



## International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

---

Volume 5 | Number 1

Article 31

---

1-2011

# Feature Essays: Getting There: An Integrative Vision of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Pat Hutchings

*Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, [Hutchings@carnegiefoundation.org](mailto:Hutchings@carnegiefoundation.org)

Mary T. Huber

*Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, [huber@carnegiefoundation.org](mailto:huber@carnegiefoundation.org)

Anthony Ciccone

*University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*, [Ciccone@uwm.edu](mailto:Ciccone@uwm.edu)

---

### Recommended Citation

Hutchings, Pat; Huber, Mary T.; and Ciccone, Anthony (2011) "**Feature Essays:** Getting There: An Integrative Vision of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning," *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 5: No. 1, Article 31. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2011.050131>

---

# Feature Essays: Getting There: An Integrative Vision of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

## **Abstract**

**Excerpt:** Over the last two decades, the scholarship of teaching and learning has made important strides. There are now many more teachers engaged in the study of their students' learning, more outlets (like this journal) for what they discover, and a growing demand for what those outlets make available. Campus policies are evolving to create space and rewards for such work, disciplinary and professional fields have promoted it, and notions of inquiry and evidence are...

## **Keywords**

Scholarship of teaching and learning, SoTL

## **Creative Commons License**

Creative

Commons

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0](#)

Attribution-

License.

Noncommercial-

No

Derivative

Works

4.0

License

## **Getting There: An Integrative Vision of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

### **Pat Hutchings**

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching  
Stanford, California, USA  
[Hutchings@carnegiefoundation.org](mailto:Hutchings@carnegiefoundation.org)

### **Mary Taylor Huber**

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching  
Stanford, California, USA  
[Huber@carnegiefoundation.org](mailto:Huber@carnegiefoundation.org)

**Anthony Ciccone** University of  
Wisconsin-Milwaukee Milwaukee,  
Wisconsin, USA [Ciccone@uwm.edu](mailto:Ciccone@uwm.edu)

*Ultimately, investigative work into teaching and learning will not be an intriguing aside, or add-on, but an essential facet of good teaching— built into the expected repertoire of scholarly practice.*

—Lee S. Shulman<sup>1</sup>

### **Introduction**

Over the last two decades, the scholarship of teaching and learning has made important strides. There are now many more teachers engaged in the study of their students' learning, more outlets (like this journal) for what they discover, and a growing demand for what those outlets make available. Campus policies are evolving to create space and rewards for such work, disciplinary and professional fields have promoted it, and notions of inquiry and evidence are integral to an impressive range and number of national and international teaching improvement initiatives. Most important, findings from the scholarship of teaching and learning are being brought to bear in individual classrooms and in the design of curricula in ways that make a difference for students. Clearly, there is much to celebrate as the scholarship of teaching and learning community looks back over recent years.

As this essay's epigraph from Lee Shulman reminds us, however, the scholarship of teaching and learning is a work in progress. It is not, as they say, "there" yet. Although the movement has made great progress, in many settings it remains a special initiative—an intriguing aside, or add-on, in Shulman's words—as yet only unevenly woven into the mainstream of academic life. A deep level of institutional integration—or, as Braxton, Luckey and Helland put it, "incorporation" (2007, p. 7)—is still to come.

For the past year and a half, we have been engaged in a research and writing project focused on this question of institutional integration.<sup>2</sup> Drawing on the work of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), and seeking to understand more deeply the institutional impact of that work thus far, we have pushed ourselves toward a longer-term question: **What would academic life look like in ten years if the**

**principles and practices of the scholarship of teaching and learning were to take hold at the deep level?** What would it take to get there? And what difference would this kind of integration make for campuses, for faculty, and for students? In this essay we review some of what we've learned about impact thus far, and reflect on implications for the future.

## Background

In early 2009, after more than a decade of activity (and while preparing to bring the program to a close at the end of that year), CASTL invited participants in its Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program to respond to a survey focused on the impact of the scholarship of teaching and learning.<sup>3</sup> Designed collaboratively by Carnegie's leadership team and by CASTL coordinators from participating institutions, the design of the survey reflected the program's culminating focus on *institutional impact*. Thus, while an earlier CASTL survey (see Cox, Huber, and Hutchings, 2005) explored how the scholarship of teaching and learning affected the teaching practices, career paths, and scholarly engagement of individual faculty, this 2009 survey focused on institutional practice and policy.

There are difficulties, certainly, in any attempt to characterize the impact of the scholarship of teaching and learning on an entire institution. This is especially so with large, decentralized campuses, institutions with multiple campuses, and organizations that bring together diverse campuses and individuals. Attempting to mitigate those difficulties, the survey employed a 7-point scale designed to capture a wide range of patterns of impact, from "widespread" to "localized," from "deep" to "mixed," and finally to "no discernible impact."<sup>4</sup> We also included open-ended questions, soliciting comments, examples, reflections, and uncertainties, and asked participants to identify important issues and directions for future work.

The survey was distributed by e-mail on January 22, 2009 to representatives from the CASTL Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program's 103 participating institutions; these include U.S. campuses from all major categories of the Basic Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 17 institutions from outside the United States, a number of educational associations or consortia, and one discipline-based organization. Typically the survey was completed by the individual serving as CASTL "point person" for the institution; the instrument invited respondents to complete the survey in consultation or collaboration with others in their setting, and about half reported doing so.

Following several reminder notices, a total of 59 surveys were returned by May 1, 2009, for a response rate of 57 percent. A preliminary report on the results was prepared and circulated at CASTL's concluding colloquium, held in conjunction with the annual conference of the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in October 2009 (Ciccione, Huber, Hutchings, and Cambridge, 2009).

## Four Areas of Impact, Promise, and Challenge

Drawing on survey results, but also on the full trajectory of CASTL's work and on developments beyond (in other projects and initiatives around the globe), we identified four areas (certainly there are others) in which the scholarship of teaching and learning can make strategic contributions to institutional practice and policy: the ways in which faculty go about their teaching; how professional development is understood and organized; the

relationship between the scholarship of teaching and learning and institutional assessment; and how the work of teaching is valued and evaluated. Our findings suggest that there has been significant, if uneven, impact in all four of these areas, but also prompt reflection on strategies for further integration—and in some cases about cautions and risks that should be kept in mind in pushing ahead.

### **Teaching Practice**

The survey asked: “How would you describe the impact of engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning on the ways that faculty approach teaching on your campus?” Respondents from 58 institutions answered this question, with the majority reporting that the scholarship of teaching and learning made a significant difference for some faculty and a more modest one for others.

A number of respondents reported that engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning had led faculty members to embrace new classroom approaches. This is not perhaps a startling finding, but it is worth pausing over. The scholarship of teaching and learning is, at its core, an approach to teaching that is informed by inquiry and evidence (both one’s own, and that of others) about student learning. In this sense, it is not so much a function of what particular pedagogies faculty use. Rather, it concerns the thoughtfulness with which they construct the learning environments they offer students, the attention they pay to students and their learning, and the engagement they seek with colleagues on all things pertaining to education in their disciplines, programs, and institutions.

That said, it appears that many faculty members who get involved in the scholarship of teaching and learning are open to—and even seeking—new classroom approaches. They are trying to find the best ways of incorporating new media into their teaching; they are troubled by the number of students who are performing poorly in their science or math classes; or they care deeply about educating students for citizenship, and want to explore how best to build students’ knowledge, skills, and confidence. The scholarship of teaching and learning, in other words, has within it a bias toward innovation, and often toward more active roles for students that engage them more meaningfully in the content, ways of knowing, and forms of practice that characterize a field. Our survey revealed, for instance, that one campus active in the scholarship of teaching and learning had surveyed its own faculty and found that 90 percent say they are using more active learning strategies.

With many educators trying out new approaches in their classrooms, the survey also suggested that faculty have new opportunities—and a new sense of permission—to share ideas and learn from one another in ways that were not so common before. There’s a public dimension built into the work, an interest in sharing pedagogical ideas and learning from one another. We heard myriad examples of how this takes place on campus, where innovators with interests in particular pedagogies (say, capstone projects) or programs (say, undergraduate research) find each other informally, through an office that supports that kind of teaching, or increasingly through participation in a variety of education reform initiatives. Centers for teaching are now supporting faculty inquiry, often organizing groups whose members meet to frame inquiry projects, to share results, and, not infrequently, to inspire each other with new ideas for their classrooms. In many cases, scholars of teaching and learning also form communities beyond campus, as participants and activists in their disciplinary and professional societies, pressing for more and better occasions to pursue pedagogical interests in conferences, publications, and other association forums.

CASTL institutions also report that faculty who engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning actively seek to discover more about their students’ experience. As one respondent put it, there’s now a “hunger for more information about how their students are

doing.” Many begin modest projects of inquiry in their own classrooms, aimed at providing evidence to inform a next stage of instructional design. However, we have seen how this effort can lead to more ambitious questions aimed at identifying common roadblocks to learning, pushing the limits of one’s own disciplinary styles of inquiry, and adopting a variety of methods for making learning more visible—including methods that fall outside one’s field (see Jacobs, 2000). There is something inviting about a pedagogical problem that is thus reframed as a problem for investigation (Bass, 1999): as faculty are drawn further into the work, survey respondents suggest, they also read more systematically in the literature on learning in their own field—a quest that can lead to the literature in neighboring fields, or even in those far away, including (for some) education and the learning sciences.

Many participants in the scholarship of teaching and learning make a further commitment to knowledge- and field-building by seeking wider audiences for their work. They not only draw from the larger teaching commons but contribute to it as well (see Huber and Hutchings, 2005). The opportunities for making work public continue to grow: posters and presentations at campus or disciplinary conferences, essays in campus publications or scholarly society newsletters, articles in pedagogical journals, edited collections, single- or multi-authored books. Some have pioneered multimedia genres, like electronic portfolios or repositories for teaching materials that make it possible to give fuller representation not just to inquiry on teaching and learning, but to the acts of teaching and learning themselves.

These developments are certainly no surprise to others who are engaged in or study the scholarship of teaching and learning. But a focus on institutional impact underlines the importance of documenting what participants are learning, and understanding more about how these lessons migrate from person to person and setting to setting (Huber, 2009). One thing is clear—from our survey and also, certainly, from interactions over the years with scores of faculty engaged in such work: faculty who become engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning are also likely to be engaged in other innovative and reform-oriented activities. The result is a mix of influences that strengthen one another in ways that are likely to become cumulatively even more significant over time. Looking ahead then, integrating the scholarship of teaching and learning—both its practices and findings—into pedagogical and curricular initiatives like first-year programs, learning communities, service learning, and undergraduate research (to name just a few) is a route to improvements that are both deeper and more widely spread.

### **Faculty Development**

When CASTL began, Carnegie’s intent was not to provide professional development for faculty. Our emphasis, rather, was on scholarship: on making the work of teaching and learning an area of systematic investigation and knowledge-building. But what became clear over the years is that the scholarship of teaching and learning is a powerful form of faculty development—“an intersection of teaching and scholarly inquiry in which faculty design, teach, and assess their courses and programs in ways that make it possible to learn from and improve their students’ experience” (Huber, 2010).<sup>5</sup> Not surprisingly, then, when asked to choose from a list of 16 school/college or campus-wide initiatives that might have been influenced by the scholarship of teaching and learning, survey respondents put faculty development at the top of the list. Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning’s cycle of inquiry and improvement allows teachers to identify and investigate questions that they care about in their students’ learning and bring what they’ve found back to their classrooms and programs in the form of new curricula, new assessments and assignments, and new pedagogies, which in turn become subjects for further inquiry. This process helps scholars of teaching and learning develop their capacities as observant, thoughtful, and innovative teachers, while making the work public contributes to a larger field of

pedagogical knowledge on their campuses and in their fields. In short, the scholarship of teaching and learning is a powerful route to professional growth, and it is therefore important to ask, What would campus-based professional development programs and opportunities look like in the future if they were more fully informed by the principles and practices of the scholarship of teaching and learning?

In asking this question, we are aware that while this is work that faculty can do on their own, preferably in the company of a small group of like-minded colleagues from their campus or disciplinary networks, formal faculty development centers are playing increasingly important roles. They are providing programs for graduate students and for faculty new to the scholarship of teaching and learning; access to literature, methodological expertise, and other resources helpful to faculty engaged in the work; an array of forums for making teaching public in the campus community; and, in general, a place where people can find colleagues for discussion and collaboration around pedagogical issues of common interest. Perhaps most important in light of our focus on institutional integration, faculty development initiatives—and their directors and staff—are well positioned to connect scholars of teaching and learning with educational issues and initiatives (like those mentioned in the section on teaching above) of wider institutional concern.

Faculty development wasn't always this way, nor is it entirely this way yet. For many years, formal programs to promote professional improvement operated in a cultural milieu that emphasized teaching as transmission of content. Since faculty with doctorates were already presumed to command content expertise, "development" meant modest support for keeping up with disciplinary trends, while support for pedagogical purposes primarily responded to crises: assistance for faculty who were having trouble in the classroom, teaching assistant preparation, response to the learning needs of a more diverse student body, help with using new teaching technologies, and the like. Unfortunately, faculty often formed a negative view of these efforts as overly remedial, technical, and generic. In contrast, the scholarship of teaching and learning, with its emphasis on pedagogical inquiry and innovation, implied a different model of development: a "narrative of growth" instead of a "narrative of constraint" (O'Meara, Terosky, and Neumann, 2008). For this reason, scholars of teaching and learning, especially in the movement's early days, often went about their work outside the purview of faculty development centers.

Yet faculty developers and scholars of teaching and learning share a common goal: transforming teaching and learning for the better. And, over time, the benefits of partnership have become clear. Scholars of teaching and learning have gained advocates with better access to resources that can facilitate inquiry, innovation, collaboration, and knowledge-building. And professional development centers have gained allies among faculty who are interested in participating in teaching initiatives that go beyond their own classrooms and programs, through which they can help raise students' levels of learning and build their own pedagogical networks and expertise.

When these opportunities are organized around issues of wide campus concern—for instance, assessment, curriculum revision, new media pedagogy, and undergraduate research—then both efforts, faculty development and the scholarship of teaching and learning, gain currency and relevance. Of course, there are risks. But that is always the case when activities that have been cultivated on the margins of institutional operation move closer to center stage and into the spotlight. But scholars of teaching and learning—along with faculty developers—have too much to offer to hold back from this chance to influence their institutions' larger educational agendas. More fully integrating the two is a promising strategy for further, future impact.

## **Assessment**

Interest in assessment picked up new life in the United States through the hearings and report of former U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings' National Commission on the Future of Higher Education (2006), the debates it sparked, and the initiatives through which the higher education community responded (see Shavelson, 2010; Ewell, 2009; Banta, Griffin, Flateby, and Kahn, 2009). Less noted in the national debate are the family resemblances between institutional assessment and the scholarship of teaching and learning (Hutchings, 2010), and among the real surprises from the CASTL survey were the emerging connections between these two important movements in higher education—connections that come with both promise and challenge.

On the one hand, assessment shares with the scholarship of teaching and learning a focus on student learning, a more systematic evidence-based approach to educational quality, and a commitment to being more public about what and how well students are learning in college and university classrooms. Yet the two movements have important differences as well. Inquiry undertaken by scholars of teaching and learning is typically motivated by questions that arise out of classroom practice, while assessment more often begins with concerns (both externally and internally generated) about institutional effectiveness. The scholarship of teaching and learning has typically been a bottom-up effort by faculty, while assessment has been a top-down initiative from administration. Finally, they are subject to different incentives: as Peter Ewell notes, those assessing for public accountability are inclined to present as rosy a picture of student learning at their institution as possible, while those assessing for improvement—and this would include scholars of teaching and learning—are oriented towards discovering and understanding where students have difficulties (2009).

For all of these reasons, assessment and the scholarship of teaching and learning have proceeded on more or less separate tracks—with their different histories, methods, and champions—each somewhat wary of the other. And this is still the case in many settings. Like some respondents to the CASTL survey, we worry that blurring the distinction might put a damper on the intellectual impulse that fuels faculty engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning, and that making such work a mandate from administration would “kill it for sure.” At the same time, we were struck by reports about intersections between the scholarship of teaching and learning and assessment, and about how the two have complemented and strengthened each other.

Cautious though these beginnings may (and should) be, the possibilities are intriguing. When assessment is done in ways that offer added insight into issues of student learning, it is more likely to command the interest and involvement of faculty, and thus to enter more fully into the life of the institution. Likewise, when the scholarship of teaching and learning speaks to such pressing institutional agendas as student achievement and success, it is likely to receive more support and recognition—as is the better-informed teaching that this kind of scholarship underwrites. In short, there may be common ground here that's ripe for institutional integration, with campuses “building bridges” (as one put it) between the two movements in ways that create connected layers and levels of information about student learning.

## **Valuing and Evaluating Teaching**

Much has been said and written about the need to bring institutional reward systems into alignment with the scholarship of teaching and learning. In our survey, respondents cited examples of progress along this dimension of institutional integration. However, comments also indicated a continuing lag in recognition and reward. While the scholarship of teaching and learning has contributed to “a change in the prevailing understanding of what is



expected of professors as teachers," it is not necessarily valued in retention, tenure, and promotion. Some complain that official documents "mostly pay lip service to teaching" while others say that the scholarship of teaching and learning is still treated as "the 'poor cousin' to disciplinary research." A more nuanced perspective is reported at one baccalaureate college: "Scholarship of teaching and learning work is considered positively in hiring and promotion decisions, but it is not considered a substitute for scholarly work in one's field."

As with assessment, efforts to reconceptualize, support, and reward good teaching are back in public discourse—certainly so in the United States. In addition to spurring new attention to the role of learning outcomes assessment for accountability, Spellings' National Commission report urged colleges and universities to embrace a "culture of continuous innovation" in teaching and curriculum (2006, p. 5), a theme that many campuses were also voicing. Even at Harvard University, a distinguished task force sought to identify ways to foster and reward pedagogical improvement as a major professional commitment for academic scholars at all stages of their careers (see *Harvard Magazine*, 2006; Task Force on Teaching and Career Development to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, 2007). Indeed, a consensus seems to have emerged that it's time to revisit expectations for good teaching in higher education, and to develop some common understandings about how it can be improved.

The scholarship of teaching and learning community has much to offer the larger academic world as it takes on the question: What is good college or university teaching today? To put it most succinctly, we propose the idea of the scholarship of teaching and learning itself. As Dan Bernstein, Amy Burnett, Amy Goodburn, and Paul Savory spell it out in their book, *Making Teaching and Learning Visible*: "An excellent teacher is one who is engaged in a well-prepared and intentional ongoing investigation of the best ways to promote a deep understanding on the part of as many students as possible" (2006, p. 215). Yet even as straightforward a conception as this opens a series of difficult questions—many echoed by CASTL survey respondents—concerning the way in which teaching is recognized and rewarded in higher education today.

Since *Scholarship Reconsidered* was published in 1990, many colleges and universities have broadened or amended institutional policies to recognize and reward a wider range of faculty work, often embracing Boyer's four scholarships (discovery, integration, application, and teaching) or a version of them. Most often, however, this has involved expanding the category of "research" to give published work on pedagogy, community service, or public scholarship a place in the rhetoric—if not fully, yet, the reality—of the research category for promotion and tenure purposes. This has been an important development, and, while there is still a lot of hard work to do to realize its promise, it has helped give visibility to the scholarship of teaching and learning in the various disciplines, and hope to people who have begun to undertake it.

But what about teaching itself? The movement started by *Scholarship Reconsidered* has always had larger aspirations: to encourage and recognize the intellectual work in teaching, and make it (echoing Shulman once again) "an essential facet of good teaching—built into the expected repertoire of scholarly practice."

This integrative vision raises important questions about what teaching evaluation would look like if it too focused on features, like those identified in the Carnegie report *Scholarship Assessed*, that characterize a wide range of scholarly work: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997; Bernstein and Huber, 2006). Recent years have seen important initiatives and experiments to supplement student evaluations of

teaching with portfolio approaches, and to improve the academic community's capacity for the peer review of such materials. But this will be a long and, doubtless, bumpy road.

Campuses will likely make more progress on that road if they work together, developing new models and metrics for recognizing the intellectual work in teaching, and for discerning strengths and weaknesses in records of performance; doing so will be an important way of showing respect for academics as teachers. It will, in addition, give a boost to faculty who teach with a persistent focus on their students' learning and who have a willingness to engage with pedagogical literature and discussion in search of ways to create richer learning environments. The likely downstream consequences of better evaluation are also worth consideration: clearer messages to graduate programs, more serious discourse on teaching and learning in disciplinary and professional societies, and greater attention to the work of the growing numbers of non tenure-track faculty occupying primarily teaching roles. Finally, by fostering a more collegial culture of teaching, better evaluation will encourage faculty to contribute more thoughtfully and more often to the literature and discussion on teaching and learning, increasing pedagogical knowledge and its use for the benefit of students. This, clearly, is an area in which significant progress must still be made if the scholarship of teaching and learning is to take a lasting hold—and make an enduring difference.

### The Learning Question

In designing our survey, we endeavored to look at the scholarship of teaching and learning's impact on multiple dimensions and levels of institutional work.<sup>6</sup> One area of impact, however, rises up above the rest. The scholarship of teaching and learning may change how teachers teach, shape powerful forms of professional development, link with assessment efforts, and be woven into faculty roles and rewards. But does progress in these areas translate into improved learning outcomes for students? Our answer is yes. But comments from CASTL survey respondents underline the need for the scholarship of teaching and learning community to think hard about what is entailed in answering this question.

For starters it should be said that there are countless examples of scholarship of teaching and learning projects that focus directly and explicitly on improvements in learning—and on documenting those improvements. We think of the longitudinal study by Dennis Jacobs, a chemist at the University of Notre Dame, who designed an alternative version of introductory chemistry for at-risk students—and whose assessments showed that students in that section persisted through and did better in subsequent science courses than peers in the regular lecture section (2000, 2004). We think of the program-level studies by Kathleen McKinney of sociology majors at Illinois State University—the strategies they use and believe effective in learning the field, along with the different pathways they travel from being less to more successful in the major, from surface to deep learning, and from novice to expert learners (2007). And we think of the course-level study by Michael Smith, a historian at Ithaca College, who found that a service-learning research partnership on local environmental history helped students develop a stronger sense of themselves as ecological citizens (2010).

One campus responding to the 2009 CASTL Survey noted that faculty selected as scholarship of teaching and learning fellows on her campus "must document impact on learning," and this expectation is becoming more common. Indeed, deepening and advancing student learning can fairly be said to be *the* Project (yes, with a capital P) of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Faculty self-reports reinforce this observation, with 81 percent of respondents to an earlier CASTL survey of individual scholars of teaching and

learning reporting that they had “documented improvements in [their] students’ learning” (Cox, Huber, and Hutchings, 2005, p. 140).

Asking whether a campus commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning improves student learning in a more general way (beyond individual projects, that is) is trickier. More than a third of campuses in the final phase of the CASTL program told us that such work had a “widespread but mixed” effect on the ways faculty approach teaching, and about a quarter of reporting campuses said the work has had “deep impact” on the student learning experience. Many also say that the scholarship of teaching and learning has contributed to other educational agendas and initiatives, including pedagogical innovation, general education reform, and the first-year experience (Cicccone, Huber, Hutchings, and Cambridge, 2009).

But more telling than the numbers and lists is the way respondents described the travel and ramifications of these changes. That is, while pointing out that lines of cause and effect between the doing of the scholarship of teaching and learning and the improvement of student learning are not immediate and direct, many see more web-like, multidirectional, cascading connections. “It certainly makes teachers more attuned to the question of what and how their students are learning,” one campus leader observes. Another says, “The scholarship of teaching and learning surely is helpful if only because it prompts us to consider what we do and don’t know. Intentionally and systematically asking about student learning is likely to lead to increased student learning.” Indeed, faculty engaged in such work often end up rethinking goals and setting more ambitious expectations for student learning (Cox, Huber, and Hutchings, 2005).

On many campuses then, the scholarship of teaching and learning in a more narrow sense has become an engine for wider engagement with and thoughtfulness about matters pedagogical. New conversations are started, and those underway take more informed directions. New teaching practices begin to migrate through the culture. Students themselves get wind of this growing engagement and generate further energy. And while many campuses have wanted to distinguish between excellent teaching (or scholarly teaching) and the scholarship of teaching and learning (Hutchings and Shulman, 1999), the fact that the latter can catalyze the former is, we believe, a crucial part of the answer to the “learning question.”

Students’ own voices are surely relevant here as well. A 2009 survey of member institutions by the Association of American Colleges and Universities reveals that only two-fifths of campuses believe that their students understand campus goals for their learning (2009, p. 5). But that number is likely to shift upward as campuses find active roles for students in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Many have done so, seeing students as collaborators rather than as objects of study, asking them to help frame questions and analyze data, and, more generally, inviting them to join in the campus conversation about learning and teaching (Werder and Otis, 2010). Where this has happened, students have not only made important contributions; they have had valuable experiences that support their learning, developing new language for talking about learning, broadening their repertoire of learning strategies, and reflecting on the goals and purposes of their education.

Clearly, the “learning question” is a critical one, and it is one that many scholarship of teaching and learning activists are struggling to address in thoughtful and responsible ways. “We want help here,” one leader noted in the 2009 CASTL Survey. “We NEED help.” In truth, higher education has been casual, at best, about asking whether prevailing pedagogical practices and improvement efforts advance learning. The scholarship of

teaching and learning, along with its cousin, assessment, provides a much-needed prompt to think more carefully about how this question can be addressed, what evidence will count, and what expectations are reasonable—in the short run and over the longer term as expectations for higher education become ever more pressing.

### The Future of the Professoriate

The scholarship of teaching and learning movement has prospered in large part, we believe, because it has been invitational in tone, deliberately welcoming to any and all faculty (full-time and adjunct, senior and more junior, whatever the field or institutional type) who wish to put a toe in the water—or even to dive headfirst into the surf. This openness is consistent with the movement’s language: this is *scholarly* work, not a bureaucratic requirement.

At the same time, it is hard not to be struck by the escalating demands on faculty today. Even as serious intellectual work on learning and teaching has begun to make a place for itself in campus culture, so have pressures in other directions: rising expectations, even in so-called teaching institutions, for traditional research publications; urgings in the direction of more interdisciplinary scholarship; growing commitments to community engagement; new opportunities but also new challenges in the use of technology; high-profile imperatives around assessment, accountability, student recruitment, retention, and advising; and—most to the point here—an increasingly urgent public call to move much larger numbers of students toward more meaningful forms and levels of learning. This press to raise college success rates is, as one foundation put it, “the big goal,” and it comes with high stakes for this country’s future (Lumina Foundation, 2009).

We believe the stakes are high for the professoriate, as well. For one thing, rising expectations for student learning have come at a time of diminishing resources for higher education, as both public funding and the value of endowments drop. Doing more with less, campuses are struggling, and faculty are stretched thin just about everywhere we look. And, as is now well known, in the U.S. more than half of today’s professoriate hold positions that are part-time or “contingent,” making it difficult to do sustained work on pressing institutional agendas for student learning—or anything else, for that matter (Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006). Not surprisingly, some have worried that the academic profession is becoming a less attractive proposition for the best and brightest—and indeed less a profession than a kind of work for hire.

In the face of these realities, it is hard (as some survey respondents reminded us) to imagine that faculty can find time, energy, or motivation to take on new work. And yet, that is just what many are now doing as they take up the mantle of the scholarship of teaching and learning and set their sights on finding the best roads to a better education for more students. And perhaps, after all, this is not surprising, for such work enacts the values of inquiry, evidence, and excellence that are at the heart of academic life and identity. The scholarship of teaching and learning is not a panacea, but its practices and vision are already improving the educational experience for students, faculty, and institutions.

The world of college and university teaching has come a long way since *Scholarship Reconsidered* introduced the idea of a “scholarship of teaching,” not as a specialized area of endeavor but as an approach to teaching and scholarship available to all faculty. Since then, the conversation has moved from definitional debates to questions of impact, and the focus has shifted from the design of individual projects to collaborative work that can influence institutional change. It is no longer necessary, even desirable, for professors to teach as they had been taught: in pedagogical solitude. Faculty today (and tomorrow) can engage in

inquiry and innovation with colleagues, drawing on and contributing to the larger teaching commons. And in that commons, they will find a literature that is far richer than the familiar staple of teaching tips and anecdotes, including systematic studies by faculty like themselves investigating teaching and student learning in college classrooms and programs. One need not wait for the future to see these shifts. They're happening now. And they hold great promise for the profession of teaching, for students, and for higher education.

## References

Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2009. *Learning and Assessment: Trends in Undergraduate Education: A Survey Among Members of The Association of American Colleges and Universities*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Banta, T. W., Griffin, M., Flateby, T. L., and Kahn, S. 2009. *Three Promising Alternatives for Assessing College Students' Knowledge and Skills*. Occasional Paper , Number 2. Champaign, Ill.: National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment.

Bass, R. 1999. "The Scholarship of Teaching: What's the Problem?" *Inventio: Creative Thinking about Learning and Teaching* 1(1).  
[<http://doit.gmu.edu/archives/feb98/randybass.htm>].

Bernstein, D., Burnett, A. N., Goodburn, A., and Savory, P. 2006. *Making Teaching and Learning Visible: Course Portfolios and the Peer Review of Teaching*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker.

Bernstein, D., and Huber, M.T. 2006. "What is Good Teaching? Raising the Bar through Scholarship Assessed." Featured Presentation at the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Conference, Washington, D.C., November 9.

Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braxton, J., Luckey, W., and Helland, P. 2002. *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer's Four Domains*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29, Number 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ciccone, A. 2008. "Examining the Impact of SoTL." *The International Commons*, 3(1), 12-13.

Ciccone, A., Huber, M. T., Hutchings, P., and Cambridge, B. 2009. *Exploring Impact: A Survey of Participants in the CASTL Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program*. Stanford, Calif.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cox, R., Huber, M. T., and Hutchings, P. 2005. *Survey of CASTL Scholars*. Appendix to M. T. Huber and P. Hutchings, *The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons*. Stanford, Calif.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Eckel, P., Green, M., and Hill, B. 2001. *Riding the Waves of Change: Insights from Transforming Institutions*. "On Change V," Occasional Paper Series of the ACE Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation and The Kellogg Forum on Higher Education Transformation. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Ewell, P. T. 2009. *Assessment, Accountability, and Improvement: Revisiting the Tension*. National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment Occasional Paper, Number 1. Urbana, Ill.: National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessment.

[[http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/documents/PeterEwell\\_005.pdf](http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/documents/PeterEwell_005.pdf)].

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

*Harvard Magazine*. 2006. "Taking Teaching Seriously." 102(2), 60-65.

Huber, M. T. 2010. "Community Organizing for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning." Foreword to J. Dewar, A. Dailey-Hebert, and T. Moore (eds.), "The Attraction, Value, and Future of the SoTL: Perspectives from the Carnegie Affiliates," *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning e-Journal* 4 (1).

[<http://www.kwantlen.ca/TD>].

Huber, M. T. 2009. "Teaching Travels: Reflections on the Social Life of Classroom Inquiry and Innovation." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2).

Huber, M. T., and Hutchings, P. 2005. *The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, P. 2010. *Opening Doors to Faculty Involvement in Assessment*. National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment Occasional Paper, Number 4. Urbana, Ill.: National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment.

Hutchings, P. (ed.). 2000. *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Menlo Park, Calif.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Hutchings, P., Huber, M. T., and Ciccone, A. (Forthcoming). *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, P., and Shulman, L. S. 1999. "The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments." *Change*, 31(5), 10-15.

Jacobs, D. 2000. "A Chemical Mixture of Methods." In P. Hutchings (ed.), *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Menlo Park, Calif.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Jacobs, D. 2004. "An Alternative Approach to General Chemistry: Addressing the Needs of At-Risk Students with Cooperative Learning Strategies."

[[http://gallery.carnegiefoundation.org/collections/castl\\_he/djacobs/index2.htm](http://gallery.carnegiefoundation.org/collections/castl_he/djacobs/index2.htm)].

Lumina Foundation for Education. 2009. *A Stronger Nation through Higher Education: How and Why Americans Must Meet a "Big Goal" of College Attainment*. Indianapolis: Lumina Foundation for Education.

McKinney, K. 2007. "The Student Voice: Sociology Majors Tell Us about Learning Sociology." *Teaching Sociology*, 35, 112-124.

National Commission on the Future of Higher Education. 2006. *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: GPO.

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.

Schuster, J. H., and Finkelstein, M. J. 2006. *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Shavelson, R. J. 2010. *Measuring College Learning Responsibly: Accountability in a New Era*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Shulman, L. S. 2000. "Inventing the Future." In P. Hutchings (ed.), *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Menlo Park, Calif.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Smith, M. B. 2010. "Local Environmental History and the Journey to Ecological Citizenship." In M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, and J. L. Bernstein (eds.), *Citizenship Across the Curriculum*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Task Force on Teaching and Career Development to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. 2007. *A Compact to Enhance Teaching and Learning at Harvard*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.

Werder, C., and Otis, M. M. (eds.). 2010. *Engaging Student Voices in the Study of Teaching and Learning*. Sterling, Virg.: Stylus.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> This quotation is from "Inventing the Future," Lee Shulman's conclusion to *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* (Hutchings, 2000, p. 105).

<sup>2</sup> This essay draws from a forthcoming volume by Pat Hutchings, Mary Taylor Huber, and Anthony Ciccone, *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact*. Scheduled for release by Jossey-Bass in Fall 2011, the book explores in much more detail the central question of this essay: what might academic life and work look like if the principles and practices of the scholarship of teaching and learning were embraced and integrated at a deep level.

<sup>3</sup> The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), a major, long-term initiative of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, was established in 1998 and continuing through 2009. Its aim was to support the development of a scholarship of teaching and learning that would 1) foster significant, long-lasting learning for all students; 2) enhance the practice and profession of teaching; and 3) bring to faculty members' work as teachers the recognition and reward afforded to other forms of scholarly work. Toward these ends, activities were organized on three levels: with individual faculty, with campuses, and with scholarly and professional societies.

This essay draws primarily on the final phase of work with campuses. Running from 2006-2009, the CASTL Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program was designed to build on the influential work already done, within CASTL and beyond, and to bring the scholarship of teaching and learning more fully into the mainstream of institutional life.

Approximately 150 institutions, from the United States and around the world, were organized in twelve theme-based groups, and in a thirteenth—the CASTL Affiliates—which had no specific theme and remained open to new campuses throughout the program. Appendix B in the forthcoming volume by Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone provides a fuller account of CASTL's history, design, and activities.

<sup>4</sup> The scale was adapted from Eckel, Green, and Hill's influential 2001 publication, "Riding the Waves of Change," an occasional paper from the American Council on Education Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation and The Kellogg Forum on Higher Education Transformation.

<sup>5</sup> We would like to thank Jaqueline Dewar for suggesting the phrase "intersection of teaching and scholarly inquiry" in this definition.

<sup>6</sup> In 2007, CASTL staff (Anthony Ciccone, Barbara Cambridge, Mary Taylor Huber, and Pat Hutchings) took a stab at outlining ten cross-cutting areas of impact, coming up with a list that was later refined with the help of coordinators from CASTL's Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program. The list directed attention to contributions that the scholarship of teaching and learning is making to: important agendas and initiatives in higher education; changes in how teachers teach, and understanding how that change happens; how educators understand and talk about learning; direct and indirect effects on student learning and success; knowledge of conditions that affect the exchange and improvement of pedagogy; strengthening development programs for higher education professionals; informing change in institutional policies and practices; the culture of academic life; changes in the definition and evaluation of scholarship; and the growth and evolution of the larger movement (see Ciccone, 2008).