foreword

A few months ago, I participated in a site visit with a Carnegie Foundation team to a prominent school of engineering. When we asked both students and faculty the rather straightforward question, "What is an engineer?" we generally heard some version of the following reply: "An engineer uses mathematics and sciences to design and create things—products, artifacts—that make a difference in the world and help people to live in it." Teachers and students alike emphasized the essentially practical character of engineering as a profession that employs thought in the interests of design.

Messing with the World

A number of the respondents did not stop there, however. They went on to emphasize that once you messed with the world, you became responsible for your designs, both as they were used and also when they were no longer useful. Designed products are visible, tangible, useful, intrusive, helpful, dangerous, beautiful, ugly, and potentially eternal. Therefore, they argued, engineers should be responsible not only for what they design, but also for the life cycle of their products, for their ultimate fates as well as their immediate utilities. I was deeply impressed by their sensitivity to the connections between the practical and the ethical. As soon as you mess with the world, you take on responsibility for what you've done.

This is a point that Aristotle understood well. For him, ethics was the central focus of the practical, as distinct from the theoretical. Theoretical inquiries lead to new ideas; practical reason leads to action that makes a difference in the world. Practical work necessarily entails ethical problems—trade-offs between alternate paths, judging the prudence of one's actions. And so it is with the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The Ethics of Teaching and Scholarship

What, after all, could be more quintessentially practical than that distinctly human activity, teaching? Indeed, the practical end of teaching is changing minds, and in changing minds to help learners to understand and perform, use and enjoy, interact and relate differently than they might have otherwise. To put it another way, teaching is an intentional, designed act undertaken to influence the minds of others, and to change the world in an intensely intimate, socially responsible manner.

Such work brings with it inexorable responsibilities. Having engaged students through an act of instruction, the teacher becomes at least partially responsible for its efficacy. It is unimaginable that a teacher could teach with no concern for whether students had learned, how well they had learned, or whether their learning was appropriate to the field.

And what about scholarship? To many folks, the juxtaposition of "scholarship" and "practical" seems an oxymoron, as bizarre a conjunction as "research" and "teaching." Research has, after all, been viewed as the ultimate theoretical pursuit, with objectivity, anonymity, and *dis*engagement as its hallmarks. But

the message of this volume is that research, especially when undertaken in the pursuit of teaching and learning, is eminently practical in the richest sense of the word. As such, acts of scholarship focused on one's teaching and the quality of learning for one's students are *practical* acts, with inevitable consequences for those involved. In short, it should not surprise us that both teaching and the scholarship of teaching are strategic sites for encountering an array of ethical challenges.

Making It Public … and Generalizable

A philosopher (it may have been Max Black) once observed that philosophy begins in wonder and ends in algebra. It might similarly be observed that scholarship necessarily begins in private and ends in public. Teaching, while conducted in the public forum of a classroom, is typically a clandestine act. The scholarship of teaching makes the private public and the clandestine observable. Once the work of teaching is public, new ethical dilemmas arise.

A number of years ago, Judy Shulman published an article titled "Now You See Them, Now You Don't: Anonymity Versus Visibility in Case Studies of Teachers" *(Educational Researcher,* 1990, 19(5), 11–15). The tradition of educational research was that teachers were invisible and anonymous. They were studied by others. They were not individuals; they were clusters of behaviors or cognitions or personality variables. They were the ultimate research subjects, devoid of identity or agency. And if the teachers were subordinated to "instructional treatments," then what could be said of the students? They were even further submerged, captured in average test scores, in percentages of males and females, or in categories of socioeconomic status.

Judy's work was central to a somewhat Copernican revolution in the study of teaching, especially with regard to the role of teachers. She worked with teachers to become scholars of their own practice, to document their work and to write it up in narrative and analytic cases of teaching and learning. As in medicine, these were "problem" or "dilemma" driven cases, constructed around unexpected difficulties that the teachers had encountered, coped with, analyzed, reflected upon, and were now prepared to share. As those cases moved from private stories to published case studies, a set of new challenges, including ethical ones, arose.

Like many of the best examples of the scholarship of teaching and learning, the cases written by teachers working with Judy included rich particulars about context—detailed renderings of the school, the students, the curriculum, and the situations in which the key episodes of the case take place. These details are essential for others seeking to generalize from the cases. When I read a case study (or, for that matter, the report of an experiment or a survey), I need always to ask, What is this a case of? How similar are the circumstances under which this study was conducted to the situation to which I might wish to generalize its findings? Is this work relevant to me and my circumstances? Without substantial detail, I cannot ask these all-important questions about the work's contribution to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

But the same details that allow for generalizability also make cases potentially embarrassing to both protagonist and setting, since they often examine a collision between design and chance. The cases that Judy worked to develop were personally authored, so the teachers could take responsibility for the prac-

tices they were reporting. Yet when an authored, fully rendered case is made public, the veil of anonymity and privacy that protected the "subjects" is lifted. They are no longer safe from observation, from criticism, from exposure.

Judy and the teachers with whom she worked thus confronted ethical dilemmas very like those represented in this volume. If the scholarship of teaching does not include rich contextual detail, it may lose much of its value for others who might study and learn from the work. At the same time, every detail threatens to expose other teachers, students, and programs to uninvited scrutiny. If even the name of the teacher-author is made public, the wall of confidentiality is breached. Is that ethical? Can a teacher doing research on her own practice publish cases and other forms of scholarly work analyzing that practice if the details of the work (including its authorship) subject others to unwanted visibility? And even if permission has been granted by those immediately involved, can they possibly anticipate the many ways in which the work might be studied, interpreted, used, and disseminated?

The issues of visibility and anonymity are but one facet of the growing set of questions around the ethics of a scholarship of teaching and learning. The only way to avoid confronting such ethical dilemmas in professional work would be to stop acting entirely. And that would itself be unethical.

An Example from Medical Practice

We read the same story in the news at least once a year. In one version, a passenger on a cross-country airline experiences severe heart pain and the cabin attendant asks if there is a physician on board. A physician comes forward and attempts to assist the patient, but after several interventions the patient dies. Subsequently, the family of the deceased sues the airline and the physician, the latter for malpractice. Had the physician remained in her seat and withheld her professional service, she would have been held harmless, no questions asked.

In the other version of the story, an auto accident leaves several people badly injured by the roadside. A physician drives by and decides not to stop and render medical assistance for fear that he will be held responsible for any care he delivers. He is later criticized for inaction, for an unwillingness to act professionally. Once a person or a community takes on the mantle of a profession, every act is potentially permeated with ethical questions. This is not, as Pat Hutchings argues in the Introduction, a symptom of trouble, but a sure sign of maturity.

The Pedagogical Imperative

Much of Carnegie's work is organized around the scholarship of teaching and learning. This concept of a scholarship of teaching and learning not only describes a type of research that the Foundation conducts and supports. It is also a concept of moral action, aimed at cultural change. The scholarship of teaching and learning rests, that is, on a moral claim that I will call the "pedagogical imperative." We argue that an educator can teach with integrity only if an effort is made to examine the impact of his or her work on the students. The "pedagogical imperative" includes the obligation to inquire into the consequences of one's work with students. This is an obligation that devolves on individual faculty members, on programs, on institutions, and even on disciplinary communities.

Inherent in this vision is the idea of teacher as steward of his or her field of study. As such, those of us who teach are responsible for the integrity of that field as it is understood by others. We are responsible for what is learned, how it is learned, what value it has for students, and for our own learning through practice in ways that make us more effective in fostering important forms of learning for all students. The scholarship of teaching and learning is an instrument and a disposition for fulfilling that stewardship and sustaining that quest for integrity. But, as this volume illustrates, the very act of such scholarship introduces a new layer of responsibilities, a novel universe of ethical questions. Pat Hutchings, the Carnegie Scholars, and all others who contributed to this volume as case writers and as commentators have offered their contributions to the advancement of the scholarship of teaching.

Scholars of teaching and learning are prepared to mess with the world even more boldly than their colleagues who are satisfied to teach well and leave it at that. They mess with their students' minds and hearts as they instruct, and then they mess again as they examine the quality of those practices and ask how they could have been even more effective. Scholars of teaching and learning are prepared to confront the ethical as well as the intellectual and pedagogical challenges of their work. They are not prepared to be drive-by educators. They insist on stopping at the scene to see what more they can do.

—***Lee S. Shulman***
President, The Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching
Spring 2002