



# Writing Together: A Reflective Essay on Co-Authoring in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

## ABSTRACT

Over the past several decades, the authors of this reflective essay have written together about the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) in books, articles, reports, and blog posts. Drawing on their own experience as collaborative writers, conversations with others who have written together, and analysis of co-authored works in *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* and other outlets, they explore the possibility that writing together, for all its challenges, may now be a signature feature of SoTL. This does not, of course, suggest that work by single authors does not have a powerful place in the field. What it does indicate is that there are aspects of SoTL that invite collaborative writing. This in turn raises questions about the forms such writing may take, strategies for managing the process, and ways that co-writing may strengthen not only the SoTL movement but other developments in higher education that seek to overcome pedagogical solitude.

## KEYWORDS

co-authorship, collaborative work in SoTL, culture of SoTL, collaborative writing in SoTL

## INTRODUCTION

As staff members and senior scholars at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for many years, the two of us did a good deal of writing about the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), and we did much of it together. This includes two co-authored books and a healthy dose of articles, forewords, blog postings, and the like. It's a long list.

Now retired for a decade, we look back on our collaborative writing with amazement (after all, writing together is hard), gratitude (for the resources that made it possible), and also some questions. It seems that co-authorship, with all its challenges, may now be a kind of signature feature of SoTL. As of May 2023, 70 percent of articles in *Teaching & Learning Inquiry (TLI)* were co-authored (Chick 2024). And looking at both of the next two issues (Volumes 12 and 13), just over 80 percent are co-authored. Indeed, solo-authored pieces can feel like something of a rarity. Of course, *TLI* is only one of many outlets for SoTL, but its numbers suggest at least the possibility that co-authorship is on the rise, raising questions about the impulse to write together about teaching and learning, what forms such writing takes, how that work has advanced the field, and how it connects with and perhaps supports larger developments in higher education.

We bring to these questions our own experience, of course, but as a check on our understanding, and to expand our thinking, we spoke to three long-time SoTL practitioners who have impressive track records themselves as co-authors and whose leadership in the field provides them with a broad view of our questions. A special thanks, then, to: Nancy Chick, Texas Women's University; Peter Felten, Elon University; and Gary Poole, the University of British Columbia. We are grateful to them for sharing their observations and reflections, which greatly enriched this research.<sup>1</sup>

## REASONS TO WRITE TOGETHER

Surely there have always been educators who have questions about their students' learning and who search for and sometimes create ways to explore their questions. Today, many of those individuals find themselves in good company thanks to the "big tent," as the two of us call the SoTL movement in *The Advancement of Learning* (Huber and Hutchings 2005). Many of them are now writing together about their efforts, and it's worth asking: is there something about SoTL that invites, even calls out for, co-writing? We believe the answer is yes.<sup>2</sup>

For starters, most faculty who are attracted to the idea of exploring teaching and learning are not experts in such matters. They are historians, English faculty, psychologists, and so on—experts, that is, not in pedagogy but in their disciplines. As they venture into this new territory, they may sometimes feel like what David Pace (2004) called "the amateur in the operating room." It can feel scary, presumptuous, and maybe even dangerous. Facing these challenges, one solution, as Chick told us, is to "reach for someone else" to work with, committing "to be nervous together," and treating SoTL as provisional work in a multidisciplinary space.

Additionally, there are substantive reasons for writing together. Institutional context is often central to the research being undertaken. For instance, interest in questions about student trust have caught the attention of some scholars of teaching and learning, and a recent issue of *TLI* includes two articles on that topic, each with multiple authors from different institutions and institutional types, bringing their diverse experiences to bear.<sup>3</sup> Some collaborations pair scholars from different countries, as do the International Collaborative Writing Groups (a feature of the ISSOTL annual conference), which have explored a variety of themes with attention to how they play out in different national systems of higher education.

Writing together across disciplinary lines has also been fruitful, such as when the goal is to explore how a teaching innovation plays out in different fields of study. We think of the move by a historian and a microbiologist to challenge their students through assignments drawn from each other's fields: the historian's students presented their projects through an "interactive poster session modeled on a format more typically used by scientists," while the microbiologist's students created narratives (more common in the humanities) around the "bugs" they researched for their class (Reichard and Takayama 2013, 169). Co-authors may also bring their different disciplines' methods and theories to bear on a particular learning problem. For example, a psychologist and an English literature professor have examined "annotation as preparation for discussion" in an interdisciplinary undergraduate seminar (Feito and Donahue 2008).

These stories and examples, as well as others that readers of this journal can surely point to, offer important insights and findings. But those who engage in co-authorship can, we suspect, also point to the challenges. First among these, and perhaps most foundational, may be different ideas about what, exactly, is meant by "research," and the wide range of what Huber (2002) points to as "disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning." One person may be committed to a case study approach, looking closely at the experience of a small number of students; others may lean toward a more quantitative approach, wanting to see sample sizes that allow wider conclusions. As noted above, there's power in working with scholars from other countries and institutional types. But these differences can also complicate the work, as can efforts to engage individuals in varied roles and status—a senior, recognized scholar of teaching and learning and an undergraduate student, for instance. And finally, what makes all of these issues challenging is that perspectives which may seem to be "academic," are often, in fact, deeply personal, matters not of method or style but of personal identity and values—passion projects, if you will—which can make collaboration more difficult but also, more powerful.

This does not happen by accident. The SoTL community and ISSOTL as an organization have worked hard from the beginning to create opportunities for collaboration. We think of the International Collaborative Writing Groups, for instance, as well as this journal, the conference, and committee structures, but also work in other projects, organizations, and campuses in which SoTL is valued and supported. Not by accident, the result is very much in the spirit of what Carnegie Foundation president Lee S. Shulman (1993), described in *Change* magazine as “Teaching as Community Property,” arguing that one of the most stubborn impediments to improvement is “pedagogical solitude,” the fact that teaching is something one does alone, with the classroom door metaphorically (or otherwise) closed. In this sense, Chick told us, writing together is not only a way to get different perspectives and more varied expertise into the picture. It also builds new and valued relationships, creating, as Shulman writes, “communities of conversation, communities of evaluation, communities in which we gather with others in our invisible colleges to exchange our findings, methods, and our excuses” (1993, 6). In short, co-authorship, challenging though it may be, helps put an end to pedagogical solitude, creating connections that matter and last across institutions, national boundaries, and disciplines (Chick 2024). We suspect that many members of ISSOTL were like Poole, who told us that he got involved “because of the people.”

Indeed, co-authorship is a way to bring new people into SoTL’s big tent. Sometimes that involves an experienced scholar inviting a colleague who is new to the work to write together—an occasion for mentoring, as Felten called it in our conversation. Engaging students as co-inquirers and co-authors is perhaps the best known form of this kind of mentoring. Often, we have seen it done with postdocs and graduate students but there has been special attention to engaging undergraduates as co-authors as well. This work can deepen faculty members’ ability to tap into students’ classroom experiences and—perhaps even more importantly—enrich students’ own understanding of learning and teaching. (We will say more about students later.)

#### CULTIVATING COLLABORATIVE WRITING

Collaborative writing is obviously not exclusive to SoTL. In every field, one can point to examples of co-authorship—indeed, in some fields, typically in the sciences, there are widely accepted norms for recognizing the roles that co-authors have played in the work leading up to publication and in the order in which authors are listed on the finished piece. In other fields, typically in the humanities, this is definitely not the case. In these fields, scholarship has typically been understood as an individual undertaking, and “writing together” is an uncommon experience, sometimes viewed with suspicion when it comes to receiving credit toward academic advancement.

Co-authorship in SoTL stands in between: it is widely accepted but is so far not much constrained by externally imposed norms regarding roles in the process of inquiry or author order.<sup>4</sup> This flexibility is surely an advantage in keeping the field open to people with different disciplinary backgrounds, professional styles, and institutional concerns. But it does mean that collaborations in SoTL can vary considerably and can involve a good bit of muddling through or, in some cases, advance negotiation.

Behind any instance of “writing together” is often a longer process that may include moments of collaboration around the question, idea, or issue that motivated the project: a literature review; designing and carrying out an inquiry (and all the work that can involve); analyzing findings; and planning conference presentations or an article. Some co-authors will have taught together; others will have coordinated a process of inquiry in their separate classrooms or programs or compared results of similar inquiries later on.<sup>5</sup> Our work together (and with other colleagues), involved participation on the leadership team for the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and

Learning (CASTL) for over a decade. We got to know the 158 faculty fellows whose inquiries provided the examples we described in our publications; we also designed, administered, and interpreted results from two surveys of these fellows; and we wrote and presented separately on different aspects of these scholars' works. Writing together was another "moment" in a long process of collaboration. When we began writing together, we already knew each other and our common subject matter very well.

Even so—and we believe this is the case with any set of collaborators when they put their proverbial pens to paper—we had to resolve a series of questions: Who will write what and when? How will the authors review and edit each other's writing? Will there be an attempt to speak in "one voice?" If so, how will that be accomplished?<sup>6</sup>

In our conversations with Felten, Chick, and Poole, we heard about a variety of ways in which collaborators get these tasks done. There's what Poole called the "divide and conquer" strategy for co-authoring, where writers agree on a rough outline and divvy out the parts. A variation might be that after the authors draft their designated parts, they then take over as lead on each other's drafts. Chick uses an informal typology of metaphors for variations on such collaborations, including the "relay," the "jigsaw," and (with an eye to a truly integrated set of different voices) "cooking soup."

We also heard about variations on a single-author (or single-editor) approach for managing teams of co-authors. In one project, the collaborators did a whole lot of talking and recording and then one group member took all of the notes and wrote an elaborated outline for the essay. Felten told us about a specially funded project in which the authors hired an editor who guided the collaborators in a similar process: the authors talked for a while and then wrote individually over three days, and ten days later, the editor sent them a roadmap for the book they were planning to write. Poole recalled his experience with one of ISSOTL's International Collaborative Writing Groups, mentioned above. After a couple days of talking, one of the group members who did a lot of writing professionally offered to take a stab at a first draft. She assigned "subtasks" to people who then all became commentators on that draft.

Understandably, things don't always go well. "Writing together" requires patience and what Poole referred to as a trade-off between efficiency and true collaboration. It can be hard for some authors to hand their work over to a colleague. Sometimes an author may want to write a complete draft and then balk when the other wants to change something or to contribute more substantively.

There are also practical issues. For many scholars of teaching and learning, the work must be done between teaching classes and serving on campus committees, often with few resources. Many worry about how their work will be viewed by their colleagues and how it will be valued for purposes of tenure, promotion, and annual reviews. Such concerns, along with the shifting circumstances of people's personal lives, can shape and color collaborations, including negotiations around the division of labor, deadlines, author order, and the like.

One way to avoid frustration is to come to some understanding up front. Chick suggests that co-authors have "starting conversations" about how they each approach writing and collaboration. We also heard about a colleague who makes use of a more formal written agreement laying out roles agreed to ahead of time.

Being clear about who's doing what can be especially important when students are part of the process, as indeed they often and increasingly are; after all, it is listening more carefully to students that has moved many scholars into SoTL work. In the case of postdocs and graduate students, roles may be relatively clear since they may bring expertise as members of a relevant research group in their program. The most appropriate and respectful ways to include undergraduates in the work can be less clear. Sometimes, we suspect, students are invited to be part of SoTL work as a mark of

inclusivity. But that is not enough. Accordingly, we would propose two questions to ask about the student role in SoTL work: First, what can students bring to the project that would otherwise be missing? Second, what will they take away from the experience? How will it benefit them?

As it happens, there's a growing literature about the student role in collaborative SoTL work, exploring new questions and methods they bring to the work and contributing to thinking about how the work can best be shared. Of special interest in much of this literature is a broader goal as well, focusing on how an experience with SoTL—being a co-inquirer and co-author—can help students become more intentional about their own learning. In short, students are and should be seen not just as a nice addition to the work but as integral partners and contributors.<sup>7</sup>

## OUR EXPERIENCE WRITING TOGETHER

There is not, of course, one best way to write with others. Our approach developed organically (we now realize) more than a year before we actually started work on *The Advancement of Learning*, our first sustained collaborative effort, published in 2005. It was shaped most immediately by our involvement with CASTL. Designed by Hutchings and Shulman, the latter then president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, this initiative, with programs for individual scholars, campus groups, and disciplinary societies, ran from 1997–2009, and was formative to the development of this new and, to many educators, strange notion of SoTL. Our collaboration was driven by a sense of mission at this early stage: we wanted to explain the work to a larger audience in higher education and to explore the significance of its efforts to engage “regular” faculty across the disciplines in looking closely and carefully at their pedagogical practices and student learning.

Looking back, we realize as well—in ways we did not perhaps at the time—that several important circumstances shaped our process for writing together. First, we brought to the work different but complementary professional histories and perspectives on our topic. Before joining Carnegie, Hutchings, at that time with the American Association for Higher Education, led a national project on the assessment of student learning as well as an initiative on the peer review of teaching. Huber, meanwhile, had been part of the earlier Carnegie teams that worked on *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer 1990) and *Scholarship Assessed* (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997). In these earlier roles and in the work we had done individually at Carnegie under Shulman's leadership, we had developed compatible styles of writing aimed at a general higher education audience rather than our specialized disciplinary communities—English studies for Hutchings; cultural anthropology for Huber.

Second, the circumstances of time shaped our approach to writing together. It is hard to remember at this point, 26 years hence, that SoTL was a new and puzzling notion to most educators. Drawing on CASTL's work, and on the earlier initiatives mentioned above, our job was to write on behalf of the Carnegie Foundation in ways that invited faculty to explore this new notion.<sup>8</sup> In this, we had the good fortune to be writing at a time when the field was just emerging, and the stakes were high; we had one another's experiences to draw on, and, thanks to the Foundation, we had the time and resources to focus on this exciting challenge.

These promising circumstances allowed us to collaborate in ways that felt natural and organic. We came up with a general outline, divvied up the chapters, and then each revised the other's first drafts. With those tentatively in place, we then read and revised all the chapters again (and again and again), shifting our outline, deciding what stories and examples to include where, and developing our arguments as we went along. Toward the end, we read the whole draft aloud, revising as we went. This was an important step—one that allowed us to speak with a single voice, the “ingredients”

integrated as in a good soup (to borrow Chick's metaphor). Like many who write together, we can hardly recall which ideas and which words are whose.

Indeed, most of the ideas we developed in that book—and elsewhere—emerged from, or were sharpened by, our collaboration together and with others at various moments in the long process that can lead up to a finished piece of writing. Consider the “big tent.” This image was meant to convey a view of SoTL as a “broad canopy, under which a wide range of work could thrive” as was mentioned in a private email exchange between Huber and an early CASTL scholar who wondered how SoTL was different from education research (and whether SoTL might just be a sneaky way of getting faculty members to read education research!). Huber shared this exchange with Hutchings, and Hutchings (2000) quoted it in her introduction to *Opening Lines* (9). It proved so useful that we subsequently transmuted this “broad canopy” into the more familiar image of a “big tent,” incorporating it into our talks and writing as a way of characterizing the field as open to many styles of inquiry and reflection.

The idea of the “teaching commons” that we discussed in *The Advancement of Learning* had a similar story, emerging when Huber was writing about the importance of making work in SoTL public. At that time, in the early 2000s, there was talk about “the commons” going on in economics as well as in higher education, including debates about who owns scholarship, and the word just flew out of her (proverbial) pen. But when Hutchings saw it, and we looked at it together, we realized that it was worth exploring further. Indeed, it became a cornerstone of our book: our subtitle, *Building the Teaching Commons*, pointed to our view that SoTL could have a critical role in widening the kinds of knowledge useful for college teaching and in broadening access to that knowledge.

Contexts do change, of course, especially in what has become a fast-moving area like teaching and learning in higher education. When CASTL neared its end in the winter of 2009, the two of us, together with Anthony Ciccone, then the program director, decided that the biggest questions had changed. We felt that the potential of SoTL to contribute to the teaching commons was reasonably well recognized, and that it was now time to assess how well SoTL was becoming institutionalized on US campuses. We did a survey of campus leaders in CASTL's Institutional Leadership and Affiliates Program and worked together on what soon became a new book, covering what we were learning about the work's impact on teaching and learning, professional development, the assessment of student learning, and the evaluation of teaching for purposes of academic advancement. Ciccone brought valuable campus experience in faculty development to our team, and we soon found out that the process that we had used for writing our earlier book was flexible enough to easily incorporate a third author. In just a couple of years, *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact* (Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone 2011) was born.

## THE AFTERLIFE OF WRITING TOGETHER

There is no magic formula for successful co-authoring. What we've learned from our own experience and talking to others comes down to a few basic, though not always easy, moves: It's important to take the time to talk through the substantive issues you want to write about and how they may be best addressed. And, of course, one must think about how to actually get the work of writing, editing, and revising done.

Writing together has, we believe, many benefits. For individuals, a successful collaboration can whet the appetite for more—with new partners and/or old ones. Chick, Poole, and Felten have had many writing partners over the years (including collaborations with each other). Indeed, Felten has a regular writing date with a former co-author; they enjoyed the first experience enough to plan other collaborative works together. And the same with us: we have continued to write together, as we are here!

Writing together also has benefits for SoTL as a field—or, one might even say, for the culture of the field. Of course, there’s ample space for individuals to write about their own work in SoTL, as we know from the field’s classics (for example, Bass [1998]’s “What’s the Problem?” and Calder [2006]’s “Uncoverage”). But writing together has its own special powers; it builds up a sense of community among participants and contributes to the generally collaborative and supportive culture of the field. Writing together is one of the ways in which we work together, get to know each other, negotiate our institutional, international, and disciplinary differences, push each other to higher standards, and benefit from each other’s expertise. These collaboratives, whether short- or long-lived, can—at least temporarily—form a community of practice, one of those sites for “significant conversations” that Roxa and Martensson (2009) write about that give practitioners both a sense of belonging and a sense that they and their work matter to the larger enterprise.

Finally, writing together can support a wider set of collaborative practices that are increasingly prevalent in higher education more generally, bringing people together across all kinds of boundaries—between disciplines, between institutions, between faculty and students, and between the academic and student affairs side of academe. There’s interest in finding support for faculty to teach together. Academic development centers sponsor programs to bring faculty (and often students) from different departments to work on special issues in teaching and learning. And, of course, a great many of the pedagogical innovations that scholars of teaching and learning explore foster modes of collaborative learning. We are thinking about students here—working in groups, for instance, and doing projects together. But as we hope this essay makes clear, we’re also thinking of educators, faculty, and others whose work is strengthened and supported by a culture that values collaborative practices wherever they occur: in conversation, debate, and, yes, writing together.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Nancy Chick, Peter Felten, and Gary Poole for conversations about writing together in SoTL. We also wish to thank *TLI*’s three reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions. Writing this essay has been a collaborative process, indeed.

#### AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

*Pat Hutchings (United States) provided leadership for SoTL during her time as senior scholar and vice president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. She has also worked extensively on the assessment of student learning and on campus culture.*

*Mary Taylor Huber (United States) served on the leadership team for SoTL programs as a senior scholar at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. She has written widely on changing faculty cultures in higher education.*

#### NOTES

1. Nancy Chick was director of the Endeavor Foundation Center for Faculty Development at Rollins College when we interviewed her on April 2, 2025. She has since moved to Texas Women’s University as the executive director of the institution’s Center for Faculty Success. Peter Felten is executive director of the Center for Engaged Learning, a professor of history, and assistant provost for teaching and learning at Elon University. Gary Poole is Emeritus Scholar at the Centre for Health Education Scholarship in the faculty of medicine at the University of British Columbia.

2. We recognize that there are collaborative genres other than co-authorship, such as conference panels and/or edited volumes around a common theme. In this paper, we are focusing particularly on co-authorship.
3. A quick perusal of the contents of volume 13, *TLI*'s latest issue at the time of writing, shows 13 co-authored articles. At the time the work for this article was done, three were by authors from different countries, five were by authors from different institutions, and six were by authors in different roles—faculty, administrators, and students (post-docs, graduate students, and undergraduates). Nine of the 13 articles were by authors from different disciplines (although that wasn't always crystal clear).
4. For example, *TLI*'s "author acknowledgement" guidelines specify that "All named authors have made significant contributions to this work, have approved the final version for publication, and are accountable for the accuracy and integrity of their contributions to the work." They do not, however, give guidance as to the order of authors.
5. We are focused on writing together in this essay, but as one of our *TLI* reviewers rightly observes, there is space here for a different conversation about the process of collaborating on SoTL research and inquiry.
6. There are some fascinating accounts of how this process has taken place in particular projects: Michael Lewis's account (2017) of the collaboration between psychologists Leon Tversky and Daniel Kahnemann (author of *Thinking, Fast and Slow* 2011); the reflections of the authors of *Women's Ways of Knowing* in the tenth anniversary edition of that pathbreaking book (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule 1986); and comments on the history of the sociological classic, *Habits of the Heart* (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, and Swidler 1985) by the biographer of lead author Robert Bellah (Bortolini 2021). There is not, to our knowledge, anything comparable in SoTL. Thanks to Nancy Chick for pointing us toward the preface by Belenky et al. (1986).
7. There's a growing literature on the ways students can be valuable members of collaborative SoTL projects and writing. With thanks to our reviewers for their suggestions, we have included a number of relevant examples, with full citations, in the references (Felten, Bagg, Bumbry, Hill, Hornsby, Pratt, and Weller 2013; Healey, Matthews, and Cook-Sather 2020; Werder and Otis 2010; Werder, Pope-Ruark, and Verwoord 2016).
8. As senior staff at Carnegie, we were free from some of the anxieties that SoTL scholars often face when building careers as faculty members. However, our work did have high stakes for us at Carnegie and, more importantly, within the profession more widely.

## REFERENCES

- Bass, Randy. 1998. "The Scholarship of Teaching: What's the Problem?" *Inventio: Creative Thinking about Learning and Teaching* 1 (1).
- Belenky, Mary Field, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, and Jill Mattuck Tarule. 1986. "Preface to the Tenth Anniversary Edition: Telling Tales." In *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*, Tenth Anniversary Edition, edited by Mary Field Belenky, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, and Jill Mattuck Tarule. Basic Books.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, and Ann Swidler. 1985. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. University of California Press.
- Bortolini, Matteo. 2021. *A Joyfully Serious Man: The Life of Robert Bellah*. Princeton University Press.
- Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

- Calder, Lendol. 2006. "Uncoverage: Toward a Signature Pedagogy for the History Survey." *The Journal of American History* 92 (4): 1358–70. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4485896>.
- Chick, Nancy L. 2024. "Epilogue." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 2024 (177): 103–107. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20582>.
- Feito, Jose Alfonso, and Patricia Donahue. 2008. "Minding the Gap: Annotation as Preparation for Discussion." *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education* 7 (3): 295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022208094413>.
- Felten, Peter, Julianne Bagg, Michael Bumbry, Jennifer Hill, Karen Hornsby, Maria Pratt, and Saranne Weller. 2013. "A Call for Expanding Inclusive Student Engagement in SoTL." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 1 (2): 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.2979/teachlearningqu.1.2.63>.
- Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. Jossey-Bass.
- Healey, Mick, Kelly E. Matthews, and Alison Cook-Sather. 2020. *Writing About Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Creating and Contributing to Conversations across a Range of Genres*. Elon University Center for Engaged Learning. <https://doi.org/10.36284/celelon.oa3>.
- Huber, Mary Taylor. 2002. "Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching." In *Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Exploring Common Ground*, edited by Mary Taylor Huber and Sherwyn Morreale. American Association for Higher Education and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Huber, Mary Taylor, and Pat Hutchings. 2005. *The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons*. Jossey-Bass.
- Hutchings, Pat. 2000. *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Hutchings, Pat, Mary Taylor Huber, and Anthony Ciccone. 2011. *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Reconsidered: Institutional Integration and Impact*. Jossey-Bass.
- Kahnemann, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Lewis, Michael. 2017. *The Undoing Project: A Friendship that Changed our Minds*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Pace, David. 2004. "The Amateur in the Operating Room: History and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning." *American Historical Review* 109 (4): 1171–92. <https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr/109.4.1171>.
- Reichard, David A., and Kathy Takayama. 2013. "Exploring Student Learning in Unfamiliar Territory: A Humanist and a Scientist Compare Notes." In *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning In and Across the Disciplines*, edited by Kathleen McKinney. Indiana University Press.
- Roxa, Torgny, and Katarina Martensson. 2009. "Significant Conversations and Significant Networks: Exploring the Backstage of the Teaching Arena." *Studies in Higher Education* 34 (5): 547–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802597200>.
- Shulman, Lee. S. 1993. "Teaching as Community Property: Putting an End to Pedagogical Solitude." *Change* 25 (6): 6–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1993.9938465>.
- Werder, Carmen, and Megan M. Otis, editors. 2010. *Engaging Student Voices in the Study of Teaching and Learning*. Stylus.
- Werder, Carmen, Rebecca Pope-Ruark, and Roselynn Verwoord. 2016. "Students As Co-Inquirers (Special Section Guest editors' Introduction)." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 4 (2): 5–7. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.4.2.2>.



Copyright for the content of articles published in *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* resides with the authors, and copyright for the publication layout resides with the journal. These copyright holders have agreed that this article should be available on open access under a Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>). The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited, and to cite *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* as the original place of publication. Readers are free to share these materials—as long as appropriate credit is given, a link to the license is provided, and any changes are indicated.