

A Synthesis of the Challenges Facing SoTL at Carnegie Affiliate Institutions

Jacqueline Dewar, Loyola Marymount University

Marilyn Cohn, Maryville University

Authors' Contact Information

Jacqueline Dewar
Loyola Marymount University
email: jdewar@lmu.edu

Marilyn Cohn
Maryville University
email: mcohn@maryville.edu

Abstract:

The Carnegie Foundation's initiative to promote the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) through the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) program ended in October 2009. Within its last three years, 17 diverse institutions in the United States and Canada chose to make a connection to CASTL by joining its Affiliates program. This required a commitment by each Affiliate to explore the role of SoTL in its own institutional context, and to provide support and recognition for ongoing inquiry into evidence-based improvement of student learning. The opening article in this issue of Transformative Dialogues gives the Affiliates' collective view of what attracts institutions to SoTL now and what is needed to sustain SoTL. Then nine Affiliates tell the 'stories' of their institutional involvement with SoTL, including the role that their CASTL affiliation played. Each of those stories closes with a section that delineates the challenges facing that institution in continuing to support and advance SoTL. This final essay provides a synthesis of the challenges described by the nine Affiliates and compares them to those faced by the six institutions of the Building Scholarly Communities group of the CASTL Institutional Leadership Program (Gurm et al., 2009). It also examines the attrition from the Carnegie Affiliates group in an attempt to gain additional insights into the task of sustaining SoTL initiatives. The essay concludes by suggesting that a new and overarching challenge for the SoTL movement is to develop networking opportunities to replace the Carnegie Foundation's prestigious leadership and enable institutions to address the clearly identified but highly complex issues that confront the acceptance of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as a legitimate and valued form of research.

Key Words:

Scholarship of teaching and learning, SoTL, future of SoTL, SoTL challenges, CASTL, CASTL Affiliates, Carnegie Affiliates, network.

Introduction

The Carnegie Affiliates, whose work is the focus of this issue of *Transformative Dialogues*, are a collection of 17 very diverse institutions in the US and Canada that chose to join the 2006-9 CASTL (Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) Affiliates program. This required an institutional commitment to explore the place of SoTL in its institutional context, and to provide support and recognition for ongoing inquiry into evidence-based improvement of student learning. Thus, the group found itself uniquely situated to contribute to the conversation about what attracts institutions to SoTL and what is needed to sustain the movement that the Carnegie Foundation had so ably promoted for the last two decades. The collective experience of the Affiliates, including lessons learned, is detailed in the article that opens this issue, *The Carnegie Affiliates' Perspective on the Attraction, Value and Future of SoTL*.

When the CASTL program ended with a final convening on October 21, 2009 at Indiana University - Bloomington, representatives from 11 of the 17 Affiliate institutions participated in the Affiliates' session. All those present agreed in principle for their institutions to disseminate their work in this journal. One of the 11 subsequently concluded that because it also had membership in one of the leadership themed groups, and had been working with that group, it should not submit an article for this journal. A call for papers was issued to the remaining 16 CASTL Affiliates after a proposal for an issue of *Transformative Dialogues* dedicated to the work and experiences of the Carnegie Affiliates was accepted by the journal editors. Altogether, nine Affiliates responded, and thus, this journal issue contains stories from the following Carnegie Affiliates:

Indiana University - Purdue University, Fort Wayne

[*The difference a CASTL has made: Building on a Solid Foundation*](#)

Loyola Marymount University

[*SoTL and Community Enhance One Another to Create Impact at Loyola Marymount University*](#)

Maryville University

[*The Story of Maryville University's Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Program: From the Perspective of the "SoTL" Facilitator*](#)

National Center for Science and Civic Engagement (NCSCE)

[*To deepen and sustain innovation: Incorporating the scholarship of teaching and learning into a diverse and diffuse science education systemic reform project*](#)

Northern Alberta Institute of Technology

[*Fostering a Culture of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning \(SoTL\) at a Polytechnic Institution*](#)

Park University

[*Collaborating for Change: Utilizing Cross-Institutional Partnerships to Advance the Scholarship of Teaching at Primarily Undergraduate Institutions*](#)

Purdue University

[*One Small Step for Teaching, One Giant Leap for Scholarship: The Importance of Recognition at a Research University*](#)

Thompson Rivers University

[*The Path Towards the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at Thompson Rivers University*](#)

Viterbo University

[*Student Learning Through Co-curricular Dedication: Viterbo University Boosts Faculty/Student Research and Community Services*](#)

Each of these articles closes with a discussion of the challenges that the institution faces in continuing to support and advance its SoTL work. This final essay provides a synthesis of the challenges cited by the Affiliates in those articles. Then it explores commonalities with and differences from the challenges faced by institutions in one of the CASTL Institutional Leadership themed groups, Building Scholarly Communities, as detailed in a recent issue of this journal (Gurm et al., 2009). This Institutional Leadership group consisted of six post-secondary institutions (3 in Canada, 2 in the United States, and 1 in the United Kingdom). For the four years of their collaboration, these institutions, through the leadership of key individuals and with the support of campus teaching and learning centers, worked to create a culture that valued SoTL equally with the scholarship of discovery (Gurm et al., 2009). Hence, because of the commitment each Affiliate made to explore the place of SoTL in its institutional context, and to provide support and recognition for this work, the comparison of the Affiliates with this group is particularly apt.

Challenges to the Future of SoTL as Seen by the Affiliates

The authors used grounded theory (Glasser, 1998) and open coding to categorize the challenges for the future of SoTL identified by the Affiliates in the original drafts of their essays, prior to peer-review and revision. The authors made independent passes through the data and these were followed by discussion to produce the categories of challenges shown in Table 1. These are presented in order of descending frequency with an explanation of each category.

	Type of Challenge	Explanation and Exemplars
7	Understand SoTL benefits	Lacking an understanding of SoTL benefits; working to demonstrate SoTL impact; pursuing strategies to clarify SoTL benefits such as connecting SoTL to institutional initiatives or mission; finding ways to assess SoTL impact on student learning; valuing the investigation of all types of SoTL questions, not just <i>What works?</i> questions
6	How SoTL counts	Aligning reward systems with a broader definition of scholarship; being concerned SoTL not be viewed as privileged or required; finding ways to count SoTL work that does not lead to peer reviewed publication
5	Shared definition of SoTL	Needing to develop a shared understanding or definition of SoTL across the entire institution
5	Need more resources	Needing more resources – often with special reference to the economic downturn of 2008-9
5	Time and workload	Finding time for SoTL work given current faculty workload trends
4	Recruit more participants	Needing to recruit more participants, often in reference to disciplines that are underrepresented in SoTL work on the campus
2	Loss of Carnegie and collaborations	Dealing with the loss of Carnegie's leadership and finding ways to maintain cross-institutional collaborations
4	Other	Affiliates with very particular concerns included: a research-intensive university addressing a culture that does not place high priority on teaching; a master's degree granting institution concerned with scaling up classroom research done by a single investigator to more collaborative projects or program-level projects; an institution in transition dealing with the reality that faculty may lack training to produce scholarly research; a multi-institutional 'center' trying to encourage and support widely geographically dispersed scholars with very different levels of support for SoTL at their home institutions

Table 1. Frequency (#) and Types of Challenges to the Sustainability of SoTL

The nine institutional contributors to this issue of *Transformative Dialogues* represent quite diverse institutions (4 private, 4 public, 1 national center for science and civic engagement; 2 are in Canada, 6 in the United States, 1 works with faculty from around the world, but mostly US faculty; 1 research intensive, 5 master's degree granting, 2 recently shifted from two-year to four-year degree granting, 1 non-degree granting but works with the entire range of degree granting institutions). Despite their widely varying characteristics, for the most part, each institution shares concerns about the future of SoTL with several other institutions, including institutions with very different characteristics than their own. In order to indicate how concerns are shared across institutional types, Table 2 groups institutions by type of highest degree offered and then shows the challenges each institution has identified.

Table 2		Type of Challenge to Sustainability of SoTL							
Institution	Understanding SoTL	How SoTL counts	Shared Definition of SoTL	Recruit more participants	Need more	Time and workload	Loss of Carnegie and Collaborations	Other	Type and Location
Research intensive – PhD granting									
Purdue University	X	X			X		X	X	Public US
Master's degree granting									
Indiana U Purdue U - Fort Wayne	X	X	X						Public US
Loyola Marymount University	X	X	X	X					Private US
Maryville University	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	Private US
Park University		X			X	X	X		Private US
Viterbo University	X		X			X			Private US
Transitioned from 2-year to 4-year degree granting									
Northern Alberta Institute of Technology		X			X	X		X	Public Canada
Thompson Rivers University	X		X	X					Public Canada
Other									
National Center for Science and Civic Engagement	X				X	X		X	Multiple Types & Locatns

Table 2. Types of Challenges to the Sustainability of SoTL by Institution

Seeing the types and frequency of the challenges identified by the Affiliates (Table 1) and observing the common occurrences of these concerns across institutional types (Table 2), a question naturally arises. How can this information help us to understand and address these challenges toward the goal of expanding and institutionalizing SoTL work in higher education? In search of an answer, this article next examines the details embedded in each type of challenge and seeks possible connections among them. It concludes that the six most frequently cited types of challenges actually divide into two larger themes: Defining, Valuing and Rewarding SoTL and Attracting Sufficient Resources; and further, that the loss of Carnegie's leadership complicates efforts in both of these areas.

Understanding SoTL Benefits

Seven of the nine Affiliates expressed in one form or another, the need for a shared understanding of the value or benefit of having a strong SoTL program on each campus. For example, Thompson Rivers (TRU) maintains that "Given the historical emphasis on the importance of teaching, the lack of faculty involvement with SoTL highlights that the link between SoTL and effective teaching is still missing for many TRU faculty." Loyola Marymount is currently pursuing a goal to "solidify and make more visible connections between SoTL and the university's mission" and Indiana Purdue - Fort Wayne's challenge is "to focus and coordinate our efforts and our resources toward a well-articulated goal that will capture the imaginations of our faculty and communicate the value of investigating student learning." Further, Maryville is surveying students of faculty engaged in SoTL studies in an attempt to assess the impact on and hopefully benefits for student learning. Maryville's SoTL facilitator puts it this way: "We cannot just assume that faculty willingness to examine their teaching will lead to positive outcomes for them and for their students; we must, at least, try to find ways to document it."

Counting SoTL Work

The problem of connecting SoTL work to the university reward system was the second most frequently mentioned challenge. For Purdue, the only research-intensive university contributing to this issue, this problem requires answers to three basic questions:

1. "Does teaching matter at a research university?"
2. Can teaching be scholarship?
3. Why is SoTL important at the university and beyond it?"

However, for the other Affiliates where expectations for research are much lower and in some cases not required at all, there are also obstacles to aligning the reward system with a broader definition of scholarship. For example, Indiana Purdue – Fort Wayne speaks of the challenge to "modify our reward structure to coincide with an inclusive conception of the nature of scholarship" while Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT) is "struggling" with "ways to record faculty members' SoTL activities." NAIT adds that, "peer reviewed publications are not, and cannot be required, realistically from faculty who may lack the technical training to engage in scholarly research and are not currently granted time to engage in research as part of their

regular workload.” Loyola Marymount is working on the complexities of evaluating SoTL work that “does not reside in a single discipline” and of identifying “outside evaluators who are able to review SoTL work submitted in tenure and promotion dossiers.” A recent series of institutionally sponsored conversations at Loyola Marymount has been exploring how “new forms of scholarship (in particular SoTL and the scholarship of engagement) should be valued and rewarded in the merit, tenure, and promotion process....” Park argues that “Adapting scholarship expectations to integrate productively with a rigorous teaching schedule is essential in an era when many institutions are adding faculty classifications (i.e. lecturers or “teaching” faculty) that omit scholarship expectations altogether (Jaschik, 2008), suggesting that teaching and scholarship can be extricated without harm and disadvantage.” And finally, Purdue makes the case that support for SoTL is dependent on its quality. According to its report, “One crucial component of SoTL is the necessity of rigorous application of research methods to the study of teaching pedagogy and learning.”

Developing a Shared Definition of SoTL

A majority of the Affiliates represented in this issue are still working on developing campus wide consensus on a definition of SoTL and a description of what it entails. For example, survey data from Thompson Rivers (TRU) indicated that a “majority of faculty at TRU do not have a clear understanding of the scholarship of teaching and learning.” At Viterbo, it is hoped that “A faculty reflection session on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning this spring will aid faculty members in making explicit what they are doing implicitly as an extension of the learning environments created throughout the variety of projects undertaken during the past few years.” Loyola Marymount (LMU) reports that at a roundtable discussion during its 2009 SoTL Showcase Week, “it became apparent that some LMU faculty and administrators still have an incomplete understanding of what SoTL entails and how SoTL differs from good teaching practice or scholarly teaching.” Finally, despite its strong commitment to research, Purdue maintains that “It is necessary to educate ourselves and our university on what SoTL means and how it is achieved.”

Connections Among the Challenges of Defining, Valuing and Counting SoTL

The details just revealed about the three most prevalent types of challenges serve to highlight the linkages among them. In universities where traditional, discipline-based research is the norm, those who attempt to establish the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as a legitimate and valued type of inquiry will generally encounter a set of interrelated questions similar to the following:

- What is SoTL?
- Why should faculty or institutions embrace it?
- How can institutions evaluate the quality of this work?
- How should it count in tenure and promotion cases?

These questions target interconnected components of an overarching challenge, which is how to identify SoTL as scholarly work, assess its impact, and communicate its

benefits to higher education institutions so that SoTL can claim a place in faculty reward systems. CASTL leaders and participants alike have acknowledged this challenge in recent publications (Ciccone, 2008; Gurm, 2009).

Needing More Resources

This is the first of a second set of three related challenges involving different types of resources, both financial and human. In the category of needing more resources, the recent economic conditions were frequently cited. For example, for the National Center for Science and Civic Engagement, the “economic downturn” led to a significant reduction in funds available to support travel, and that, in turn, resulted in fewer applicants to a SoTL workshop attached to its summer institute. Purdue makes the point more generally:

“One of the biggest challenges that SoTL faces at Purdue, and at many universities, is surviving the cut when budgets are trimmed. Unless SoTL is considered relevant to the campus community and central to the university mission, it faces an uncertain future.”

The Northern Alberta Institute of Technology story directly links the downturn and need for more resources to the next category of challenges, which is time and workload. In referring to the “current government cuts in post-secondary education under an economic recession,” Northern Alberta maintains that the “resulting decrease in budgets threatens to increase faculty’s workloads, which will allow less time to spend on SoTL activities.”

Addressing Time and Workload Issues

Fifteen out of the original group of 17 Affiliates were comprehensive or teaching rather than research-intensive institutions. Because faculty workloads at these institutions typically include heavy teaching, advising, and service responsibilities, it is not surprising that the time to devote to SoTL or any other type of scholarship is limited. This is certainly the case at Maryville where one of the biggest challenges is to “explore ways to reward the scholarly effort that participating faculty are willing to make with some type of release time.” However, since current economic conditions suggest that this will not happen in the foreseeable future, a more immediate challenge is “to determine how to encourage faculty to do this work, without burning them out.” Park tells a similar story: “A persistent challenge for Park University, and PUIs [primarily undergraduate institutions], will be to devise realistic, accessible opportunities for a faculty audience with demanding teaching and student advising responsibilities.”

Recruiting More Participants

The challenge to attract more faculty members to SoTL work seems to be multifaceted. One facet is related to the resource and workload issues raised above. Given their significant workloads and the lower expectations for research, many faculty at comprehensive or teaching institutions understandably balk at taking on “one more thing”... especially something that is not clearly embedded in the reward structure. Another aspect of this issue is that SoTL seems to attract faculty from some disciplines

more than others. At Maryville, the faculty from Arts and Sciences has been under-represented in the SoTL Seminar program, possibly because they are so “committed to their disciplinary studies.” Loyola Marymount, where participation in SoTL is highly concentrated in the Sciences, also faces the under-represented issue, and formulates a goal to “continue to broaden the base of SoTL scholars across all of the six schools and colleges in the university.” This challenge of attracting more participants may also be connected with the challenges stated earlier in terms of some faculty not actually understanding what SoTL is and how it counts toward tenure and promotion.

Connections among the Resource-related Challenges

In examining the specific concerns that Affiliates expressed regarding the need for more financial resources, a lightened workload, and the involvement of a larger and broader base of faculty, connections again arise. Without financial resources to support efforts or provide release time, it is difficult to get faculty to commit to an interdisciplinary research process that has yet to be fully accepted and rewarded by many institutions, and for which few faculty obtain all the requisite skills as part of their disciplinary training.

Loss of Carnegie and Collaborations

In describing challenges for the future in the closing sections of their institutional stories, only two Affiliates spoke directly to the loss of Carnegie leadership and CASTL’s opportunities for collaborations. The Park story expressed this loss in very serious terms: Perhaps the most poignant among the challenges faced by Park University is the “loss of national SoTL organizational leadership like that provided by the Carnegie CASTL program. Carnegie has provided Park University with venues and resources to support cross institutional partnerships; we have found these partnerships to be critical to sustaining momentum for SoTL amidst shifting institutional resources.” Purdue also found great value in national support and collaboration. According to their story, Carnegie and CASTL affiliation has provided

“visibility and weight to our SoTL work. In addition, by facilitating collaboration amongst institutions, our SoTL programs are a part of a larger initiative, which is useful in maintaining support on our campus. Maintaining and expanding collaborative linkages has been important in understanding the changing needs of SoTL research and development, and will continue to play a part in furthering the needs of our institution.”

As Park and Purdue’s comments indicate, the “Carnegie connection” proved to be a significant aid in recruiting individuals, obtaining resources, and gaining greater recognition for SoTL work, and one that will be missed.

In addition to the views expressed by Park and Purdue in the closing sections of their articles, the importance of Carnegie’s support and collaboration opportunities were mentioned throughout the stories of other Affiliates as factors that attracted them to CASTL and contributed to their successes. Moreover, the opening article in this journal issue (Dewar, Dailey-Hebert, & Moore, 2010) presented multiple forms of evidence documenting the high value that the Affiliates placed on their Carnegie connection and

their great desire for a vehicle to maintain and promote institutional level collaborations. The Affiliates' self-study survey completed in Spring 2009 revealed that the most important factor in deciding to join the Affiliates was the Carnegie name affiliation. The analysis by Dewar et al. (2010) of discussions and written reflections at the final CASTL convening session indicated "the Affiliates found great value in the cross-institutional collaborations, gained insights through the dialogue and resources shared, and believe that developing venues for similar collaborations is critical to sustaining SoTL in higher education." Thus, the importance of Carnegie's leadership and of the collaborative opportunities afforded by the CASTL program to the Affiliates has been clearly established. The value of CASTL and the impact of its dissolution will be revisited in the closing remarks.

Comparing Challenges Identified by the CASTL Affiliates with Those by a CASTL Leadership Group

Having examined the challenges facing the Affiliates in advancing and sustaining their SoTL initiatives, we now explore commonalities with and differences from the challenges identified by institutions in one of the CASTL Institutional Leadership themed groups, Building Scholarly Communities. This Institutional Leadership group, which consisted of six post-secondary institutions (3 in Canada, 2 in the United States, and 1 in the United Kingdom), worked to create a culture that valued SoTL equally with the scholarship of discovery (Gurm et al., 2009). Since each Affiliate had to make a commitment to explore the place of SoTL in its institutional context, and to provide support and recognition for this work, the Affiliates shared similar overarching goals with the members of the Building Scholarly Communities group. It turns out both groups identified many of the same challenges, but the Affiliates group experienced greater attrition from its membership.

Building Scholarly Communities: Lesson Learned (Gurm et al., 2009) states that these institutions "all struggled with the definition of SoTL" (p. 2) and their initial goal of arriving at a common definition across their cluster was impossible to achieve in the end. They also found that defining SoTL at the institutional level proved "to be more difficult than we first anticipated" (p. 6) but that "the process of having this discussion has been beneficial in building community and increasing understanding amongst individuals and institutions" (p. 6). We have seen that the Affiliates found that coming to a common understanding of the definition of SoTL on their campuses was an ongoing challenge for them as well.

The Institutional Leadership group found that some of their institutions "failed to grasp the potential of SoTL for the enhancement of student learning. This was particularly evident in cultures where promotion, tenure, and other rewards stemmed from success in the scholarship of traditional disciplinary research initiatives" (Gurm et al., 2009, p.7). Different institutional contexts led to different approaches and levels of success in legitimizing SoTL as a form of research. Thus, this group shares with the Affiliates the challenges of getting their institutions to understand the benefits of SoTL and appropriately align reward systems. They also observed: "Ensuring adequate resources, both institutional and personnel, as well as concerns over institutional commitment were issues faced by all institutions in the cluster" (p.7). These concerns

align with three identified by the Affiliates: needing more resources, recruiting more participants, and time and workload issues.

As a themed group, institutions in the Building Scholarly Communities seemed to have entered with high expectations for communicating and collaborating as a group. Because of costs, logistics and varying levels of access to technology, communication proved challenging but “key to creating scholarly communities” (Gurm et al., 2009, p.10). They noted that “financial constraints made face-to-face meetings difficult to arrange for all members” (p.7) and “the withdrawal of one of our institutional members” (p. 7) also had an impact. They clearly valued the synergies emanating from their CASTL group, as did the Affiliates. One difference between the two CASTL groups that will become apparent in the next section is the much higher attrition that occurred from the Affiliates.

Gurm et al. (2009) note one final emergent theme: “We realize that all of our institutions have a mandate to enhance student learning/engagement. Indeed, emphasizing the connection between SoTL and student learning was seen as a powerful lever for continuing to advance our work” (p. 10). One institutional member had been quite successful in obtaining resources for a SoTL Fellows Program (Smetkowski, Conway, & Starrett, 2009) by demonstrating its success in encouraging faculty to adopt or adapt teaching methods shown by SoTL investigations to be effective. This theme relates directly to the Affiliates’ concerns about being able to offer evidence tying SoTL to improved student learning and helping colleagues understand the benefits of SoTL.

The Attrition Rate from Carnegie Affiliate Designation to Final Dissemination

In an attempt to gain additional insights into the task of sustaining SoTL initiatives, this section examines the erosion in the Affiliates’ participation as the group moved toward this final dissemination effort. As described in the opening article (Dewar et al., 2010), in Spring 2009 to prepare for the Affiliates’ report on the “attraction, value and future of SoTL” at the final convening, a survey was distributed electronically to the designated coordinator for each Affiliate institution. Fourteen of the 17 Affiliates filled out the survey providing an 83% response rate. Over the summer of 2009, seven of the Affiliates actively collaborated via a wiki to plan the Affiliates’ presentation for the final convening. Eleven Affiliates had representatives at the final convening and participated in the Affiliates’ session, a substantial reduction from the original seventeen. Certainly the effects of the economic downturn meant less discretionary travel money was available in Fall 2009. Those present agreed unanimously in principle to contribute to this issue. As mentioned in the introduction, one of the 11 subsequently concluded that because it also had membership in an institutional leadership themed group, and had been working with that group, it should not submit an article for this journal. Although an inclusive call went to all of the Carnegie Affiliates via the listserve, email, and the wiki inviting participation in this issue, submissions by at most ten Affiliates was the realistic expectation. Therefore, the final result of nine contributions is quite satisfying. Still, it represents an overall attrition rate from Carnegie Affiliate designation to participation in this final dissemination opportunity of 43% (computed by removing the one Affiliate who was also a member of an institutional leadership group, and observing the loss of participation by 7 Affiliates out of 16).

This significant loss deserves some consideration given the focus of this article is on the future of SoTL. While the exact reasons for the attrition are not known, a few communications indicated that one or more of the following may have been factors: shifts in the assigned coordinator's responsibilities or priorities, insufficient financial or human resources to carry through with the CASTL initiative, change in institutional priorities, or lack of institutional fit with SoTL. Not surprisingly these factors echo some earlier themes. If, as reported in Dewar et al. (2010), a few individuals can make a difference in initiating a SoTL effort, then losing a few leaders can result in loss of momentum. The nine Affiliates contributing to this issue identified needing resources and recruiting more people as critical challenges to the sustainability of SoTL efforts. And if an institution lacks a shared understanding of SoTL, an appreciation for its value, or a reward system that acknowledges and values this work, it can hardly provide a fertile ground for SoTL initiatives.

The previous section described how the Affiliates encountered many of the same challenges as the Building Scholarly Communities Institutional Leadership group, which also had lost a member from its initial group of seven. Even so, this themed group had a much lower attrition rate than the Affiliates (14% versus 43%). Institutional type may have been a factor. Both groups included a variety of institutional types, with each group counting research intensive, masters' degree granting, and at least one technically-oriented university amongst their members. However, the Affiliates group was more diverse as it also included institutions that granted only two-year degrees or only baccalaureate degrees as well as several that transitioned from being two-year degree institutions by adding four-year degree programs. The attrition from the two- or four-year only degree institutions was particularly high. The lowest attrition among the Affiliates occurred from master's degree granting institutions and institutions in transition. Also the larger size of the Affiliate group and the fact that it was open to new members until the final year, created ongoing complexities in communication and in creating a sense of community and shared identity. By contrast, the themed group had a specific focus and its membership was fully populated from the very beginning, factors that likely contributed to better retention.

Closing Thoughts

Despite significant attrition in the CASTL Affiliates group, the nine institutions represented in this issue have testified enthusiastically to the attraction and value of being part of a group affiliated with the highly respected Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. All 14 of the institutions responding to the Affiliates' Spring 2009 self-study survey rated the results of their membership in the Affiliates as either "better than or about as expected," resulting in a 100% approval rating (Dewar et al., 2010). Further, while only two of the Affiliates specifically identified the formal dissolution of CASTL as a major challenge in the closing sections of their stories, many more of the Affiliates have indicated in other ways that they greatly valued the cross-institutional collaborations, gained insights from shared resources and dialogues, and seek venues for similar collaborations at the institutional level.

In light of this consensus and the findings that Affiliates and participants of the Building Scholarly Connections Institutional Leadership group experienced so many of the same types of challenges, it seems reasonable and perhaps even imperative to

tackle those challenges together rather than alone. The analysis presented in this essay suggests that many of the specific obstacles coalesce around two major themes: (1) *Defining, Valuing and Rewarding SoTL* and (2) *Attracting Sufficient Resources*. Since these complex challenges have persisted throughout the decade of CASTL leadership and across highly diverse institutions, there is no reason to believe they will be resolved easily in the future. From the beginning, CASTL leadership argued that an essential component of SoTL was the willingness to “go public” so that the findings would be open to critique and accessible to build upon (Shulman, 2004; Huber & Hutchings, 2005). The same argument can be made for the efforts at institutions involved in the SoTL movement. The tenure of the CASTL organization may be over, but the work to embed SoTL into academic culture is unfinished. A significant challenge for the next decade will be to develop and maintain new collaborative connections among institutions to address shared difficulties in advancing SoTL.

In conclusion, the nine Carnegie Affiliate institutions represented in this issue have made major progress in advancing SoTL on their campuses but each faces critical challenges in sustaining and furthering their accomplishments. Despite their widely diverse contexts, cultures and missions, there is considerable overlap in the obstacles that they have identified for the future of their SoTL initiatives. In addition, the challenges delineated by the Affiliates map almost one for one to those encountered by the Building Scholarly Communities CASTL Leadership group (Gurm et al., 2009). While the full acceptance and appreciation of the scholarship of teaching and learning as worthy and valued scholarly work for faculty in higher education is yet to be fully achieved, thanks to Carnegie’s CASTL Affiliates program, there are now more connections, collaborations and advocates pursuing Boyer’s vision of a broadened definition of scholarship (1990) and sharing a strong desire to foster future cross-institutional networking opportunities.

References

- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ciccone, A. (2008, January). Examining the impact of SoTL. *International Commons*, 3(1), 12-13.
- Dewar, J., Dailey-Hebert, A., & Moore, T. (2010, July). The attraction, value and future of SoTL: Carnegie Affiliates’ perspective. *Transformative Dialogues*, 4(1). Retrieved from <http://www.kwantlen.ca/TD.html>
- Glasser, B. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Gurm, B., Van Melle, E., Cooper, L., Kalish, A., Macpherson, A., Leger, A., ..., & Johnson, T. (2009, July). [Building scholarly communities: Lessons learned](#). *Transformative Dialogues*, 3(1). Retrieved from <http://kwantlen.ca/TD/TD.3.1/>
- Gurm, B. (2009, July). Is all scholarship equally valued? Fusion of horizons on the definition and status of scholarship. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2). Retrieved from http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/v3n2/essays_about_sotl/_Gurm/index.htm

- Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jaschik, S. (31 March 2008). Better contracts for full-time adjuncts. *Inside HigherEd*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/03/31/fulltime>
- Shulman, L. S. (2004). *Teaching as community property: Essays on higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Smetkowski, B., Conway, K., & Starrett, D. (2009, July). [SoTL, CASTL, and the CSTL at Southeast Missouri State University: A symbiotic relationship](#). *Transformative Dialogues*, 3(1). Retrieved from <http://kwantlen.ca/TD/TD.3.1/>