This chapter presents a continuum that represents our understanding of development and growth toward the scholarship of teaching. We give examples of each of the three phases of the continuum and explore the role of faculty developers in the development of the scholarship of teaching.
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In this chapter, we address two unresolved issues from the Delphi study regarding the scholarship of teaching. First, we address the nature of the “isolation of the scholarship of teaching from the primary work of the disciplines and of departments” (Exhibit 1.3, item 15). When discussing this issue, we focus on the conceptual isolation of teaching in general from the primary work of the disciplines, because we consider that these are often distinct from each other and not integrated. We contrast this with the scholarship of teaching that we consider to be integrated with the scholarship of discovery (Boyer, 1990) rather than isolated from it. We elaborate this distinction through a continuum of growth toward the scholarship of teaching. Second, we address “whether a scholar of teaching studies teaching as a discipline in itself or whether teaching is studied through another discipline” (Exhibit 1.3, item 13). We do this by providing examples of how we have tried to break down the isolation of teaching from the work of the disciplines and by exploring the characteristics of scholars of teaching. Finally, we discuss the role of faculty developers in developing scholars of teaching. This is of particular interest to us as members of a faculty development center, the McGill Center for University Teaching and Learning (CUTL).

The Development of the Scholarship of Teaching: A Continuum of Growth

Our goal is not to define scholarship of teaching; many have done that (for example, Boyer, 1990; Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan, 1991; Shulman, 1993, 1998; Menges and Weimer, 1996; Kreber, 1999). Rather, we begin by
sharing our analysis and understanding of the development of the scholarship of teaching, integrating the definitions of others with our own knowledge of teaching and learning in higher education and our experience of working with professors. This framework allows us to be explicit about how we conceive of this growth and helps us to better understand our role as faculty developers.

We concur with Shulman (1993) who discusses the isolation of teaching and calls for an end to pedagogical solitude by making teaching community property and thus more highly valued. Our framework explores how the conceptual isolation of teaching from the primary work of the disciplines and of departments is reduced as one grows toward scholarship of teaching. We believe that it is possible to reduce isolation and increase integration through the knowledge that one develops and the interactions in which one engages.

We summarize the development of the scholarship of teaching in a continuum of three phases, which is based on the assumption that all professors are experts in their discipline (see Table 8.1). Phase One is an intention to grow and develop knowledge about one’s own teaching. We see this as the first phase in reducing the conceptual isolation of teaching from the primary scholarly work of the disciplines and departments: professors begin to see teaching as an essential and engaging aspect of their role, rather than an interference with their research. Phase Two is characterized by a professor initiating a transition from only thinking about his or her own teaching to discussing it with colleagues in the discipline. This phase further reduces isolation of teaching from the primary work of the disciplines and moves toward integrating the two by creating communities of professors who dialogue about teaching, and develop and exchange knowledge about teaching in their discipline. Professors begin to make explicit their pedagogical content knowledge, the knowledge that integrates their knowledge of the subject matter with their knowledge of how to teach it. During Phase Two, professors tend to take increasing responsibility for enhancing the value of teaching within their departments and faculties, thus reducing the perception of professors that teaching development centers are the sole repositories of knowledge about teaching. Phase Three is a shift toward growth in scholarship of teaching. This third phase is characterized by an intention to share expertise and develop scholarly knowledge about teaching that has a significant impact on the institution and the field. In this phase, professors are actively and intentionally integrating teaching and the scholarship of discovery to become scholars of teaching.

We have listed a representative sample of processes characteristic of individuals engaged in each phase. We have tried to place the processes in each phase from less complex to more complex. Our model suggests that professors can move in two directions in the continuum: within a phase, indicating a growth in complexity; and across phases, indicating a growth toward scholarship. It is possible to move within and not move across, to
Table 8.1. Continuum of Growth Toward the Scholarship of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase One: Growth in own teaching</th>
<th>Phase Two: Dialogue with colleagues about teaching and learning</th>
<th>Phase Three: Growth in scholarship of teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop personal knowledge about their own teaching and their students’ learning</td>
<td>Develop and exchange knowledge about teaching and learning in their discipline</td>
<td>Develop scholarly knowledge about teaching and learning that has significance and impact for the institution and the field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reflect on teaching
- Engage in institutional teaching development activities
- Engage in innovation in teaching
- Intentionally evaluate own teaching to make improvements
- Read about teaching and learning
- Can understand and describe principles underlying teaching and learning decisions
- Can demonstrate the validity of knowledge of teaching they hold, through assessment by others, including students, peers, and administrators
- Engage colleagues in the discipline in conversations that make explicit their pedagogical content knowledge
- Mentor other teachers in the discipline
- Provide leadership in teaching at disciplinary level (for example, organize events for department, faculty)
- Provide leadership in teaching at university level (for example, work as member of teaching and learning committee, faculty developer)
- Engage in disciplinary and multidisciplinary teaching associations
- Grow in understanding of the complexity of teaching and learning
- Draw on literature and research on teaching to inform institution and field
- Publish and make presentations about teaching (may or may not be based on research)
- Obtain funding for research on teaching
- Carry out research on teaching using an approach to inquiry consistent with understanding teaching and learning
- Publish and make presentations about research on teaching
- Mentor others in doing research on teaching
- Have a comprehensive knowledge of the research and literature on teaching and learning

become increasingly excellent in teaching and yet choose not to move toward engaging others or engaging in scholarship.

Prior to engaging in activities in a subsequent phase, it is necessary to engage in a range of processes in the current phase, but not necessarily in all of the processes. For example, early on in Phase One, a professor might move into the beginning of Phase Two, dialogue with colleagues, while continuing to grow in his or her own teaching, and later move forward into processes associated with the scholarship of teaching (Phase Three). Can a professor move from Phase One to Phase Three without entering Phase Two? We think not, because it is necessary to get a sense of community beyond oneself before moving into scholarship. A faculty member who is a scholar of teaching has reached excellence and complexity in all phases.
**Phase One: Growth in One's Own Teaching.** We have observed that professors usually begin the continuum of growth toward the scholarship of teaching through an intention to develop their own teaching, usually through a mechanism of action, reflection, and improvement (for example, McAlpine, Weston, Beauchamp, Wiseman, and Beauchamp, 1999) that becomes increasingly more explicit or formal. As they move through this phase, professors develop an increasing sense of teaching competence. We provide two examples (with disguised identities). The first is a relatively new untenured professor in the Faculty of Engineering who is a good example of a professor who has entered Phase One. She displays the first three attributes in this phase of development: regularly attending teaching development activities, engaging in teaching innovation, and reflecting on her own teaching (as evident in her agreement to participate in a research project with us that requires explicit reflection on her own teaching). At this point, it is clear that she is interested in increasing her understanding of her own teaching although it is still too early to know whether this interest will gradually move her from focusing on her own teaching to focusing on dialogue about teaching and learning with the disciplinary community. The second example is a tenured professor from the Faculty of Science, an award-winning teacher with more than twenty years’ experience. He has a remarkable interest in teaching and has grown in his own teaching such that he exhibits all attributes in the first phase. He is a good example of an excellent teacher who has focused his interest in teaching in Phase One and has chosen to spend his time on perfecting his teaching. To the best of our knowledge, he is only minimally involved in attributes related to Phase Two. Many excellent teachers never undertake the shift from Phase One to Phase Two. Perhaps not every faculty member wants to or has to become a scholar of teaching.

**Phase Two: Dialogue with Colleagues About Teaching and Learning.** In our experience, we have noted that, at some point, certain professors become interested in engaging in conversations and work with others who are interested in teaching. In Phase Two, professors move beyond personal reflection and engage with colleagues to co-construct a more complex understanding of pedagogical content knowledge within their discipline and more generic knowledge of teaching across disciplines. This furthers the integration of teaching into the primary work of the disciplines and of departments.

We present three case examples of Phase Two processes designed to provide the opportunity for dialogue with colleagues about teaching and learning. Table 8.2 presents a matrix for considering the examples in terms of who initiates the activity and in what contexts the activities occur. We see three initiators: individual professors, faculty developers, and university administrators. We see two contexts in which the activities tend to occur: informal groups and formal structures. Given the constraints of space, we have selected three particularly interesting cases to illustrate processes that represent Phase Two activities.
Table 8.2. Examples of Phase Two: Initiators and Context for Dialogue about Teaching and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiators</th>
<th>Informal groups</th>
<th>Formal structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Department of Physics</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty developers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**An Informal Group Initiated by a Professor.** The first example is an informal group that was initiated by a professor from the Department of Physics. We have worked with this professor previously as he has developed his own teaching. This time he called to ask whether CUTL could give a workshop to introduce physics teaching assistants (TAs) to some new aspects of the physics curriculum. We think it helps integrate teaching into the discipline if we work with individuals in departments to respond to the needs they perceive. Thus we suggested that if he and a group of professors would work together to design and implement a workshop, CUTL would be glad to help. He agreed, and although not all the professors he invited came, a consistent core attended regularly. To date, three professors and one graduate student have jointly planned and delivered two workshops for forty TAs, and another workshop is scheduled. The group intends to continue meeting and planning workshops, and to follow the same sequence with TAs next year.

How did this activity provide a Phase Two opportunity for dialogue with colleagues about teaching and learning? It brought together a group of professors interested in teaching to discuss what seemed to be endemic issues in introductory physics courses. In trying to find solutions, they talked explicitly about how to teach certain concepts in a way that students understand. In doing so, they made explicit their tacitly held pedagogical content knowledge (for example, McAlpine and Harris, 1999), because they had to explain to others the methods they felt were most effective in helping students learn.

**A Formal Structure Initiated by a Faculty Developer.** In this second example, the director of CUTL approached the dean of the Faculty of Science to see whether he would be interested in having a faculty developer whose time was spent solely helping his faculty undertake any initiatives they felt were appropriate. The only criterion set by CUTL was that activities for faculty professors would have to be voluntary, which is one of our basic principles of faculty development. The dean was interested, so CUTL and the Faculty of Science advertised a joint appointment, working half-time in science and half-time in CUTL. The selection committee included representatives from
psychology, chemistry, physics, and higher education (the academic home of CUTL). In the process of creating a job description, the selection committee had to struggle with making explicit how the individual would model excellent science teaching.

How did this activity provide a Phase Two opportunity? This process engaged colleagues within a faculty in dialogue about teaching and learning. Through this conversation, committee members from different fields learned about each other’s criteria for teaching excellence in science and were pressed to create a shared perspective. This process also helped the group to conceive that someone from inside or outside their own disciplines could have the expertise to help them grow in teaching. This interaction broadened the perspective of both the Faculty of Science and CUTL about integrating teaching into the primary work of the disciplines.

A Formal Structure Initiated by an Administrator. This third example was initiated by an administrator in the Department of Family Medicine. The administrator requested that CUTL give a teaching portfolio workshop (a teaching portfolio is required for promotion and tenure). We recognize that there are disciplinary differences in teaching and wished to encourage department members to make explicit their own criteria to guide both the development and evaluation of a teaching portfolio. Thus we suggested that instead of CUTL giving a workshop, a CUTL member join their departmental tenure and promotion committee to help them define effective teaching in their context and to design their own workshop based on the criteria they defined. The committee met three times to define criteria and subsequently designed a workshop specifically for their department members.

How did this activity provide a Phase Two opportunity? The professor who initiated the contact is well developed in her own teaching and is a scholar of teaching. In her role as an administrator, she is trying to bring dialogue about teaching and learning into the department and thereby reduce the isolation of teaching from the clinical community. The role of faculty developers in encouraging such integration is not to give them a workshop but to help them create their own. Thus in creating the document to describe the teaching portfolio expectations, committee members were forced to be explicit about their assumptions and expectations regarding teaching excellence in relation to their department and their field. This is a particular challenge in an area in which most faculty members define themselves by their clinical practice. The creation of a teaching portfolio requires that faculty members recognize that teaching is an important part of the role of a faculty member and helps them to recognize that much of what they do in clinical practice is teaching, thus merging their conceptions of practice and teaching. We hope that they will see their teaching in a different way.

Phase Three: Growth in Scholarship of Teaching. After engaging in a number of Phase Two activities, some professors begin to see that the inquiry ethic that drives their scholarship of discovery can also drive inquiry into teaching. They exhibit increasing interest in sharing their knowledge
and expertise about teaching and learning, a critical attribute in developing as a scholar of teaching. Well-developed scholars of teaching have grown in their own teaching and achieved a certain level of competence, have engaged with others in enhancing the value of teaching in the institution and discipline, and contribute to the growth and dissemination of knowledge related to teaching in the discipline or in general.

An example of a scholar of teaching is a tenured professor in the Faculty of Medicine. She is an award-winning teacher with more than twenty years of teaching experience. She demonstrates all the attributes in Phases One and Two. We would call her a mature scholar of teaching: she exhibits most attributes in Phase Three. Not only does she publish about teaching, but she carries out research on teaching, mentors others in carrying out research on teaching, and exhibits initiative and leadership. We suspect that maturity as a scholar of teaching is more likely to occur later in a career, when teaching and research are well developed.

There has been some discussion as to whether a scholar of teaching studies teaching as a discipline in itself, such as through higher education, or whether teaching can be studied through another discipline. Our position is that a scholar of teaching can study teaching through any discipline. In fact, our model of a continuum of growth toward the scholarship of teaching is based on the assumption that scholars of teaching can emerge from any and all disciplines.

**Role of Faculty Developers in Developing Scholarship of Teaching.** Although professors may move through the continuum of development on their own, faculty developers can and often do help professors to move through the phases. In Phase One, professors themselves are usually the initiators for their own growth in teaching. Faculty developers often provide a venue for people to learn about their own teaching through formal activities such as workshops and consultations and informal activities such as private conversations.

In Phase Two, faculty developers usually respond to professors’ requests by encouraging consideration of activities that will create dialogue with colleagues within the discipline. In the physics and family medicine examples we gave earlier, the faculty developers for each had an essential role in helping the professors conceptualize the activity in a new way. The professors then initiated the process within the unit, and the faculty developers subsequently helped guide meetings, prepare written documents to synthesize discussion within a teaching and learning framework relevant to the project, and search out and distribute relevant literature. However, faculty developers occasionally initiate Phase Two processes at faculty or university levels when we can see potential or opportunities for increasing the community of scholarship around teaching. This was the case with the Faculty of Science example we gave earlier.

In Phase Three, faculty developers often work collegially with professors on a cooperative project or research related to teaching and learning.
For instance, we often ask professors to be participants in our research on teaching and learning in higher education, thus making them more aware of the nature of research in this area. As faculty developers, we sometimes analyze and write with professors about teaching experiences. We have also worked with professors to help them design and carry out research projects in areas of interest to them.

We believe that faculty developers can help to accelerate the process of moving through the three phases of growth toward the scholarship of teaching. For example, the Teaching Scholars program in the Faculty of Medicine is accelerating growth toward scholarship of teaching within that discipline. This program requires participating physicians to take two courses related to teaching in higher education, to carry out an independent study related to improving teaching in the Faculty of Medicine, and to attend a monthly seminar to discuss their projects and experiences. The progress of one assistant professor who is primarily engaged in clinical practice exemplifies this process. He chose to join the Teaching Scholars program one year ago and began to take courses that would help him develop his knowledge about teaching. As a result, he has begun to grow in his own teaching, already exhibiting many attributes in Phase One. The program also engages him in Phase Two activities: talking about teaching with other teaching scholars at monthly meetings. As well, he has engaged in Phase Three activities, carrying out a research study about the value of a particular teaching strategy in his field, a study he presented at a faculty development workshop. We find this program an interesting example of how faculty developers can accelerate the process of growth. For instance, although teaching scholars are new to thinking about teaching, they quickly are required to participate in activities typical of those who are moving toward the scholarship of teaching. However, because the structure of the program requires them to engage in processes at each phase, we note that they do not have the opportunity to exhibit the initiative and leadership we think may be necessary for fully developing into scholars of teaching. Thus although we think that potential for maturing into a scholar of teaching can be accelerated with this kind of program, because it is new, we do not yet know about the long-term outcomes.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have addressed two unresolved issues from the Delphi study regarding the scholarship of teaching: the nature of the isolation of the scholarship of teaching from the primary work of the disciplines and of departments, and whether a scholar of teaching studies teaching as a discipline in itself or whether teaching is studied through another discipline. We have discussed isolation of teaching in general from the primary work of the disciplines but have considered the scholarship of teaching as integration rather than isolation. We propose a continuum of growth toward the
scholarship of teaching that highlights the possibility of growth or development within and across three phases, a continuum that makes clear the role of intentionality within each phase in increasing one’s knowledge both about teaching and learning and about leadership in the valuing of teaching. This view of the growth of the scholarship of teaching is based on the assumption that scholars of teaching can and will emerge from any and all disciplines. We were interested in how the continuum would help us understand our role as faculty developers. We conclude that if our goal is to encourage the scholarship of teaching, then we must move beyond helping individual professors to grow in their own teaching and facilitating dialogue with colleagues about teaching and learning; we must do more to support professors’ transition into Phase Three, growth as scholars.
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