

Editors' Introduction: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Remixed

Laura Cruz, Editor-in-Chief

Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence
The Pennsylvania State University

[With the *Transformative Dialogues* editorial team: Chas Brua, Eileen Grodziak, and Jacob Kelley]

Part 1: News and Notes from the *Transformative Dialogues* Editorial Team

New *Dialogues* Feature Section

In keeping with the spirit of our name (*Transformative Dialogues*), the editorial team is pleased to announce the debut of a new recurring section of the journal: *Dialogues*.

For this new section, we invite authors to submit works in which there is a conversation, or similar forms of exchange, between two or more participants that facilitate deeper insights, open lines of inquiry, or evolving relationships in the service of personal and/or scholarly transformation related to teaching and learning.

We wish for this section to not only feature dialogues but also to act as a form of dialogic space in which authors and readers can openly and creatively explore ideas in the spirit of relating with others. With that in mind, submissions to the *Dialogues* section may be presented in conventional formats such as stage dialogue, letters, or interviews, but we encourage authors to consider a wide range of alternative approaches—including digital media—to how their work may be represented in this space.

Submissions for *Dialogues* are currently being accepted through our regular submission portal. All submissions will be double-blind peer reviewed.

Upcoming Special Issues

Speaking of dialogues, you may look forward to our upcoming special issues (listed below), each of which features exchanges across conventional divisions within higher education.

- Transdisciplinary Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) (Guest editors Anna Santucci and Sara Nasrollahian)
- Educational Development and Assessment (Guest editor Rob Flaherty)
- A Blossoming SoTL Culture (Guest editors Jacob Kelley and Lindsay Doukopoulos)

If you have an idea for a future special issue that aligns with *Transformative Dialogues*, please reach out to Laura Cruz (lxc601@psu.edu) to discuss the possibilities. Please note that we will continue to accept and publish regular articles in addition to those that appear in the special issues.

Part 2: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Remixed

This editors' introduction articulates how the articles in the present issue of *Transformative Dialogues* reflect our authors' engagement in re-combining, re-configuring, and re-imagining SoTL's three primary components: scholarship, teaching, and learning—and beyond.

Overview

This journal primarily publishes work that falls under the heading of the scholarship of teaching and learning, frequently abbreviated as a single acronym, SoTL. Newcomers to the field may not be aware that each component of the term “scholarship of teaching and learning” came as the result of a series of transformative dialogues that started during the movement's early history.

Scholarship

In his classic 1990 text, Ernest Boyer challenged higher education to reconsider how we categorize the work that faculty do, proposing a new framework that recognized other forms of scholarship, or scholarly work, beyond the conventional emphasis on basic research (renamed the scholarship of discovery).

Teaching

When Boyer first articulated his framework for scholarship reconsidered, he did not use the acronym SoTL. Rather, his original conception called for a scholarship of teaching (no “L”), with an emphasis on what he characterized as the inherently intellectual act undertaken by faculty when they integrate disciplinary knowledge with pedagogical principles.

Learning

Learning was added later, influenced by what Barr and Tagg (1995) identified as a broad paradigm shift toward universities being seen not as providers of instruction but primarily as facilitators of learning. This change in perspective engendered rich—at times contested—conversations that increasingly differentiated the practice of scholarly teaching in a classroom from the dissemination of scholarship as a public artifact. In this latter conception, learning provides the foundation for which teaching practice is focused, enhanced, and assessed.

Indeed, much of SoTL has embraced learning as not only its primary focus but also as a means for legitimizing the practice within institutions. Noted critic Roger Boshier (2006) called for a re-naming from SoTL to SoLT to not only reflect these trends but perhaps to push them further.

Similarly, in a recent review of SoTL literature, Karen Manarin and colleagues (2021) took the collective body of work to task for not providing sufficient emphasis on learning, despite it ostensibly serving as the primary focus of measurement. More recently, Canning and Masika (2022) argued that the emphasis on increasingly sophisticated measurements of learning, especially when conducted beyond the single classroom, has eroded previous distinctions between SoTL and educational research. While the two previously mentioned scholars suggest consigning SoTL to history's dustbin, others have argued for a more proactive strategy of further strengthening SoTL's distinctive identity.

Part of that distinction is the “big tent” philosophy of SoTL (i.e., the inclusion of many practitioners across multiple disciplines, as well as the concomitant use of a broad range of research tools, perspectives, and, perhaps most importantly, questions.” The proverbial “what works” questions may have provided much of the bread and butter of empirical SoTL studies to date (the subject of Manarin and colleagues' review) (Hutchings, 2000), but there are not only not the only types of questions that SoTL seeks to answer, nor are such questions the only generative lines of inquiry in and about SoTL. For example, meta-SoTL, as Nancy Chick and Gary Poole deem works about, but not necessarily of, SoTL, continues to be a vibrant scholarly discourse (Poole & Chick, 2014), as does the scholarship of educational development (SoEd), which focuses on developing faculty as both scholarly teachers and scholars of their practice (Felten & Chick, 2018). Most recently, several leading voices in the field have called for a rethinking of what questions we ask in SoTL, how we ask them, and for/by whom (Chick, 2023; Cruz & Grodziak, 2022; Halpern, 2023; Lofgreen, 2023). In a similar spirit of re-invention, the authors of this issue of *Transformative Dialogues* engage in creatively re-combining, re-configuring, and re-imagining SoTL's three primary components: scholarship, teaching, and learning.

Contributors and Contributions

Michael Dunlop and Nicole O'Brien, for example, challenge readers to consider a pedagogical case study—used in an interdisciplinary setting—as a form of scholarship. The publication of such case studies (for use in the classroom) is highly valued within business education, but the practice has not been extensively adopted outside of that context. Looking beyond case studies, journals such as *Prompt* (writing assignments) and *Syllabus* (syllabi) regularly publish pedagogical materials as scholarship, often accompanied by instructor/creator reflection. Such publications straddle the line between scholarly teaching and scholarship, serving to bring the former to a broader audience, while simultaneously raising important questions about scholarly impact beyond citations.

Natalie C. Ulrich, Lindsay M. Rossow, Lisa Merideth, and Michael Kiener blur several boundaries in their assessment of a SoTL seminar for instructors offered through the institution's center for teaching and learning (CTL). For this project, the authors served multiple roles—facilitators, designers, participants, and scholars—which challenges conventional assumptions of researcher positionality. In this particular study, the primary “learners” are instructional faculty, who found that engagement in SoTL positively affected their teaching practice, which, in turn, affected the climate for teaching on their campus, suggesting potential lines of connection between student, instructor, and organizational learning.

Dana Ménard, Laura Chittle, Michelle Bondy, Julia Power, and Lana Milidrag also focus on instructional faculty, but their lens is not positive transformation but rather the identification of a potentially significant impediment to instructor development: imposter phenomenon. Defined as the belief that the person is not qualified to perform the essential functions of their jobs and may be “found out and judged by others,” the phenomenon is known to be prevalent among instructional faculty in higher education. Until recently, however, the experience had previously been treated primarily as a human resources issue. Instead, the authors propose a holistic view of teaching (and related development) that extends beyond the classroom to include affective factors which foreground that practice, such as instructor confidence and well-being.

Several of our contributors attribute related affective and/or metacognitive factors not to faculty but to current students (and, by extension, emerging citizens and future employees). Douglas W. Leonard, for example, reflects on the power of metacognitive strategies to promote genuine empathy, a skill which is not only valued in the history classroom but also in the workplace. Similarly, Subhadra Ganguli examines how cooperative learning approaches can enhance learning outcomes beyond content knowledge (in business math), including adaptability and career self-efficacy. Speaking of self-efficacy, Cynthia Stavrianos proposes the integration of what she calls metacognitive prospection, a course design strategy intended to instill self-directed/agentive learning for students, an outcome intended to be developed not just for use in the classroom but as part of a lifelong learning strategy.

In her definition of self-regulated learning, Stavrianos quotes Barry Zimmerman’s (1998) influential phrasing... “academic learning as something they [students] do for themselves rather than something that is done to or for them” (p. 1). Indeed, the recognition of, and related desire to break down, conventional hierarchical roles between instructional faculty and students, is the subject of our final two sets of authors. LaVonne Riggs- Zeigen, Elizabeth Larson, and Thomas Dyer provide a literature review of restorative thinking (defined as “the metacognitive processing of the power dynamics in a learning environment that works toward equalizing the balance of power”) with particular attention to how these often complex undercurrents play out in the online learning environment. Susan Garrow-Oliver reports on a students-as-partners project in which an instructional faculty member re-designs a capstone course with two students. In an interesting twist on the co-creation model, Garrow-Oliver also notes the influence of the community partners, who are often recipients and/or participants in student-generated capstone projects.

Conclusion

Just as Boyer sought to bridge the inequitable divide between teaching and research as the basis of faculty work, the collective contributions of the authors in the volume suggest that we may be in a period of creative recombination, breaking down previous divides between teaching and learning practice(s), instructor and student, and classroom and community. This suggests that perhaps one of SoTL’s distinctive attributes is its seemingly irrepressible ability not just to adapt, but also to shape, the ever-changing culture of teaching and learning in higher education.

References

- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning—A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 27(6), 12-26.
- Boshier, R., & Huang, Y. (2008). In the house of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), teaching lives upstairs and learning in the basement. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(6), 645-656.
- Canning, J., & Masika, R. (2022). The scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL): the thorn in the flesh of educational research. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(6), 1084-1096.
- Chick, N. L. (2023). Rereading SoTL: Toward new beginnings. *Innovative Higher Education*, 1-13.
- Cruz, L. E., & Grodziak, E. M. (2021). SOTL under Stress: Rethinking Teaching and Learning Scholarship during a Global Pandemic. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 9(1), 3-13.
- Felten, P., & Chick, N. (2018). Is SoTL a signature pedagogy of educational development?. *To Improve the Academy*, 37(1), 4-16.
- Felten, P., & Geertsema, J. (2023). Recovering the heart of SoTL: Inquiring into teaching and learning ‘as if the world mattered’. *Innovative Higher Education*, 1-18.
- Halpern, F. (2023). The morphology of the SoTL article: New possibilities for the stories that SoTL scholars tell about teaching and learning. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 11.
- Hutchings, P. (2000). Approaching the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Opening lines: Approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning*, 1-10.
- Löfgreen, J. (2023). Navigating between Scylla and Charybdis: SoTL as its Own Kind of Inquiry. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 11.
- Manarin, K., Adams, C., Fendler, R., Marsh, H., Pohl, E., Porath, S., & Thomas, A. (2021). Examining the focus of SoTL literature—teaching and learning?. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 9(1), 349-364.
- Poole, G., & Chick, N. (2022). Great introspections: How and why SoTL looks inward. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 10.