

## **Beyond the scholarship of teaching: searching for a unifying metaphor for the college teaching profession**

**Michael Theall, University of Illinois at Springfield**

**Raoul Arreola, University of Tennessee, Memphis**

**Paper presented at the 81<sup>st</sup> annual meeting of the American Educational research Association.**

**Seattle: April 14, 2001.**

### **Background**

In his preface to *Scholarship Reconsidered* Ernest Boyer (1990) said, "After all, it's futile to talk about improving the quality of teaching if, in the end, faculty are not given recognition for the time they spend with students." (p. xi) He went on to note, "... that, on far to many campuses, teaching is not well rewarded..." (p. xii) and he identified the various pressures imposed on faculty, suggesting that the reward system should enhance their diverse efforts rather than restricting them. He said that it was necessary to, "...define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar." and that, "It's time to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great diversity of functions higher education must perform. For American higher education to remain vital, we urgently need a more creative view of the work of the professoriate". (p. xii) Finally, in emphasizing a needed focus on undergraduate education he also acknowledged the reality that, "...the degree to which this push for better education is achieved will be determined, in large measure, by the way scholarship is defined and, ultimately, rewarded." (p. xiii)

This paper reviews Boyer's reconsideration of the priorities of the professoriate as a landmark effort to revitalize higher education and the faculty role, but this paper also attempts to go beyond Boyer's proposals to an even broader view of the professoriate and the profession of college teaching. Why? Because, recent research (Braxton, 2001; Franklin & Theall, 2001; Theall, 2000), the shared experiences of faculty development and evaluation practitioners, and anecdotal evidence suggest that after a decade of high-profile discussion, Boyer's conceptualizations have not had a major, measurable impact on college teaching, faculty development practice, or the assignment of rewards for teaching excellence. Briefly the research suggests three things: 1) that there is not a great deal of scholarship of teaching activity; 2) that there is not a great deal of faculty interest in research outside their primary disciplines; and 3) that even if scholarship of teaching research were conducted, it would not be given weight equivalent to disciplinary research in promotion and tenure decisions. To paraphrase several faculty comments made directly to the authors, "Why would I do it if I'm not interested and if it's not considered important for promotion and tenure?"

We believe that one reason for the lack of impact is that any foundational change in the attitudes and behaviors of higher education faculty and administrators (largely former faculty) requires a global view of the profession of college teaching rather than a less comprehensive redefinition of the scholarly or other aspects of work that make up the entirety of that profession. There is also ample evidence in Boyer (1990) and other sources, that college faculty view themselves as disciplinary specialists and thus establish their professional identities within their disciplines more than as members of the broader profession of college teaching. This should come as no surprise since the focus of work in graduate programs is on more and more specific research in the discipline and the acculturation of graduate students is within the framework of the department and the discipline. Smart and Feldman (1998) have demonstrated the power of this process with respect to individual differences described by Holland (1985). The end result is both expected and logical: namely that persons with high intelligence, ability and interest in a discipline, and extensive and specific training in research in that discipline would most value the continuation of such exploration and the contribution of new knowledge to their chosen fields. The conundrum is that these persons are employed to do much more than that, but receive little or no training in any of the other aspects of the requirements of their new positions. Subsequently, their performance in these additional areas of responsibility is evaluated, often with questionable reliability and validity, in part because of the over-emphasis on their research performance.

This paper will consider certain views of the roles of college teachers over the past half-century and will attempt to incorporate them into a larger vision of the profession that includes all the arenas of activity and endeavor that form the entirety of the professional world of college faculty. In order to establish the

foundation for this vision, we begin with the early discussions of higher education, college teaching, and the roles of college teachers that preceded Boyer's work.

### **The traditional triumverate**

In common understanding, the college teacher has three arenas of endeavor: teaching, research, and service. But particularly in the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, there has been a great deal of dialogue and expressed discomfort with the relationships and relative weights of these three kinds of activities. Caplow and McGee (1) observed that even in the 1950s, new faculty were being hired as teachers but evaluated as researchers. In "The American University", Jaques Barzun (1968) described "scholars in orbit", presenting an ironic view of the professorial teaching career. He noted that, "College and university teaching is thus the only profession (except the proverbially oldest in the world) for which no training is given or required. It is supposed to be 'picked up'." (p. 36). He proceeded to note the emphasis on research and external funding and the predilection of institutions to achieve "visibility" through their faculty, and he ended with the sobering note, "Even the 'great teacher' can be explained away as a lovable man of average competence –not enough for a great university." His counterpart, the average man of research, lovable or unlovable, is still felt to be worth more." (p. 62). Supporting this contention, Carnegie Foundation studies in 1969 and 1989 (2) showed a dramatic increase in the importance of publication as a criterion for promotion and tenure in all higher education institutional classifications except in two-year institutions.

This imbalance and the common malaise it created, contrasted to the typical description of the profession as having the equal, triune responsibilities of teaching, research, and service, ultimately resulted in efforts to reform higher education, giving more balance to the roles and responsibilities that fell to the professoriate. Centers for teaching and learning and faculty development sprang up in the 1960s due, in part, to substantial sources of external funding for such efforts, but the emphasis of instruction remained on the content of the disciplines and courses involved. Despite more and more interest in college teaching and its evaluation, and the appearance of classics such as Michael Scriven's (1967) "Methodology of Evaluation" article and the first edition of Wilbert McKeachie's (1978) "Teaching Tips", there were not many major changes in policy and process related to the ways in which the college teaching profession was viewed and evaluated. The one exception was the rapidly increasing use of student ratings of instruction documented by Seldin in his several national studies (e.g., 1993), but this rapid increase often led to over-reliance on this easily-gathered information and decision making based solely on these data. The profession of college teaching was too narrowly defined and judged and this short-sightedness led to much resistance among faculty. A wider vision was necessary.

In 1986, Lee Shulman introduced an important paradigm shift in his discussion of "Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching". His focus was on the integration of content expertise and pedagogical skill and he defined "content knowledge" as "...the amount and organization of the knowledge per se in the mind of the teacher." (p. 9); and pedagogical content knowledge" as knowledge, "...which goes beyond knowledge of subject matter per se to the to the dimension of subject knowledge *for teaching*." (p. 9; italics original) He further defined "curricular knowledge" as "...the pharmacopoeia from which the teacher draws those tools of teaching that present or exemplify particular content..." (p. 10)

Shulman also described three forms of knowledge: propositional knowledge, case knowledge, and strategic knowledge as the forms in which the other categories may be organized. Propositional knowledge was made up of empirically derived 'principles', practical 'maxims', and operational 'norms "... that guide the work of the teacher...because they are morally or ethically right." (p. 11) Case knowledge was proposed to have three types: "*Prototypes* exemplify theoretical principles, *Precedents* capture and communicate principles of practice or maxims, *Parables* convey norms or values." (p. 11, italics original) Strategic knowledge was defined as a form of judgment that incorporated the ability to choose the most effective course of action from an array of instructionally-related possibilities. From Shulman's work, we can draw pictures of expert teachers as those who not only have a depth of understanding of their content, but also can extract foundational principles and concepts and translate them via a repertoire of alternative strategies, into language and other descriptions that novice learners can most easily grasp and build upon. Their curricular knowledge repertoire would also include an understanding of how to best convey both basic and sophisticated principles to skilled learners and to lead these learners into their own construction of meaningful schema. Such teachers would also know which topics and areas of content posed the greatest problems for learners and would have strategies for helping students understand difficult or complex

content. They would understand and use a variety of techniques that accommodated individual differences among learners, and they would be able to design instruction and assessments that best supported student achievement of clear and complete instructional objectives. Shulman suggested a research sequence that would involve process and content using both empirical methods and case studies that would ultimately "...provide teachers with a rich body of prototypes, precedents, and parables from which to reason." (p. 14)

Shulman's paradigm reinforced the notion that teaching was more than a matter of subject expertise and indeed, his research agenda is a precursor to those kinds of explorations that fall under the scholarship of teaching rubric and are within the legitimate purview of teacher-conducted classroom assessment and classroom research (e.g., per Angelo & Cross, 1993; Cross & Steadman, 1996) and are echoed in the discussions of "reflective practice" in work by Donald Schon (1987).

Not that the complexity of teaching went unnoticed. Research, publications, and presentations on teaching and its evaluation in the time from Barzun's (1968) book until 1990 were voluminous. Over 2500 items on college teaching and its evaluation were produced during this time. During this time, some of the work of greatest interest to higher education involved the development of a better understanding of the various dimensions of college teaching, culminating in Feldman's (1989) reviews which identified seventeen major dimensions, Murray's (e.g., 1983) explorations of "low inference" teaching behaviors, and reviews of evaluation research which clearly noted teaching as a multidimensional and complex activity (e.g., Centra, 1979; Doyle, 1983; Marsh, 1987). However, while these comprehensive reviews were concerned with teaching and its multidimensionality and complexity, these same aspects of the broader college teaching profession were not yet defined. Other writers such as Ernest Lynton (1987) commented on higher education's priorities and also expressed the view that existing conceptions of the faculty role were restrictive, saying that they, "...established too narrow a definition of scholarship and too limited a range of instruction." (p. 7)

### **On reconsidering scholarship**

To set the stage for his reconceptualization, Boyer reviewed these changes in American higher education. He noted that the focus of higher education, "... had moved from the student to the professoriate, from general to specialized education, and from loyalty to campus to loyalty to the profession." (p. 13) but by "the profession", he meant the professional field of the faculty member more so than the profession of college teaching. We agree with this assessment of the situation, but differ from Boyer in terms of addressing it. An extended description of our conceptualization of the profession of college teaching is found later in this paper.

Given the importance of scholarly activity, Boyer proposed to redefine scholarship to include not only the production of new disciplinary knowledge ("the scholarship discovery"), but also to other forms of scholarship including "integration", "application", and "teaching" whose definitions are by now, quite well known. Tacitly acknowledging the reality of the preeminence of the scholarship of discovery, Boyer's reconceptualization capitalized on the notion of scholarship in an effort to bring a missing balance to the profession. This was a powerful political stroke for at that time, without connection to scholarship, there was little chance to raise the importance, recognition, or reward provided for excellence in teaching in its own right, nor was there much chance to elevate the profession of college teaching to a more appropriate level. No cynicism was involved in this reconceptualization, for as Boyer stressed almost immediately after the initial definitions of the four kinds of scholarship, "First, all faculty should establish their credentials as *researchers*." (p. 27; italics original) Given this precondition, the value and importance of teaching could be reified because teaching could be considered a form of scholarship. However, the very thing that made Boyer's model appealing to many (namely, that it considers "scholarship" as the essential element in the profession of college teaching), can also be viewed as the major limitation of the model. The model is unilateral and given its emphasis on reconsidering scholarship as the priority of the professoriate, it excludes from consideration the many other roles that faculty must play. It did not completely do what Boyer hoped in terms of recognizing "...the full range of faculty talent and the great diversity of functions higher education must perform" (1990, p. xii). Additionally, if one objective of the model was to provide faculty with recognition for the time they spend teaching, there was a discrepancy in putting emphasis not on the act of teaching, but on the investigation of the process.

Clearly, if the redefinition of scholarship involved the priorities of the professoriate, then attention had to be given to how this redefined work would be assessed.. Boyer and his associates began this work, resulting in the

publication of Glassick, Huber, & Macroff's "Scholarship assessed: the evaluation of the professoriate" (1997) shortly after Boyer's death. They considered how scholarly work should be assessed and arrived at a set of six standards: "clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique" (p. 25). These criteria logically resembled criteria for any other form of scholarship but they were limited in the same way as the Boyer model. If the evaluation of the professoriate was limited to an assessment of the scholarship of the individual, then what of the myriad other activities and responsibilities that made up the work of the college teacher? Did this emphasis not reinforce the notion that scholarship was the overarching role and responsibility of the faculty and that other aspects of performance were secondary?

This dichotomy became more clear when Schulman & Hutchings (1999) noted (in bold print at the head of a page) that, "A scholarship of teaching is *not* synonymous with excellent teaching. It requires a kind of 'going meta', in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning." (p. 13) In this article, they cited Shulman's (3) previous definition that, "A scholarship of teaching should...entail a public account...of teaching...in a manner susceptible to critical review...and amenable to productive employment in future work..." (p. 6) Shulman & Hutchings' distinction between the scholarship of teaching and excellent teaching was not meant to devalue excellent teaching but in one sense, it reinforced the message of Glassick et. al (1997) that the evaluation of the professoriate should be based on an assessment of the scholarship of the individual in accordance with the standard criteria for assessing scholarship. What was to be the value of excellent teaching? What weight was to be assigned to such teaching? How was it to be documented? If, indeed, scholarship was the priority of the professoriate, then teaching could not be.

In the 1990s, many other writers were discussing similar issues. Braskamp & Ory (1994), Centra (1993), Theall & Franklin (1990, 1991), and others discussed faculty evaluation practice and teaching improvement. All these writers stressed the multidimensionality of teaching and its evaluation and the need for a broad array of options and process to fully and accurately make judgments about performance. At mid-decade, in a discussion of the "duties of the teacher", Scriven (1994) noted the old saying "those who can, do; those who can't, teach" and suggested the following change, "Those who can do these hundred difficult things can teach well; those who teach well can change the world in their lifetime; those who can't, can only do something less important" (p. 151) As with Barzun and other earlier writers, Scriven emphasized the issue of the multiple roles of teachers and by implication, the view that evaluation should include a consideration of all those 'duties' rather than only one aspect of performance. Based on several years of work in faculty evaluation Arreola (1995) proposed guidelines for "Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system". Using a series of matrices that arrayed various responsibilities of faculty against weighted types and sources of information determined by participant consensus, he outlined a process that clarified both expectations and ways in which performance could be accurately and fairly measured. The "Source Impact Matrix" could be used to guide the faculty evaluation process with respect to teaching as well as any other role filled by a faculty member. This work considered the evaluation of faculty from a perspective that was broader than a view considering scholarship or teaching alone.

A recent book by James Bess ("Teaching alone, teaching together", 2000) further explored the complexity of college teaching. Its main thesis can be summarized in the following quotation:

To reiterate the premise of this book: instructional subfunctions or roles are so diverse and require such different mixes of tasks, talents, and temperaments that the smaller parts must be played by more than one person. Yet, competency in any one of these is a necessary but not sufficient condition....The belief of the authors in this book is that in most colleges and universities, the matching of tasks, talents, and temperaments has not been properly addressed in the last fifty years....The argument suggested here is that the manifold functions and tasks required of faculty are now so extensive that effective professional education and training for each of them are not possible in the time frame of the typical doctoral degree period of study. (pp. 7-8)

Bess and associates proposed seven subroles of teachers: "pedagogue, researcher, lecturer, discussion leader, integrator, assessor, and mentor" (p. 22). These were classified in three larger categories. "Preparatory roles" included the researcher and the pedagogue who designed and developed the content and process of instruction. "Contact roles" included the lecturer and the discussion leader who delivered the instruction in a classroom or other setting. "Facilitating roles" included the mentor, the integrator, and the assessor who supported teaching and learning outside the classroom through role modeling, individual assistance, and the provision of performance feedback. The thrust of the book (and a controversial thrust at

that) was that since one person could not effectively fill these varied roles, instruction should be provided by a team of persons, each fulfilling one role. Roles could rotate among team members but at no time would one person be expected to fill all the roles.

The appeal of this proposal is that it acknowledged the complexity of teaching. The drawback is that it proposed a structure and a sharing of authority so different from contemporary practice that it would be met with considerable resistance. The “cybernetics” of typical higher education institutions (Birnbau, 1988) do not match well with this new conceptualization of teaching. While we strongly agree with the essential notion that college teaching requires a diversity of skills and knowledge, from the perspective of this paper, Bess’ book has the same limitation as Boyer’s: namely, that it considers a unilateral aspect of the college teaching profession. The roles of the teacher constitute but one set of requirements in the larger array of responsibilities that form the profession of college teaching.

Nonetheless, there is support for this differentiated notion of faculty/teaching roles. A unique perspective is offered in many chapters of Bernice Pescolozido and Ronald Aminzade’s “The social worlds of higher education” (1999). For example, Craig Calhoun (1999) suggests that “...we should abandon the notion that college teaching is one task...” (p. 19) and adds, “Whatever our empirical expectations, an ideological commitment to the notion that college teaching is a single occupation weakens our ability appropriately to differentiate norms for teachers called on to do different types of work.” (p. 20) In the same book, Paul Baker (1999) refers to “the lonely work of teaching” (p. 95) citing research that faculty are unwilling or unable to communicate with each other. Baker notes that, “In most departments and on most campuses, they (i.e., researchers) encountered “hollowed” collegiality. Relationships among faculty are superficial and ‘collegiality remains thwarted with regard to faculty engagement with issues of curricular structure, pedagogical alternatives, and student assessment’” (p. 96) Donald Finkel and G. Stephen Monk (1999) caution against “the Atlas complex”, a paralyzing state of affairs that places faculty in the role of being “...caught in the middle of their classes by a host of mysterious forces – hidden assumptions, hidden expectations, and the results of their own isolating experience.” (p. 118). In effect such faculty face the task of trying to support the entire enterprise of teaching and learning and assume an inappropriate and unnecessary Atlas-like burden of responsibility. Finally, in a direct consideration of the troubles of the academic professions, Burton Clark (1999) lists five systemic concerns, “...secondarization, excessive teaching, attenuated professional control, fragmented academic culture, and diminished intrinsic reward and motivation.” (p. 54) He notes that academic professions can include, “...a variety of contexts that generate ‘absorbing errands’...” (p. 58) but that when these contexts fade disenchantment follows and academics seek sources of satisfaction outside the academy. Particularly with the last three items, we see connections to what has limited Boyer’s (1990) reconceptualization. In effect, the scholarship of teaching will not meet its promise if faculty lose professional control (or even perceive to do so), because an external locus reduces expectancy, effort, performance, and satisfaction as Keller (1983), Perry (1991), and others have described. Likewise if academic cultures are fragmented, then faculty can retreat into their own disciplinary specialty worlds and relate only to the research and professional activities of these worlds. Finally, if intrinsic rewards and motivation are reduced or removed for certain kinds of activity, there can be little expectation that faculty will engage in these activities (Theall, 1998).

### **A broader conceptualization**

Just as Shulman & Hutchings (1999) proposed that a scholarship of teaching required “going meta”, we believe that any reconceptualization of the profession of college teaching requires the same. In order to establish the profession itself, to effect change, to broaden the understanding of the field, we must adopt a ‘meta’ approach. Of the many definitions of the prefix “meta”, the most relevant is of something that is beyond or that transcends something else. In philosophy, metaphysics includes the study of being and of the universe: according to the translation from Latin, “the things after the physics”. For our purposes, the prefix, when attached to the profession of college teaching, denotes a larger view than has been presented before, in effect, a conceptualization that includes the things that make this profession larger than its simple title, “college teacher”, may suggest. Thus we see the profession of college teaching as encompassing a range of skills and abilities that transcends any one of its component parts and requires not just participation in its various activities, but is based on skilled craftsmanship, continuous reflection, assessment, and evaluation, and a developed understanding of the theoretical approaches and applied practices of the

various components of the profession, accompanied by an equally deep understanding of their interactions and likely outcomes.

We often hear of “meta-theory” and since the concept is related, it bears review. There are many kinds of theory. Predictive theory is the foundation of empirical research and provides the meat of testable hypotheses. Explanatory theory, often the result of experimentation, describes laws and relationships. We use the term propositional theory here, to refer to ideas employed in “thought experiments” which can lead to predictive theory: Einstein’s “Gedanken” for example. The quest for many researchers in all fields of investigation is a grand or unified theory that provides a relational or comprehensive structure bringing together the explanations of varied phenomena, and organizing them so as to reduce their individual complexities into a coherent single description: Hawking’s ‘theory of everything’. Finally, there is “metatheory”, more a ‘theory of theories’ than an explanation of phenomena. A metatheoretical approach considers the structure and content of other theories or the nature of a field. In any number of academic disciplines, we find “meta-theories”. The term is used not simply to suggest a larger ‘gestalt’ for the discipline, but to propose a unified and blended conceptualization that forms the basis for that discipline itself. Scriven (1991) in his “Evaluation Thesaurus” provides the following definition of a ‘meta-theory’. He says it is, “A theory about the nature of a field of inquiry, engineering, or craft. It deals with matters such as the definition of the field’s boundaries, its differences from neighboring fields or disciplines, the reason why certain methods work well for it and others are inappropriate....It is often very informal, sometimes entirely implicit, but its existence is a prerequisite for the existence of a discipline, since it is the self-concept of the discipline, and a discipline without a self-concept is just practice in one place rather than another...” (p.232)

We feel that such a view is necessary to the true establishment of the meta-profession of college teaching. A metatheoretical view of higher education teaching and learning and the profession of college teaching would thus consider a range of perspectives on the topic and attempt to demonstrate their relationships and implications for the development of the profession and related fields of inquiry. It can provide a self-concept for the field and take it beyond simple practice. The use of the words “self-concept” is important for another reason. We feel that the meta-profession of college teaching does not have a sufficiently strong self-concept with respect to other professions. Partly, this is because so many of its practitioners identify first, with their disciplinary affiliations and professions. Ask a college teacher what she/he teaches and the answer will most often be the name of his/her discipline. College teachers conduct research in their disciplines, attend professional meetings with others in their disciplines, belong to disciplinary professional organizations, and value most, scholarship related to their disciplines that is found in their disciplinary journals. Their self-concept is as members of disciplinary fraternities or sororities. They are “cosmopolitans” to use Bimbaum’s (1988) word: those whose professional affiliations are widespread and in the disciplines. There is nothing inherently wrong with this emphasis. Those who seek advanced degrees in a field and who aspire to “profess” it, must be interested in and motivated by the field itself. They can not be apathetic about their content and also be successful teachers.

But the meta-profession of college teaching makes demands beyond the discipline and it is generally acknowledged that one’s status within the discipline is more weighty and meaningful than one’s status within the teaching profession. When Parker Palmer (1998) discussed “The Courage to Teach”, he stressed the extent to which the individual must be willing to invest of ‘self’ in teaching, saying, “Teaching, like any human activity emerges from one’s inwardness, for better or worse.” (p. 2). The intensity of personal involvement necessary to excellence in teaching can not be evaluated with a single questionnaire or with a tally of published articles, and it is clear that without a healthy self-concept, a person can not deal easily with the fluctuating joys and sorrows that Palmer documents. If we are to evaluate the college teaching profession at all, we must extend this idea beyond each teacher to the profession itself. Until we do, our view will be biased in the direction of narrow definitions that do not promote fair and equitable decisions about performance: decisions which deny the complexity and variety of contributions made to education and society by members of the profession.

Therefore, an important objective of our work is to establish an equity of self-concept, an acceptance that the meta-profession of college teaching is one which deserves recognition and credit in and for itself. Teaching is a calling worthy of respect, or attention, and of careful exploration, investigation, reflection, and dialogue. It is not simply a secondary subject for a more important activity: research. The extension of the meta-professional approach would be to thus propose multiple paths of activity including informal dialogue and documentation of professional efforts as well as more formal investigation which could lead to better understanding of the interactions of the various

variables affecting the profession of teaching in the higher education context. The underlying objectives of such work would be twofold: first, to provide a basis for more complete and appropriate definition, appreciation, evaluation, and recognition of the profession; and second, to energize a productive cycle of theory, research, and practice whose ultimate target would be a more unified picture of this complex and multidimensional process, the environments in which it takes place, and the outcomes that result. Teaching and learning are hallmarks of human activity. We must also bring together the work of understanding teaching and learning with the need to better understand and appreciate teachers and learners for as with any other human endeavor, there must be recognition and reward for those who undertake these tasks. Even though we recognize that success is not always guaranteed, our view must encourage innovation and risk-taking. That view and its operationalization in policy and process must be an inclusive one, not seeking only to identify those few with the highest scores, but searching for the range of legitimate accomplishments that truly convey the impact of the profession.

### **The domains of the meta-profession**

Arreola and others (Arreola, 2000; Arreola, Aleamoni, & Theall, 2001; Theall, 2001) have attempted to define the domains of the meta-profession. The following description draws on this work and provides an indication of the breadth and depth of expectations for members of the profession.

The first criterion for a meta-profession is that it is built upon one or more “base” professions. For the meta-profession of college teaching the base profession is most often the field in which one receives specific training and preparation. The elements of the base profession, the teaching profession, and various other areas of responsibility are outlined below.

#### Elements of the base profession including:

- knowledge of the field and its content
- specific expertise in one or more sub-fields within the base field
- expertise in the methods of the discipline
  1. the processes and operations of the field
  2. practices of the field including applied and clinical practice
  3. the epistemology of the field
  4. methods of investigation of the field
  5. documentation techniques and publication
- networking within the discipline
- knowledge of professional organizations and activities
- participating in peer review

#### Elements of the teaching profession including:

- designing, developing, and delivering instruction
  1. knowledge of systematic instructional design process
  2. developing instructional objectives
  3. producing instructional materials
  4. choosing delivery methods
- assessing and evaluating instruction and its outcomes
  1. conducting classroom assessment
  2. testing and grading
  3. knowledge of teacher and course evaluation literature and practice
- knowledge of teaching and learning theory and practice
  1. understanding classroom, lab, clinical, distance, and other instructional settings
  2. knowledge of motivation
  3. knowledge of individual differences
  4. knowledge of the dimensions of college teaching
  5. using sources of information
- managing learners and instructional processes
  1. sequencing, pacing, organizing
  2. using group process in small and large groups
  3. adapting methods to situations

- using instructional tools, methods and technologies
  1. using new technologies
  2. using techniques such as collaborative methods
- advising, mentoring, and related roles

Other elements of the college teaching profession including:

- understanding of higher education organization and operations
- knowledge of institutional policies and related regulations
- hiring, selecting, and evaluating faculty and staff
- knowledge of local promotion and tenure policies and practices
- participating in student and faculty recruiting efforts
- using leadership skills
- managing people and finances
- developing faculty and staff
- carrying out administrative duties
- goal setting and planning
- participating in various roles in team efforts
- participating in institutional governance
- participating in interdisciplinary curriculum development
- representing the institution, department, or discipline
- providing service of several types
- participating in outreach and community efforts

This list is not all-inclusive but it clearly demonstrates that expectations for faculty far exceed the responsibilities for which individuals are trained in the base profession.

Two conclusions are obvious:

- 1) that in order to succeed in and efficiently carry out these many roles, faculty need significant resources for support, training, and development; and
- 2) that to appropriately evaluate faculty performance, a much broader and more inclusive process is necessary.

What is needed is approach that would, conceptualize the professoriate, not as a confederation of isolated, content-specific professional groups, but as meta-professionals with common goals and a unifying foundational role (teaching). Such meta-professionals would engage in practice that extends beyond the application of content expertise to the broader arena of inducing learning in others and participating and managing a self-governed, goal-oriented organization.

To operationalize such an approach, it would be necessary to:

- determine the nature, demands, and responsibilities of each assigned task;
- reach consensus about the relative weights of responsibilities
- decide how best to examine performance in each area
- adapt or create mechanisms for measuring performance
- clearly specify performance criteria
- train individuals when/where necessary
- test evaluation process and methods
- provide reliable, valid, unambiguous performance data
- document decisions and exercise quality control of the process
- regularly conduct formative evaluation of the process and revise as necessary.

**On finding a common ground for the meta-profession**

Earlier in this paper, we noted Baker's (1999) concern about the lack of collegiality in higher education. We feel this issue to be critical to any real change in the professoriate for without a common ground, faculty will continue to lead isolated professional lives and there will never be a basis for considering college teaching as a shared profession. Pescolozido and Aminzade (1999) summarize a discussion of diversity in higher education in the following way. They say that current conflicts are, "...based on intractable differences that are deeply rooted in



incompatible paradigms of moral enquiry.” and that the solution “...is to avoid inconclusive debates that threaten to produce cynicism and nihilism among students and to search for some common ground among the professoriate that can provide the basis for academic community and define the purposes of the university.” (p. 151) Consider the acrimony in discussions of faculty evaluation and the unrealistic but loudly-voiced claims about threats that such evaluation (and particularly the use of student-provided data) poses to hallowed traditions such as faculty autonomy and academic freedom. Such debates are not productive. In their stead, we propose discussions about what is common to members of the meta-profession and to suggest the nature of the dialogue, we consider a few common terms.

What, for example is “a body of persons having common purpose or common duties”? The answer, “a college” Who, for example, is “one chosen to serve with another”? The answer, “a colleague”. Faculty are chosen to serve with others in the context of colleges and they share certain common purposes and duties as teachers. In higher education we celebrate diversity. It is possible to say that in celebrating diversity we have created “multiversity”, that is, that attention to diversity has provided us with a gathering of persons with an incredibly broad array of skills, talents, knowledge, and experiences, and with the potential to accomplish literally any task. The synergy of this multiversity is exceptionally powerful but it needs focus. That focus can come from a view of the meta-profession that acknowledges the unique position of teaching as the common ground for all faculty regardless of discipline.

But what then is a “university”. The root of the word universe is essentially “the one thing” or “the whole”. Have we lost sight of “the one thing” or is it among us in the form of our one, common profession, teaching? If we are to have a true university, do we not need that one thing, that common focus as a basis for collegiality? The elevation of college teaching to the level of a meta-profession provides the opportunity to establish a focus and to capitalize on that which is common to all faculty. Using the meta-profession as an organizing theme, we can find paths to better, more equitable evaluation of individual performance and to more widespread understanding of the complex and difficult tasks and requirements that college teachers face. We can better explain to those who hold us accountable, what we do and why we do it. And we can make college teaching what it should be, a profession of honor and importance.

#### Reference notes:

- 1) per a secondary citation by Boyer, 1990, p. 11
- 2) per Boyer, 1990, Table 1, p. 12.
- 3) as cited in Shulman & Hutchings, 1999

#### References

- Angelo, T. A. & Cross, K. P. (1993) Classroom assessment techniques: a handbook for college teachers. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Arreola, R. A. (1995) *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Arreola, R. A. (2000a) *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation* 2nd ed. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Arreola, R. A. (2000b) Interview. The Department Chair, 11 (2), Fall, 4-5.
- Arreola, R. A., Aleamoni, L. W. & Theall, M. (2001) College teaching as a meta-profession: reconceptualizing the scholarship of teaching and learning. Paper presented at the Faculty Roles and Rewards Conference of the American Association for Higher Education. Tampa, FL: February 4.
- Baker, P. (1999) “Creating learning communities: the unfinished agenda.” In B. Pescolozido & R. Aminzade (Eds) The social worlds of higher education: handbook for teaching in a new century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

- Barzun, J. (1968) The American university. New York: Harper & Row
- Bess, J. L. & Associates (2000) Teaching alone, teaching together. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988) How colleges work: the cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: jossey bass.
- Boyer, E L. (1990) Scholarship reconsidered. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Braskamp, L & Ory, J. C. (1994) *Assessing Faculty Work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Braxton, J. , Helland, P. A. & Lucky, W. (2001) Faculty engagement in Boyer's four domains of scholarship: results of a national survey.
- Calhoun, C. (1999) "The changing character of college: institutional transformation in American higher education." In B. Pescolozido & R. Aminzade (Eds) The social worlds of higher education: handbook for teaching in a new century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Centra, J. A. (1979) Determining faculty effectiveness: assessing teaching, research, and service for personnel decisions and improvement. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1993) *Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, B. R. (1999) "Small worlds, different worlds: the uniqueness and troubles of American academic professions." In B. Pescolozido & R. Aminzade (Eds) The social worlds of higher education: handbook for teaching in a new century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Cross, K. P. & Steadman, M. H. (1996) Classroom research: implementing the scholarship of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Doyle, K. O. (1983) Evaluating teaching. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Feldman, K. A. (1989) The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. *Research in Higher Education*, 30, 583-645.
- Finkel, D. & Monk, S. (1999) "Dissolution of the Atlas complex." In B. Pescolozido & R. Aminzade (Eds) The social worlds of higher education: handbook for teaching in a new century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Franklin, J. & Theall, M. (2001) Faculty opinions about the scholarship of teaching. Paper presented at the 81<sup>st</sup> annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Seattle WA: April 13.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Mearoff, G. I. (1997) Scholarship assessed. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Holland, J. L. (1985) Making vocational choices. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Keller, J. M. (1983) "Motivational design of instruction." In C. M. Riegeluth (ed.) Instructional design theories and models: an overview of their current status. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lynton, E. & Elman, S. E. (1987) New priorities for the university. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987) Students evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11, 253-388.

- McKeachie, W. J. (1978) Teaching tips: strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers. 1st ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Murray, H. G. (1983) Low inference classroom teaching behaviors and student ratings of college teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 856-865.
- Palmer, P. J. (1998) The courage to teach: exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Perry, R. P. (1991) "Perceived control in the college classroom." In J. C. Smart (ed.) Higher education: handbook of theory and research (Vol 7). New York: Agathon.
- Pescolozido, B. A. & Aminzade, R. (1999) The social worlds of higher education: handbook for teaching in a new century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Seldin, P. (1993) How colleges evaluate professors 1983 vs 1993. AAHE Bulletin, 12, October, 6-8.
- Scriven, M. (1967) "Methodology of evaluation." In R. Tyler, R. Gagne, & M. Scriven (Eds.) Perspectives of curriculum evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1991) Evaluation thesaurus 4<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Sage Publications.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1994) "Duties of the teacher." Journal of personnel evaluation in education, 8 (2), July, 151-184.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986) "Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching." Educational Researcher, 15, 4-14.
- Shulman, L. S. & Hutchings, P. (1999) "The scholarship of teaching: new elaborations, new developments." Change Magazine, September-october, 11-15.
- Smart, J. C. & Feldman, K. A. (1998) "Accentuation effects of dissimilar academic departments: an application and exploration of Holland's theory." Research in Higher Education, 39 (4), 385-418.
- Theall, M. (Ed.) (1998) "Motivation from within: approaches for encouraging faculty and students to excel." New Directions for Teaching and Learning #78. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2000) Assessing the scholarship of teaching: valid decisions from valid evidence, Part II: formative assessment, recognition, and application of the scholarship of teaching.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2001) "We, the University". Presentation to faculty and administration at Southwest Missouri State University. Springfield, MO: February 7.
- Theall, M. & Centra, J. A. (2001) Assessing the scholarship of teaching: valid decisions from valid evidence. In C. Kreber (Ed.) "Scholarship revisited." New Directions for Teaching and Learning # XX. San Francisco: Jossey Bass (in press).
- Theall, M., & Franklin, J. L. (Eds.) (1990). Student ratings of instruction: Issues for improving practice (Eds.). New Directions for Teaching and Learning #43. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (Eds.) (1991) "Effective Practices for Improving Teaching." New Directions for Teaching and Learning. # 48. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.