MandernachFinal.pdf
    - http://www.athleticInSight.com/Vol7Iss4/Selfesteem.htm
- *Theoretical articles and literature reviews* should include an introduction (purpose), subheadings for the relevant perspectives and themes, and a detailed section(s) on conclusions (applications, recommendations, implications, etc.). The following links provide general examples of this type of article:
    - http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/winter84/royal84.htm
    - http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/winter84/mclean84.htm
- *Classroom innovation and critical reflections* should be organized via an introduction (purpose, problem, or challenge), relevant background literature, project description, evaluation of effectiveness (may include student feedback, self-reflections, peer-insights, etc.), and conclusions (applications, implications, recommendations, etc.). If describing classroom-based work, please include copies of relevant assignments, handouts, rubrics, etc. as appendices. The following link provides a general example of a critical reflections article:
    - http://www.compositionstudies.tcu.edu/coursedesigns/online/33-2/ritter.htmlv

The limited length of *InSight* articles (manuscript should be no more than 10 pages, not including abstract, references or appendices) requires authors to focus on the most significant, relevant factors and implications.

- References - Select your references carefully to ensure that your citations include the most current and relevant sources. As you select your references, give preference to published sources that have proven pertinent and valuable to the relevant investigations. The goal is not to incorporate ALL relevant references, but rather to include the most important ones.
- Tables, Figures, Appendices & Graphics - Authors are encouraged to include supporting documents to illustrate the findings, relevance or utilization of materials. Particularly relevant are documents that promote easy, efficient integration of suggestions, findings or techniques into the classroom (such as rubrics, assignments, etc.). Supplemental information should enhance, rather than duplicate, information in the text.

The importance of clear, effective communication cannot be highlighted enough. Many manuscripts with relevant, original, applicable ideas will be rejected because authors do not communicate the information in a manner that facilitates easy understanding and application of key points. The value of a manuscript is lost if readers are unable to overcome written communication barriers that prevent use of the knowledge. With this in mind, authors are strongly advised to seek informal feedback from peers and colleagues on manuscripts prior to submission to *InSight*. Requesting informal reviews from relevant professionals can highlight and correct many concerns prior to formal submission, thus improving chances of publication.

References

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Calfee, R. & Valencia, R. (2001). *APA Guide to preparing manuscripts for journal publication*. Washington, DC: APA

The following "Quick Tips" provide suggestions and guidance for submitting manuscripts to _InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching_. _InSight_ is a peer-reviewed publication highlighting the scholarly contributions of postsecondary faculty. The following information provides an overview of the purpose; scope and functioning of InSight so that faculty may better understand the _InSight_ publication process.

Scope & Focus

InSight features theoretical and empirically-based research articles, critical reflection pieces, case studies, and classroom innovations relevant to teaching, learning and assessment. While there are a broad range of acceptable topics, all manuscripts should be supported with theoretical justification, evidence, and/or research (all methods and approaches relevant to qualitative and quantitative research are welcome); all manuscripts should be appropriately grounded in a review of existing literature.

Audience

InSight emphasizes the enhancement of post-secondary education through the professional exchange of scholarly approaches and perspectives applicable to the enrichment of teaching and learning. Relevant to this mission, manuscripts should be geared toward post-secondary faculty and administrators; included in this audience are full-time and adjunct faculty; face-to-face, hybrid and online faculty; tenure and non-tenure track instructors; trainers in corporate, military, and professional fields; adult educators; researchers; and other specialists in education, training, and communications. Recognizing the cross-disciplinary readership of _InSight_, manuscripts should present material generalizable enough to have relevance to post-secondary instructors from a range of disciplines.

Review Process

All submissions are evaluated by a double-blind, peer-review process. The masked nature of the reviews helps ensure impartial evaluation, feedback and decisions concerning your manuscript.

This review process utilized by _InSight_ mandates that you should keep the following points in mind when preparing your manuscript:
- Your name and other identifying information should only appear on the title page; the remainder of the manuscript should be written in a more generalized fashion that does not directly divulge authorship.
- All information needs to be explained and supported to the extent that an individual not familiar with a particular institution's mission, vision or structure can still clearly understand the relevance, significance and implications of the article.

Focus of the Review

Prior to dissemination to the reviewers, the _InSight_ Managing Editor will conduct a preliminary appraisal for content, substance, and appropriateness to the journal. If the manuscript is clearly inappropriate, the author will be informed and the manuscript returned. Appropriate manuscripts will be electronically sent to two reviewers for blind evaluation. Although there is an attempt to match manuscripts and reviewers according to content, interests, and topical relevance, the broad focus

of the journal dictates that papers be written for applicability to a wide audience. As such, reviewers may not be content experts in a relevant, matching academic discipline.

The manuscript will be reviewed and evaluated according to the following dimensions:

- <u>Relevance</u> - The most important feature of your manuscript is its relevance; the decision to accept or reject a manuscript is typically based on the substantive core of the paper. As such, manuscripts should introduce the substance of the theoretical or research question as quickly as possible and follow the main theme throughout the article in a coherent and explicit manner.
- <u>Significance</u> - Related to relevance, significance refers to the value of your manuscript for substantially impacting the enhancement of post-secondary education relevant to the target topic. Significant manuscripts will clearly highlight the value, importance and worth of a relevant topic within a meaningful context.
- <u>Practical Utility</u> - As highlighted previously, the goal of *InSight* is to enhance teaching and learning through the exchange of scholarly ideas. With this purpose in mind, all manuscripts should emphasize the practical value, relevance or applicability of information. Manuscripts should go beyond the simple reporting of information to provide InSight into the implications of findings and the application of information into meaningful contexts.
- <u>Originality</u> - The most effective articles are those that inspire other faculty through innovative practices, approaches and techniques or via the thoughtful self-reflection of the purpose, value and function of educational strategies. Thus, manuscripts that highlight original approaches or perspectives will be given priority. Per the nature of published work, all contributions must be the original work of the author or provide explicit credit for citations.
- <u>Scholarship of Teaching</u> - Contributions to the enrichment of teaching and learning should be grounded in relevant theoretical concepts and empirical evidence. As such, articles should be free from flaws in research substance/methodology and theoretical interpretation. All conclusions and recommendations must be substantiated with theoretical or empirical support; personal classroom experiences and critical reflections should be framed within a structure of existing literature.
- <u>Generalizability</u> - The broad goals and varied audience of *InSight* mandate that manuscripts be written for consumption across a range of disciplines that allows generalizability of findings and implications. Thus, while classroom techniques may be developed, tested and reported for a specific discipline or student population, the manuscript should go on to highlight the implications for other populations.
- <u>Clarity</u> - All manuscripts must be written in a clear, professional manner free from grammatical flaws and errors in writing style. The purpose of the manuscript should be clearly defined, relevant and supported by the evidence provided. All manuscripts should be structured in a manner that promotes a clear, cohesive understanding of the information presented. Be sure that your manuscript is free from organizational, stylistic or "sloppiness" barriers that would prevent effective communication of your work.

Review Outcomes

Based upon the feedback and recommendations of the two anonymous reviewers, the Editor will make a final publication decision. Decisions fall into the following categories:

- Reject - Rejected manuscripts will not be published and authors will not have the opportunity to resubmit a revised version of the manuscript to *InSight*. All rejections will be handled in a courteous manner that includes specific reasons for rejection.
- Revise and Resubmit – A manuscript receiving a revise-and-resubmit recommendation shows potential for publication, but needs significant attention and revisions. Those electing to resubmit will be subjected to a novel round of blind review.
- Accept Pending Revisions - A manuscript accepted-pending-revisions meets all the major requirements for publication but may need improvements in substantive, mechanical or methodological issues. Once these issues are adjusted for, the manuscript will receive a "quick review" by the Editor prior to publication. Very rarely is an article accepted with no changes required; as such, most manuscripts are accepted in this category.
- Accept - Accepted manuscripts will be published "as-is" with no further modifications required.

References

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Calfee, R. & Valencia, R. (2001). *APA guide to preparing manuscripts for journal publication*. Washington, DC: APA.

"Be an opener of doors for such as come after thee."
~ Ralph Waldo Emerson