

Why and How to Look

I didn't start out planning to write a book about pedagogical scholarship. I began with some favorite articles—ones that had improved my practice, made me think, and deepened my devotion to teaching. I had collected them across the years from discipline-based pedagogical periodicals in fields far removed from my own. I thought that more faculty should benefit from their very relevant content. But as I began assembling this collection (most end up in this book as the exemplars cited in Chapters Four and Five), larger questions kept emerging: What makes these articles so good? What features define them, and how are they different from other work in the body of previously published pedagogical literature? Does this previously published work hold lessons relevant to current interest in the scholarship of teaching? Is this work scholarly? Why don't more faculty read more pedagogical literature? The questions kept sidetracking me until I realized a collection of noteworthy examples was much less valuable without considering these larger issues. Previously published practitioner pedagogical scholarship needed critical review and analysis. It needed to be looked at as a body of literature. As work on the project proceeded, the questions solidified into three reasons that this previously published work merits review, which are presented in this chapter.

From the start of this project, I also struggled with the question of approach—how this previously published work should be looked at. I wanted readers to look at the work with open minds, to see this review as an opportunity to examine pedagogical scholarship with fresh eyes, to ask old questions but consider new answers—in essence, to look in ways that make learning possible. But a conundrum presented itself. I was not looking at the scholarship for the first time. I had formed opinions about it. Truth be known, I am passionately committed to the need for scholarly work on teaching and firmly convinced that it can be credible scholarship and a viable literature for professional practice. Could I challenge readers to make up their own minds and at the same time fill the book with my ideas about what this scholarship is and could be?

I decided it might work as long as I kept before readers the need to approach the work with open minds and press them to look at it broadly. To help keep minds open and perspectives broad, I use questions as honest queries—because even though I may think I have answers, at this juncture those responses should only be used as starting places, points of departure from which readers should develop their own theories, test their ideas, and form conclusions for themselves. As writer and reader we commit to the same goal: a different and better future for scholarly work on teaching and learning completed by practitioners.

Before considering why and how to look at this literature in more detail, I need to establish the parameters of this review. A simple definition will get us started; Chapter Two explores matters of definition in depth. For now it is sufficient to know that this book considers previously published work on teaching and learning authored by college faculty. It is not the same as what I will refer to as educational research, the product of those fields devoted to the exploration of a range of issues for all educational levels, but a practitioner scholarship that explores postsecondary teaching and learning and is completed by faculty in disciplines other than education.

Why Look?

Why look at previously published scholarly work on teaching and learning? Three reasons justify the review and can be previewed briefly. The first is easy and straightforward: the time is right, and no one has taken a serious and comprehensive look back. The second two reasons emerge out of what scholarly work on teaching and learning most needs in order to advance as scholarship and from what college teaching most needs in order to improve.

First, practitioner work on teaching and learning must be credible scholarship. It needs to count, to be taken seriously, and to be of a caliber that merits reward and recognition. Second, college teaching desperately needs a viable literature associated with professional practice. Only doing the first, making pedagogical scholarship credible, will serve important but limited ends. However, addressing both accomplishes a larger objective. Pedagogical literature has the power to improve the practice of individuals as well as that of the profession. For teachers, it identifies ways to teach that promote more and better learning. For the profession, it helps to establish benchmarks and best practices. During this time of opportunity, we look back to see what the past might teach us about credible scholarship and viable literature. Each justification merits fuller exploration.

The Time Is Right

Interest in the scholarship of teaching, one of four kinds of scholarship identified in Boyer's (1990) work, has created a window of opportunity for pedagogical scholarship. As already noted in the Preface, attempts to define more precisely what Boyer meant by the scholarship of teaching have been multiple (see Kreber's Delphi study of definitional issues, 2001b) and are indicative of widespread interest in scholarly work on teaching and learning. These efforts have been accompanied by attempts to illustrate the scholarship of teaching via individual faculty work and programmatic initiatives. Most notably in the United States, the Carnegie Foundation has

funded the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) in conjunction with the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE). There have also been programs promoting the scholarship of teaching worldwide. For an excellent summary of them as well as extensive references, see Healey (2003). Many of these initiatives call for new forms of scholarship and new venues for dissemination.

While funded projects have pushed the envelope, at most institutions that are not part of those projects the interest is less cutting edge but still present. There is an openness, a willingness to consider how scholarly work on teaching might count for professional advancement. The extent of openness, of course, depends on the type of institution. At places with teaching missions, there has always been more openness, but encouragement and expectations for pedagogical scholarship have been missing or modest (Weaver, 1986). However, recent years have seen an increase in these venues in both research expectations for faculty and the value placed on pedagogical scholarship. At other places, most notably the research universities, there has not been openness to pedagogical scholarship; in fact, the encouragement has been to *not* complete it. Even at these universities, however, interest in the scholarship of teaching has opened doors, not widely, but enough for some of us to get a toe in.

As these initiatives challenge us to consider new forms of pedagogical scholarship, a look at already completed work balances the calls for change. There is about this previously published pedagogical work a comforting familiarity. It exists most commonly as articles in refereed journals, books, reports, and monographs—those formats for disseminating scholarship that have stood the test of time. They are known and accepted within the academic community. Yes, there is room and need for new formats and venues, but for an academic community inexperienced with and still only modestly supportive of pedagogical scholarship, this is a safe and sensible place to build further understanding and commitment. A promo-

tion and tenure committee may question the merit of scholarly work on teaching and learning, but if the work is published as an article in a refereed journal, at least the format and venue are familiar and credible.

More important, those calling for new forms of scholarly work should be made cognizant of those used in the past. Better decisions about the future are the likely result of having looked carefully at what's behind, and so far, little retrospective analysis has occurred. Without it, we cannot say if it makes sense to dig new foundations or build new work on these existing foundations. Without it, we cannot prevent the remaking of old mistakes. Despite a history of growth in an unfriendly, sometimes hostile, environment, the body of previously published work on teaching and learning does have lessons to teach us. As we consider alternative forms, formats, and functions for pedagogical scholarship, we move to a more enlightened future if the lessons of the past accompany us.

Credible Pedagogical Scholarship

More important than the timeliness and appropriateness of looking back is the second justification for this review of previously published scholarly work on teaching and learning: we need credible pedagogical scholarship. Historically, work on teaching and learning done by faculty practitioners has not been seen as robust, reward-worthy work. It is still not a preferred or assured path to professional advancement, despite recent interest. Based on the survey response of 1,424 faculty at five different types of colleges and universities and from four different disciplines, 75 percent of the sample listed no publications in the scholarship of teaching domain for the previous three years (Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2002). These levels of non-publication were consistent across institutional type and academic discipline.

Why don't more faculty do pedagogical scholarship? It may not be of interest. That is probably true for some faculty, but it seems more likely that others potentially interested do not see the work

being rewarded or recognized. They do not view it as a viable path to professional advancement.

Most of us need not look at national surveys for compelling evidence that pedagogical scholarship still counts for little. Consider the full professors at your institution and another cohort of the recently tenured. How many reached the rank of full professor because of their research productivity? How many were promoted to this level on the basis of their pedagogical scholarship? How many of the recently tenured acquired that status with a dossier containing mostly or exclusively pedagogical scholarship? Even at places where faculty are promoted on the basis of teaching excellence, how often is pedagogical scholarship regularly part of the equation?

The diminished value of pedagogical scholarship is also apparent with the academic disciplines. In Huber and Morreale's work (2002) on disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching, the chapters written about the fields of management, engineering, history, chemistry, and communication all confirm the second-tier status of work on teaching and learning. I would be surprised if there is any academic discipline where pedagogical scholarship merits the same reward and recognition given research work in the field.

Out of this longstanding lack of credibility emerges the first of two central questions explored throughout this book: What would make pedagogical scholarship credible? Obviously, gaining this respect involves more than the scholarship itself. It will take changes in the value placed on teaching within both higher education and society at large. But the question as it is explored here relates to the literature itself. What characteristics of scholarly work completed by practitioners would make it credible? What features indicate rigor and intellectual integrity? How is this kind of scholarly work alike and different from discipline-based scholarship? With a better future for pedagogical scholarship the objective, the look back is about identifying characteristics and features of previously published work and then assessing their potential as char-

acteristics and features of credible scholarship. That's the second reason that a look back is justified.

Viable Pedagogical Literature

In addition to the need for credible pedagogical scholarship, a second, equally compelling, need exists. If practice is to improve and college teaching is to develop respect as a profession, there must be a viable literature associated with it. The future of scholarly work on teaching and learning involves more than its production, as central and necessary as this consideration is. Most faculty still teach with no or very little formal training. Their further growth and development as teachers are stunted when their learning derives only or mostly from what they experience. There are important insights to be gleaned from the experience, wisdom, and research of others and a deeper, more reflective analysis of one's own. A viable pedagogical literature affords the opportunity for this larger learning.

However, to improve practice and have an impact on the profession, pedagogical literature must be seen as a valuable repository of information. It must be read; currently only a very few do so. The evidence that supports this fact is easily summoned: look at the subscription rates for a given pedagogical periodical and compare it to the number of faculty teaching in the field. The periodicals reviewed in this book have circulations that range between five hundred and ten thousand, but they belong to disciplines with thousands—in some cases tens of thousands—of faculty members. To illustrate specifically, the cross-disciplinary publication *College Teaching* has about 1,400 subscribers (Statement, 2005, p. 13); there are almost 620,000 faculty members in the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 2001–02).

Further evidence exists in the research literature as well. Quinn (1994) reports on the reading habits of a group of full professors, all recipients of teaching awards—a group the researchers expected to be “the most curious and experimental of teachers, precisely the

ones who would consult the literature as they develop pedagogical refinements and innovations” (p. 64). They found that only 35 percent of this cohort reported that they got fresh ideas about teaching from reading. Thirty percent reported that they spent no time reading about teaching. Those who did most often reported that they spent one to two hours a month on such reading. Few reported any systematic, substantive reading of pedagogical literature in their field or elsewhere.

I don't have any trouble believing these findings. In my workshop activities with faculty I regularly ask, “What are you reading about teaching?” “What have you learned recently from the literature?” The silences are frequently just as prolonged and awkward as when I query my beginning students about what they've been reading.

My experience is neither isolated nor exceptional. Writing about their field, Wankat, Felder, Smith, and Oreovicz (2002) observe, “Most engineering professors do not read the literature that demonstrates the advantages of student-centered instructional methods and continue to insist on lecturing exclusively” (p. 231). The failure to implement any number of instructional approaches known to promote more and better learning attests further to the neglect of the pedagogical literature by faculty in most fields. Huber (2002) succinctly sums up the point: “Academics are not in the habit of reading about teaching and learning: Thus, when a problem turns up, they are more likely to ask advice from an old friend or colleague than to go to the library” (p. 29).

So, pedagogical literature is only read by a few. But there is also a second sense in which pedagogical literature is not widely read. In this case, it is the matter of what faculty read when they do access the literature. They favor pedagogical material from and within their disciplines. Here the evidence exists in the pedagogical periodicals themselves, specifically the reference lists at the end of the articles. In the majority of cases, the most frequently cited sources are previously published articles from that same pedagogical

cal periodical. Writing at the conclusion of her editorship of the *Journal of Social Work Education*, Gambrell (2003) observes, “One striking feature of the many manuscripts submitted to the *Journal* during this three-year period was the confinement of literature reviews to material in social work, neglecting rich areas of related inquiry in other fields” (p. 3). Or consider the book review sections of these periodicals (almost all of these journals have one). The bulk of books reviewed are textbooks in the discipline. Rarely will you find books reviewed that distill and integrate educational research, or books that address pedagogical issues generally. An actual survey of forty-five members of the *Teaching of Psychology* editorial board asked them to list up to ten general books and articles they considered essential pedagogical reading. Despite the fact that they were also asked to list essential sources on teaching psychology, three of their top five generic recommendations were sources authored by or written for psychologists (Saville and Buskirk, 2004). The literature is not widely read, meaning few faculty read it, and few read pedagogical materials outside their disciplines.

The cost of not having a viable literature associated with instructional practice is high. Because norms do not expect systematic growth and development for college teachers, classroom practice rests unevenly on what has been well established experientially and empirically. The less-than-perfect understanding of both can be seen in how faculty think about what they do, or, more accurately, how they don’t reflect on what they do. Many teach from habit, blind to the premises and assumptions that ground the practices they routinely use. Further evidence can be found in faculty conceptions of teaching. Teaching does involve skills, instructional nuts and bolts, strategies and techniques. It is related and inextricably tied to content. But these simplistic conceptions trivialize the complexity that is inherently a part of teaching. Classrooms are dynamic venues where what happens one day never guarantees what will happen the next. In that kind of environment power lies not in having many techniques and a good grasp of content, but in the ability to

select and adapt so that techniques and content serve changing learning needs.

How faculty view the teaching-learning relationship also leads to some uninformed instructional decision making. Faculty's continuing fixation with teaching prevents them from seeing that teaching has no purpose unless it can be directly and explicitly connected to and with learning outcomes. True, most teaching does result in learning. But faculty views of learning should be much more precise than that. What students learn and how they learn are fundamentally functions of how they are taught. Instruction that is didactic, lecture-based, and content-driven produces one kind of learning. Instruction that is facilitative, interactional, and experiential produces another kind of learning. (Kember's research work most convincingly illustrates this effect, starting with his 1994 study with Gow, but their findings are being corroborated by others, such as Church, Elliot, and Gable, 2001.) Instructional practice suffers because many faculty fail to think, conceive, or view teaching and learning cognizant of the knowledge base on which it rests.

In addition to these costs to individual practice, there is the price paid by the profession. What other profession exists without a viable literature supporting its practice? In what other profession can those who practice do so for years without expanding or updating their knowledge or skills? What other profession fails to use its literature to set benchmarks, identify best (or at least preferred) practices, and exert at least some pressure on those professionals who fail to meet standards? That college teaching has no viable literature associated with its practice illustrates one of the most significant ways in which teaching and learning have been devalued.

The need for a viable literature for the profession can be framed as a second question that justifies a look back: What would make pedagogical literature viable? Are there lessons to be extracted from the previously published literature itself? Do some features make it readable? Do some characteristics motivate change and the implementation of findings? What of this literature could be used to

benchmark best practices? With a better future for pedagogical scholarship the objective, the look back is about identifying characteristics and features of previously published work and then assessing their potential as characteristics and features of a viable pedagogical literature. That's the third and final reason justifying a look back.

How to Look

As important as understanding *why* we should look at previously published pedagogical scholarship is considering *how* to look at it. How previously published scholarly work on teaching and learning is viewed will influence what is seen and ultimately what is learned. To gain the most insights, I believe it is necessary to look at the work with an open mind and to consider it broadly, across disciplines.

Looking with an Open Mind

Few will begin the review having no opinions, even though most will not have read widely in previously published pedagogical literature. The circumstances surrounding previously published work on teaching and learning are well known and have obvious quality implications. Given that the work has not counted for scholarly advancement and is not well known, widely read, or highly regarded, it's easy to conclude (as some may already have) that no or very little quality work has been completed.

But does that view rest on valid assumptions? Could other assumptions offer a more viable explanation? It may be that the work is not widely read because there are no norms expecting that faculty keep current of pedagogical developments. It may be that the work is not highly regarded because teaching itself continues to be devalued. In a proposal for broader and more precise definitions of scholarship in psychology, Halpern and others (1998) describe the effects of prejudicial thinking about teaching: "Despite public statements to the contrary, a de facto prejudice against teaching

continues to characterize higher education, a prejudice that has been labeled ‘teachism’ to symbolize its similarity to other prejudicial ‘isms’ such as sexism, ageism, and racism. Like other prejudices, it can be subtle or overt, and its effects are pervasive because it influences almost every aspect of academic life” (p. 1,294). If the work isn’t read because faculty aren’t expected to use literature to grow and develop as teachers, or if the work isn’t read because teaching continues to be devalued, those are quite different reasons from assuming previously published work isn’t read because it isn’t any good.

Quality issues as they relate to the overall caliber of previously published work cannot and should not be ignored. Given the value of proceeding into the review with an open mind, let me propose a sensible stance to take on quality—one that reckons with reality at the same time as it balances the issue of merit against the questions of what is needed to advance pedagogical scholarship and literature.

First, work of questionable quality has certainly been published. There is no dodging this fact. I do not intend to commit professional suicide by listing examples, but trust me, they are easy to find. However, documenting the number serves no real purpose. This is published work, water passed under the proverbial bridge—it cannot be unpublished. Instead, we can use it to mark the place from which we begin and from which our motivation to improve springs. Let us opt to take from it lessons that will enhance scholarly work on teaching and learning.

The second fact explains the first: given the conditions under which it has been created, flaws in this literature are not unexpected. This fact does not excuse the flaws in the literature but it does help to explain why they are there. Moreover, the presence of flaws in general is not particularly troubling. What body of work in any field is without them? Of more concern are the flaws themselves. Two questions will be relevant when we consider such flaws in Chapters Four and Five: How widespread is the flaw? Do we have a fixable flaw or an inherent defect? We will discover we have some of both.

The third fact tempers the first: the quality of previously published pedagogical scholarship varies. Its quality is not uniformly awful. It varies across many dimensions over the years, with some tangible signs of improvement appearing in recent changes and explored in Chapter Two. It varies within disciplines and across them, as it does within given issues of a journal and across the different journals in this family of publications. It varies depending on the type of scholarship. Some approaches are consistently stronger than others. In sum, a comprehensive look at previously published pedagogical scholarship reveals a continuum of quality.

Finally, the fact that counterbalances the first: some scholarly work of high quality has been published. Yes, you may at this point say, that's my opinion, but it is an opinion that will be substantiated by examples, many cited in Chapters Four and Five, as well as others throughout the book. And yes, the criteria being used to make that determination have not yet been articulated, but they will be subsequently, also in Chapters Four and Five.

Looking at previously published pedagogical scholarship with an open mind means expecting to see work that ranges across the quality continuum but not being preoccupied with the relative proportion of fine or flawed work. Troublesome characteristics and features of previously published work are identified and discussed subsequently, but the more central focus of the book is on using good examples to find our way to a kind of scholarly work on teaching and learning more likely to be valued and read, that is, credible pedagogical scholarship and viable pedagogical literature.

Looking Across Disciplines

To learn the most from this look back, one also needs to approach the work broadly, viewing it as a collective entity and considering it outside disciplinary boundaries. The goal here is not to relocate this scholarship to some generic place but to look at previously published work with fresh eyes, to see it in different ways and from different

perspectives. Consider four benefits likely to accrue when the work is approached from this broad, inclusive perspective.

The first builds on a lesson learned in faculty development work. We have discovered time and again across the years of working with faculty on implementing a wide range of instructional initiatives that they learn much from and through collaboration with faculty from disciplines other than their own. Faculty gain from colleague collaboration when the objective is individual efforts to improve teaching, so the disciplines stand to learn from and with each other when the topic is pedagogical scholarship. Huber (2002) elaborates, “There are certain questions that come more naturally to some disciplines than others, problems that call for different methods, issues that lend themselves to different explanatory strategies, and audiences that respond to different forms of address” (p. 20). Consider one very specific example: Calder, Cutler, and Kelly (2002), writing about the scholarship of teaching in history, note, “There is a great need to know about the state of practice. How do history teachers teach? Who uses textbooks, document readers, and the like, and how do they use them? What is the state of cognition among teachers themselves, what do they think history is, and what are their instructional goals for students?” (p. 60). An impressive amount of state-of-practice descriptive work has been completed in the fields of psychology, sociology, and marketing, reported respectively in *Teaching of Psychology*, *Teaching Sociology*, and the *Journal of Marketing Education*. Not only would history find models, methods, instrumentation, and approaches to data analysis, all fields would benefit from replicating these valuable inquiries.

The example should not be taken as evidence that the fields of psychology, sociology, and marketing do better pedagogical scholarship than history. Rather, this kind of descriptive research grows naturally from how psychologists, sociologists, and marketers—and others in the social sciences—study behavior. The pedagogical knowledge base is enlarged and enriched by various methodological approaches. But if pedagogical scholarship only uses the meth-

ods and approaches of the discipline, this benefit is diminished, to say nothing of liabilities incurred when those methods don't fit the nature of teaching and learning phenomena.

The second benefit of this broad view comes not from these different approaches to scholarship but from findings that are the same: power resides in well-established findings. Again, I can be specific. Over the last ten to fifteen years, virtually all of the pedagogical periodicals have published articles that report on the inclusion of group work (of various types) and the almost uniformly positive impact of those strategies on a number of different learning outcomes. In this case, the experiences and findings reported by practitioners are consistent with results well established in educational research. It is true that the quality of these practitioner analyses varies (as does some of the educational research), but even discounting a significant number of them, a convincing amount of evidence still supports the proposition that students can and do learn from and with each other. Yes, it is important to have evidence documenting that conclusion within a particular field, but the power of what is known about how groups facilitate learning in one field is strengthened by similar findings from many fields. Here's a reason that a collective literature can better serve the profession: It enables us to challenge faculty in our own and other disciplines who ignore approaches to teaching that promote learning. It enables us to establish benchmarks, to identify practices that really are best, and to begin to gain respect for the profession by addressing issues of standards.

In addition to benefiting the study of teaching and learning within a discipline, looking broadly at pedagogical scholarship can support the efforts of teaching advocates. Pedagogical scholarship has a long history of being dismissed or marginalized in virtually all our fields and at most of our institutions. Interest in the scholarship of teaching has started to change some of this situation, but those who advocate for pedagogical scholarship are still not a majority. They can advance their cause more effectively if they know how

issues are being handled in other fields and can draw examples from what's being done across disciplines. There is still a considerable amount of "aping" behavior among disciplines, just as there is between institutions. New approaches have more appeal if they are perceived to be part of the latest trend—if they are being implemented in those fields and at those institutions we respect and aspire to be like.

And finally, possibly difficult to accept at the moment, is the benefit that faculty can improve their individual practice by reading pedagogical scholarship in fields other than their own. Of course, this does not rule out disciplinary colleagues as sources of instructional information—I would happily let them remain the primary source. But it does assert that some important pedagogical knowledge transcends disciplinary boundaries. The examples come easily. Learning problems that result from poor time management and low self-confidence are not discipline-specific. They plague students everywhere. Classroom management problems do not belong to one or two fields. They perplex faculty, especially new ones, everywhere. Does this deny the validity of discipline-specific pedagogical knowledge? Not at all. Understanding differential equations does make it easier to select the instructional strategies most effective in teaching that particular math content successfully. Content knowledge is one, but not the only, kind of pedagogical knowledge.

If personal testimony is persuasive, I have been reading pedagogical scholarship from a wide range of disciplines since the early 1980s. In my own teaching, most of what I believe and do has come from and been informed by the scholarship of faculty in fields other than my own. The five pedagogical periodicals I have learned the most from (in no particular order) are the *Journal of Chemical Education*, *Engineering Education*, the *Journal of Management Education*, *Teaching Sociology*, and *Teaching Psychology*—and my field is speech communication. Am I proposing that faculty read all the pedagogical periodicals? Of course not; I'd be happy if they regularly read one! What I'm after here is the more fundamental recognition that

disciplinary pedagogical knowledge can have relevance to others. Am I claiming that all pedagogical scholarship is useful in all contexts? Of course not! There are lots of articles and examples appearing in the *Journal of Chemical Education* that I don't understand, but if I had to list the five pedagogical articles that have most influenced what I do in class, "What Do You Do When You Stop Lecturing," by Black (1993), published in the *Journal of Chemical Education*, would definitely appear on that list.

The point may not have been made convincingly yet, but it stands no chance of being established unless pedagogical scholarship is approached broadly, unless an open mind allows for the possibility that work worth reviewing has been done in other fields. The chapters to come showcase pedagogical scholarship from a wide range of disciplines. I think it is exemplary work, widely applicable and relevant. But my views are offered here in the hope they will encourage others to look and decide for themselves.

A broad look at pedagogical scholarship potentially accrues four benefits: lessons about pedagogical scholarship for the disciplines to learn from each other; the power of well-established findings to advance the profession; more effective advocacy for those working to advance the teaching-learning agenda; and the power of reading widely to improve individual practice. I think these four benefits make a strong case for looking broadly, and the need to do so is further cemented when subsequent exploration uncovers problems that result when pedagogical scholarship is viewed exclusively from the disciplinary perspective.

To sum the issues of why and how to look at previously published pedagogical scholarship: given the importance of the three reasons that justify taking a look back, I'm glad that this book ended up being more than an anthology of exemplary articles. A unique opportunity presents itself. Reward and recognition for scholarly work on teaching and learning has started to occur, but what has only begun must be cultivated and nurtured. We need to identify and explore specific features that will establish the credibility of this

practitioner scholarship. Looking back may lead to answers. Long-absent respect for college teaching as a profession can be attributed in part to the lack of a viable literature associated with its practice. During this time of opportunity we need to push the door open wider and explore what kind of literature practitioners need in order to develop their instructional skills and knowledge and what features could establish its viability as the literature of the college teaching profession. Looking back may lead to answers.

Equally as important as the reasons that justify a review of previously published scholarly work on teaching and learning is the matter of approach—how the work should be viewed. To learn all that it has to teach, the work needs to be approached with an open mind, and it needs to be looked at broadly—in new places and in new ways. With a justification and approach now in hand, we stand ready to survey the territory we are about to explore.