

Chapter 1

Riding the Fourth Wave: An Introduction to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Andrea S. Webb

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3963-5057>

The University of British Columbia, Canada

ABSTRACT

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) is an important international movement in higher education. It is a continuously developing field that is traced back to Ernest Boyer's 1990 report, "Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate," which outlines his argument for an understanding of scholarship that includes a scholarship of teaching. This chapter traces the history and development of SoTL as a research domain since 1990. It includes specific attention to the rationale and dimensions, the debates and critiques of the field, as well as the potential future directions

INTRODUCTION

Societal, economic, and political influences have drawn attention to teaching and learning in higher education. In reaction, institutions of higher education are shifting from an instructional paradigm to a learning-centered approach (Barr & Tagg, 1995). No longer is the transfer of knowledge from master to acolyte sufficient. In order to function in today's professional culture, graduates of higher education require adaptive skills to assist them as they navigate diverse international contexts and changing technology in a rapidly shifting employment market. In response, institutions of higher education are creating environments where students discover and construct knowledge for themselves through initiatives on flexible learning and the individualization of curriculum.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) is an international movement, coming into maturity in the 21st century, which contributes to the quality of teaching and learning in higher education as well as a growing body of educational literature (Hubball, Pearson, & Clarke, 2013). Operating under "the big tent" (D'Andrea, 2006; Gilpin, 2011; Huber & Hutchings, 2005, p. 4), SoTL is accessible to

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-2212-7.ch001

all disciplines, including inter- and intra-disciplinary inquiry. Through literature-informed, rigorous methodological inquiry, and peer-disseminated findings, SoTL provides a practical and complementary undergirding for research into learning, regardless of the theoretical positions from which inquirers come (Gilpin, 2011; Hubball, Clarke, Webb, & Johnson, 2015). This chapter traces the development of SoTL as a research domain. It includes specific attention to the history of SoTL and its dimensions, including the critiques of the field, and suggests potential directions for the next wave of SoTL.

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION: THE CONTEXT

Given the importance, and challenges, of the teaching–research nexus, this paper traces the history and development of the field of SoTL since 1990. The landscape of teaching and learning in higher education is complex, with increasing student diversity, the development of niche programs, the use of technology to enhance flexible learning, and highly specialized disciplinary knowledge butting up against institutional and public accountability. Into this landscape, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning offers a way for higher education institutions to encourage faculty to engage with research, teaching, and innovation through proactive faculty development and supportive institutional governance.

The Scholarship of Teaching (SoT) arose out of the fertile ground of previous work in the educative practices of disciplines. During the first decades of the 20th century, a small number of disciplinary societies sponsored specialized journals (i.e., the American Society for Engineering Education, starting in 1910, and the Division of Chemical Education of the American Chemical Society published the *Journal of Chemical Education*, starting in 1924) (Huber & Hutchings, 2005, p. 9). The 1960s saw an explosive growth in the discussion and debate in the wider higher education community, coinciding with the massification of higher education in North America (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). The *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Change* both began publishing in 1969, and in 1972, the United States Department of Education began providing financial support for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Around the same time, the National Science Foundation introduced new initiatives to improve education practices in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM).

However, it is hard to underestimate the influence of the Carnegie Foundation in furthering the study of higher education. Founded in 1905, it has a long history of involvement in educational policy and research (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.); however, it was Ernest Boyer’s appointment as president that initiated the separation of the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation. The newly separated Foundation’s interest in higher education was broadened to include all levels of the educational experience, not just politics and policies.

In his influential work, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Ernest Boyer (1990) suggested that the 1990s would become the decade of undergraduate education. But at the center of this debate, he predicted, would be the issue of faculty time, as stakeholders debated the primacy of the professoriate’s activities. For what activity do institutions of higher education engage professors? Is it possible to have fruitful discussions about the importance of teaching in higher education if professors are not recognized or compensated for the improvements in this area? This tension still exists; however, a number of institutions are recognizing this tension and addressing teaching and learning in higher education as an area worthy of scholarship. It is not “an intriguing aside, or an add-on, but an essential facet of good teaching—built into the expected repertoire of scholarly practice” (Shulman, 2000, n.p.).

The Scholarship of Teaching

According to Boyer (1990), institutions of higher education had, at the time, adopted too narrow a view of scholarship, “one that limits it to a hierarchy of functions” (p. 15), with basic research as the first and foremost scholarly activity. However, Boyer went on to suggest that “causality can, and frequently does, point in both directions” (p. 16). Teaching, research, and service are actually intertwined into a comprehensive, dynamic relationship where they are continuously influencing and overlapping with each other. Good teaching is a scholarly, dynamic endeavor undertaken by faculty as learners (Boyer, 1990). It transforms and extends knowledge as well as transmitting it. There is also a key place for the learner in Boyer’s definition of good teaching; classroom discussion, comments, and questions push professors in new and generative directions. The application of knowledge should be understood as an act of scholarship on par with the discovery of knowledge through research, the integration of knowledge, and the sharing of knowledge through teaching (Boyer, 1990). Therefore, Boyer concluded that what is needed in higher education is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar—“a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching” (Boyer, 1990, p. 24). Boyer highlighted four keys to scholarship: discovery (research), integration (moving outside the disciplinary silos), application (bringing knowledge to bear on consequential problems), and teaching (initiating students into the best values of the academy). At the crux of *Scholarship Reconsidered* is the assertion that the academy needs to avoid a narrow definition of scholarship and to recognize and reward all four categories of scholarship.

The SoTL movement has incited the academy to reconceptualize the place of teaching and learning within tertiary education. Making teaching “community property” (Shulman, 1993) has gone a long way toward moving beyond the teaching-versus-research debate and giving a broader, more valuable meaning to classroom practice (Boyer, 1990). This is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar, bringing “legitimacy to the full scope of academic work” (Boyer, 1990).

THE WAVES OF SoTL

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning can be divided into three waves or phases (Gurung & Schwartz, 2010), although the borders of these phases could be debated. While the early phases were concerned with definition and theorization, it is the opening up of the third wave that has included and invited a broad array of practitioners into the “big tent.” This third phase has been particularly generative, as it has featured the maturation of the field, with rich dialogue and debate through international journals and conferences.

Priorities and Assessment (1990–1998)

The first 10 years of SoTL were taken up with definitions (Huber, 2010). Between Boyer’s definition of a Scholarship of Teaching to Shulman’s of teaching as a public act, early SoTL scholars were concerned with conceptualizing a Scholarship of Teaching with value to institutions of higher education.

Utilizing its position as an external driver of change, The Carnegie Foundation continued to advocate for recognition of a scholarship of teaching. In *Scholarship Assessed: A Special Report on Faculty Evaluation* (later published widely as *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*), Glassick, Huber,

and Maeroff (1997) consider the standards that might be used in assessing scholarship in all its forms. They suggest that in the narrow definition of scholarship focused on discovery/research, the sharing of knowledge through teaching and the application of knowledge through service have suffered. The reward structure in higher education continues to be a challenge, and there is little consensus on how to move forward. They note that scholars seeking promotion and tenure present a long list of publications and numerically validated student evaluations of teaching with scant acknowledgement of academic values like integration, application, and teaching. Based on a broad conceptualization of scholarship across many disciplines, the authors define scholarly work based on six qualitative standards: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective preparation, and reflective critique. They also suggest that documenting this scholarship requires “rich and varied materials that the scholar and others assemble over time to make a case” (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997, p. 37). The qualities of a scholar extend beyond, but are connected to, a body of knowledge and include personal characteristics such as integrity, perseverance, reason, courage, humility, and honesty. This key publication articulates a possible path for institutions of higher education to explore in order to recognize scholarship in teaching as a rigorous academic pursuit.

Following Boyer’s death in 1997, Lee Shulman became the president of the Carnegie Foundation. Shulman’s vision was to create a center for advanced study for teachers of all levels. This marked a major turning point for the Scholarship of Teaching, as Shulman worked with the American Association for Higher Education on the concept of teaching as community property and as a scholarly practice in a community of peers. This led to the launch of The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) in 1998, as a major initiative to bring about change in pedagogical research. The program

sought to support the development of a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning that: fosters significant, long-lasting learning for all students; enhances the practice and profession of teaching, and; brings to faculty members’ work as teachers the recognition and reward afforded to other forms of scholarly work (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.),

building upon *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990) and *Scholarship Assessed* (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). The intention of CASTL was to make teaching public to a scholarly and general community and to subject it to critical peer review. This move reinforces the public, pedagogical role of the Scholarship of Teaching.

Widening the Field (1998–2004)

A key characteristic of the second wave or phase is the ongoing theoretical development of SoTL. By 1999, Hutchings and Shulman (1999) have characterized SoTL as a catalyst for change. They have also extended the Scholarship of Teaching to include learning as foundational to the definition. Marking the division between Boyer’s SoT and the new SoTL, Hutchings and Shulman suggest that all faculties have an obligation to excellence in teaching. This is echoed by Huber and Morreale (2002) as “across the academy, “regular” faculty are taking systematic interest in curriculum, classroom teaching, and the quality of student learning” (p. 1). However, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning must take up four additional challenges: beginning the conversation about credible methods of inquiry, keeping SoTL open to a wide set of inquiries, making a commitment to publicly share research (Shulman, 1993), and

Riding the Fourth Wave

creating sustainable change. In this phase, SoTL seeks to facilitate change by bringing rigor and rich research to investigations of a pedagogical and curricular nature.

Hutchings (2000) describes SoTL as “not yet fully defined or conceptualized” (p. 2). Drawing from the taxonomy of research questions from CASTL institutes, she identifies the research questions as divided into four categories: what works?, what is?, visions of the possible, and new conceptual frameworks. Identifying theory building as important to the development of SoTL, Hutchings suggests that the last category of questions is where the field can be enriched—especially through cross-disciplinary collaboration.

The second wave of SoTL’s development also highlights the methodological flexibility of faculty members engaging in inter- and intra-disciplinary research. Recognizing that each discipline has its “own intellectual history, agreements, and disputes about subject matter and methods,” Huber and Morreale (2002) acknowledge that SoTL scholars “must address field-specific issues if they are going to be heard in their own disciplines, and they must speak in a language that their colleagues understand” (p. 2). This second phase of SoTL acknowledges disciplinary difference, but heeds Boyer’s scholarship of integration; “growth in knowledge also comes at the borders of disciplinary imagination” (Huber & Morreale, 2002, p. 2). As interdisciplinary conversations and collaborations become more frequent and substantial, SoTL widens the “trading zone” (Gallison, 1997, as cited in Huber & Morreale, 2002, p. 2), where meanings and methods may vary but contributes to the intellectual discourse and debate on teaching and learning in higher education (Shulman, 2000).

When studying the domains of knowledge about teaching, Kreber and Cranton (2000) contend, “the scholarship of teaching includes both ongoing learning about teaching and the demonstration of teaching knowledge” (p. 478). They utilize Mezirow’s concepts of content, process, and premise reflection as a framework from which to derive instructional, pedagogical, and curricular knowledge about teaching. In each of these domains, knowledge is created through three forms of reflection, leading to nine components of a Scholarship of Teaching (See Kreber & Cranton, 2000, for a visual model of the Scholarship of Teaching [p. 485] and a table of examples of indicators of the Scholarship of Teaching [p. 488]). They state that faculty members who commit to the Scholarship of Teaching engage in three different kinds of reflection on both theory-based and experience-based knowledge as it relates to questions of instructional design, pedagogy, and the broader curriculum. These nine components could then serve to inform new ways of documenting how learning and knowledge about teaching could be demonstrated.

Shulman (2000) concludes *Opening Lines* with a chapter entitled, “Inventing the Future.” He advocates for the role of professor to include teacher, mentor, steward, and public servant and calls for institutional support with formal structures that merge institutional commitments to both teaching and inquiry. Ultimately, SoTL cannot be sustained in isolation, and professors must create intellectual communities that transcend institutional boundaries (Shulman, 2000).

SoTL Under the Big Tent (2004–2011)

The conclusion of CASTL in 2010 (Huber, 2010) would have been a logical place to launch the third wave of SoTL (Gurung & Schwartz, 2010), with a smooth transition buoyed by optimism for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. However, the concept of the SoTL commons (Huber & Hutchings, 2005, 2006) is the defining feature of the transition to the third phase of the development of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. The SoTL commons, also called the teaching commons, is “an emergent conceptual space for exchange and community among faculty, students, administrators, and all others

committed to learning as an essential activity” (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). It is an intellectual space where a diversity of SoTL scholars can engage with others and judiciously borrow practices and insights from various communities. They can adapt them for new purposes in order to capture, and build upon, the intellectual work being done in teaching and learning.

The establishment of the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ISSoTL) and its international conference in 2004 demonstrate the interest and inclusion of an international community focused on dialogue and debate in SoTL. The culmination of the transition to the third phase is the publication of the International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (IJSoTL) in 2007. While the journal is not officially affiliated with ISSoTL, the first issue of IJSoTL included invited articles by Pat Hutchings and Carolin Kreber, founding members of ISSoTL.

Hutchings (2007) highlights the tension in SoTL between theory and practice, with the ultimate application in the classroom. There is so much diversity by personal approach, department, and faculty that it is challenging to create links across SoTL through the disciplines, but she asserts that looking for common themes and aims is essential to continuing the work of SoTL. Kreber (2007) focuses on authenticity in SoTL practice. As practitioners, “an important question we need to address is whether the ‘Scholarship of Teaching and Learning’ is in the important interest of students” (Kreber, 2007, p. 3). An ethical dimension of SoTL means taking great care with our subject matter and our students (MacLean & Poole, 2010), and reviews of the SoTL literature suggest that the foundational dialogue supports responsiveness to educational contexts and responsibility to changing demographics in higher education. The third wave is also characterized by an emphasis on the transformational agenda of SoTL (Gilpin & Liston, 2009).

The third wave of SoTL culminates in *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact* (Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011). In it, the authors reflect on the expansion of the teaching commons to the core areas of higher education work. Speaking specifically to campus leaders, in order to situate SoTL as a set of principles and practices that are central to institutions’ goals for student learning, the authors attempt to guide future phases of SoTL work in classroom teaching, professional development, institutional assessment, and the recognition and reward for pedagogical work. This call marks a new direction for SoTL. As representatives of the third phase in SoTL, all these authors bring attention to the integration of research, practice, and teaching by SoTL scholars within and across many disciplines.

CRITIQUES OF THE SoTL

Throughout the three decades of SoTL work, there have been several enduring critiques, which are addressed within the literature.

Localized, Classroom-Based Research

Specific critiques of SoTL have tended to focus on its localized, classroom-based research (Haigh, 2012). Many scholarly teaching projects are undertaken to address a personal or situationally specific issue (Haigh, 2012) and are therefore not seen as applicable outside of the specific locale as the projects are undertaken to address local and institutional contexts. Stierer and Antoniou (2004) note that much of the pedagogic research in the UK is conducted by researchers from disciplines other than education.

Riding the Fourth Wave

These practitioner-researchers are mainly concerned about issues within their own disciplinary and professional contexts, rather than with the nuances of educational research methodology. This approach to pedagogic research could either be criticized as ‘amateurish’ and ‘parochial’, or applauded as relevant to the needs and local circumstances of practitioners, and reflecting emerging syntheses of educational research methodologies and the research traditions from practitioners’ own subjects and disciplines. (Stierer & Antoniou, 2004, p. 283)

A similar challenge exists in North American higher education (Chick, 2014). As this research reflects concerns from within a community, the outcomes or recommendations are thought to be transitory or limited in their persuasiveness. Generalization across disciplinary contexts is impeded by epistemological and ontological differences across disciplines. Tight (2018) continues this critique in a systematic review of academic research in SoTL. However, McKinney and Jarvis (2009) reject the dismissal of SoTL work, emphasizing the value of the SoTL commons and applying the SoTL work of others. Additionally, Chick and Poole (2018) argue that studying learning at the micro level provides a detailed examination of the building blocks of learning in higher education. This long-standing critique continues to be debated and discussed in SoTL journals and at conferences.

Theoretical and Practical SoTL Research

While the debate over the definition of SoTL continues (Chick, 2014; Felten & Chick, 2018; Potter & Kustra, 2011), the field is moving forward to consider the practical and the theoretical in SoTL research, including the differing conceptions of the place of educational theory in the SoTL (Geertsema, 2016; Huber, 2010; Kanuka, 2011; Svinicki, 2012; Parker, 2008).

The Place of Education Theory in SoTL

The relationship between educational research and SoTL is longstanding and often fraught with tension (Larsson, Mårtensson, Price, & Roxå, 2017). Parker (2008) discusses the differing conceptions of the place of educational theory in North American and European SoTL. As the Carnegie roots of SoTL are in the disciplines (Huber & Morreale, 2002), many SoTL scholars tend to work within their discipline, taking on the most common methodologies of their field. Essentially, Parker is arguing that SoTL needs more education theory to legitimize its application in an educational space. Kanuka (2011) and Svinicki (2012) both weigh in on this pivotal debate. Focusing on the place of educational research within SoTL, Kanuka (2011) questions whether it is enough to take teaching public through peer review and critique. She suggests that it is necessary to use educational research frameworks when approaching SoTL research. Credibility as a researcher comes from knowledge in the theory of the content area and their educative practices:

academics engaged in SoTL whose expertise falls outside of the field of higher education will take time to learn about education research traditions, the extensive corpus literature in teaching and learning in higher education that exist – not the least of which are theories of learning. (Kanuka, 2011, p. 9)

Svinicki (2012) also tackles the challenging question of “how well someone needs to understand both the discipline and the theories and methods of educational research to be entitled to engage in SoTL”

(p. 1). However, rather than requiring expertise in educational theory, Svinicki advocates for the SoTL community to encourage teams of researchers working together over time to produce deep scholarship of high rigor. Svinicki further identifies two models for conducting SoTL research. First, the research team utilizes distributed expertise where no one researcher is expected to know everything, and all can contribute their expertise. The teaching commons (Huber & Hutchings, 2005, 2006) is one form of this collaboration. Second, Svinicki argues for programs of research rather than single studies. In reaction to early SoTL research targeted at a single semester, course, or constrained time-period (i.e., during a sabbatical), she suggests longitudinal research in order for the study to develop over time.

Approaches to SoTL Research

Building upon the theory debate, another productive tension is the debate over the epistemological and methodological approaches, which mark the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (Thomas, 2011). Huber (2010, p. 7) delineates two camps: the narrow constructionists, who emphasize SoTL's affinity with conventional research, and the broad constructionists, who are happy to use the "big tent" to cover a wider range of work in greater or lesser degrees of polish and make it public in forums with local and far reaches.

As a distinctive form of research (Hubball & Clarke, 2010), SoTL research is within the "broad umbrella for many different disciplines and interdisciplinary approaches" (p. 8). It is impossible to prescribe quantitative or qualitative methods, as the research will be driven by the nature of the research question. Therefore, Danielson (2012) proposes that we consider SoTL as a methodology, or a "a philosophical study of plurality of methods" (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fisch, 1974, p. 8, as cited in Danielson, 2012, p. 2), and build learning communities through the generative, heuristic methodology of SoTL. If researchers adopt the concept of a safe trading zone for boundary-crossing research, then SoTL research can be a rich forum where scholars from different fields, interests, and philosophical orientations find space, and thrive, as their work seeks to change the landscape of teaching and learning at the classroom, institutional, national, or international level (Danielson, 2012; Gurung, 2014; Hubball & Clarke, 2010; Huber & Morreale, 2002; Miller-Young, Yeo, & Manarin, 2018).

Lack of Training in Educational Research

Additionally, faculty members in most disciplines have no formal training in the kind of multi-disciplinary research that SoTL encompasses. Indeed, they often have no training in teaching itself (Huber & Hutchings, 2005, p. 30). Therefore, through mobilization of the SoTL commons, campuses need to become or support places where this work can take place through programs, structures, and rewards. Activating SoTL research teams (Svinicki, 2012) brings together differing academic expertise and educational development in the pursuit of credible and significant teaching and learning research. Different disciplines bring different rules and assumptions about what constitutes credible evidence and what kind of methods yield scholarly results. Differences of opinion in this area can make it hard for SoTL to be valued across disciplines, yet disciplines can borrow and learn from one another. This borrowing may enrich the lessons learned and make the work more broadly significant (Huber & Hutchings, 2005; McKinney & Jarvis, 2009). Yet, interdisciplinary structures entail both strengths and weaknesses. Interdisciplinary research is more likely to innovate from cross-pollination, but institutional reward structures continue to flow through departments.

Institutional Barriers

Institutionally, there are still many barriers to change (Hubball & Pearson, 2010; Webb, Wong, & Hubball, 2013), including entrenched systems of credit hours, scheduling, methods of teaching and assessment, departmental or disciplinary silos, administration systems, and reward systems that value research over pedagogical or curricular leadership. The policies and practices that are designed to improve standards and efficiency in higher education are often at odds with those designed to improve student learning (Hockings, 2005; Young 2006). A personal commitment to teaching and to students is identified as the primary motivation for improving teaching, yet a commitment to be an exceptional instructor may mean sacrificing possibilities for promotion (Young, 2006). The unanimously acknowledged low status of teaching (Young, 2006), despite new developments to enhance teaching and learning at post-secondary institutions, combined with a lack of reward for exceptional teaching, are identified as the major barriers to developing teaching and learning in higher education (Dobbins, 2008; Young, 2006). As argued by Elen, Lindblom-Ylanne, and Clement (2007), academic developers at research-intensive universities have to work within the institutional mandate through the development of “research-intensive teaching” (p. 125).

Nevertheless, while these critiques identify some of the long-standing challenges to SoTL research, current SoTL scholars are working to address many of these barriers and to push SoTL in new directions.

SoTL IN THE FOURTH WAVE (2012–PRESENT)

At the close of its third decade, the field of SoTL has matured to address many of its critiques and explore new areas of teaching and learning in higher education. Some SoTL scholars would argue that SoTL is comfortably in the “big tent,” and the creation of *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, the official journal of ISSOTL, marks a clear movement into the current wave of SoTL. So, where does SoTL go now? Where is the fourth wave?

SoTL in the fourth wave is addressing new challenges and following new paths. The current landscape of practice includes a diverse number of faculty, educational/academic developers, and students engaging in sustained, collaborative investigation into teaching and learning in higher education. Informed by past critiques, the SoTL community is focused on sustained involvement of academics and the identity of SoTL scholars, who are often outside of traditional faculty positions.

As mentioned previously, the transition out of the third wave includes a renewed focus on institutional support and challenges to SoTL. The micro, meso, and macro levels of SoTL work (Simmons, 2016) include collaborative teams connecting institutional centers for teaching and learning with disciplinary researchers. SoTL scholars are no longer just disciplinary researchers exploring teaching and learning within their discipline; they include educational developers, students, and administration.

Bolstered by the expanding scope of SoTL research, many SoTL scholars are looking beyond their institutional context (micro, meso, and macro) to consider the mega, global engagement with SoTL. Increasing internationalization, including regional conferences (e.g., EuroSoTL) and journals (e.g., *Asian Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* and *SoTL in the South*), is supporting the development of SoTL within local educational contexts. However, there are debates as to how SoTL could be taken up around the world.

The next section of the chapter will discuss some of the current directions in SoTL, opportunities for SoTL scholars, and the potential for these areas to be the foci of the fourth wave of SoTL.

Addressing New Challenges

Sustained Faculty Engagement

Encouraging tenure track and sessional (adjunct) faculty members to engage in SoTL is still a challenge. Bortolini's 2018 article, "SoTL: The Party That No One Really Wants to Go to," highlights the ongoing challenges of buy-in and sustained engagement among faculty members. While SoTL research is rigorous, has an active community, and adds credence to educational endeavors in higher education, there is a need to build capacity amongst faculty members in order to develop and initiate impactful SoTL projects (Simmons, 2016). Understanding and addressing the intellectual and institutional challenges identified by academics in higher education can support the SoTL work of faculty members. Yet, the constraints to navigating SoTL hinder sustained engagement by faculty and staff in a variety of contexts. Identifying and understanding these constraints is of particular importance to instructional teams facilitating professional development programs in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (Webb, 2019). There have been two directions to support faculty in SoTL: threshold concepts and decoding the disciplines.

It is often taken for granted that academics are excellent researchers; even so, they are not always familiar or comfortable with SoTL research, and faculty members need to be guided through the language and research conventions of SoTL (Chick, 2014, 2018). The Decoding the Disciplines approach (Middendorf & Pace, 2008) supports the shift from reflective teaching to SoTL by helping faculty identify the researchable questions that align with the interests of their discipline. While research into the threshold concepts in SoTL (Tierney, 2016; Webb, 2019) highlights the places where those new to SoTL get stuck and which concepts constrain faculty members from sustained engagement in SoTL. In order to support ongoing engagement with SoTL, it is important that this topic continues to be investigated.

Identity of SoTL Scholars

SoTL scholars are often betwixt and between; they identify with their disciplinary background, but have also developed a new identity as a SoTL scholar (Kensington-Miller, Renc-Roe, & Moron-Garcia, 2015; Miller-Young et al., 2018; Simmons et al., 2013). Ingrained disciplinary cultures often slow scholars' enculturation into SoTL and often leave some academics unable or unwilling to let go of specific disciplinary ways of thinking (Bunnell & Bernstein, 2012). There is a tension between their responsibility to the discipline and their personal responsibility to scholarly curiosity and the students they teach (Webb, 2019). But this either/or dichotomy misses the fundamental issue that SoTL research is an intertwining of teaching and learning within a disciplinary or institutional context (Felten & Chick, 2018). At the same time, a lack of professional incentives (often related to merit or tenure and promotion criteria) discourages participants from ongoing engagement with SoTL (Webb et al., 2013).

The changing nature of employment in higher education may also impact SoTL scholars' identities (Miller-Young, Yeo, & Manarin, 2018). As Kensington-Miller, Renc-Roe, and Moron-Garcia (2015) and Bennett et al. (2016) discuss, the position of academic developer often places SoTL scholars in the liminal space: betwixt and between disciplinary cultures and educational research.

Issues for Teaching Focused Faculty (TFF), for whom teaching and learning scholarship, and SoTL specifically, may or may not be considered part of their workload, are particularly challenging. Rawn and Fox (2017) examine the position and perceptions of TFF in a recent study. Increasingly, TFF are permanent positions with allocations for service, but include inconsistent requirements for scholarly

Riding the Fourth Wave

activities. Nonetheless, a large number of their study participants report being active in teaching, service, scholarly teaching, and curriculum leadership. The interconnected areas of SoTL engagement and identity have proved generative for further investigation.

Additionally, continued theorizing on the nature of an educational leader (Fields, Kenny, & Mueller, 2019; Hubball et al., 2015; Miller-Young et al., 2017) can help to characterize SoTL leadership, as the identity of SoTL scholars can also be connected to their position as pedagogical or curriculum leaders within their institution or discipline.

Following New Paths

Global SoTL

SoTL in the “big tent” praises the methodological and theoretical pluralism of SoTL, but how is cultural pluralism represented (Chng & Looker, 2013)? As SoTL knowledge is conceptualized as relational—it connects SoTL practitioners with the work they disseminate to the community—local recommendations require a localized understanding of SoTL (Booth & Woollacott, 2018, p. 537), attending to the generative potential of reconsidering SoTL in context (Liebowitz, 2017). Instead of attempting to promote a global uptake of SoTL, SoTL leaders and advocates could be promoting “glocal” understanding of SoTL programs: global in principles, but local in situation (Patel & Lynch, 2013). Glocalization of the curriculum is an attempt to balance the driving forces of contemporary curriculum practice, namely localization, internationalization, and globalization. With a focus on glocalization, global SoTL positions itself as promoting SoTL diversity through curriculum reform (Fanghanel et al., 2015). Glocal philosophies encourage SoTL research and programs that are aligned with SoTL principles (like Felten, 2013), but with curriculum practices that are locally mediated.

Program-Level Assessments

While the third wave of SoTL was concerned with pedagogical insights, the fourth wave has turned its attention to program-level assessment (Hubball & Burt, 2004; Hubball et al., 2013; Hubball & Gold, 2007). This means encouraging SoTL scholars to move beyond individual classroom research to program and curricular change (Hubball & Burt, 2004; Gilpin, 2011). Bringing curriculum assessment under the umbrella of SoTL means responding to the call by Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) and further widening the shelter of the “big tent” to institutional-level examination.

Curriculum reform is often a complex process shaped by social, political, economic, organizational, and cultural factors (Hubball & Burt, 2004). The Scholarship of Curriculum Practice (SoCP) focuses on investigating scholarly approaches to curricula change in higher education. As higher education contexts demand empirical evidence to support program reform, there is urgency for SoCP in order to enhance learning-centered curricula (Hubball & Gold, 2007). SoCP involves a systematic, rigorous, and cyclical process of inquiry, shaped by diverse learning contexts. SoCP recognizes that curriculum practice is inherently situated, socially mediated, and locally implemented (Hubball et al., 2013). It recognizes that the development, implementation, and evaluation of curricula are situated within a context and may be rooted in “signature pedagogies” (Shulman, 2005) of the discipline. Hubball and Gold (2007) suggest that critical examinations of an undergraduate curriculum should not be relegated to the five-year cycle of data-gathering for institutional and/or accreditation reviews. Rather, constructing and revising under-

graduate curricula should be considered as scholarly, formative, and developmental review processes for all stakeholders in the program learning community.

Applying a scholarship approach to curriculum decisions can inform individual decisions and bring the findings to a peer review for a formalized sharing. This more expansive view of SoTL, a rigorous and robust evaluation of undergraduate and graduate programs through SoCP, has a strong strategic value to research intensive universities making high-stakes curriculum decisions (Hubball et al., 2013; Hubball, Lamberson, & Kindler, 2012; Hubball & Pearson, 2010).

Students as Partners

In his principles for good practice in SoTL, Peter Felten proposed that SoTL should be conducted with students (Felten, 2013). This echoed a growing interest in exploring student engagement as a joint venture to shape teaching and learning in higher education (Bovill, Bulley, & Moss, 2011; Healey, Flint, & Harrington, 2014; Matthews, 2016; Werder, Thibou, & Kaufer, 2012).

Students as Partners (SaP) proposes that the relationship between student and professor be developed through partnership as one based on respect, responsibility, and reciprocity (Cook-Sather, Bovill, & Felten, 2014). The relationship is dialogic, in which the learning and teaching are co-conceptualized and co-created between equal partners. A systematic review of the literature highlights four themes: the importance of reciprocity; the need to make space for sharing the realities of partnership; a focus on partnership activities that are small scale, at the undergraduate level, extracurricular, and focused on teaching and learning enhancement; and the need to move toward inclusive, partnered learning communities (Mercer-Mapstone et al., 2017).

Recently, Felten's principles have been adopted as the guidelines for ISSoTL conference pedagogy (Moore, 2019), and there has been significant interest in engaging SaP in pedagogical and curricular research. Matthews (2017) has proposed principles for good practice in SaP, and an international journal was created in 2017.

CONCLUSION

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning provides a vehicle to engage educators as advocates for our disciplines, as well as for teaching and learning in higher education. Lee Shulman (2000) reminds us, "a professor is a member of a learned profession" (p.103), who has a responsibility to serve as a steward of his/her discipline or profession. So, rather than decide between doctor as researcher and doctor as teacher, those who engage in SoTL are both researcher and teacher, as many of the chapters in this volume attest. But the world of work in higher education is no longer the same landscape that Shulman mapped in 2000. Is SoTL moving beyond the "big tent"? Do the past metaphors for SoTL engagement still ring true? In the evolving world of higher education, frequently, hiring is not happening in traditional, disciplinary appointments. Instead, there is an increasing number of positions as Teaching-Focused Faculty or positions as educational developers or curriculum leaders in para-academic positions. This change increases both the complexity and the opportunity in the work of SoTL scholars.

The future of SoTL is firmly connected to the evolving state of higher education. As institutions reflect on the educational experience of students and respond to the needs of accrediting organizations and employers, it behooves them to demonstrate program, curriculum, and pedagogy changes that are

Riding the Fourth Wave

connected to rigorous empirical research. Conducting and disseminating SoTL research operates as a bridge between excellence in teaching and excellent research on teaching. The ongoing reconceptualization of Boyer's Scholarship of Teaching serves as a valuable addition to the teaching–research nexus of higher education. It provides the possibility for encouraging dynamic advancement within institutions. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, both in its programs and practice, provides a compatible way for higher education to support and engage in research, teaching, and innovation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Barr, R. B. & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 27(6), 12-26.
- Bennett, R., Hobson, J., Jones, A., Martin-Lynch, P., Scutt, C., Strehlow, K., & Veitch, S. (2016). Being chimaera: A monstrous identity for SoTL academics. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(2), 217–228. doi:10.1080/07294360.2015.1087473
- Booth, S., & Woollacott, L. C. (2018). On the constitution of SoTL: Its domains and contexts. *Higher Education*, 75(3), 537–551. doi:10.1007/10734-017-0156-7
- Bortolini, K. (2018, November 29). SoTL: The party that no one really wants to go to. *University Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/sotl-the-party-that-no-one-really-wants-to-go-to/>
- Bovill, C., Bulley, C. J., & Moss, K. (2011). Engaging and empowering first-year students through curriculum design: Perspectives from the literature. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(2), 197–209. doi:10.1080/13562517.2010.515024
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bunnell, S. L., & Bernstein, D. J. (2012). Overcoming some threshold concepts in scholarly teaching. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 23(3), 14–18.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (n.d.). *Foundation history*. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/about-us/foundation-history>
- Chick, N., & Poole, G. (2018). Editors' introduction: In defense of microscopes. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 6(1), 1–2. doi:10.20343/teachlearninqu.6.1.1
- Chick, N. L. (2014). 'Methodologically sound' under the 'big tent': An ongoing conversation. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8(2). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2014.080201

- Chick, N. L. (Ed.). (2018). *SoTL in action: Illuminating critical moments of practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Chng, H. H., & Looker, P. (2013). On the margins of SoTL discourse: An Asian perspective. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1*(1), 131–145. doi:10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.131
- Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- D'Andrea, V. (2006). Exploring the methodological issues related to pedagogical inquiry in Higher Education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 107*, 89–98. doi:10.1002/t1.247
- Danielson, M. A. (2012). SoTL as a generative heuristic methodology for building learning communities. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 6*(2). doi:10.20429/ijstotl.2012.060204
- Dobbins, K. (2008). Enhancing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: A study of factors identified as promoting and hindering the scholarly activities of academics in one faculty. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 2*(2). doi:10.20429/ijstotl.2008.020217
- Elen, J., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., & Clement, M. (2007). Faculty development in research-intensive universities: The role of academics' conceptions on the relationship between research and teaching. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 12*(2), 123–139. doi:10.1080/13601440701604948
- Fanghanel, J., McGowan, S., Parker, P., McConnell, C., Potter, J., Locke, W., & Healey, M. (2015). *Literature review. In Defining and supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL): A sector-wide study*. York, UK: Higher Education Academy.
- Felten, P. (2013). Principles of good practice in SoTL. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1*(1), 121–125. doi:10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.121
- Felten, P., & Chick, N. (2018). Is SoTL a signature pedagogy of educational development? *To Improve the Academy, 37*(1), 4–16. doi:10.002/tia2.20077
- Fields, J., Kenny, N. A., & Mueller, R. A. (2019). Conceptualizing educational leadership in an academic development program. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 24*(3), 218–231. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2019.1570211
- Geertsema, J. (2016). Academic development, SoTL, and educational research. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 21*(2), 122–134. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2016.1175144
- Gilpin, L. (2011). Scholarship of Teaching and Learning trades. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 5*(2). doi:10.20429/ijstotl.2011.050204
- Gilpin, L., & Liston, D. (2009). Transformative education in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: An analysis of SoTL literature. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 3*(2). doi:10.20429/ijstotl.2009.030211
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gurung, R. A. R. (2014). Getting foxy: Invoking different magesteria in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 2*(2), 109–114. doi:10.20343/teachlearninqu.2.2.109

Riding the Fourth Wave

Gurung, R. A. R., & Schwartz, B. M. (2010). Riding the third wave of SoTL. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 4(2). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2010.040205

Haigh, N. J. (2012). Sustaining and spreading the positive outcomes of SoTL projects: Issues, insights, and strategies. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 17(1), 19–31. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2011.586462

Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2014). *Engagement through partnership: Students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education*. York, UK: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/engagement-through-partnership-students-partners-learning-and-teaching-higher-education>

Hockings, C. (2005). Removing barriers? A study of the conditions affecting teaching innovation. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(3), 313–326. doi:10.1080/13562510500122149

Hubball, H. T., & Burt, H. (2004). An integrated approach to developing and implementing learning-centred curricula. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 9(1), 51–65. doi:10.1080/1360144042000296053

Hubball, H. T., & Clarke, A. (2010). Diverse methodological approaches and considerations for SoTL in higher education. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1). doi:10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2010.1.2

Hubball, H. T., Clarke, A. C., Webb, A. S., & Johnson, B. (2015). Developing institutional leadership for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Lessons learned with senior educational leaders in multi-national research-intensive university contexts. *International Journal of University Teaching and Faculty Development*, 4(4). Retrieved from https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/product_info.php?products_id=53411

Hubball, H. T., & Gold, N. (2007). The scholarship of curriculum practice and undergraduate program reform: Integrating theory into practice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 112(112), 5–14. doi:10.1002/tl.293

Hubball, H. T., Lamberson, M., & Kindler, A. (2012). Strategic restructuring of a centre for teaching and learning in a research-intensive university: Institutional engagement in scholarly approaches to curriculum renewal and pedagogical practices. *International Journal for University Teaching and Faculty Development*, 3(2), 95–110.

Hubball, H. T., & Pearson, M. (2010). Grappling with the complexity of undergraduate degree program reform: Critical barriers and emergent strategies. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 3(3). Retrieved from http://kwantlen.ca/TD/TD.3.3/TD.3.3_Hubball&Pearson_Undergraduate_Degree_Program_Reform.pdf

Hubball, H. T., Pearson, M., & Clarke, A. (2013). SoTL inquiry in broader curricula and institutional contexts: Theoretical underpinnings and emerging trends. Invited peer-reviewed essay for inaugural issue. *International Journal for Inquiry in Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 41–57. doi:10.1353/iss.2013.0009

Huber, M. T. (2010). Editorial: CASTL has concluded. Long live the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 9(1), 5–8. doi:10.1177/1474022209357660

Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2006). Building the teaching commons. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38(3), 24-31. Doi:10.3200/CHNG.38.3.24-31

Huber, M. T., & Morreale, S. P. (2002). Situating the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. In M. T. Huber & S. P. Morreale (Eds.), *Disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching: Exploring common ground* (pp. 1–24). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Hutchings, P. (2000). Approaching the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. In P. Hutchings (Ed.), *Opening lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/elibrary/approaching-scholarship-teaching-and-learning>

Hutchings, P. (2007). Theory: The elephant in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning room. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2007.010102

Hutchings, P., Huber, M. T., & Ciccone, A. (2011). *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. (1999). The Scholarship of Teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 31(5), 10-15. Doi:10.1080/00091389909604218

Kanuka, H. (2011). Keeping the scholarship in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(1). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2011.050103

Kensington-Miller, B., Renc-Roe, J., & Moron-Garcia, S. (2015). The chameleon on a tartan rug: Adaptations of three academic developers' professional identities. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 20(3), 279–290. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2015.1047373

Kreber, C. (2007). What's it really all about? The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as an authentic practice. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2007.010103

Kreber, C., & Cranton, P. (2000). Exploring the Scholarship of Teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 476–495. doi:10.2307/2649149

Larsson, M., Mårtensson, K., Price, L., & Roxå, T. (2017). Constructive friction? Exploring patterns between educational research and the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Proceedings of the EuroSoTL, 2017*, 161–165.

Liebowitz, B. (2017). The significance of SoTL in the South. *SoTL in the South*, 1(1), 1–3.

MacLean, M., & Poole, G. (2010). An introduction to ethical considerations for novices to research in teaching and learning in Canada. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(2). doi:10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2010.2.7

Matthews, K. E. (2016). Students as partners as the future of student engagement. *Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal*, 1(1), 1-5. Retrieved from <https://journals.gre.ac.uk/index.php/raise>

Riding the Fourth Wave

- Matthews, K. E. (2017). Five propositions for genuine students as partners practice. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(2). doi:10.15173/ijpsap.v1i2.3315
- McKinney, K., & Jarvis, P. (2009). Beyond lines on the CV: Faculty applications of their Scholarship of Teaching and Learning research. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3(1). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2009.030107
- Mercer-Mapstone, L., Dvorakova, S. L., Matthews, K., Abbot, S., Cheng, B., Felten, P., & Swaim, K. (2017). A Systematic Literature Review of Students as Partners in Higher Education. *International Journal for Students As Partners*, 1(1). doi:10.15173/ijpsap.v1i1.3119
- Middendorf, J., & Pace, D. (2008). Easing entry into the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning through focused assessments: The “Decoding the Disciplines” approach. *To Improve the Academy*, 26(1), 53-67.
- Miller-Young, J. E., Anderson, C., Kiceniuk, D., Mooney, J., Riddell, J., Schmidt Hanbidge, A., & Chick, N. (2017). Leading up in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8(2). doi:10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.2.4
- Miller-Young, J. E., Yeo, M., & Manarin, K. (2018). Challenges to disciplinary knowing and identity: Experiences of scholars in a SoTL development program. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 12(1). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2018.120103
- Moore, J. (2019, March 23). ISSoTL Conference Pedagogy [Web post]. Retrieved from <https://www.issotl.com/issotl-conference-pedagogy>
- Parker, J. (2008). Theory of SoTL: Translating international perspectives. In *Proceedings of The London Scholarship of Teaching and Learning 7th International Conference 2008* (pp. 171-176). London: City University London.
- Patel, F., & Lynch, H. (2013). Glocalization as an alternative to internationalization in higher education: Embedding positive glocal learning perspectives. *International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 25(2), 223–230. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1016539>
- Potter, M., & Kustra, E. (2011). The relationship between scholarly teaching and SoTL: Models, distinctions, and clarifications. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(1). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2011.050123
- Rawn, C. D., & Fox, J. A. (2017). Understanding the work and perceptions of teaching-focused faculty in a changing academic landscape. *Research in Higher Education*, 59(5), 591–622. doi:10.1007/11162-017-9479-6
- Shulman, L. S. (1993). Teaching as community property: Putting an end to pedagogical solitude. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Education*, 25(6), 6-7. Doi:10.1080/00091383.1993.9938465
- Shulman, L. S. (2000). Inventing the future. In P. Hutchings (Ed.), *Opening lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/elibrary/inventing-future-opening-lines-approaches-scholarship-teaching-and-learning>
- Shulman, L. S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52–59. doi:10.1162/0011526054622015

Simmons, N. (Ed.). (2016). *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Canada: Institutional impact. New Directions in Teaching and Learning, 146*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; doi:10.1002/tl.20192

Simmons, N., Abrahamson, E., Deschler, J. X., Kensington-Miller, B., Manarin, K., Morón-García, S., & Renc-Roe, J. (2013). Conflicts and configurations in a liminal space: SoTL scholars' identity development. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1*(2), 9–21. Retrieved from <https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/TLI/article/view/57382/43155>

Stierer, B., & Antoniou, M. (2004). Are there distinctive methodologies for pedagogic research in higher education? *Teaching in Higher Education, 9*(3), 275–285. doi:10.1080/1356251042000216606

Svinicki, M. D. (2012). Who is entitled to do SoTL? *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 6*(2). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2012.060202

Thomas, S. (2011). Broadening conceptions of what constitutes knowledge and evidence in SoTL. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 5*(1). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2011.050125

Tierney, A. M. (2016). *More than just a teaching fellow: The impact of REF and implications of TEF on life science teaching-focused academics in UK HEIs (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Durham, UK: University of Durham. Retrieved from <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/11826/>

Tight, M. (2018). Tracking the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education, 2*(1), 61–78. doi:10.1080/23322969.2017.1390690

Webb, A., Wong, T., & Hubball, H. T. (2013). Professional development for adjunct teaching faculty in a research-intensive university: Engagement in scholarly approaches to teaching and learning. *International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 25*(2), 231–238. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/index.cfm>

Webb, A. S. (2019). Navigating the lows to gain new heights: Constraints to SoTL engagement. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(2). doi:10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2019.2.8173

Werder, C., Thibou, S., & Kaufer, B. (2012). Students as co-inquirers: A requisite threshold concept in educational development. *Journal of Faculty Development, 26*(3), 34–38.

Young, P. (2006). Out of balance: Lecturer's perceptions of differential status and rewards in relation to teaching and research. *Teaching in Higher Education, 11*(2), 191–202. doi:10.1080/13562510500527727

ADDITIONAL READING

Bishop-Clark, C., & Dietz-Uhler, B. (2012). *Engaging in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: A guide to the process, and how to develop a project from start to finish*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Hubball, H. T., & Clarke, A. (2010). Diverse methodological approaches and considerations for SoTL in higher education. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1*(1). doi:10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2010.1.2

Riding the Fourth Wave

Hubball, H. T., Clarke, A., Chng, H. H., & Grimmett, P. (2015). The scholarship of educational leadership in research-intensive university contexts: Implications for promotion and tenure supervision. *Asian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 92–107. Retrieved from <http://www.cdtl.nus.edu.sg/ajsotl/article/the-scholarship-of-educational-leadership-in-research-intensive-university-contexts-implications-for-promotion-and-tenure-supervision/index.html>

O'Brien, M. (2008). Navigating the SoTL landscape: A compass, map and some tools for getting started. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(2). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2008.020215

Poole, G. (2010, March 2). The promises and potential of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Moving slowly along a fascinating path. *Academic Matters*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicmatters.ca/2010/03/the-promises-and-potential-of-the-scholarship-of-teaching-and-learning-moving-slowly-along-a-fascinating-path/>

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Curriculum: Curriculum refers to a particular course of study. It is often a selection of relevant content structured according to the learning context and organized to guide learners through a process.

Educational Leader: An educational leader is a faculty member whose employment involves high-stakes decisions regarding curricular and pedagogical initiatives at a departmental, faculty, or institutional level.

Faculty Member: A faculty member is an individual who belongs to a faculty or department in higher education. They are appointed to permanent employment in frequently tenure, tenure-track, or instructor positions.

Higher Education: Post-secondary education, especially at a college or university.

Interdisciplinary: Combining two or more academic disciplines or fields of study. Biochemistry represents an interdisciplinary approach to a field.

Intradisciplinary: Being within the scope of a single academic discipline.

Multidisciplinary: Composed of several, usually separate, fields of study or expertise. A multidisciplinary cohort brings together faculty members from diverse academic disciplines.

Pedagogy: The art and science of teaching, pedagogy is the methods of lesson, course, and program delivery.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is a rigorous, literature-informed, and peer-reviewed framework for investigating teaching and learning in higher education. It is methodologically flexible and open to many types of inquiries into pedagogical, curricular, disciplinary, and institutional contexts.

Teaching–Research Nexus: The interrelated links between teaching and research in higher education.