

***On the Distinction Between the
Scholarship of Teaching and Scholarly Teaching***¹

Monica Reis-Bergan
James Madison University

(This essay and the invited responses that follow it originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for November 2002.)

The challenge of distinguishing between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching reminds me of a similar dilemma I faced in my third-grade art class. The favorite activity of my teacher in this class was a color game. She would tell us the object to be colored and the specific crayon or crayons to use to color it. She would call out, “Color the sky greenish-blue, color the water in the pond bluish-green.” My 8-year-old brain struggled to understand the difference between these two colors. Weren’t they both somewhat blue and somewhat green? Why would this distinction ever be important? However, now as an adult, after selecting a greenish-blue suit jacket, helping a friend paint her office a bluish-green and thousands of other color experiences, I can articulate the significant difference between these hues despite the redundancy in their names. In greenish-blue the dominant color is blue and green is the accent color; likewise, bluish green is predominantly green but the essence of blue is present as well.

So it is true with the challenge of distinguishing between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching. Like those hues that caused me consternation in third grade, there are strong similarities between the concepts. However, careful observation and exploration of their nuances yields significant differences as well.

In the years following World War II, scholarship was typically defined as the publication of original research. Boyer’s (1990) treatise, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, broadened the definition of scholarship beyond this narrow focus to include the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching. This novel conceptualization of scholarship fueled debate about the role of teaching and research in the broader educational community. These discussions resulted in a diverse array of publications and conferences debating and discussing the concept of scholarship across a variety of disciplines.

For example, The Society for Teaching of Psychology charged a task force to redefine scholarship in psychology (Halpern et al., 1998). The task force articulated a multifaceted definition of scholarship in psychology that was published in the *American Psychologist* (Halpern et al, 1998). The new definition of scholarship included five domains of activities:

¹ Reis-Bergan, M. (2003). On the distinction between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching. In W. Buskist, V. Hevern, & G. W. Hill, IV, (Eds.). *Essays from e-xcellence in teaching, 2002* (Chap. 12). Retrieved [insert date] from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Web site: <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/index.html>

original research, integration of knowledge, application of knowledge, pedagogy, and teaching. Original research was defined as the “creation of new knowledge” (Halpern et al., 1998 , p. 1295). Included in this category are activities typically recognized and rewarded as scholarly activities (e.g., dissemination of original data or theory in a refereed scholarly journal). Integration of knowledge as a scholarship domain highlighted the value of creating new knowledge based on the original work of others. Review articles, books, and meta-analyses represent examples of scholarly work included in this domain.

Application of knowledge as a domain of scholarship can take many forms but ultimately involves using psychological knowledge to benefit society at large. The scholarship of pedagogy is unique to the discipline of psychology. Psychology includes a growing knowledge base of how people learn and remember, thus it is a natural fit for psychologists to conduct research on teaching and learning processes. An example of a scholarship in this domain would be the development of a specific form of learning software to promote student learning and the evaluation of this product’s effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes. The scholarship of teaching is reflected in the work of exceptional teachers who make an original contribution to the field of psychology as a whole. An example of scholarship in this domain might include integrating information in a unique way that stimulates intellectual curiosity in students, colleagues, and the larger community of scholars.

The task force agreed with the view that scholarship in all areas can be judged with a shared set of features and endorsed the six features described by Diamond and Adams (1995). Diamond and Adams’ (1995) work was the culmination of broad survey of scholarship definitions across a wide variety of disciplines. These authors noted that activities that require a high level of expertise in a given discipline, are innovative, can be extended or replicated, can be documented and peer reviewed, and have significance or impact in the discipline characterize work that would be considered as scholarship in most disciplines (Diamond & Adams, 1995).

According to my interpretation of these guidelines, teaching is scholarship when it builds on existing knowledge and requires expertise in a discipline specific area. For example, consider listening to a lecture on the history of psychology given by Dr. Ludy Benjamin. He is an expert in this field and his teaching expands beyond the knowledge that exists in any textbook. The teacher as scholar is intentional in his or her quest for expertise. The purposeful action of accumulating knowledge and becoming an expert often leads to creative insight into the discipline material. This leads naturally to the second criteria of scholarship, innovation. The teacher as scholar is inventive and pioneering in some way. By presenting information in unique and original ways the teacher as scholar stimulates students to be curious intellectually. With a solid understanding of the discipline area, the teacher as scholar can challenge and modify information to meet the unique needs of the students in the course. Beyond living in the moment in front of the class, the scholarship of teaching involves important documentation of the class experience. The teacher as scholar organizes and evaluates his or her work in a manner suitable for public presentation. Scholarship documentation may involve putting together a teaching portfolio or a teaching publication. By packaging the teaching experience into a portable form, teachers as scholars may make their work public and available for peer review. By seeking evaluation of expert colleagues at other

universities, teachers as scholars may gain valuable feedback to enhance further their teaching expertise.

Peer review may also take the form of observation in the classroom. The teacher as scholar invites multiple visitors to provide a reliable assessment of teaching effectiveness. This peer review is not chance based but intentional. Teachers as scholars seek out review of their work and perceive the feedback as a valuable tool in striving toward excellence. Scholarship in teaching requires more than just one good lecture. Teachers as scholars continually evaluate and reflect on their teaching. As a result, scholarship in the classroom can be replicated from class period-to-class period and year-to-year. Because of the public nature, the intentional peer review, and replication of expert teaching, the teacher as scholar exists beyond the walls of the classroom. Teaching is scholarship when it has a significant impact in the field of psychology nationally and internationally. The teacher as scholar educates future teachers, models the scholarship of teaching for others to emulate, and takes an active role in shaping the discipline for future generations of teachers. This sort of impact could be accomplished, for example, by publishing an article on teaching or hosting a teaching conference.

What, then, is scholarly teaching? For me, understanding the distinction is a similar process to the one learned in my art class. When I had successfully colored the sky greenish-blue, then I knew that the color on the pond had to be different. Scholarly teaching builds on existing knowledge but not at the level of expertise. Scholarly teaching might involve teaching a course outside of your area or teaching a course for the first or second time. Just like in other areas of scholarship, it takes time and effort to be an expert in a given topic area. The scholarly teacher might only read one or two textbooks on a topic. The teacher as scholar has expertise in the topic and is current in his or her reading above and beyond the textbook. When preparing lectures, the scholarly teacher will pull ideas from published teaching manuals and use effective teaching methods but not necessarily demonstrate new and inventive teaching strategies. The scholarly teacher might save syllabi and course materials in a file drawer but not document them in a polished form as demonstrated by the teacher as scholar. The scholarly teacher will rarely seek out a peer to sit in their course. By contrast, the teacher as scholar will seek the evaluation of others, especially those who are also experts in his or her field. Scholarly teachers may have a significant impact on the lives of their students but remain unknown beyond the halls of their institution. The teacher as scholar has the additional responsibility of having an impact on the teaching profession as a whole.

As a new teacher, my self-evaluation is that my teaching is not at the level of scholarship stressed by the task force (Halpern et al, 1998). As I ponder this new view of scholarship, I am unsure if it is something I will strive to achieve as a new faculty member. Unlike the literature in my research field, many of the influential articles and leading writers in the scholarship of teaching are new to me. As I worked on this essay, I read classic articles that I had never seen or heard about in my graduate education. Although I found this reading exciting and stimulating, I'm not sure if I have the time as a new faculty member to refine my courses, keep current in the readings related to the course, keep current with my research literature, conduct research and publish in my field, and read this new body of literature.

Another question I have is how to break into the big leagues of the scholarship of teaching. Research scholarship as traditionally defined has a clear procedure. You conduct research and prepare a manuscript tailored to a desired journal. Many different publication outlets exist, each with a particular audience and reported level of excellence. It might be easiest to think of it as something similar to college basketball tryouts. You can try out for the Duke Blue Devils or the Bridgewater College Eagles. If you are a competent basketball player, you can generally find a program that will welcome you as a player. Likewise, if you have a research manuscript, you can often find a publication outlet suitable for your work. The accomplishment of having a paper published is accepted by most as a “win.” For less critical audiences any publication is seen as positive. For more discerning audiences the accomplishment of publishing an article in a prestigious journal article is valued more highly than publishing in a lower level journal.

The pathway to achievement in the scholarship of teaching is less understood. Even after reading many articles on this topic it wasn't until after I read the article by Mary Taylor Huber (2001) describing four case studies of individuals crafting their careers around the scholarship of teaching, that I understood how this process might work. As I thought about the scholarship of teaching, I was picturing a linear accumulation of accomplishments in the area of teaching. However, the case studies brought to light that the scholarship of teaching often involves crossing traditional boundaries of teaching, service, and research. For example, the teacher as scholar develops an innovative class activity designed to reduce gender stereotypes in the workforce. Research on the effectiveness of this activity is published in a teaching journal and the teacher is invited to give a talk about the activity for state employees. These activities, when organized under the heading of teaching as scholarship, make a nice package. However, each activity could also fit under the traditional categories of teaching, research, and service. From this perspective, the accomplishments of the teacher as scholar are fragmented and moderate in status. The challenge I see for the scholarship of teaching is presentation and acknowledgement of accomplishments. This is a plight also experienced by track and field competitors in the decathlon and heptathlon. Like the teacher as scholar, they excel in many areas and combine their skills together to amass total points. However, like the teacher as scholar, their accomplishments are often downplayed as a result of the diversity of events they must complete. When asked to describe the “world's greatest athlete” many will think of Michael Jordan or Ken Griffey Jr. or other sports figures who have honed specific talents confined to an individual arena of sport. Generally only among track and field enthusiasts is the decathlon or heptathlon athlete revered for his or her excellence as a balanced all-around athlete.

As I ponder the rest of my academic life, I appreciate the options in front of me. I may choose at some point to strive for excellence in the scholarship of teaching or simply keep my aspirations at being a scholarly teacher. Both pursuits are worthwhile, but require different kinds of skills and audiences.

The Scholarship of Teaching: The Best of Both Worlds²

Diane F. Halpern
Claremont McKenna College

Thanks to Monica Reis-Bergan for advancing the conversation on “the scholarship of teaching” with her honest reflections about a difficult and controversial topic. Apparently the greenish-blue—bluish-green confusion that she articulates so well in her essay is a common one. Because the confusion seems to center on the question of boundaries—where does scholarship end and teaching begin—a good place to continue the dialogue on this topic may be by defining what the scholarship of teaching is NOT. One problem with crossing boundaries between any two areas is the risk that everything becomes some of both—in this case both teaching and scholarship. The scholarship of teaching is NOT a new term for really good teaching. It is not as though teaching turns into scholarship as it improves. The boundary between these concepts is not as permeable as the blend of two colors along the color scale. Both teaching and scholarship can vary along quality dimensions ranging from awful to super; they do not morph into each other no matter how good or how awful either becomes. Original research, defined as the collection of data that (usually) support a hypothesis, can also be good or awful, just as it can be more or less innovative, public, useful, or insightful. Both scholarship and teaching can vary independently along multiple dimensions.

All scholarship involves the creation of something new. When teaching is scholarly, the instructor creates a new way of understanding or advancing knowledge about the topics being taught and learned. The innovation could be a new way of putting two topics together, a new technology that accelerates learning or makes transfer more probable, a framework for integrating seemingly diverse concepts, or almost any other innovation in instructional design. The creation of new ways of teaching and learning must also conform to the other standards of scholarship. For example, they must be made public so others can judge their quality. The scholarship of teaching can be made public by submitting the creative product to a peer-reviewed Web site, for publication in a teaching or content area journal, or for presentation at a scholarly conference. The instructional innovation must be judged to be high quality, reflect a high level of expertise, and it must be capable of being extended or replicated—just like any other type of scholarship. The innovation cannot be categorized as scholarly if any of these components are missing.

The scholarship of teaching permits a broader definition of scholarly activities—one that is more in line with the public perception that teaching is a primary activity of college faculty and more in line with a primary mission of every college and university—the promotion of quality learning. Colleges and universities have multiple components to their mission; the commitment to quality instruction is only one of them, but it should be a central part of every college or university mission. The scholarship of teaching is compatible with the other

² Halpern, D. (2003). The scholarship of teaching: The best of both worlds. In W. Buskist, V. Hevern, & G. W. Hill, IV, (Eds.). *Essays from e-xcellence in teaching, 2002* (Chap. 12). Retrieved [insert date] from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Web site: <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/index.html>

missions of colleges and universities, such as the creation of new knowledge through research, community service, and the preparation of a professional workforce. The inclusion of scholarship of teaching as a scholarly activity does not denigrate the more traditional types of scholarship; it adds additional possibilities for academic success and encourages a type of scholarship that has direct effects on student learning.

There are many reasons why we need a definition of scholarship that includes innovations in teaching and learning. Higher education is facing many new challenges because advanced learning is critical for the success of every individual in our increasingly complex society. Life-long learning has moved from being a slogan to a reality as more adults return to classrooms at periodic intervals throughout their adult years and seek more on-the-job and experiential learning to maintain or advance their employment status. Our students are also changing—a broad range of international students are studying in U. S. colleges and the “junior year abroad” option is becoming the norm for U. S. students, and not just a prerogative for the wealthy few. More students need more education, which makes it incumbent on us to find better ways to advance learning. Many of us can make meaningful contributions that will change how others teach and learn. However, if excellence in the complex area of innovations in teaching is not recognized in tenure and promotion decisions as scholarship, even the most dedicated among us will choose to spend our limited time on the more traditional types of scholarship that offer tangible rewards in the areas of promotion, tenure, and salary. If the scholarship of teaching is not recognized as such, then there will be fewer gains in this important area.

Reis-Bergan modestly claims that, by her own self-evaluations, she is not yet at the level of scholarship in her teaching. Although we have never met, I expect she will soon be at that level and beyond. I make this prediction based on her insights into the important questions about teaching and scholarship. I look forward to learning from her future scholarship and wish her generation of new professors a lifetime where their creative methods are rewarded and legitimized as an exciting and new type of scholarship.

Pursuing Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching³

Randolph A. Smith
Ouachita Baptist University

Professor Reis-Bergen has shared her beliefs about the distinction between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching. I agree with much that she had to say and wish to offer some thoughts of my own.

Reis-Bergen wonders if she should pursue the scholarship of teaching or remain content with being a scholarly teacher. This is certainly a valid question, but it is not much different than the question any graduate student faces: What area of scholarly activity should I pursue for my career? Am I more interested in development, learning, cognition, psychopathology, or just what aspect of psychology? Although pursuing one area of scholarship does not automatically rule out pursuing another, it is increasingly difficult to maintain expertise in two or three areas thanks to psychology's ever increasing specialization. It is rare, indeed, to find Renaissance scholars within psychology today. Thus, I don't believe that everyone should pursue the scholarship of teaching any more than I believe everyone should conduct research in the field of cognitive psychology or clinical psychology (or any other specialization).

I applaud Reis-Bergen's pursuit of scholarly teaching. Certainly, we, as teachers, owe our students the best possible information and the best possible presentation that we can offer. Thus, scholarly teaching requires a two-pronged approach: We must keep updated in our content areas, but we must also stay current about teaching styles and approaches (i.e., current pedagogical theory and practice). Just as we have not-so-fond memories of teachers who used the legendary yellowed lecture notes, we also have dismal memories of teachers who couldn't "teach their way out of a wet paper bag." Scholarly teaching demands that we avoid both of these pitfalls. Thus, I take issue with a couple of Reis-Bergen's statements about scholarly teachers. I do believe that scholarly teachers should pursue "new and inventive teaching strategies." If we do not, we run the risk of presenting material in the same style we adopted as beginning teachers. Most of us, I think, would like to believe that our teaching has evolved (for the better) since those early days. However, it is paramount that we *act* on that belief—we must take steps that help turn the belief into reality. For example, I believe that scholarly teachers can pursue teaching improvement through attendance at regional or national teaching conferences and teaching sessions held at the APA and APS meetings. For somewhat selfish (but also altruistic) reasons, I hope that scholarly teachers regularly read *Teaching of Psychology (ToP)*. Thus, I believe that scholarly teaching involves long-term and consistent attempts to improve one's teaching abilities.

Along that same line, I believe that scholarly teachers may well seek out a colleague to sit in on their classes. If we want to improve our teaching, peer evaluations certainly have the

³ Smith, R. A. (2003). Pursuing scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. In W. Buskist, V. Hevern, & G. W. Hill, IV, (Eds.). *Essays from e-xcellence in teaching, 2002* (Chap. 12). Retrieved [insert date] from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Web site: <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/index.html>

potential to help us. Many colleges involve a peer observation as part of their faculty evaluation program. However, rather than inviting colleagues to visit their classes because they have to, scholarly teachers may wish to invite colleagues to visit in order to get feedback on their teaching style and approach. In addition, scholarly teachers may wish to visit colleagues at their campus who have excellent teaching reputations—peer observation is certainly a two-way street with the opportunity for both colleagues to benefit. I have heard Drew Appleby (Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis) say that he systematically observed his undergraduate teachers and learned teaching strategies that he would later use as a teacher (as well as strategies that he would avoid). I wish I had been as systematic as Drew. However, I have learned to observe colleagues in classes I have taken since I began teaching at Ouachita and to observe colleagues from around the country at professional meetings as they make presentations. I have found some helpful classroom skills in these venues also. I believe that scholarly teachers can learn from observing other teachers and by having other teachers observe them.

Finally, I would like to address Reis-Bergan's question about "how to break into the big leagues of the scholarship of teaching." Unlike the big leagues of athletics where you have to play your way on to the team, you can volunteer to join the team that is involved in the scholarship of teaching. The Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP) is open to membership from all levels of teaching. Additionally, STP is almost always looking for volunteers to get involved with its work on behalf of teaching. For example, in the first 2002 issue of *ToP*, there was a call for volunteers to serve as mentors for less experienced teachers and for STP members to be considered for nomination to APA boards and committees. In the second 2002 issue, STP President Bill Hill called for suggestions for new initiatives for STP, and Program Chair Regan Gurung called for volunteers to review for the 2003 STP program at the APA convention. Reading the News section of *ToP* is a good way to find out about opportunities to get involved in STP's activities. Everyone I know who is part of the STP hierarchy got their start by volunteering in some capacity. I strongly encourage anyone wanting to get involved with the scholarship of teaching to volunteer for service in STP

Best wishes to Professor Reis-Bergan as she pursues her teaching career—whether she opts for scholarly teaching or the scholarship of teaching, being mindful of the options and the importance of teaching is critical for our discipline.

An Additional Model of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning⁴

Daniel Bernstein
University of Kansas

Dr. Reis-Bergin's essay is a very thoughtful and perceptive reflection on the topic of the scholarship of teaching (and learning; SOTL). She identifies the tension between different conceptions of this increasingly popular term, and her color metaphor aptly points out the importance of even subtle nuances in meaning. Overall, her essay provides a useful rumination on the idea underlying the term and on some of the issues that surround an individual's decision to enter into this professional activity; anyone considering doing the SOTL would be well advised to work through the issues and topics put forward here. As I read it, there were a few places in which additional and complementary perspectives occurred to me, and I will add them here in support of the basic position articulated in her essay.

The Diamond and Adams (1995) and Halpern et al. (1998) treatments of scholarship are very worthwhile, and there is another account of this subtle topic that also merits the attention of interested readers. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) produced a volume called *Scholarship Assessed* for the Carnegie Foundation that is the follow-up volume to Boyer's (1990) book. Building on the ethnographic work of cultural anthropologist Mary Huber, the authors examined the practices and beliefs of the community of people who call themselves scholars, looking for common themes and shared characteristics. Their list of key characteristics includes having the following: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, meaningful results, critical reflection, and clear communication.

Although the overlap among the three works is great, the Glassick et al. (1997) account highlights the recognition that methods of inquiry need to be appropriate to the ways of knowing characteristic of each field of study and that the results of the inquiry are central to reflective consideration of what has been learned. These two features have some specific relevance to SOTL. One is that there are a wide variety of forms of inquiry into knowing about human action, and we should explore a full range of approaches beyond those generally promoted by experimental psychologists who study education. Another is that presentation of evidence and examples of what students understand should be the centerpiece of any reflection on teaching, and teaching suggestions that do not engage the resulting learning are not yet complete as scholarly work. I recommend this work for the consideration of anyone interested in SOTL, and a brief and readable summary (written by the authors) is available at < <http://www.unl.edu/peerrev/about/scholarship.html>>.

I believe Dr. Reis-Bergan is very much on target in focusing on the documentation of teaching as a key issue for our consideration. There are many forms of presentation for

⁴ Bernstein, D. (2003). An additional model of the scholarship of teaching and learning. In W. Buskist, V. Hevern, & G. W. Hill, IV, (Eds.). *Essays from e-xcellence in teaching, 2002* (Chap. 12). Retrieved [insert date] from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Web site: <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/index.html>

intellectual work from which to choose, and it is not obvious which is best. I would like to add to the list of possible documentation methods something called a “course portfolio,” which was developed by Bill Cerbin, a psychologist at the University of Wisconsin–La Crosse. As elaborated in Hutchings (1998), a course portfolio presents a reflective analysis of the learning in a single course, and even perhaps across several offerings of that course. The teacher identifies clear intellectual goals for learners, describes the instructional design intended to achieve those goals, offers samples of student work on assignments created by the instructor, and finally reflects on how well the goals were met and what further refinements might be attempted in the next available opportunity to teach the course. For the teacher, preparing a course portfolio provides an occasion for learning from each semester’s experience with teaching and student understanding. For the reader there is both an opportunity to build on what a colleague has done as a teacher and an opportunity to evaluate the quality of the understanding of a field that has been demonstrated in a class.

For many university teachers the format of a course portfolio seems unfamiliar, and it appears to give privilege to the social science way of knowing (make a plan, gather evidence, ask if the plan worked). However, the point of the Glassick et al. (1997) book is that all scholarly inquiry has a similar deep structure of planning, evaluating results, and thinking about what has been learned. In this more inclusive model, course portfolios are constructed within the rules of evidence appropriate to the field that is being taught, and more faculty members are comfortable engaging in this kind of scholarly work. Although this approach is both more challenging than doing well controlled experiments and less likely to yield definitive conclusions that would move educational or psychological theory forward, it is an activity that virtually all college teachers could engage in without taking time away from the other missions that also demand their attention.

For the past several years a consortium of research-oriented universities has been promoting the use of course portfolios to build a community of discourse around teaching, and over 50 professors have generated course portfolios in a wide range of fields. These works look different from typical scholarship of teaching in a number of ways, most prominently in that there is rarely any attempt at formal experimental evaluation and that there are virtually always samples of student performance that illuminate the teacher’s goals and their students’ resulting understanding. This work is highlighted on the Web site <<http://www.unl.edu/peerrev/aahe>> and linked pages. There are three examples of portfolios at that Web location, and anyone who would like to look at a larger sample of portfolios (including half a dozen in psychology) can contact me directly to arrange access.

The course portfolio approach also offers a complement to the conventional view that visiting a classroom is the primary way of understanding a colleague’s teaching. Presenting a portfolio (Bernstein, 2002) focuses on the instructional design prepared by a teacher for the whole course experience (not just class time), the creation of opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding, and samples of the work students do in the course. This model does not give privilege to any personal style or teaching method; instead it asks about the outcomes and allows the professor to identify an effective means of achieving rich intellectual goals.

Finally, I think Dr. Reis-Bergan's comment about the problem of gaining recognition as a well rounded academic is extremely important. It appears that the academic world, perhaps like the rest of nature, favors specialization; those who focus on one professional domain often achieve results that more part-time contributors can only admire. I have found it very useful to consider a lifespan developmental view of a career, including serial periods of focus on different parts of my life as a college professor. After getting tenure as an all-rounder, I had a period focused on large grants, one focused on editorial work, and most recently a time focused on teaching. I have been fortunate to find a very lively audience for the work on teaching that I have done recently, and it was possible only because my job allowed me some release time from research to treat teaching with the same focused energy that I have given at other times to research. Considering the varied context of faculty positions in higher education, perhaps we can identify appropriate ways to make sure that at some point we have time to focus deeply on teaching without other distractions. Such a plan might allow for the production of outstanding work on learning that would gather the attention it deserves.

*Why I Am Not a Chef Yet—A Reply to Halpern, Smith, and Bernstein*⁵

Monica Reis-Bergan
James Madison University

As I read through the comments of my esteemed colleagues, I became perplexed over how to respond. I was struck by certain aspects of their essays and due to the rather odd way my mind works, I found a metaphor to capture some of the elements highlighted in their essays.

Most adults can cook. Some individuals are very poor cooks and others astound and amaze us with their delectable meals. Some cooks are specialists (grilled cheese or crême broulee) and others are generalists. Cooking meals is a staple of American life. Likewise, teaching is a staple of American education. In this particular set of essays, the authors have pondered the distinction between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching. A similar discussion could be had on the distinction between the concept of being a cook and being a chef. I will argue that the scholarship of teaching is similar to the work of a chef and the work of a scholarly teacher is similar to that of a great cook.

What does it mean to be a chef versus a cook? If asked this question many would answer that a chef creates new dishes. Diane Halpern concisely noted, “All scholarship involves the creation of something new.” The teacher as scholar creates new knowledge related to teaching and learning. Similar to the chef, the teacher as scholar is not creating new ingredients, but rather combining them in ways that are novel or incorporating ingredients that typically are not used. This is not to say that cooks aren’t occasionally making new dishes as well. In fact good cooks often go beyond the recipe box. This difference between cooks and chefs is what happens when they create the new dish. For chefs and teachers as scholars the creation itself is the focus of their attention. Therefore, considerable energy is expended analyzing their unique contribution to their profession. Dan Bernstein remarked on the critical role of reflection and documentation of teaching as it relates to scholarship. The chef and teacher as scholar examine their creations critically and write down the goals, plans, content, consequences, and potential future refinements of their work. This documentation facilitates extension and replication of the work as well as making the process and product available for peer and public review. The teacher as scholar is very likely to find the course portfolio to be an important and useful tool.

The course portfolio however, would also aid the scholarly teacher and likewise critical reflection and documentation would be beneficial to the household cook. As an example, my grandmother was an outstanding cook. Her recipe box, however, was a disaster. The recipe cards were tattered and torn. My grandmother simply used the recipe cards as a guide and then dismissed them as soon as the dish was prepared. If she did something original to the

⁵ Reis-Bergan, M. (2003). Why I am not a chef yet--A reply to Halpern, Smith, and Bernstein. In W. Buskist, V. Hevern, & G. W. Hill, IV, (Eds.). *Essays from e-xcellence in teaching, 2002* (Chap. 12). Retrieved [insert date] from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Web site: <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/index.html>

recipe, such as blending in an extra ingredient, it remained undocumented and unappreciated. The recipe card, therefore, was not representative of the corresponding food dish and thus many of us failed to make the dishes like Grandma when we inherited her recipe cards after her death. I desperately wish my grandmother had documented her recipes in more detail. Likewise, at the beginning of each semester when I pull out my course notes, I berate myself for not including more critical reflection and documentation.

Cooking shows on television provide chefs with outside evaluation of their work. Chefs are often showcased for their cooking techniques as well as the final product. For cooks, however, the focus is typically on the final outcome. When asked to attend dinner at a friend's house the time of arrival is typically after the meal is prepared. Rarely is this friend asking you to come watch him or her whip up the eggs in some inventive way. The focus of the cook is satisfaction with the final dish. Differences in public accessibility to process are also apparent between scholarly teachers and teachers as scholars. Scholarly teachers often approach evaluation of their work with evidence of teacher ratings, student letters, and performance assessments. Scholarly teachers are quick to showcase the final outcome of their teaching, the individual student. Colleagues often appreciate the skills and motivation that students possess after a class with "Dr. Scholarly Teacher" but remain mystified as to what actually occurred within the walls of the classroom. The teacher as scholar provides an examination of the process as well as the outcome.

Scholarly teachers, like good chefs, appreciate outside evaluation of their techniques. Randy Smith highlighted the value of peer evaluation in his essay. He described a culture of public teaching that opens the doors of the classroom to teaching colleagues as well as to students. Teachers as scholars welcome observations by peers and in turn observe others in their teaching venues. This mutually beneficial process leads to learning by evaluation and observation. A peer might have a helpful comment on how to refine a demonstration. It is also possible that in observing a fellow teacher a strategy is showcased that the observer is able to use in his or her own classroom. Opening the doors of the classroom can also be beneficial to the scholarly teacher. It is important for the scholarly teacher to keep evolving and better serving the needs of the student. Observation by peers may provide insight into areas of improvement as well as areas of excellence.

Smith also mentioned the importance of interacting with the teaching profession beyond the scope of the institution. Regional and national teaching conferences provide sessions that focus on strategies to improve teaching. Keeping current in the teaching literature and taking advantage of mentoring opportunities provided by STP are other ways to improve one's teaching abilities. These resources are useful for scholarly teachers in keeping current in the field but have the added importance for teachers as scholars because these activities provide opportunities to make their scholarly work public. A similar dynamic exists in the cooking profession. Culinary practices and knowledge change and chefs must stay current in their profession by going to conferences and participating in apprenticeship programs through societies like the Professional Chef's Association and the American Culinary Federation. The National Culinary Review provides chefs with information about current trends and techniques in the culinary arts. These resources are crucial to the chef, but likewise many household cooks might benefit from reading and expanding their cooking repertoire.

I agree with Diane Halpern's argument that teaching and scholarship "do not morph into each other." Scholarly teachers and teachers as scholars can both benefit from innovation, documentation, peer evaluation, and expanded interaction with the field of teaching. However, this does not imply that they are the same or that scholarly teaching is a weaker form of the scholarship of teaching. The goal of being a scholarly teacher is not settling for second best. The scholarly teacher is similar to the good household cook. It takes hard work and planning to cook well-balanced healthy meals for yourself or a family. Not everyone is good at it and the consequences of an unhealthy diet are significant. Poor nutrition has been implicated in the development of several cancers, hypertension, coronary heart disease, obesity, and diabetes. The scholarly teacher likewise works hard to provide the best academic environment for the growth of students' minds.

The scholarship of teaching deserves its own status as a form of scholarship. No one would assume that being a household cook is the same as being a chef. There are similarities in the actual work, but the structure of the work and the expectations are different. The chef is seen as an expert in the culinary field. Likewise, we need to make clearer the distinction between the scholarly teacher and teacher as scholar. Too often work related to the scholarship of teaching is relegated as additional work in the teaching domain and the activities of the two distinct types of teachers are merged together. Diane Halpern makes the eloquent argument that higher education is facing many challenges and needs meaningful contributions that advance our understanding of teaching and learning. I agree. However, in order to facilitate this type of interest and energy in young faculty, the scholarship of teaching needs to exist as a research emphasis in graduate education. Teachers as scholars need to be educated about this domain of scholarship and mentored in the unique techniques and skills. They need to think about teaching as their scholarship domain—and not as an additional teaching activity. The energy demanded to achieve excellence in any area of scholarship is substantial. Therefore, work related to the scholarship of teaching needs to be regarded by colleagues and administrators as scholarship.

Thus, at this point in my career I am working hard to be a scholarly teacher and publish scholarly articles in health psychology. I also cook meals for my husband and children when I am not working late grading papers or meeting with research groups. My future career development might involve the scholarship of teaching. I am fairly confident, though, that I won't be a chef anytime soon.

References

- Bernstein, D. (2002). Representing the intellectual work in teaching through peer-reviewed course portfolios. In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist, (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (215-229). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Diamond, R., & Adams, B. (1995). *Recognizing faculty work: Reward system for the year 2000*. New Directions for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Halpern, D. F., Smothergill, D. W., Allen, M., Baker, S., Baum, C., Best, D., Ferrari, J., Geisinger, K. F., Gilden, E. R., Hester, M., Keith-Spiegel, P., Kierniesky, N. C., McGovern, T. V., McKeachie, W. J., Prokasy, W. F., Szuchman, L. T., Vasta, R., & Weaver, K. A. (1998). Scholarship in psychology: A paradigm for the twenty-first century. *American Psychologist*, 53, 1292-1297.

Huber, M. T. (2001). Balancing acts designing careers around the scholarship of teaching. *Change*, 33, 21-29.

Hutchings, P. (Ed.) (1998). *The course portfolio*. Washington: AAHE.