

CHAPTER ONE

Why the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Matters Today

We believe the time has come to move beyond the tired old “teaching versus research” debate and give the familiar and honorable term “scholarship” a broader, more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work.

—Ernest Boyer¹

In 1990 The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published Ernest Boyer’s short book, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. It was a time of transition for U.S. colleges and universities. The Cold War’s end had weakened the conventional rationale for federally funded research; America’s diminished economic position had raised questions about higher education’s teaching effectiveness; a host of social and environmental crises called out for renewed attention to service. “Challenges on the campus and in society have grown,” Boyer stated, “and there is a deepening conviction that the role of higher education, as well as the priorities of the professoriate, must be redefined to reflect new realities” (p. 3).

Scholarship Reconsidered proposed a novel approach for addressing these problems. As Russell Edgerton, then president of the American Association for Higher Education, explained in an endorsement for the book: “The problem is not simply one of ‘balance’—of adjusting the weights we attach to teaching, research, and service—but of reclaiming the common ground of scholarship that underlies all these activities.”² By identifying *the scholarship of teaching*, along with the scholarships of discovery, integration, and application as “four separate, yet overlapping functions” of the professoriate (p. 16), Boyer introduced an intriguing new term into academic discourse, and initiated a lively conversation about what it might mean to undertake college and university teaching as serious intellectual work.

2 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

Since 1990 that conversation has traveled far. In concert with a broad shift in focus from teaching to learning among thoughtful educators, the scholarship of teaching has become “the scholarship of teaching *and learning*,” and the work has widened too. Today “the serious study that undergirds good teaching” (Boyer, 1990, p. 23) is understood to include not just knowledge of the discipline, but also “the latest ideas about teaching the field” (Hutchings and Shulman, 1999, p. 13). Teaching and learning have both become more public: faculty are reflecting on their teaching in ways that can be shared with a wider community of educators, and, using a variety of evidence-gathering and documentation strategies, they are making their students’ learning more visible too. Today’s scholars of teaching and learning treat their classrooms and programs as a source of interesting questions about learning; find ways to explore and shed light on these questions; use this evidence in designing and refining new activities, assignments, and assessments; and share what they’ve found with colleagues who can comment, critique, and build on new insights (Huber and Hutchings, 2005).

By going public with their work, scholars of teaching and learning are also venturing into and helping to create a new space for pedagogical exchange and collaboration that two of us have called the *teaching commons*, a space in which “communities of educators committed to pedagogical inquiry and innovation come together to exchange ideas about teaching and learning and use them to meet the challenges of educating students for personal, professional, and civic life” (Huber and Hutchings, 2005, p. x). Of course, there have always been small communities of scholars in every field who have made pedagogically relevant work available to each other through regular channels of scholarly discourse—conferences, publications, collaborations, and the like. And there have long been networks of specialists in education and the learning sciences. But scholars of teaching and learning—typically faculty who teach their subjects but have not generally considered themselves pedagogical experts—are making distinctive contributions. They are helping through their own work to connect different regions within this commons (bringing literature from their own fields to bear on teaching issues, borrowing from the literature of other fields); they are finding ways to use the ideas they discover through the commons to understand and improve learning in their own classrooms and programs; and they are adding to that commons a new body of knowledge derived from inquiry and innovation in situations of practice.³

The number of faculty engaged in this work, though as yet modest, is growing.⁴ And these men and women are worth watching because the scholarship of teaching and learning, as practiced today, foreshadows what members of the academic profession will be doing as educators tomorrow. The United States provides *access* to higher education for a wide population. But student *success* lags too far behind. The most urgent matter concerns the large number of

students who start but don't complete college.⁵ But the broader issue, as Derek Bok argues in *Our Underachieving Colleges*, concerns “unfulfilled promises and unrealized opportunities” (2006, p. 57). Undergraduates, even those who complete degrees, are not learning as much or as well as they should. If students are to be adequately prepared for life, work, and civic participation in the twenty-first century, colleges and universities must pay closer attention to the heart of the educational enterprise. What is it really important for students to know and be able to do? How can higher education institutions and their faculty help students get there? The scholarship of teaching and learning brings powerful new principles and practices to ground deliberations about these questions in sound evidence and help point the way.⁶

This book is about the scholarship of teaching and learning, why it matters today—and what it promises for tomorrow. In this first chapter, we situate the work in the broader context of the turn toward learning in higher education policy and practice, and discuss the challenges this shift poses for institutions and faculty. Because we draw many of our examples and insights from the experience of individuals and institutions participating in the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL, 1998–2009), we will describe that program and its place in the larger movement that is broadening the scope and deepening understanding of this work. We then look briefly at four areas we believe to be the growing edge for the work's impact on higher education. These areas, subjects of the next four chapters, include classroom teaching and learning, professional development, assessment, and the value (and evaluation) of teaching. Our final chapter asks what colleges and universities would look like if the principles and practices of the scholarship of teaching and learning were to take hold across academic culture, and what leaders can do to move their institutions in that direction. We conclude this first chapter with a look at the evidence we draw on in this book, followed by a return to *Scholarship Reconsidered*, and our conviction that the scholarship of teaching and learning can help colleges, universities, and the academic profession responsibly and effectively address the new realities confronting higher education today.

In short, we argue that it is time to reconsider the scope of the scholarship of teaching and learning, and see it as a set of principles and practices that are critical to achieving institutional goals for student learning and success.

THE TURN TOWARD LEARNING

The scholarship of teaching and learning is part of a broader transformation in the intellectual culture of higher education, where attention to learning has

4 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

been growing steadily over the past twenty years. As Robert Barr and John Tagg put it in their influential 1995 article, “From Teaching to Learning”: “A paradigm shift is taking hold in American higher education. In its briefest form, the paradigm that has governed our colleges is this: A college is an institution that exists to provide instruction. Subtly but profoundly we are shifting to a new paradigm: A college is an institution that exists to produce learning. This shift changes everything. It is both needed and wanted” (p. 13). Researchers in neuroscience, psychology, and education; funders from public and private foundations; leaders of higher education associations and policy centers; accreditors; college and university administrators; professional developers; and information technology specialists have all contributed to this shift—and so, importantly, have front-line practitioners: faculty themselves and even students. The result, if not as radical as the term “paradigm shift” suggests, has included an extraordinarily rich array of pedagogical, curricular, and assessment initiatives that often challenge familiar ways of educating college and university students.

Manifestations of this turn toward learning are everywhere, especially in renewed attention to student learning outcomes spurred by accreditation requirements that ask institutions to be more intentional about their educational programs and to determine whether they are actually achieving their goals. Colleges and universities across the country have set up committees and established offices to coordinate campus efforts to identify learning outcomes at departmental, program, and institutional levels and to devise appropriate assessment strategies and improvement cycles. Indeed, it would be hard to find faculty anywhere who have not by now engaged in such activities in at least modest ways.

Institutions’ efforts in this regard are strengthened by initiatives undertaken through a variety of academic associations. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has been particularly influential in seeding campus deliberations on learning outcomes for liberal education, most recently through its Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative. Identifying four “essential learning outcomes” (knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, intellectual and practical skills, personal and social responsibility, and integrative learning) to be achieved “at successively higher levels across [students’] college studies,” AAC&U has organized a host of conferences, institutes, and cross-campus projects to elucidate and elaborate what these ambitious goals might mean in theory and look like in practice (2007, p. 3).

Many other associations are also leading efforts along these lines. For example, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities’ American Democracy Project, initiated in 2003, has involved 220 institutions that have set a goal of producing “graduates who are committed to being active, involved

citizens in their communities.” The project has brought campuses together in national and regional meetings, in a national assessment project, and in “hundreds of campus initiatives including voter education and registration, curriculum revision and projects, campus audits, specific days of action and reflection (MLK Day of Service, Constitution Day), speaker series, and many recognition and award programs” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, “About Us”). Similarly, Campus Compact, an association of some 1,200 presidents of two- and four-year colleges and universities, offers a variety of resources and initiatives to help institutions organize, support, and assess community service, civic engagement, and service learning (Campus Compact, “Who We Are”).

Disciplinary and professional fields have been no less active. The STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), in particular, stand out—in part due to the National Science Foundation’s efforts to improve the recruitment and retention of women and minorities as science majors, and to enhance science literacy for all (Seymour, 2001). Over the past twenty years, the National Science Foundation (and other science education foundations) have funded a great number of collaborative efforts to explore curricular and pedagogical innovations aimed at helping more students learn more science at more sophisticated levels of understanding. This is not to say that the work has been without controversy, but it has helped to make conversation about teaching and learning a more familiar part of academic science, and to make promising innovations better known and more widespread (for instance, the early introduction of design experiences into engineering programs; see Shepard, Macatangay, Colby, and Sullivan, 2009).

Indeed, the desire to engage undergraduates in disciplinary knowledge practices is a common thread running through educational reform in a wide swath of fields today. Across the disciplinary spectrum, one can find critics of older, more “passive” pedagogies, which have often emphasized mastery of content at the expense of an understanding of how that knowledge is produced and used. For example, a recent collection of essays, *Exploring Signature Pedagogies: Approaches to Teaching Disciplinary Habits of Mind*, by faculty from the University of Wisconsin System (Gurung, Chick, and Haynie, 2008) explores this shift to more active learning in the humanities (history, literary studies), in the fine arts (creative writing, music theory and performance, the arts), in the social sciences (geography, human development, psychology, sociology), and in the natural sciences and mathematics (agriculture, biological sciences, computer science, mathematics, physics). These reform ideas are the leading edge in disciplinary pedagogy, not yet the norm but opening new possibilities for undergraduate learning in many fields.

One of the best overviews of what has (and has not) been accomplished through the past twenty years of attention to learning in higher education

6 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

can be found in George Kuh's study *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter* (2008). In this important report, Kuh—founding director of the National Survey of Student Engagement—discusses 10 teaching and learning practices that “have been widely tested and that have been shown to be beneficial for college students from many backgrounds” (p. 9). The list, familiar to all who follow the reform literature in higher education, includes first-year seminars; common intellectual experiences; learning communities; writing-intensive courses; collaborative assignments and projects; undergraduate research; diversity/global learning; service and community-based learning; internships; and capstone courses and portfolios. All these strategies are being used today to promote disciplinary habits of mind as well as the kinds of cross-cutting learning outcomes envisioned by AAC&U's LEAP initiative. Yet Kuh finds that these practices are not evenly distributed within or across institutions.

In fact, many high-impact practices like first-year seminars and common intellectual experiences cannot be implemented by a single faculty member or department alone; and none of them—even when they *can* be done by an individual working on his or her own—are easy to do well. As Kuh notes, these practices do not come with simple blueprints to follow, but “take many different forms, depending on learner characteristics and on institutional priorities and contexts” (2008, p. 9). As a result, whole communities of practitioners, both national and international, have assembled around each of these (and many other) promising practices, with their own conferences, workshops, publications, and web sites.⁷

Educational innovation today invites, even requires, levels of preparation, imagination, collaboration, and support that are not always a good fit (to say the least) with the inherited routines of academic life. As we'll see throughout this book, leaders and participants in efforts to improve students' educational experiences and outcomes often feel they are working against the grain. Bureaucratic barriers, financial realities, time constraints, and faculty evaluation policies can all inhibit the development or spread of promising pedagogical and curricular practices within (and among) institutions (Schneider and Shoenberg, 1999). And these factors are exacerbated by the rise in the number of faculty on contingent appointments, often without access to the support, security, and seniority that would encourage and enable them to devote the time or to take the risks associated with innovation at the classroom and program levels (Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006; Gappa, Austin, and Trice, 2007).

How, then, can higher education make good on the promise of the turn toward learning? Policies work best when they build on what is already present in a culture—even if it is only a subculture—and higher education is fortunate to have a growing number of faculty who have already intensified their engagement with teaching in significant ways. As Derek Bok suggests, “one should

not be too pessimistic . . . about the prospects for enlisting faculty support for a more searching, continuous process of self-scrutiny and reform” (2006, p. 342). We agree. There are professors on every campus who are looking closely and critically at their students’ learning, redesigning their courses and programs, and coming together to share what they’ve learned with others. Broadly speaking, these are the faculty who are engaged in what is now widely called the scholarship of teaching and learning.

LOOKING CLOSELY AND CRITICALLY AT LEARNING⁸

The scholarship of teaching and learning encompasses a broad set of practices that engage teachers in looking closely and critically at student learning for the purpose of improving their own courses and programs. It is perhaps best understood as an approach that marries scholarly inquiry to any of the intellectual tasks that comprise the work of teaching—designing a course, facilitating classroom activities, trying out new pedagogical ideas, advising, writing student learning outcomes, evaluating programs (Shulman, 1998). When activities like these are undertaken with serious questions about student learning in mind, one enters the territory of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

One of the best-known programs to develop and explore the possibilities of this approach to pedagogy was the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, which concluded nearly a dozen years of work in 2009. Initiated in 1998 under the leadership of Lee Shulman, successor to Ernest Boyer as president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, CASTL included a national fellowship program for individual scholars of teaching and learning, and a succession of programs to promote the work on campuses and in disciplinary and professional associations. CASTL’s reach was wide: over the years, 158 faculty members pursued classroom research projects in six cohorts of the year-long fellowship program; over 250 colleges and universities signed on for one or more of the campus program’s increasingly international three phases; and some two dozen scholarly societies worked to raise the intellectual profile of teaching in their fields (see Appendix B).

The ripple effects of CASTL’s work have been notable too. As participants in its various activities have moved into positions of greater responsibility in their departments, institutions, and fields, they have been able to engage others—faculty, graduate students, undergraduates. They have also begun to infuse principles from the scholarship of teaching and learning into important pedagogical and curricular initiatives. Such well-known efforts as the Peer Review of Teaching Project at the University of Nebraska (Bernstein, Burnett, Goodburn, and Savory, 2006), the Visible Knowledge Project led by Georgetown University (Bass and Eynon, 2009), and the History Learning Project at Indiana

8 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

University of Bloomington (Diaz, Middendorf, Pace, and Shopkow, 2008) have had significant links with CASTL, as has the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ISSOTL), founded in 2004. As long-time members of Carnegie's CASTL staff, we are not unbiased, but it is surely fair to say that CASTL has played a central role in the development of the scholarship of teaching and learning in the United States and in linking that movement with similar efforts elsewhere in the world.⁹

Like any emergent field, the scholarship of teaching and learning has grown and developed over the years. One participant in CASTL's Institutional Leadership Program mentioned to us his surprise, upon rereading the movement's early literature, at its somewhat defensive tone. And it's true: 10 years ago advocates of the scholarship of teaching and learning spent a great deal of time at meetings, conferences, and in publications discussing the meaning of the term.¹⁰ Today, however, participants are often willing to skip the definitional prologue and dive right into the pedagogical and curricular issues with which they're concerned. This doesn't mean that definitions are unimportant, especially on campuses (and in countries) where the scholarship of teaching and learning is new. But the movement is now mature enough to live and grow within a set of tensions that inform the field.

One of these tensions can be dubbed the "theory" debate—about the work's relationship to research in education, to professional development, and to the learning sciences (see Hutchings, 2007; Hutchings and Huber, 2008). Briefly put, the question concerns the legitimacy of the literatures and methods that shape teachers' questions about learning and the kinds of evidence they seek in order to answer them. On the one hand, this debate points to the different disciplinary styles of inquiry and argument that faculty bring to the scholarship of teaching and learning (Huber, 1999; Healey, 2000; Huber and Morreale, 2002; Mills and Huber, 2005; Huber, 2006; Kreber, 2006), as well as to competing definitions of excellence in the production of knowledge that characterize different fields (see Lamont, 2009). Humanists, in particular, have felt the heavy hand of social science approaches to learning and have sought to work within, and stretch, their own disciplinary styles of inquiry and interpretation to illuminate and ultimately improve student experience in their classrooms and fields (see, for example, Linkon and Bass, 2008).

A related territorial tension concerns the appropriate roles of "experts" and "amateurs" in the study of learning in higher education *within* particular disciplines and fields. Felt most acutely in mathematics and the sciences, this involves finding space for scholars of teaching and learning vis-à-vis the growing ranks of education specialists in these fields (see Dewar and Bennett, 2010; Huber and Morreale, 2002; Coppola and Jacobs, 2002). Should pedagogical exploration be the province of those specially versed in the research literature and methods of discipline-based education research? Or is the scholarship of

teaching and learning for everyone who wishes to be a reflective practitioner, especially given new opportunities for expanding pedagogical goals and repertoires? Can both contribute to knowledge building and improvement? Where do they overlap? Where do they differ?

These questions lead to an even more basic tension within the scholarship of teaching and learning: the “big tent” debate. Narrow constructionists prefer to emphasize the work’s affinities with conventional academic research—though usually with modifications to accommodate the practicalities of practitioner inquiry into student learning in one’s own classroom, program, institution, or field (see McKinney, 2007a; Richlin, 2001). Broad constructionists, the big tent advocates, are happy to use the term to cover a wider range of work (documentation, reflection, inquiry) in greater or lesser degrees of polish, made public in forums with nearer or farther reach. While the former emphasize the work’s value as “research” within academic reward systems, the big tent view looks *also* toward elaborations within the category of “teaching,” and is thus more hospitable to teachers who want to participate if only occasionally or in modest ways (Huber and Hutchings, 2005; Kreber, 2007; Phipps and Barnett, 2007).

Perhaps it’s because it has these two “sides” (looking toward research, on the one hand, and teaching on the other), that the scholarship of teaching and learning can be so large, containing (with a nod to Walt Whitman) multitudes. Certainly it has proven to be a welcome destination for faculty who come to serious consideration of teaching and learning via quite different routes. To be sure, there are faculty who begin with a strong interest in making better pedagogical decisions, seeking evidence about how best to align activities, assignments, and assessments with desired outcomes—eager from the outset to engage in “hard thinking about new course designs” (Calder, Oct. 28, 2009). But teachers also enter the big tent through other doors.

Many faculty, for example, have been moved by the writing of Parker Palmer (2007) and others to attend to the emotional and spiritual dimensions of both teaching and learning (Huber, 2008a). Others come to more serious engagements with teaching and learning through concerns about weaknesses in students’ mastery of a skill (say, writing), grasp of a field (say, history), or about uneven achievement among students of different ethnicities and backgrounds (say, women and minorities in the sciences). For some, the entrée has been through convictions about the importance of particular pedagogies (service learning, for example) or particular goals (civic engagement, for example). The scholarship of teaching and learning can provide common ground to develop all these passions and interests, colleagues with whom to collaborate, a growing knowledge base about pedagogy and curriculum, and a sense of community that can break through the isolation that college teachers so often feel.

Indeed, the scholarship of teaching and learning has both an individual and an institutional face today. Yes, many participants believe that the work will

10 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

eventually change the ways in which faculty think and act as teachers (thus underlining the importance of welcoming all comers). And bringing faculty's inclinations and skills as scholars to questions about learning in their own classrooms is central to the movement. Yet, as surgeon and writer Atul Gawande notes of a parallel movement in medicine, those who do their best to "make a science of performance, to investigate and improve how well they use the knowledge and technologies they already have in hand" almost inevitably end up with ideas about how to make *systems* work better, as well (2007, p. 56). And the same is true of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Some of the most interesting applications and experiments to emerge in recent years are collaborative efforts focused on systemic initiatives, such as curriculum reform, program review, or assessment. This is where the scholarship of teaching and learning is being most actively reconsidered and reinvented today. It is this territory that we are especially interested in exploring in this book.

AREAS OF IMPACT, PROMISE, AND CHALLENGE

In what areas of college and university life has the scholarship of teaching and learning made the biggest impact so far? In what areas does it show special promise? What challenges does the work face in the years ahead? The four areas we examine in this book were chosen because of their strategic importance for institutional change, and because they suggest how the scholarship of teaching and learning can inform core aspects of academic life and work. These areas include: the ways in which faculty go about their teaching (Chapter 2); how professional development is understood and organized (Chapter 3); the relationship between the scholarship of teaching and learning and institutional assessment (Chapter 4); and how the work of teaching is valued and evaluated (Chapter 5). In discussing these areas, of course, we touch on many others, including the implications of the scholarship of teaching and learning for graduate education, contributions to a variety of pedagogical and institutional initiatives, effects on student learning, and what campus leaders can do (Chapter 6) to advance the work's institutional integration and impact.

Teachers and Learning

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. Its most important area of impact, then, is on how faculty conduct themselves as teachers. The scholarship of teaching and learning 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, 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.

The scholarship of teaching and learning also fosters faculty involvement with each other 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. 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 through conferences, publications, and other association forums.

Faculty who engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning also seek to discover more about their students' experience. Many begin modest projects of inquiry in their own classrooms, aimed at providing evidence to inform a next stage of instructional design. However, 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 the 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, 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 other learning sciences.

Many participants in the scholarship of teaching and learning make a further commitment to knowledge building by seeking wider audiences for their

12 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

work. They not only draw from the larger teaching commons but contribute to it as well. 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 multiauthored 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.

Does the scholarship of teaching and learning—all this pedagogical experimentation, study, reflection, conversation, and writing—actually improve outcomes for students? This is a question that advocates hear more and more often as they try to make the case to colleagues that the time and money necessary to support the work will be resources well spent. There are countless examples of individual scholarship of teaching and learning projects that focus directly and explicitly on learning improvement, explore students' areas of strength and weakness, and document the effectiveness (or not) of particular pedagogical strategies. But asking whether a campus commitment to this work, as embodied in a set of activities to encourage and support it, improves learning outcomes in a more general way is a harder question, in part because the higher education community is only beginning to map out the complex lines of cause and effect between faculty development programs (of any kind) and student achievement. Chapter 2 concludes with reflections on how and what to think about this "learning question."

Faculty Development

The scholarship of teaching and learning is a powerful form of faculty development. Engaging in a 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 pedagogical knowledge on their campuses and in their fields. It is a powerful way for faculty to grow as professionals over time.

Although 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 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. Because 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, in its emphasis on pedagogical inquiry and innovation, implied a different model of development—a "narrative of growth" instead of what was frequently perceived as 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, 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. 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. Engaging these agendas need not be seen as a departure from the classroom inquiry and innovation that's at the heart of the scholarship

14 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

of teaching and learning. Making these connections extends and enriches the work, instead.

Assessment

Assessing what students learn during college has become increasingly important for purposes of public accountability, accreditation, and for the improvement of teaching and learning. Interest in assessment picked up new life 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). As we note in Chapter 4, 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, whereas 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 toward 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. This has contributed to a troubling gap. As a recent survey of institutional practices conducted by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment has shown, assessment has become nearly ubiquitous in U.S. higher education, largely because of accreditation requirements, but the results are not used nearly as much for the design and redesign of courses and programs as one would hope (Kuh and Ikenberry, 2009). On the other side of this gap, faculty engaged in improvement efforts often lack the kinds of data that institutional assessment efforts can provide.

Our argument, then, is that it would be to the advantage of both assessment and the scholarship of teaching and learning if bridges between them could be built—a challenge that is just beginning to be addressed by administrative and faculty leaders, as they discover what each other’s efforts can bring to the table. 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, and when it involves students themselves as participants in the process (as many scholars of teaching and learning have done), it is more likely to command the interest and engagement 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.

Valuing and Evaluating Teaching

As with assessment, efforts to reconceptualize, support, and reward good teaching are also 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 on the Future of Higher Education 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 Daniel Bernstein, Amy Nelson 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 concerning the way in which teaching is recognized and rewarded in higher education today.

16 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

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 yet fully 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, in Lee Shulman's words, "an essential facet of good teaching—built into the expected repertoire of scholarly practice" (2000, p. 105). In particular, we ask in Chapter 5 what teaching evaluation would look like if it too focused on features, like those identified in the Carnegie Foundation 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). We draw here on recent 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.

EVIDENCE AND VOICE

Understanding (even measuring) the actual and potential impact of the scholarship of teaching and learning is extraordinarily difficult, but if the movement is to continue to grow and thrive, it's important to try. In this book, we draw on a wide range of evidence and experience about the inroads that the scholarship of teaching and learning has made into academic life. We hope that this effort will underline the need to document the impact of the work as its networks and knowledge develop and spread.

That, at least, has been the thinking behind the efforts that CASTL itself has made to document the movement's impact over the years. These efforts began in 2001 with an extended inventory of conditions at colleges and universities participating in the first iteration of the CASTL Campus Program (1998–2001).¹¹ A second survey in 2004 explored the experience of participants in the first five classes of CASTL's national fellowship program (137 at the time), seeking insights about how individual faculty members were faring in this work—what influenced their initial involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning; what activities they had engaged in; consequences for their classrooms; support and constraints for the work in their departmental, campus, and disciplinary contexts; and their general sense of whether the work would prosper in the future (Cox, Huber, and Hutchings, 2005). We will draw on these surveys in this book.

However, our most important source of original data for this study comes from a more recent survey, designed specifically in recognition of the growing engagement of scholars of teaching and learning with institutional agendas. This 2009 survey of participants in the CASTL Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program (2006–2009) canvassed people who have been leading efforts to promote and support the scholarship of teaching and learning within their campuses, university systems, scholarly and professional societies, or cross-campus academic initiatives. Designed in collaboration with a subset of these leaders, our survey aimed to tap these scholars' insights into the work's contributions to critical areas of institutional practice and policy.

A few words about the Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program should be helpful in situating our respondents' authority as commentators on the institutional impact of the scholarship of teaching and learning. As described in CASTL's official statements, this program built on "influential work undertaken by colleges and universities, campus centers and educational organizations, scholarly and professional societies, and previous phases of CASTL's own work with campuses, to facilitate collaboration among institutions with demonstrated commitment to and capacity for action, inquiry and innovation in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Participating institutions were selected

18 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

and organized in a distributed leadership model of 13 groupings to address specific themes and issues important to the improvement of student learning, as well as the development and sustainability of a scholarship of teaching and learning movement” (see Appendix B). The leaders of these groups, then, had experience in directing one or more initiatives in their institution, often over a period of several years—some for over a decade of CASTL-related work. And, because we encouraged respondents to consult with colleagues in answering the survey questions, the responses mentioned in our discussion are informed not only by a leader’s personal experience but also by the collective wisdom of an institutional leadership team—including in several cases students, whose voices we have sought to capture as well.

The scholarship of teaching and learning has practitioners, advocates, organizers, and other supporters across the spectrum of U.S. higher education—and also internationally (especially, though not exclusively, in Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, Ireland, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom). As readers can see from Appendix B, the institutions involved in the CASTL Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program included U.S. campuses (and systems of 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. To be sure, there are many colleges, universities, and academic associations with lively initiatives in the scholarship of teaching and learning that did not participate in the CASTL program. And, of course, the program also did not include institutions where interest in the work was too sparse or scattered to apply for participation. No one, to our knowledge, really knows how rare or widespread engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning is in the United States or elsewhere. Although the answer—and in lieu of reliable numbers, people’s perceptions—depends entirely on how strictly or broadly one defines the work, it is important to keep a skeptical but open mind and to neither over- nor underestimate the extent of individual and institutional involvement.

Our survey is certainly not a random sample of higher education, but it can provide, we believe, an important picture of the impact of the scholarship of teaching and learning at places where it is most established. And even there, as readers will see, we have recognized that the work is seldom evenly distributed, and have asked respondents to make a rough estimate of both the depth and extent of impact. For four key areas—how faculty approach teaching, the character of the student learning experience, the institutional culture in support of teaching, and the contribution of the work to other campus initiatives and agendas—we employed a seven-point scale designed to capture patterns of impact, from “widespread” to “localized,” from “deep” to “mixed,” and finally, to “no discernable impact” at all. (The scale was adapted from Eckel,

Green, and Hill, 2001.) The survey also included open-ended questions, soliciting comments, examples, reflections, and uncertainties; many of the quotes and anecdotes readers will find come from these replies or from follow-up interviews, as citations will make clear. When referring to this survey's findings, we cite the report that we wrote (with Barbara Cambridge) and distributed at the final gathering of campuses participating in the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, October 21, 2009, Bloomington, Indiana (see Ciccone, Huber, Hutchings, and Cambridge, 2009). Because the 2009 report is not readily available, a lightly edited version is included in Appendix A.

At the same time, we have drawn on other surveys and studies where available—seeking, especially, perspectives that might cast a critical eye on the claims of the movement.¹² But most important, we base our understanding of the impact of the scholarship of teaching and learning on the growing literature produced by practitioners themselves. The scholarship of teaching and learning (like other kinds of scholarship) encourages a commitment to going public with what is learned, thus contributing to the teaching commons. As long-time contributors to this teaching commons ourselves, we are grateful to the many colleagues whose work has helped us obtain a fuller picture of the achievements and challenges that the movement has experienced in the past, emergent areas of engagement in the present, and critical issues for the future of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

ENGAGING INSTITUTIONAL AGENDAS

This is, of course, an anxious time in the academy. A recession as severe as the one we have been living through exacerbates and makes even more visible the vulnerability of the academic profession. In the United States, this includes the decline of the tenure-track career, the closing of teaching and learning centers, and heightened competition among institutions of higher education. Though this may seem an inauspicious time to be calling on faculty to focus on anything but survival, we have seen that the scholarship of teaching and learning provides a welcome beacon. As the experience of CASTL Scholars and campuses suggests, it is making teaching itself a more intellectually engaging, collaborative, meaningful, and energizing dimension of academic life. The work is also beginning to make good on its promise to improve the learning experience for students.

The spirit of *Scholarship Reconsidered* remains highly relevant to the academy today. The message that there's an underlying scholarly dimension to different kinds of faculty work is particularly important at a time when many colleges and universities are appointing faculty to teaching-only positions, often not on the tenure-track, increasing the danger of further separating the roles of

20 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

teaching and research. We believe that the scholarship of teaching and learning is the best way for institutions to keep the interconnections between these intellectual functions alive for *individual* faculty. But, as we argue in this book, it is also possible to advance core *institutional* agendas through the scholarship of teaching and learning. This effort will involve encouraging the scholarship of teaching and learning as an approach to designing learning environments at the classroom, program, and institutional levels, supporting it through updated faculty development initiatives, engaging it in designing and conducting assessment and improvement cycles, and, finally, recognizing and rewarding it for its contributions to the institution's educational mission.

The scholarship of teaching and learning, like the other "new" scholarships of integration and engagement, will always push against the academy's specializing grain. Indeed, as we have noted in this introduction, familiar tensions between theory and practice, and even between research and teaching, are built into the very term ("*scholarship*" of "*teaching and learning*") and into the work itself. But these are necessary tensions; to collapse one of these terms into the other, or to emphasize one side of the work over the other, would diminish the power and potential for the improvement of practice that comes from their combination.

Over the last two decades, scholars of teaching and learning have accomplished a great deal. They have pioneered approaches to classroom inquiry that provide evidence and inspiration for pedagogical improvement. They have found new ways to make teaching and learning a more collaborative enterprise, strengthening it by working together on common problems. They have helped colleagues see that pedagogy can be intellectually serious work. And, by familiarizing themselves with, drawing on, and contributing to the literature in a wide variety of forms and formats, they have enlarged the teaching commons and made it a livelier place. All these accomplishments are works in progress that continue to develop and grow. It is time now to move the work into a wider range of activities that serve the educational mission, and to weave it more firmly into the fabric of academic life.

Notes

1. This quotation is from *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (p. 16).
2. Edgerton's endorsement was printed on an insert to the first edition of *Scholarship Reconsidered*. In *Scholarship Assessed*, the Carnegie Foundation's follow-up report to *Scholarship Reconsidered*, this common ground of scholarship was characterized by six standards, applicable to all four types of faculty work (giving due consideration to their various genres and audiences). These standards (as mentioned later in this chapter) included: clear goals, adequate preparation,

WHY THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING MATTERS TODAY 21

appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997, pp. 22–36).

3. There is a large literature on the idea of a “commons,” of course. We have been influenced by Bollier’s concerns (2001, 2003) about what’s happening to public assets in an age of “market enclosure,” especially in regard to “preserving the academic commons.” We have also been influenced by the work of economists and political scientists (Ostrom, 1990, 2005; Palumbo and Scott, 2005) on the collective responsibilities that communities must take to preserve the benefits of resources held for common use, organize social cooperation in particular ways, and develop a set of practices to regularize the resource’s use. (On the concept of a “knowledge commons” in particular, see Hess and Ostrom, 2007.)
4. We base this statement on a variety of markers of growth for the field, including what appear to be an increasing number of local (campus-based), regional, and national forums, programs, and initiatives that use the phrase to communicate the nature of their focus or activity. Although there are no adequate national surveys or statistics on the numbers of faculty engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning, the 2009 Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) offers an intriguing hint of what such a survey might show. In a special section, FSSE asked a portion of their respondents—“7,300 faculty members at 50 institutions”—about their “engagement in and perceptions of institutional support for systematically collecting information about the effectiveness of their teaching beyond end-of-term evaluations” (Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, “Other Teaching and Learning Results: Scholarship of Teaching and Learning”). According to the FSSE web site, the proportion of faculty who collected additional course information “quite a bit” or “very much” ranged from 41 percent in the biological sciences to 68 percent in education, with other fields in between: 47 percent in physical sciences, 47 percent in arts and humanities, 49 percent in social sciences, 57 percent in engineering, 58 percent in business. Further, the “findings suggest faculty tend to engage in scholarship of teaching and learning activities despite the fact they feel unsupported by their institution. The trend is consistent across disciplinary fields” (“Other Teaching and Learning Results: Scholarship of Teaching and Learning”).
5. A broad agreement among educators and policymakers that too few students finish their degree or certificate programs has fueled a variety of public and private efforts to improve completion numbers and rates (see U.S. General Accounting Office, 2003; Lederman, 2010). Of course, there are complex methodological issues in how such numbers are calculated and interpreted (see Larson, 2010), and how U.S. completion rates compare to those in other wealthy countries (see Adelman, 2009).
6. Actually, the principles and practices in question (inquiry, going public, evidence-based design, and the like) are not new: each has a history in college-level pedagogy. What’s new is the emphasis on bringing them together. As two of us and Lee Shulman said in sketching the history of the field some years ago, “a host of related developments gave further momentum and substance to

22 THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING RECONSIDERED

the work” (Huber, Hutchings, and Shulman, 2005, p. 35). See Chapter 3 for further discussion of the history of the scholarship of teaching and learning in the United States. Of course, in other countries scholars of teaching and learning have drawn on different literatures, institutional developments, and initiatives.

7. For instance, there are large literatures now on learning communities, which are widely believed to offer community college (and other) students a much-needed sense of belonging on campus (see Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education; Tinto, 1997). There is also much written work on service and community-based learning, the subtleties of which matter greatly to faculty who use them to help students develop their capacities to apply knowledge to real-world problems or to hone the skills of civic participation (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens, 2003).
8. This section draws from Huber (2010a).
9. Pat Hutchings was founding director of CASTL in 1998. Mary Huber, who had been a member of Carnegie’s *Scholarship Reconsidered* team and a coauthor of *Scholarship Assessed*, joined the CASTL staff at the beginning of 1999. Tony Ciccone directed CASTL’s activities at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee from 1998 to 2007 (as we will discuss in Chapter 2), and was director of CASTL’s Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program from 2007 to 2009.
10. Over the movement’s history, participants have enjoyed (and sometimes wearied of) a bumper crop of definitional discussions, yielding many fine distinctions such as those between excellent teaching, scholarly teaching, and the scholarship of teaching and learning (Hutchings and Shulman, 1999); pedagogical development, scholarship of teaching, and pedagogical research (Gordon, D’Andrea, Gosling, and Stefani, 2003); research, investigations and evaluations, literature reviews, and scholarship of teaching and learning (Prosser, 2008), and more. Many of these terms articulate boundaries that can be useful situationally, depending on one’s audience, institution, discipline, or purpose. We know of a number of settings, for instance, where the scholarship of teaching and learning is alive and well but leaders of the work deliberately avoid the term.
11. In early 2001, participants in the first iteration of the CASTL Campus Program (1998–2000) were asked to prepare a “Mapping Progress Report” documenting support for the scholarship of teaching and learning. This comprehensive self-study, completed by 58 of the 190 campuses involved in the program by late 2000, included an examination of the institution’s mission, infrastructure, and integration (how the scholarship of teaching and learning was represented in public documents, how it was supported through various offices on campus, and how it connected with other campus priorities and changes in campus culture helped by attention to the work); participation by students, faculty, and campus leaders, and plans for continuity; campus support, including money (internal and external) and time; faculty selection and development; faculty evaluation; collaboration (across and beyond campus); uses of technology; initiatives that didn’t work or hadn’t worked yet and next steps; promising signs of progress; and opportunities not yet tapped. For further information about the early work of the

CASTL Campus Program, including reflections on the “Mapping Progress” activity, see Cambridge (2004b) and Appendix B in this volume.

12. There are many sources of commentary on the movement to establish a scholarship of teaching and learning. Among the most important are reports by campus leaders at institutions involved in the work, leaders who are often well attuned to tensions and shortcomings. Some of these reports are publicly available. For example, several participants in the first iteration of the CASTL Campus Program contributed essays to *Campus Progress: Supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* (Cambridge, 2004a), and four of the groups in the CASTL Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program have published either a book on their work (Werder and Otis, 2010), or a collection of essays in special issues of the electronic journal *Transformative Dialogues* (Kalish and Stockley, 2009; Dewar, Dailey-Hebert, and Moore, 2010; Michael, Case, Danielson, Hill, Lochbaum, McEnery, and Perkins, 2010). Surveys are also a common mode for self-assessment and a site for friendly critique. We have mentioned CASTL’s own surveys (Cox, Huber, and Hutchings, 2005; Ciccone, Huber, Hutchings, and Cambridge, 2009), but smaller groups have also done them. See, for example, Dewar and Cohn’s analysis of results (2010) of a survey they administered to campus leaders in their CASTL Affiliates Group, and a survey by another CASTL Institutional Leadership Group of faculty who had participated in their summer institutes for scholars new to the work (Michael, Case, Danielson, Hill, Lochbaum, McEnery, and Perkins, 2010). Larger surveys on changes in academic policy and practice, whether of faculty, students, or administrators (that is, the National Survey of Student Engagement, Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, or the survey of provosts on “Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship” reported by O’Meara and Rice, 2005) help place the work in a larger context, serving as a useful brake on exaggerated or overly modest claims.