

Teaching Excellence, Teaching Expertise, and the Scholarship of Teaching

Carolyn Kreber

ABSTRACT: The previous decade witnessed significant advancements in the scholarship of teaching at the levels of both theory building and program development. Notwithstanding these achievements, there remains considerable ambiguity regarding the meaning of the concept. This ambiguity has implications for faculty evaluation. Excellence in teaching, expertise in teaching, and the scholarship of teaching are analyzed according to the nature and sources of knowledge construction underlying each. Practical examples are included to illustrate differences. It is argued that excellence in teaching and the scholarship of teaching are both important but should be recognized and rewarded in their own right.

KEY WORDS: scholarship of teaching; teaching excellence; teaching expertise.

My purpose in this conceptual article is to distinguish between three different ways in which higher education instructors can engage with teaching. These three forms of engagement are teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. Discussing differences and similarities in both the nature and the sources of knowledge construction underlying each, I suggest that scholars of teaching are *excellent teachers* as well as *expert teachers*; but they differ from either one in that scholars of teaching share their knowledge and advance the knowledge of teaching and learning in the discipline in a way that can be peer-reviewed. I conclude by raising some challenges this taxonomy poses for policy and practice.

Background

Teaching continues to be undervalued at research-intensive universities despite numerous initiatives to provoke change (e.g., Knapper & Rogers, 1994; Martin & Ramsden, 2000; Smith, 1991). The classic

Carolyn Kreber is currently Associate Professor of Adult and Higher Education in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, Canada. She received her B.A./B.Ed. from the Pädagogische Hochschule Freiburg, Germany, her M.Ed. from Brock University in Southern Ontario, and her Ph.D. in higher education from the University of Toronto/OISE. Her special research interests include teaching and learning at the postsecondary level, faculty development as well as lifelong learning.

attempt to address this disparity in the rewards allocated to teaching and research was to suggest that scholarship means more than the discovery of new knowledge in the discipline. It extends to the integration, application, and transmission of knowledge, which has been referred to as the “scholarship of teaching” (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 1992). Though coining the term is typically attributed to Boyer and his colleagues at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997), it has become evident over the past several years that the scholarship of teaching is not exclusively a North American idea but one of international scope. Not only did the previous decade witness a surge of publications on the topic nationally as well as internationally (e.g., Diamond, 1993; Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Healey, 2000; Kreber & Cranton, 2000; Menges & Weimer, 1996; Morehead & Shedd, 1996; Paulsen & Feldman, 1995; Richlin, 1993; Shulman, 1998; Taylor, 1993; Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin, & Prosser, 2000; Weimer, 1992), but new programs aimed at promoting the scholarship of teaching were initiated not just in the United States (Cambridge, 2000; Hutchings, 1999), but also most notably in Britain (Baume & Baume, 1996; ILT, 2001) and Australia (Martin & Ramsden, 2000). There is a tendency in both Britain and Australia to conceive of the scholarship of teaching as a campus activity, in other words, as an endeavor aimed at promoting an institutional environment that is supportive of teaching and learning. In the United States the scholarship of teaching has been conceived of as both a campus activity as well as an activity or career path individual faculty may wish to pursue (Cambridge, 2001).

As a result of these recent initiatives and publications the higher education literature now also offers models on the scholarship of teaching, some of which are empirically derived (e.g., Trigwell et al., 2000; Weston & McAlpine, 2001) while others are deduced from existing theory (e.g., Kreber & Cranton, 2000; Paulsen & Feldman, 1995). The purpose of these models ranges from explaining the attainment, development, and conceptualizations of the scholarship of teaching (Kreber & Cranton, 2000; Trigwell, et al. 2000; Weston & McAlpine, 2001) to showing how it differs and overlaps with other facets of scholarship (Paulsen & Feldman, 1995).

Despite these significant advancements in the domain of “teaching scholarship” over the past decade at both the level of theory or model building as well as the level of program development, the results of a recent survey suggest that the majority of faculty still perceive considerable ambiguity in the meaning of the concept (Franklin & Theall 2001).

No less than six years ago Menges and Weimer (1996) had already observed that the “The *scholarship of teaching* has become an amorphous term, equated more with commitment to teaching than with any concrete, substantive sense of definition or consensus as to how this scholarship can be recognized” (p. xii). Likewise, Andresen (2000) cautioned us more recently that “If the notions of *scholarship*, *scholar* and *scholarly* are to avoid emptiness and become useable as descriptors of teaching, as Ernest Boyer hoped, the concept behind these terms needs clarifying” (p. 137).

In response to this dilemma, attempts were made to define the scholarship of teaching. Based on a philosophical analysis, Andresen (2000) proposed that scholarship, including the scholarship of teaching, should involve critical reflection as well as scrutiny by peers and that it should be driven by an inquiry ethic. Using the research tradition of phenomenography (Marton, 1981), Trigwell et al. (2000) interviewed academics at an Australian university to identify how they construe the concept. The outcome of the study was a model distinguishing five different conceptions that are conceived as hierarchical in nature. The authors argued that conceptions of the scholarship of teaching differ along four dimensions: (1) the sources of information individuals draw upon, (2) the focus of their reflection, (3) the extent and nature of their communication of insights, and (4) their conceptions of teaching and learning (Kember, 1997; Prosser, Trigwell, & Taylor, 1994). Likewise, Kreber (2001, 2002), in a recent survey using the Delphi method, identified conceptualizations of the scholarship of teaching on which academics could reach consensus. In that study, the eleven participants¹ were also asked to identify issues surrounding the scholarship of teaching which they consider to be unresolved to date. Participants in the Delphi study contended that clearer definitions are needed to distinguish the meaning of concepts such as teaching expertise, teaching excellence, and the scholarship of teaching. Perhaps most importantly, panelists agreed that not everybody should be expected to practice the scholarship of teaching but that teaching excellence should be valued in its own right. Despite significant advances in higher education in the area of the scholarship of teaching these studies suggest that a unified definition of the concept continues to be lacking, let alone a clearer understanding of how it differs and overlaps with related phenomena.

¹For information regarding panel membership see Kreber (2002) and Kreber (2001)

A much needed contribution to present discourse on the scholarship of teaching, therefore, would be to provide faculty and academic administrators with a language and an understanding that permits them to distinguish the various ways of practicing post-secondary teaching: excellence in teaching, expertise in teaching, and the scholarship of teaching. Furthermore, in view of panelists' contention that the recognition and assessment of the scholarship of teaching remain important unresolved issues (Kreber, 2002; Theall & Centra, 2001), more precise definitions of teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching could clearly enhance present faculty evaluation practices.

Recent faculty evaluation literature (e.g., Centra, 1993; Glassick et al., 1997; Braskamp & Ory, 1994) has not ignored suggestions to conceptualize scholarship more broadly. However, this literature does not address the question as to whether, and if so how, teaching excellence and the scholarship of teaching should be rewarded differently. I propose that a first step towards achieving a clearer understanding of what is being evaluated is to explore specifically the sources and nature of knowledge construction for teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. My purpose, therefore, in this article is to discuss three questions:

- What are the sources and nature of knowledge construction in teaching excellence?
- What are the sources and nature of knowledge construction in teaching expertise?
- What are the sources and nature of knowledge construction in the scholarship of teaching?

Teaching Excellence

As already discussed, one of Boyer's (1990) considerations in proposing a more comprehensive conceptualization of scholarship was the widely shared view that, at research-intensive institutions specifically, teaching is given far less weight in tenure and promotion decisions than is research. For some of his followers, the scholarship of teaching then was seen as an appropriate way of "upping the ante with respect to teaching" (Menges & Weimer, 1996) at research-intensive institutions; and the scholarship of teaching was interpreted essentially as teaching excellence (see, for example, Morehead & Shedd, 1996). There might be a difference, however, between *wanting teaching to*

count in higher education and *wanting it to count as scholarship* (Smith, 1997).

Based on my previous work as a faculty developer, knowledge of the literature, and research with university teachers, I have observed that the majority of faculty would agree to the following observations about teaching. It is seen as a very time-consuming but also scholarly activity in that it requires sound knowledge of one's discipline as well as a good understanding of how to help students grow within, and perhaps even beyond, the discipline. Also, excellent teachers are seen as those who know how to motivate their students, how to convey concepts, and how to help students overcome difficulty in their learning.

Perhaps there is less commonality in how faculty think teaching excellence comes about. How do excellent teachers know what to do? Mentkowski and associates (2000) discuss four ways in which knowledge about learning and teaching can be constructed: through formal research, collaborative inquiry, the literature, and practice or experience. Granted, excellent teachers may derive their knowledge of how to teach from all of these sources; yet, they may derive it from active experimentation and reflection on personal experience alone. This latter point is crucial to the argument developed here and will be revisited below. First, however, it will be helpful to examine how teaching excellence is typically identified.

Excellence in teaching is usually identified on the basis of a judgment made about *performance*. Students, peers, and in some cases faculty members themselves describe how they perceive the performance. Awards for teaching excellence, for example, are ordinarily not adjudicated on the basis of how much someone *knows* about teaching. Indeed, for the effective practice of teaching and, by implication, the quality of student learning, an assessment of how much someone knows about teaching may even be perceived as irrelevant. In identifying teaching excellence, it is deemed far more pertinent that the *performance* was perceived as successful or effective by those who had the experience (i.e., present and former students, peers, and the instructors themselves).

We now widely accept that it is possible for everyone to become a good teacher who exerts the effort, and we recognize the belief that *good teachers are born not made* as a myth (Weimer, 1990). An experience most faculty share is that preparing courses, offering interesting and motivating lectures and seminars, and supervising and consulting with students require extensive energy and time. In sum, being or becoming a good teacher is hard work; and many colleagues would agree that excellence in teaching performance should be rewarded more

highly than is presently the case. An important question that needs to be posed, however, is whether it is this form of teaching excellence that should count as scholarship or whether excellence in teaching and the scholarship of teaching are perhaps different and require different evaluation criteria and rewards. The significant point here is that teaching excellence could be based exclusively on knowledge that teachers construct as a result of their personal teaching experience. Schön (1983) and others argued that this knowledge is generated through “reflection in action” and “reflection on action.” Clearly, this is one important and valid form of knowing about teaching. Note also that there is room for this kind of a scholarship of teaching in the model proposed by Trigwell et al. (2000). However, these authors emphasize that the five conceptions they identified are hierarchical in nature with higher-order forms of the scholarship of teaching encompassing the lower-order ones.

An example may illustrate what we usually mean by teaching excellence:

Chris is an Associate Professor in the Physical Sciences. For the past five years Chris’s teaching evaluations have been in the top 5% of his university. At a small ceremony held in recognition of his reception of a well-deserved university teaching award he comments on his teaching this way: “People often ask me how I manage to receive such good evaluations. I tell them ‘the secret is you have to love the classroom! You have to find enjoyment in engaging with students. And you have to be attentive to what’s happening.’ In my view, there is nothing more motivating and gratifying than seeing the light come on in students’ eyes. I have not always been a good teacher. When I first started teaching I had no idea about how to teach. I made many mistakes, such as overloading students with readings, filling my lectures with far too much content, and not showing any flexibility in my teaching. I deliberately filled my lectures as I was afraid that students could ask me questions that I would not know the answer to. Over time I realized what worked in my classes and what didn’t. I also became more comfortable with not knowing everything. I kept the approaches that worked and threw out the bad stuff. The students like it, and this shows in the excellent work they are doing. I feel I have some valuable advice to share, and that’s why I agreed when invited to participate in our peer consultation program.

Analyzing this example in terms of the four dimensions of the scholarship of teaching proposed by Trigwell et al. (2000)—conceptions of teaching, sources of information, focus of the reflection, and communication of insights—Chris has already begun to move towards a conception of teaching that is learning-oriented. At the same time, however, he still operates at the lower end of the information dimension as there is no evidence that he has consulted the literature on teaching and learning, let alone literature that is specific to his discipline. Reflection is

evident but unfocused, or directed at the class as a whole, rather than at a particular problem that he seeks to examine in greater depth. Finally, communication of insights does take place but not through peer-reviewed media.

The scholarship of teaching, or higher forms thereof, on the other hand, while not negating the value of the practitioner's personal experience, needs to go beyond this. Thus, we ask if there is value in knowledge about teaching that goes beyond the practitioner's personal experience.

How reasonable is it to assume that knowledge resulting from educational research enhances practice? Norris (2000) criticizes the view that teachers' personal knowledge, constructed on the basis of teaching experience, is superior to theoretical knowledge on teaching as suggested, for example, in the work of Carr (1992), Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1990), Munby and Russell (1994), and Schön (1983). These authors argued that theoretical knowledge has no real relevance to teachers as it cannot be *directly applied to practice*. Norris presents a strong rationale for the consideration of educational theory by teachers, suggesting that it enhances teaching. According to Norris, it is essential that teachers understand the value of theories as "general models" which need to be adapted to educators' specific context, rather than misconstrue them as situational or context-specific problem-solving strategies. Using theory to inform practice then cannot, and should not, occur in the form of a direct application of a recipe to a given problem. It rather implies a series of decision-making processes on the part of the teacher. Norris contended that "How and whether research-based knowledge applies to a given situation is one that is answerable only by those who know the particulars of the situation. When the situation is the classroom, teachers know the most about them." It is here that both the teachers' experience-based knowledge about teaching as well as their formal or research-based knowledge about teaching coincide as equally valid sources of information. As post-secondary teaching is highly contextual, the most effective teachers may likely be those who constantly reflect not only on their personal teaching experience but on the extent to which educational theory explains their experience. This idea will be taken up below.

Teaching Expertise

It is indeed a well-accepted notion within the higher education literature that faculty learn about teaching largely as a result of their personal teaching experience (Boice, 1992; Weimer, 1990). Typically it is a

trial and error approach whereby strategies that work well are kept and those that do not work well are dismissed. Though empirical evidence is scarce, it is generally agreed that faculty arrive at their decisions as to which approaches to keep and which to dismiss based on certain reasons. In the language used in the educational literature this kind of reasoning is referred to as “reflection.” While reasoning and reflection are at times associated with a conscious sequential problem-solving procedure, for most teachers this decision-making process will be rather intuitive and subconscious. Over time, most faculty develop a repertoire of approaches and strategies that tend to work well. Nonetheless, some teachers continue to engage in reflective thinking about what works and what does not and ask themselves why it worked or did not work. Their attention is focused on specific problems in their teaching practice, and their goal is to solve them. When this reflective process is also self-monitored and self-evaluated, we call it self-regulated learning.

Self-regulation theorists view learning as a process that occurs in three major phases identified as (1) forethought, (2) performance and volitional control, and (3) self-reflection (e.g., Pintrich, 1995; Zimmerman, 1998). Each phase is characterized by various beliefs and processes that have a direct influence on learning. Skillful self-regulators are described as:

- setting specific hierarchical learning goals rather than non-specific goals,
- holding a learning goal orientation rather than a performance goal orientation,
- having high self-efficacy and being intrinsically interested,
- managing to focus on their performance,
- using self-instructional techniques,
- self-monitoring the learning process rather than only the outcome,
- seeking self-evaluation,
- attributing success or failure to the strategies used rather than their ability,
- having positive self-reactions,
- and showing a high level of adaptivity.

The expertise literature (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993) suggests that faculty who continuously engage in self-regulating their learning about teaching develop expertise in teaching. In contrast, teachers who at one point engaged in reflection and as a consequence developed a repertoire of effective algorithms, strategies, or routines they rely on exclusively, would, according to this literature, most likely not be considered

experts though some may indeed be “effective teachers” or “excellent teachers.”

What then is the difference between expert teachers and excellent teachers? The difference is *not* that non-experts are not effective. The difference is that experts are excellent teachers, but excellent teachers are *not necessarily* experts. A closer look at this literature clarifies this distinction. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993) showed that people pursuing “expert careers” (p. 11) continually reinvest the mental resources set free by the process of pattern learning and automatization in problems they encounter in their work. Thereby they approach these problems at increasingly higher levels of complexity, which, in turn, leads them to develop more sophisticated skills and knowledge. Experienced individuals that carry out only practiced routines, no matter how effective these are, reduce the dimensions of the job to what they are used to doing. This means that experts continuously seek out new opportunities to further their understanding of problems. It is precisely by identifying, analyzing, and solving problems that experts, over time, develop problem solving strategies that are *even more effective*. This desire to be *even more effective* underlies the motivation of experts. Does the present reward structure in higher education support the development of expertise in teaching?

It follows that if being effective is seen as sufficient and being “even more effective” is not externally rewarded, then the internal motivation to become “more effective” needs to be very high. We usually understand motivation as a force that leads individuals to put effort into behaviors or strategies leading to accomplishing a goal. Reviewing various models of motivation to explain what drives faculty at work, Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) concluded that “Cognitive theories of motivation assume that people make decisions about how to behave by evaluating their capacity to respond to situations and estimating their possible losses” (p. 21). While both Weiner (1985) and Atkinson (1977) emphasize achievement disposition as an important factor in determining the degree of motivation an individual may experience for a given task, Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory stresses the motivational value of the task itself. According to Vroom’s expectancy theory, the force guiding the decision-making process can be understood as a combination of the perceived expectancy of a person that goals can be reached and the value the person attributes to the task. While expectancy theory is only one of many lenses that can be applied to explain what motivates faculty at work (for a thorough discussion of non-cognitive as well as cognitive theories of motivation see Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995), it

was shown to be helpful in identifying factors that may either foster or hinder faculty's development of teaching expertise (Kreber, 2000b).

Examined through the lens of expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), we then witness an interesting situation in the academy. Take the two main functions of the professoriate: research and teaching. On the research side, faculty members are rewarded for their excellence by their own institution. These rewards operate on various levels. "Effective researchers" will be granted tenure and promotion. There is a minimal level of performance that is expected and needs to be met, and the bar as to what constitutes this minimal standard has been raised at most research-intensive institutions in recent years. In addition, however, there are institutional incentives that promote performance that goes beyond "effectiveness," put differently, beyond meeting the minimal standard. For example, more articles and more grants mean more money (at those institutions where merit pay still exists!). Apart from institutional incentives there are external rewards such as the prestige that comes along with being acknowledged at international conferences and journals or being invited to share one's special knowledge with the community or industry. Furthermore, at research universities, most faculty find the pursuit of research to be rewarding in a different sense. They like doing it. It provides them with a sense of enjoyment and accomplishment. For some their research is so enjoyable that it approximates optimal experience, or "Flow" (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). We observe then that this intrinsic motivation to pursue research is further supported by external rewards. This combination of internal and external rewards for varying levels of research activity facilitates the development of expertise in research.

On the teaching side, external rewards for teaching are also present, but there are fewer than for research. Furthermore, effective teaching is generally considered good enough. It would follow that expertise in teaching, going beyond what is necessary, or "becoming even more effective," is not something that is externally rewarded. It matters little whether you receive a teaching award once, or twice, or ten times; but it matters a lot whether you publish one article or two or ten, and it matters a lot whether you receive one external research grant or two or ten. In line with this analysis, for faculty members to develop expertise in teaching this process would rely strongly on an inner or intrinsic motivation with few external rewards. This intrinsic motivation would result from the degree to which they value the satisfaction gained from learning about teaching and the degree to which they believe that their efforts to learn about teaching will be successful (Kreber,

2000b). Clearly, the presence of external rewards would further support this process. Identifying appropriate evaluation criteria would then become important. As will be shown later, expertise in teaching and the scholarship of teaching share important features. First however, let us explore the sources of knowledge leading to the development of teaching expertise.

In order to reach expertise three kinds of knowledge are particularly relevant: declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and implicit knowledge (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993). An important part of the declarative knowledge of expert teachers is knowledge found in books and articles about teaching and learning. This is precisely the knowledge of educational theory (Norris, 2000) discussed earlier. Expert teachers then would not exclusively rely on experience but would continuously construct new knowledge as they combine their declarative knowledge of educational theory with their procedural knowledge of how to teach. They rely upon their implicit knowledge of how to self-regulate their learning. In this way they advance theory and at the same time perform effectively.

It might be rather naïve to discuss the knowledge of the expert teacher without making reference to the discipline knowledge in the subject matter being taught. Clearly, the very same knowledge domains that are relevant for the development of expertise in teaching—declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and implicit or tacit knowledge—underlie the development of expertise in the discipline. When teachers develop expertise, they not only mediate theoretical knowledge about education with their knowledge derived from personal teaching experience, they also develop increasingly better ways of helping students understand the subject matter. When expertise in the discipline is effectively combined with knowledge of how to teach, the latter being derived from both educational theory as well as experience, we witness the construction of *pedagogical content knowledge* (Paulsen, 2001a,b; Shulman, 1987). It is then the construction of pedagogical content knowledge that is characteristic of expert teachers.

The example below illustrate expertise in teaching.

Sally, is a Professor in Chemical Engineering with 12 years of experience. Like Chris, she is recognized as an excellent teacher by her peers. Apart from teaching well, which is reflected in good evaluations, Sally is known for her fairly extensive knowledge of what makes good teaching. Pedagogical journals and newsletters in her field, as well as other general materials such as “To improve the academy,” “New directions in teaching and learning,” or “The teaching professor,” each viciously

attacked by numerous, little yellow post-it notes, fill a good part of her office book shelves. Not all of her knowledge is bookish though. She has actively applied the concepts introduced in the literature to specific problems in her own classroom where she uses her personal or experience-based knowledge of working with students in engineering classes, her extensive knowledge of chemical engineering, as well as the knowledge gained from the teaching and learning literature. In doing so she draws on formal and personal sources of knowledge construction about teaching and effectively combines these with her knowledge of the discipline to construct pedagogical content knowledge. Sally has a reputation not just as a good teacher; her peers observe that she continuously furthers her knowledge and that the insights of one week will soon be replaced by new ones.

Analyzing this example in terms of the four dimensions of the scholarship of teaching proposed by Trigwell et al. (2000), we observe that Sally, too, holds a conception of teaching that is learning-oriented. At the same time, however, she operates at the higher end of the information dimension as there is plenty of evidence that she regularly consults literature on teaching and learning within and beyond her specific discipline. Reflection is focused or directed at particular problems that are examined in greater depth. Finally, communication of insights does take place but not through peer-reviewed media.

The scholarship of teaching, or higher forms thereof, on the other hand, while encompassing what is described here, needs to go beyond this.

The Scholarship of Teaching

Would we expect scholars of teaching to be expert teachers? As already discussed, the term *scholarship of teaching* has been construed in many different ways. Kreber and Cranton (2000) as well as Trigwell et al. (2000) described it as a continuum, on which the scholarship of teaching is equated with teaching excellence (for example, Morehead & Shedd, 1996) on the one hand and with publications in peer-reviewed media on the other (for example, Richlin, 2001). Perhaps the most relevant educational knowledge is created, however, neither through experience nor publications alone but through the struggle with the mediation of theory and practice. What needs to be considered are both existing theoretical constructs as well as insights drawn from experience. Interpreted thus, scholars of teaching should be expert teachers; yet, our expectations of such scholars might have to go beyond this. Shulman (1998) suggested that the scholarship of teaching entails a public account of some or all of the following aspects of teaching—vision, design, interaction, outcomes, and analysis—in a manner that can be

peer reviewed and used by members of one's community. These descriptors certainly apply to a traditional notion of scholarship, as we find in the case of refereed articles, public presentations, and books on teaching and learning. As we saw earlier, the development of expertise in teaching would then rely heavily on this kind of formal educational theory or "scholarship" in teaching (see also Smith, 2001).

However, the scholarship of teaching can also be public, shared, and peer-reviewed in a less traditional sense. Some have argued that the scholarship of teaching could be documented and shared through teaching portfolios (e.g., Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991; Kreber, 2001). Others have suggested that the scholarship of teaching is shared also through mentoring colleagues (Weston & McAlpine, 2001) in addition to presentations, research, and publications. In a similar vein and drawing on the work of Pat Hutchings (1999), Cambridge (2000) writes "The scholarship of teaching is not aimed exclusively at publication. Scholars of teaching and learning are exploring multiple ways of making their work public, including the internet, faculty development activities, and public presentations" (p. 57). An example illustrates what practicing the scholarship of teaching could look like:

Denis is an Assistant Professor of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. Like Sally, Denis also continuously adapts his teaching to new contexts. In doing so he, too, draws on formal and personal sources of knowledge construction about teaching and effectively combines these with his knowledge of the discipline to construct pedagogical content knowledge. But in addition to what Sally does, he participates in conferences on teaching in his discipline, documents his knowledge through manuscripts that he submits for peer-review, and shares his special knowledge within department or faculty wide discussion groups and mentoring programs. By doing so he validates his knowledge.

Again using Trigwell et al.'s (2000) model to analyze this example, we observe that Denis, too, holds a conception of teaching that is learning-oriented. He also operates at the higher end of the information dimension as he consults the literature on teaching and learning within and beyond his specific discipline. Reflection is focused or directed at particular problems that are examined in greater depth. Finally, communication of insights takes place through peer-reviewed media.

Conclusion

The idea of the scholarship of teaching may only appeal to a small fraction of our faculty. In line with Boyer's initial intent, Hutchings (cited in Cambridge, 2000) suggested "The scholarship of teaching is

not for everyone for all time. Faculty members do different kinds of scholarly inquiry and pose different questions at different times in their professional lives. Some scholars will choose to focus on teaching and learning; others will not" (p. 57). However, if only a few colleagues choose this focus in their careers, this does not suggest that the concept has failed. To the contrary, if a small number of faculty in disciplines other than education begin to build a career around exploring the teaching and learning dimension of their discipline, even if perhaps just for a few years as originally suggested by Boyer (1990), we witness a true change in what counts as scholarship. For too long we have conceived of relevant knowledge in the discipline exclusively as that which relates to the content of the field, paying little attention to how knowledge is constructed and transmitted. Many have discussed the relationship between research and teaching with some arguing that there is little to no relationship (e.g., Braxton, 1996; Feldman, 1987; Hattie & Marsh, 1996) and some arguing that there is a strong relationship (Clark, 1997; Colbeck, 1998; Kreber, 2000a; Rae & Frost, 1997; Rowland, 1996). Those who argue that there is a relationship perceive an integration of teaching and research. The greatest integration of research and teaching will occur if faculty are given the opportunity to not only advance the knowledge of their field, but to integrate this with existing knowledge, apply it, and explore the best ways of teaching it.

According to the analysis presented here, *scholars of teaching* are *excellent teachers*, but they differ from both *excellent* and *expert* teachers in that they share their knowledge and advance the knowledge of teaching and learning in the discipline in a way that can be peer-reviewed. They differ from excellent teachers in the nature and sources of their knowledge construction, with personal teaching experience being only one of various valid sources. *Scholars of teaching* are also *expert* teachers in that they engage in focussed reflection on or self-regulated learning about teaching, relying on and building on their declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and implicit knowledge of teaching and learning and the discipline. However, they go further so as to make their knowledge public.

Scholars of teaching not only teach well and can demonstrate or share effective practices with colleagues, they also *know more* about teaching. In doing so they draw on formal and personal sources of knowledge construction about teaching, effectively combine this with their knowledge of the discipline to construct *pedagogical content knowledge*, continuously further this knowledge through self-regulated learning processes, and validate their knowledge through peer-review.

Excellence in teaching and the scholarship of teaching are indeed different and should be recognized and rewarded in their own right. By equating the one with the other to “make teaching count” in academe, we may inadvertently downplay the important work done by those of our colleagues who have taken the risk of pursuing the scholarship in teaching within their discipline. However, the opposite scenario—to play down teaching excellence by recognizing scholarship—is also possible. For this reason this article should not conclude without raising some of the challenges the proposed taxonomy poses.

Now that we have fairly clear parameters as to what constitutes the scholarship of teaching (see also the work done by the Carnegie Foundation as well as Kreber & Associates, 2001), what might be the consequences? To what extent can we expect the faculty at large to accept the definitions offered? How inclusive is the notion of the scholarship of teaching as espoused at present? Criticized at one time as being too inclusive and elusive a concept to be helpful to guide faculty work and evaluation, we now may need to ask whether the concept has become too exclusive? I suggested recently that the scholarship of teaching might have become too narrowly defined, too much concerned with inquiry into teaching and learning in one’s discipline, the development of pedagogical content knowledge, and peer reviewed publications and presentations, thereby excluding a large proportion of the professoriate who wish to practice the scholarship of teaching from the recognition that the term carries (Kreber, in press b). Is it possible to reconceptualize the scholarship of teaching in such a way that it regains some, yet not all, of its initial inclusiveness? The taxonomy discussed in this article makes sense in logical terms but what we need to explore next is whether it makes sense in practical terms as well. How reasonable is it to assume that we can maintain an egalitarian system of higher education teachers if some teachers are considered to be more scholarly about their teaching than others? Is having different evaluation criteria really the answer? Scholarship is a prestigious concept after all, and universities are known to recognize scholarship. But if scholarship of teaching is considered more prestigious than teaching excellence, would teaching excellence not be undervalued? And wasn’t one reason behind efforts to institutionalize the scholarship of teaching in our universities to make teaching count? Clearly, this should not be the only reason behind the scholarship of teaching. Furthermore, not all teaching is scholarly, and differentiating between that which is and that which is not is a meaningful endeavor therefore.

Nevertheless, we need to be careful not to advocate a model of the scholarship of teaching which leads to an undervaluing of teaching

excellence in our universities. In practice, therefore, distinguishing between the two makes sense only if each is eventually considered in its own right and valued in its own right, and not by comparing the two to each other. Whether or not such an egalitarian view can be maintained within institutions known to have a reward system in place that recognizes and rewards only the best but takes for granted the good remains to be seen. My purpose in this article has not been to provide criteria to guide faculty evaluations, which has been done elsewhere (e.g., Glassick et al. 1997; Kreber & Cranton, 2000). Rather I hope to engender, and deepen, discussion on the nature of teaching excellence versus the scholarship of teaching.

References

- Andresen, L.W. (2000). A useable, trans-disciplinary conception of scholarship. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19, 137–153.
- Atkinson, J.W. (1977). Motivation for achievement. In T. Blass (Ed.), *Personality variables* (pp.25–108). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baume, C., & Baume, D. (1996). A national scheme to develop and accredit university teachers. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 1, 51–58.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1993). *Surpassing ourselves*. Chicago and La Salle: Open Court.
- Blackburn, R.T., & Lawrence, J.H. (1995). *Faculty at work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Washington, DC: The Carnegie Foundation.
- Braskamp, L.A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Braxton, J.M. (1996). Contrasting perspectives on the relationships between teaching and research. In J.M. Braxton (Ed.), *Faculty teaching and research: Is there a conflict? New Directions for Institutional Research*, no. 90 (pp.5–14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cambridge, B.L. (2000). The scholarship of teaching and learning: A national initiative. In M. Kaplan & D. Lieberman (Eds.), *To improve the academy*, 18, (pp. 55–68). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Cambridge, B.L. (2001, April). *Campus conversations on the scholarship of teaching*. Paper presented as part of the Symposium “More on the scholarship of teaching: Follow-up studies, reactions, and the possible future”. American Educational Research Association, Division J, Post-Secondary Education, Seattle, WA.
- Carr, D. (1992). Practical enquiry, values, and the problem of educational theory. *Oxford Review of Education*, 18, 241–251.
- Centra, J.A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation : Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, B. (1997). The modern integration of research activities with teaching and learning. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 241–256.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. *Educational Researcher*, 19(2), 2–11.
- Colbeck, C. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate research and teaching. *Journal of Higher Education*, 96, 647–672.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow. The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper Perennial.

- Diamond, R.M. (1993). Changing priorities and the faculty reward system. In R.M. Diamond and B.E. Adam (Eds.), *Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000* (pp. 5–23). *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 81. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship of teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Feldman, K.A. (1987). Research productivity and scholarly accomplishments of college teachers as related to their instructional effectiveness: A review and exploration. *Research in Higher Education*, 26, 227–298.
- Franklin, J., & Theall, M. (2001, April). *Faculty opinions about the value and interest of the scholarship of teaching. After a decade, have Boyer's goals been achieved?*. Paper presented as part of the Symposium "More on the scholarship of teaching: Follow-up studies, reactions, and the possible future". American Educational Research Association, Division J, Post-Secondary Education, Seattle, WA.
- Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed. Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H.M. (1996). The relationship between research and teaching: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 507–542.
- Healey, M. (2000). Developing the scholarship of teaching in higher-education: A discipline-based approach. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19, 169–189.
- Hutchings, P. (1999). *1999 Pew Scholars Institute*. Menlo Park, CA.
- ILT (2001). (The Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education). <http://www.ilt.ac.uk/about.html>
- Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualization of the research into university academics' conceptions of teaching. *Learning and Instruction*, 7, 255–272.
- Knapper, C., & Rogers, P. (1994). *Increasing the emphasis on teaching in Ontario universities. Contributed paper*. Task Force on Resource Allocation, Ontario Council on University Affairs: Toronto, Ontario.
- Kreber, C. (2000a). How teaching award winners conceptualize academic work: Further thoughts on the meaning of scholarship. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5, 61–78.
- Kreber, C. (2000b). Becoming an expert university teacher: A self-directed process. In H. Long (Ed.), *Practice and theory in self-directed learning* (pp. 131–143). Schaumburg, IL: Motorola University Press.
- Kreber, C., & Associates (2001). *Revisiting scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching*. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kreber, C. (2001). Conceptualizing the scholarship of teaching and identifying unresolved issues: The framework for this volume. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Revisiting Scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 1–19). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kreber, C. (2001). Designing a teaching portfolio based on a formal model of the scholarship of teaching. In D. Lieberman & C. Wehlburg (Eds.), *To improve the academy*, 19, (pp. 268–285). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Kreber, C. (2002). Controversy and consensus on the scholarship of teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27, 151–167.
- Kreber, C. (in press). Challenging the dogma: Towards a more inclusive view of the scholarship of teaching. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*.
- Kreber, C., & Cranton, P.A. (2000). Exploring the scholarship of teaching. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71, 476–495.
- Martin, E., & Ramsden, P. (2000). Introduction. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19, 133–135.
- Marton, F. (1981). Phenomenography-describing conceptions of the world around us. *International Science*, 10, 177–200.

- Menges, R. J., & Weimer, M. (1996). *Teaching on solid ground: Using scholarship to improve practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mentkowski, M., & Associates (2000). *Learning that lasts*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morehead, J.W., & Shedd, P.J. (1996). Student interviews: A vital role in the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 20, 261–269.
- Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(2), 86–95.
- Norris, S. P. (2000). The pale of consideration when seeking sources of teaching expertise. *American Journal of Education*, 108, 167–195.
- Paulsen, M.B. (2001a). After twelve years of teaching the college teaching course. In D. Lieberman & C. Wehlburg (Eds.), *To improve the academy*, 19, (pp.169–192). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Paulsen, M.B. (2001b). The relation between research and the scholarship of teaching. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Revisiting scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 19–31). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no.86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Paulsen, M.B., & Feldman, K.A.(1995). Toward a reconceptualization of scholarship: A human action system with functional imperatives. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66, 615–641.
- Pintrich, P.R. (Ed.). (1995). *Understanding self-regulated learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., & Taylor, P. (1994). A phenomenographic study of academics' conceptions of science learning and teaching. *Learning and Instruction*, 4, 217–231.
- Rae, A., & Frost, P. (Eds) (1997). *Researchers hooked on teaching : Noted scholars discuss the synergies of teaching and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rice, R. E. (1992) Toward a broader conception of scholarship: The American context. In T. Whiston and R. Geiger (Eds.), *Research and higher education: The United Kingdom and the United States* (pp. 117–129). Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Richlin, L. (Ed.) (1993). *Preparing faculty for the new conceptions of scholarship*. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Richlin, L. (2001). Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. In C. Kreber (Ed), *Revisiting scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 57–69). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rowland, S. (1996). Relationships between teaching and research. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1, 7–21.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 1–22.
- Shulman, L.S. (1998). Course anatomy: The dissection and analysis of knowledge through teaching. In P. Hutchings (Ed.), *The Course Portfolio*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Smith, R. (1997, June). Making teaching count in Canadian higher education: Developing a national agenda. *Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, Newsletter of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE)*, pp. 1–10.
- Smith, R. (2001). Expertise in teaching and in the scholarship of teaching . In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Revisiting scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 69–79). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no.86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, S.L. (1991). *Report: Commission of inquiry on Canadian university education*. Ottawa, Ontario: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Taylor, K. L. (1993). The role of scholarship in university teaching. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 23(3), 64–79.
- Theall, M., & Centra, J. (2001). Assessing the scholarship of teaching: Valid decisions from valid evidence. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Revisiting scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp.31–45). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no 86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). Scholarship of teaching: A model. *Higher Education Research and Development, 19*, 155–168.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.
- Weimer, M. (1990). *Improving university teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weimer, M. (1992). Scholarship of teaching. *Journal of the Freshman Year Experience, 4*(1), 41–58.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review, 92*, 548–573.
- Weston, C., & McAlpine, L. (2001). Making explicit the development towards the scholarship of teaching. In C. Kreber (Ed.), *Revisiting scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching* (pp. 89–99). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no.86. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zimmerman, B.J. (1998). Developing self-fulfilling cycles of academic regulation: An analysis of exemplary models. In D.H. Schunk, & B.J. Zimmerman (Ed.), *Self-regulated learning. From teaching to self-reflective practice* (pp.1–10). London: The Guilford Press.