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This paper is an attempt to develop a constructive and substantive conversation about the nature of teaching. I have, in fact, written it in conversation with my colleagues at Alverno College and with others from other colleges and universities. It represents my reflection on the practice of scholarship when shaped by student learning as its ultimate purpose. That reflection is based on my experience at Alverno, where teaching is recognized and rewarded as our primary professional responsibility. In this sense, the ideas in the paper are descriptive. But they also serve as a challenge to faculty to take seriously the unique requirements of scholarly activity that has student learning as its goal.

The statement above is from the first printing of this paper in March 1993. It conveys hope that the paper might be a contribution to national and local conversations about teaching in higher education. The statement on the inside cover describes some results of these conversations during the past eighteen months and raises questions for our continuing discussion.
Introduction to Second Printing

It has been more than a year since the first printing of this paper. We had planned to revise it based upon insights derived from discussions we have had with colleagues across the country and around the world. However, we find that we have even more questions than we had before. Therefore, we have decided that more discussion is needed and that we will reprint the original paper — with this new introductory statement — in order to continue and expand the dialogue.

The discussions have made the complexity of the teaching enterprise even more apparent. They have raised many significant questions that deserve our serious attention:

1. **Creating a Public Discussion of Teaching:** How do we provide a theoretical conception of teaching that is broadly applicable, while preserving the contextual reality of teaching particular students in varied settings? How do we create a language to use in describing teaching as a scholarly activity when even the word, “teaching,” has connotations that limit the way we think about it? How do we provide a clear, coherent picture of teaching scholarship without creating simplistic formulas?

2. **Professional Identity of Undergraduate Faculty:** How do we provide a new vision of scholarship that, by a primary focus on student learning, transforms our professional identity? How do we address this as a substantive transformation so that it is not perceived as an additional list of activities? How can we ground the discussion of teaching strategies in the larger conceptual issues for example, curricular frame works, collaboration among faculty, assessment, etc.?

3. **Disciplines as Frameworks for Learning:** How do we become more effective in working with our disciplines as frameworks for student learning? How do the changing disciplinary boundaries affect the way we think about this? What are the principles, concepts and methodologies that we want our students to learn? How does our understanding of the relationships among the disciplines affect our thinking about student learning and its relationship to their professional, personal and civic lives?

4. **Graduate Education:** And how do we work with graduate programs to make doctoral programs more attentive to the development of scholars who are able to teach their students and who see that as their primary responsibility? What are the various abilities graduate students need to develop in order to be scholarly teachers?

With these questions in mind, we see this paper and the discussions based on it as the beginning of our work on this subject. The six domains of teaching addressed in the paper have been helpful in considering what the scholarship of teaching means, but much more needs to be done. During the next year we plan to develop other materials to address some of the questions raised above. As we do so, we look forward to hearing from you about your own insights into this important subject.
Beyond the Debate: The Nature of Teaching

Introduction

The call for improved teaching and for a redefinition of scholarship in higher education today has led to a barrage of arguments about the relationship between teaching and research. Some insist that research and teaching are inextricably linked to one another; others claim that research often distracts faculty from the teaching enterprise. Some say that faculty should strike a balance between research and teaching; others view research as a necessary prerequisite to teaching. The argument takes other forms as well, but there is usually something missing from the debate: a comprehensive discussion of what we mean by “teaching.” To assume that we all have a common conception of the activity we call “teaching” is to ignore what may be the most fruitful path of inquiry in considering the nature of scholarship.

One of the problems in conducting a constructive conversation about teaching is that the word itself carries with it connotations and images that are too restrictive limiting it, for example, to lecturing, presenting, or delivering information. Lee Shulman has pointed out that the phrase “stand and deliver,” used as the title of the film about the master teacher, Jaime Escalante, is misleading because of the image of teaching it reinforces. We may also tend to think of teaching as something that takes place only in a classroom. Recent concern about the small number of hours that some faculty actually spend in class may raise some important questions about institutional priorities, but they also have the potential to reinforce the notion that teaching only involves what happens in a classroom. It is important, then, to construct a comprehensive image of teaching that conveys the breadth and depth of scholarship that is involved when we take seriously our role as professional educators.

Before proceeding with the construction of such an image, I wish to make a significant point about the way I have approached this process. Although I am writing this piece as my own reflection and usually in the first person, I want to emphasize that the writing of it has been a highly collaborative enterprise. Both the motivation to write this and many of the ideas contained in it come from colleagues within my own institution and across the country. For example, we as a faculty at our college have been discussing the scholarship of teaching regularly at college institutes during the past several years. During that same time, I have had the opportunity to participate in the Forum for Exemplary Teaching sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education. That ongoing dialogue with colleagues within and outside my institution led me to write this paper. I took an early draft of the paper to the entire faculty at our college as a stimulus for further discussion of the scholarship of teaching and for feedback on the paper itself. We had lively discussions in our departments and then as an entire faculty about the ideas in the paper. I also received written responses from most of the faculty about the paper, and I have revised it several times with their suggestions in mind. I make this point about the process by way of
acknowledgment, but, more importantly, to underscore a crucial dimension of the teaching enterprise: systematic collaboration among colleagues about the most significant aspects of educating our students. In that spirit, I hope this paper creates a conversation about the substance of teaching.

**Domains of Teaching: Student Learning as Focus**

All institutions of higher learning claim to have undergraduate education as a priority. They may have other missions as well, depending on the nature of the particular institutions, but they insist that they will provide a sound education for their students. College catalogues, admissions office literature, and departmental goal statements all make a case for commitment to the learning of students; and this emphasis has increased with the current national discussion about educational reform. If the scholarship of faculty is to match that rhetoric, we must give increased attention to whatever will make us better teachers so that our students truly are learning in more effective and imaginative ways. If student learning is the ultimate goal of the work that we do, becoming better teachers is our primary professional responsibility.

Good teachers realize that educating students involves more than walking into a classroom and doing what comes naturally. They know that thoughtful preparation of courses and class sessions is necessary to effectively assist their students to learn. We can agree, then, that teaching extends beyond what teachers do in the classroom to the various kinds of study they need to do to develop as educators. This is an assumption that seems almost embarrassingly obvious, but it may have implications that challenge the conventional images of what it means to be a teacher.

What do teachers need to be studying and thinking about in order to provide the best learning environments for students? Most us have been socialized in graduate school and in other contexts to begin answering this question by focusing on the disciplines we teach, so we emphasize the need to be expert or current in our disciplines. This is an important consideration, of course, but the meaning of it might change if we begin with a different focus: the students we are teaching. The point of education, after all, is the learning that students do. The purpose of undergraduate learning is not to provide a forum for faculty to talk about favorite subjects; rather, it is to ensure that students develop the understanding and abilities they need in order to respond to and shape the world in which they live.

**Disciplines as Frameworks for Student Learning**

Once student learning becomes the ultimate focus of our scholarship, it is important to approach our disciplines as frameworks for that learning. An essential component of scholarly activity in this context is transforming our disciplines into processes that assist our students to learn. In my own discipline of philosophy, for example, I need to ask how consistency and logic can help students become more thoughtful and precise thinkers.
At the same time, I need to consider how the study of a variety of philosophical perspectives can assist students to become more imaginative and flexible thinkers. Since some view precision as an obstacle to imagination, I need to develop ways of making sure that students develop these processes as complementary aspects of making meaning in their own lives. I want to make philosophy not just an object of study, but a way of approaching the world, and this means that my scholarship is grounded in the questions which will help me do that. I want to consider here some of those general and more specific questions that reflect a view of a discipline as a framework for learning.

Some of them concern the students’ understanding of the very nature of philosophy. In what ways can my discipline be truly significant for my students? As I consider the nature of philosophy, and a changing nature it is, what are the abilities and qualities of the discipline that will be most helpful to my students? How can I make my discipline come alive in meaningful ways for my students? Are there modes of discourse other than formal philosophical texts that will help students get to the heart of the discipline?

Some of them concern the process of helping students use the discipline to reflect on their own lives. What kinds of experiences will engage students in understanding and using the discipline? How should I organize their study of philosophy so students are using philosophical methods, not just explaining them? How can I assist students to make connections between my discipline and their own experiences? How can I help students connect the issues and methods of philosophers with the issues and methods they engage in their own lives? What can I do to get a sense of how students are changing because they are studying my discipline? How will I know not just whether students understand the ideas they are studying, but also how they respond to them?

Some of the questions concern how the discipline affects my design of assessment. What must students be able to do in order to demonstrate that they have grasped and can apply key concepts and methods of the discipline? Have I clearly articulated for myself and students what I expect they should be able to do because they have studied philosophy? What kinds of assessment strategies are most appropriate to my discipline and will help to determine whether students have indeed developed the abilities the discipline has to offer? Are there ways of assessing philosophy that might be different from the assessing of other disciplines?

These questions are hardly exhaustive and have limits of their own. For example, they are stated in a way that could imply a rather narrow focus on our individual disciplines, while neglecting the truly interdisciplinary character of most learning. On the other hand, the questions do suggest a context for scholarship, a way of thinking about our disciplines that presumes an emphasis on their role as vehicles of learning. Such questions are central to the scholarship that we pursue as teachers. They may not be sufficient to the scholarship of teaching, but they are certainly necessary to it.

Approaching disciplines as frameworks for student learning requires that we think
about our disciplines in the context of teaching. We need to forge a relationship between disciplinary study and our experience of teaching the particular groups of students we work with in our classrooms. To be sure, we bring areas of expertise from graduate school and other study to our teaching, and this makes us more qualified to teach in some areas than in others. The reality of much undergraduate teaching, however, requires that we actually do very little teaching of the specific area of interest we pursued in our dissertation or in articles we might have written for scholarly journals. This is not to suggest that there are no possible connections between specialized interests and what we teach; we can make substantive relationships in developing frameworks of learning.

My study of the contemporary American philosopher, Richard Rorty, has convinced me of the value of approaching philosophy as an open ended conversation rather than as an argument to establish the truth. This shift in my view of philosophical discourse has led me to encourage the same kind of discourse in the classroom, where my students and I engage in the process of constructing knowledge together with the help of the thinkers we are studying. While this particular philosophical interest of mine has led to some important insights for me as a teacher, I might not have considered the connection if I had not been asking pedagogical questions of the ideas I was studying.

That habit of mind has often led me and my colleagues to disciplines other than our own to make learning more meaningful for students. I use literature in my philosophy courses as narrative expressions of philosophical issues and perspectives, and I consider it important to examine psychological theories of moral development as a context for considering ethical theories. A colleague of mine in economics draws heavily from the insights of sociologists and historians to provide a context for the theories she wants her students to address. Another colleague in literature explores phenomenology and Buddhism with his students as a way of understanding the themes of a contemporary black American author. I know management teachers who need the insights of psychologists to teach sound management principles. These examples illustrate not only the potential connections across disciplines, but also the ways teachers can help students learn particular domains of knowledge in a more integrated and contextual manner.

Faculty members who are deeply involved in the teaching enterprise are discovering and constructing disciplinary frameworks. The very act of classroom teaching is an interactive, dynamic process in which students and teachers are discovering and constructing knowledge as we proceed. I am there to engage in philosophical discourse with students, to do philosophy together, to develop new ways of thinking about the world together while using the ideas of those who have called themselves philosophers.

In addition, the kind of scholarly activity in which we transform our disciplines into learning processes so that students can participate in the making of meaning in the classroom is certainly discovery and construction as well. It requires not only that we understand the essential concepts, issues, and methods of the disciplines we teach, but also that we have a sense of how our disciplines relate to one another so that we can help students see that, too.
Student Learning Styles and Needs

The questions that teachers need to be asking of disciplines must be further contextualized to include an awareness of how students learn. This involves general knowledge of learning patterns as well as specific insight into the particular groups of students we happen to be teaching. We can acquire a general view through the study of work that social scientists have done in such areas as developmental and cognitive psychology, in learning theory and learning styles, and in other appropriate aspects of educational psychology. In other words, we need to draw on the insights of professionals outside our own particular disciplines in order to more fully understand the students we are teaching. This kind of study has not been encouraged as a part of our professional identities for the most part, but it is important if we are to develop a sense of what will be the most effective learning strategies for students. Teachers of elementary and secondary schools have recognized this need for years and have made it a part of their professional training and ongoing study; it is more than reasonable to expect the same of those who teach undergraduates.

Although the insights of educational psychologists suggest broad patterns of development and learning that can assist us as educators, each group of students brings its own set of backgrounds, experiences, and learning styles to the classroom. To discern the unique aspects of individual students and groups of students, we need to develop ways of understanding what makes our students who they are. This can range from a general sense of the demographics of our student populations to the more particular insights about individual learning styles. For example, the fact that I teach at a women’s college, that there is a fairly even mix of traditional and non-traditional age students, and that about 20% of the students are members of minority groups makes a difference in the way I think about the strategies, dynamics, and materials I want to use in my teaching. In addition, assignments and assessments, which have been designed not merely as a basis for determining a grade but for helping me identify the learning needs of my students, provide me with more specific insight into the ways I can most effectively help them learn.

This is a more diagnostic and developmental approach to assignments and assessments in which we can gather insights into student needs and use that information to give them helpful feedback and to adjust our own pedagogical methods. This kind of approach also implies that we give serious thought to the timing and nature of assignments and assessments. It implies that we regularly and systematically gather data about whether and how students are learning throughout courses and programs so that we can make the changes necessary to improve the environment for student learning.

Assessment of Student Learning

Gathering data about student learning is central to the activity of teaching, and it provides a very different context for evaluating students. It is clear that we need to devote much of our attention to the learning experiences we plan for our students, but the counterpart to that is attention to whether and how each one is learning because of those experiences.
This focus on the actual learning of students has often taken the form of an evaluation which is expressed in a grade, a number, or a ranking. While these forms of evaluation may serve some useful purposes, they do not directly address the more diagnostic purposes of assessment with improvement of student learning as the critical concern.

When this goal is uppermost in our minds, we design assignments and assessments in ways that call forth the analytical processes of our students and reveal their strengths and weaknesses so we can provide helpful feedback to them. We also create opportunities for self-assessment in which the students themselves reflect on their learning and identify their learning strengths and needs. As students become more conscious of their learning by articulating it, they grow in their ability to be independent life long learners. Keeping these purposes in mind is essential not only to the design and timing of assessments, but also to the way we think about our teaching in general.

The classroom then provides increased opportunity both for student learning and for our observation and reflection on that learning. This can take the form of judgments we make in class about whether students are engaged and being constructively critical, whether their responses reflect a grasp of the concepts at hand, whether the assignment has actually prepared them for discussion, whether the classroom environment encourages participation by all students. We become more sensitive to these things, however, if we give sustained and systematic attention to them; that is, the study of student learning becomes a conscious and consistent aspect of our scholarly activity as teachers. The spontaneous insights come more readily and more often as we make the classroom and other student learning contexts integral to our own reflective inquiry.

How might we approach this kind of observation and reflection consciously and systematically? One method is to keep teaching journals in which we make observations about what seems to work and what does not in individual class sessions and cumulatively during a course. The journal can be used to identify patterns of student performance in assignments and assessments throughout a semester. There might be a particular area of my teaching that is a concern and could be the focus of the journal. The value of a method like this is that it provides us with the systematic data that we can use in reflecting on our teaching, and it contributes to a habit of mind that makes us more alert to the dynamics of student learning. The recording of such observations also assures that we do not lose the insights we have while teaching a course, and we can use them for revision during or after the course. We can also ask our students to respond to questions at certain points throughout a semester in order to get a better sense of how they perceive what has been helpful in their learning. The assumption behind all of these strategies is that we can help students learn more effectively if we consistently assess their progress, provide developmental feedback to them based on that assessment, and modify our own pedagogy in light of what we have made the conscious effort to discover about how our students learn.

This kind of inquiry calls upon us as teachers to become our own experts about student learning. As mentioned previously, the work of educational psychologists and other social
scientists has much to offer in terms of educating ourselves about learning processes. However, we ourselves are in a unique position to see how our particular students are learning and to think about what they need in order to continue their learning. We are in that position in the service of learning, though, only if we are giving close attention to what is happening with our students. Assignments and assessments can be a source of diagnosis, because they can tell us about the strengths and weaknesses of students and about the relative effectiveness of the pedagogical strategies we employ. They become opportunities for teachers to give helpful feedback to students and to reflect on more effective methods in the classroom. Approaching all aspects of our teaching in this more diagnostic way requires that we keep the improvement of instruction and learning as our ultimate goal.

**Curriculum Coherence for Student Learning**

We also need to consider what and how we teach in relation to the larger picture of the entire curriculum. In this sense, it is important to assure that students experience not just a collection of courses, but a developmental and coherent curriculum. This concern for the larger picture of the student’s experience across the curriculum requires that we ask ourselves questions about the relationships among the disciplines the students are learning. We need to consider not only the contribution of our own individual disciplines to the curriculum, but also the way they connect with, complement, or even challenge one another. In this sense, we as faculty must agree on the general outcomes we want to see our students develop across the disciplines and explore how we will ensure that we will teach our respective disciplines so that students will achieve those outcomes. Rather than merely hoping for conscious and integrated student learning, we need to articulate the goals of that learning and then create a systematic and coherent approach that assists students in that direction.

This means that the conceptual work of educators extends beyond the domain of our respective disciplines to reflecting on and creating an undergraduate curriculum in general. The teaching in one classroom should complement what is happening in the other classrooms, and faculty can accomplish this only through a common, coherent vision of undergraduate learning. We will, of course, have different views on some pedagogical issues, and we will bring our own unique styles and interests to our teaching. It is important, however, that we do have some common outcomes in mind so we can provide a coherent framework for learning across the curriculum. Whether we are considering learning in a major area of study or in the broader general education program, we are more likely to help students learn in developmental, integrated ways if we have carefully conceptualized a curriculum that reflects that kind of coherence.

**Collaborative Inquiry**

Coherence in a curriculum, whether in a department or across an institution, can be developed only if faculty members are in collaboration with one another about the
expectations they have for their students and about the means they are going to use to help students meet those expectations. In order to build on and complement one another in our teaching, we need to be aware of what is happening throughout the curriculum, not just in our own individual classrooms. Indeed, what we do in our classrooms should relate to what we know our colleagues are doing. For example, my colleagues and I in the philosophy department must have some common understanding of what we want our students to be able to do as a result of their study in philosophy. We must also determine how the courses we teach will systematically and developmentally assist students to develop those abilities. In the broader context, we need to think about the ways in which the study of philosophy will contribute to the developmental process of learning that students will engage throughout their undergraduate curriculum.

Addressing these vital concerns requires that teachers are talking to each other not only within departments, but across them as well. The scholarship of teaching cannot take place in isolation; it must possess a pervasive collegial character that leads to the ongoing creation and implementation of an integrated undergraduate experience for our students.

Collaboration can also make public ideas that then affect the teaching of a wider variety of faculty members. Dialogue among teachers creates an atmosphere in which new ideas emerge as we talk through issues we face; in fact, we begin to see issues we might not have seen otherwise. As a culture of collaboration develops, we are more likely to articulate the concerns we face as educators. The call for writing across the curriculum encourages us to assist each other to help our students become more effective writers in a variety of contexts. This effort demands that we discuss with our colleagues across disciplines the goals and strategies we want to pursue with our students. The national concern for the development of critical thinking in students is best addressed when we as faculty are sharing our insights about the processes we see as crucial to critical thinking and about the methods that will enable students to develop those processes.

When this kind of collaboration takes place, what might have been viewed as teaching failures become opportunities for rethinking curricula and pedagogical strategies with colleagues. The time we spend in substantive discourse across disciplines about the issues we face in teaching makes us more thoughtful, effective educators who see points of connection across disciplines or new perspectives on our own disciplines. This kind of discussion is essential to our development as professionals if we are to offer a truly coherent undergraduate education. It is an irony of the academic community that we expect students to study a wide variety of disciplines and make some integrated sense of them, but we as faculty members often move further and further away from that model in our own study. Collaboration with colleagues from other disciplines about the outcomes of education might encourage us to continue our own liberal education so that we can help students do the same.
Pedagogical Strategies

I have intentionally saved discussion of this domain of teaching for last because it is sometimes equated with the whole of teaching; that is, conversation about teaching often assumes that teaching means simply the techniques and methods we employ in the classroom. The foregoing discussion should make it clear that there is much more involved in teaching, and it should also suggest that the consideration of pedagogical strategies is a more complex and conceptual activity than we might first suspect. In determining strategies, we must first have thought carefully about what we want our students to learn. This involves context specific and relational theorizing about the ways in which our disciplines can serve as learning frameworks for our students. We can develop strategies that assist students to ask questions within the disciplinary framework, to explore issues by building on those questions, to be able to articulate hypotheses, to draw conclusions on the basis of their observations and to have confidence in them because they know how to gather evidence.

My teaching in philosophy has led me to the conclusion that students are more likely to actually engage the process of critical reflection on questions of meaning if they can see it as a process which helps them understand and make meaning of their own experience. This leads me to ask that students not only explain the ideas they are studying but also explore the implications for their own lives, provide thoughtful judgment about the relative merits of different philosophical perspectives, and discuss the difference it has made for them to have studied them. Although I have already referred to assessment and its role in assisting faculty to understand student progress in learning, it is important to think of assessment, including self assessment, as a learning strategy for students. To achieve the ultimate goal of undergraduate education, students who have developed the capability for continual learning, we must assist them to make judgments about their own learning based on criteria appropriate to the area of study.

If we also consider pedagogical strategies in collaboration with one another, we will more likely be teaching in complementary ways. It may certainly be the case that we will use strategies that are quite different, even somewhat oppositional, in character, but the way we teach our students should help them see these differences as reflections of the need for varied and imaginative approaches to the problems of life.

I recall a recent discussion between members of the philosophy department and the management department in which we explored the different outcomes we were trying to achieve with our students and the different strategies we used as a result. At the same time we discussed the common goals we hoped to achieve with our students and how that affected our strategies. We all agree, for example, that we want our students to be able to identify and deal with the complexity in issues and to be able to communicate their ideas to others effectively in writing, in the spoken word, and in group settings. As a result, both departments require that students explore complex questions and do so in written, spoken, and group formats. On the other hand, in philosophy we tend to encourage more open
ended reflection on issues and less often require that students come to consensus because the questions of the discipline have to do with meaning and do not lend themselves to final answers. In management there are times when it is important that students reach consensus because that is what they will often have to do in their professional lives. The philosophy department is not interested in educating students to be procrastinators who can never make decisions; nor is the management department attempting to teach students to make quick decisions without an appreciation for ambiguity. The key is that we consider together how to teach our students so that we are reinforcing common goals and providing alternative ways of thinking at the same time.

**Summary**

What will help students learn most effectively? This is obviously the question that we need to be asking ourselves as teachers. When we consider the question in all its dimensions, we find significant implications. The question assumes that we have thought carefully about what we want our students to learn. It also assumes that we have explicitly identified what we want our students to understand and what they should be able to do with what they understand. This means that we have thought about and articulated what our disciplines have to offer as frameworks of learning. And faculty cannot do this in isolation from one another if we are going to build a process that assists students to experience coherence in the curriculum.

We need to discuss with each other within and across departments the outcomes we want to develop in our students. In this sense, faculty members are responsible not just for what happens in our own individual classrooms, but for how it relates and contributes to what students are learning throughout their curriculum. This makes the scholarship of teaching by necessity a public and collaborative enterprise rather than a private and isolated one. It means the areas of faculty expertise extend beyond specialization in a discipline to a more comprehensive and synthesizing understanding of the domains of knowledge in general. And, finally, it requires that we construct new forms of knowledge and new disciplines as we transform our own learning into processes which will engage, inform, and assist the students we teach to develop as learners.

In this sense, the inquiry essential to teaching is a highly complex endeavor that involves a network of conceptual concerns extending far beyond the more specific question of how to have a stimulating discussion in class. There are, no doubt, other domains of teaching, but even this limited overview makes it clear that this kind of inquiry is both substantive and demanding.

**Implications for the Teaching Research Relationship**

This brings us back to the controversy over the relationship between teaching and research. Perhaps the key to resolving this issue is to look more directly at what good teaching actually requires. One of the major premises of this paper is that we might be well served to seriously examine the nature of teaching as a critical step in considering the relationship
between teaching and research. We may conclude, for example, that the very activities I have described here constitute significant research in their own right. If we view research as a process of sustained, thoughtful, and systematic study of a subject in order to enhance one’s understanding of and contribution to that subject, then clearly the processes I have described represent research.

The critical issue here, it seems, is not whether we should be doing thoughtful, productive study, but what kind of study we should be doing. I am suggesting that, in determining the nature of that inquiry, an important question to ask is this: How does our primary role as teachers shape what we study and how we study? I hasten to add that there can be all sorts of reasons to do research. A premise of this paper is that providing for the education of undergraduates is one of these reasons, and, I would add, one of the more significant reasons. It follows that the research of faculty members who are teaching undergraduates as their primary responsibility should have that purpose uppermost in mind.

This view requires that we foster a professional identity that is probably quite different from the one we were encouraged to adopt in graduate school, and that is still, in many ways, reinforced throughout the academic community. On the other hand, it is clear from my own informal conversations with colleagues around the country and from countless formal studies that a large percentage of faculty see themselves as teachers first. They seek a scholarship that incorporates that view into a way of continually transforming undergraduate education. This view embodies a way of thinking that at first may not seem familiar, but one that may challenge us to see both teaching and research in radically different ways.

In the 1990 report of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, “Scholarship Reconsidered,” Ernest Boyer recommends expanding our notion of scholarship to include four different kinds - discovery, application, integration, and teaching. Although some might quarrel with particular aspects of Boyer’s proposal, the idea that higher educational institutions are involved in a variety of endeavors, and that the scholarship of faculty should reflect that diversity, seems to be a reasonable idea. In this context, those of us who have the teaching of undergraduates as our main concern need to create and publicly acknowledge a scholarship that readily and substantively serves the learning of students. I hope this paper serves as a contribution in the creation of that scholarship, a scholarship that will help us develop exciting and effective ways of assisting our students to become capable and independent learners.
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