

The State of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Family Science

Jennifer S. Reinke
University of Wisconsin – Stout

Joel A. Muraco
University of Wisconsin – Green Bay

Trent W. Maurer
Georgia Southern University

Author Note

The authors would like to thank Brad Wuetherick and Stan Yu for their assistance in locating prior questionnaires that helped to inform the development of the measures in this investigation.

ABSTRACT. This exploratory study examines levels of support for the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) at departmental and institutional levels, the presence of SoTL within the family science field, and family science scholars' experiences with conducting SoTL research. Of the 51 family science faculty members and administrators who completed the online survey, 63% of participants indicated they had conducted SoTL research. However, departmental and institutional support varied widely. Most participants indicated uncertainty around the presence and quality of SoTL at family science-related conferences, and identified specific obstacles to conducting SoTL research. Findings underline the current state of SoTL in family science and identify new areas for future investigations. There is discussion of implications for family science faculty and administration.

Keywords: scholarship of teaching and learning, SoTL, family science

Direct correspondence to Jennifer Reinke at reinkej@uwstout.edu.

Family Science Review, Volume 21, Issue 2, 2016
© 2016 Family Science Association. All rights reserved.

The State of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Family Science

In recent decades, many scholars have written about the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) as it pertains to their classrooms, departments, institutions, and fields of study. Although research has consistently suggested SoTL can have meaningful benefits for learning environments, there is no systematic study that examines the role of SoTL across the family science field. This presents family science scholars with an opportunity to communally take steps to embrace, endorse, and support SoTL, which can enhance our discipline. To do this, however, it is important to first establish where the field of family science is in regard to SoTL. This article examines how family science scholars currently use SoTL and how family science departments and the institutions in which they are housed are recognizing and supporting SoTL.

One problematic aspect of many studies on SoTL is how scholars define SoTL, which is often too quantitative or positivist in nature (Chick, 2013). Current consensus favors a more inclusive, diverse, and application-based definition of SoTL (Chick, 2014), especially within family science, given the diverse methodological approaches (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods, etc.) that many in the field employ. Poole and Simmons (2013) define SoTL as involving post-secondary practitioners examining teaching and learning within the context of higher education. McKinney (2006) adds the elements of sharing and reviewing such work through presentations, performances, and publications. Hutchings, Huber, and Ciccone (2011) further our understanding of SoTL with their assertion that such efforts must be undertaken in pursuit of improving student learning and enhancing educational quality.

Potter and Kustra (2011) provide a SoTL definition that combines each of these elements. For the present study's purposes, SoTL is defined as

the systematic study of teaching and learning, using established or validated criteria of scholarship, to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviours, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning, and/or develop a more accurate understanding of learning, resulting in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community (Potter & Kustra, 2011, p. 2).

Although many other definitions of SoTL abound (see Maurer & Law, 2016, for a discussion), this one succinctly conveys major tenets of SoTL and reflects current approaches in SoTL research.

While the quest to improve student learning and enhance educational quality is a noble one, anecdotal evidence suggests many family science faculty members still find themselves in departments and institutions that emphasize research over teaching and mistakenly classify SoTL as teaching. Pressure to produce non-SoTL scholarly publications complicates the relationship many family science faculty members have with SoTL, given the uncertainty with which some

will receive such endeavors. Broad and inconsistent definitions of SoTL, coupled with the array of products such work generates, necessitate questions about just how and where SoTL fits for family science faculty. Such questions are especially pressing for tenure-track faculty members whose future careers rest on earning tenure. Another concern is that external reviewers for tenure decisions may be unfamiliar with what SoTL is and with how participating in SoTL contributes meaningfully to a faculty member's scholarship. Such lack of awareness could be a serious problem for SoTL-active faculty when they go up for tenure.

Engaging in SoTL may also create identity conflicts for family science scholars (McKinney, 2006; Simmons et al., 2013). Most faculty members conducted extensive research in specific family science content areas as a requirement for earning their doctoral degrees. Furthermore, the socialization process in graduate school often suggests that scholarship “generally means traditional disciplinary research on disciplinary content, not on teaching or learning” (McKinney, 2006, p. 45). Such experiences contribute greatly to the formation of one's identity as a disciplinary scholar. Being a SoTL scholar may be in addition or opposition to being a disciplinary scholar, forcing family scientists to reconcile the conflicting identities of a disciplinary scholar and a SoTL scholar (McKinney, 2006; Simmons et al., 2013). As a culture, SoTL is still in its adolescence, meaning that its identity is clear but it is still navigating what it wants to be in the future (Simmons et al., 2013). This state of development can be supportive to newcomers, but it can also make it challenging to understand cultural norms of engaging in SoTL and what specific roles and tasks constitute a SoTL scholar's identity.

Despite the overall benefits SoTL can have for learning environments, there is no systematic study of the role of SoTL across the family science field. This is surprising because many family science scholars have been and are currently employed in this work, because there are annual interdisciplinary conferences devoted to SoTL (e.g., The SoTL Commons), and because there are family science journals with strong SoTL focuses (e.g., *Family Science Review*). Considering these facts, it seems that many family science scholars are convinced of the benefits of SoTL. However, this does not mean that their departments and institutions recognize or reward such work. The purpose of the current study is to examine where and how SoTL fits into the family science field at a time of significant change in higher education.

The History of Family Science

The family science field has a somewhat complicated history that illustrates the field's continued effort to make its relevance and application transparent. While the field of family science can trace its interdisciplinary roots back to the 19th century (Smart, 2009), Groves (1946) was the first to call for a science of marriage and family that would enhance our understanding of family processes via theories, research methods, and intervention strategies that were familial. Burr and Leigh (1983) proposed naming such a discipline “famology” and asserted that, indeed, a standalone discipline had been achieved. In 1984, then president of the National Council of Family Relations (NCFR) Bert Adams appointed a task force whose sole purpose was to examine development of the family discipline (NCFR Task Force on the Development of the Family Discipline, 1988; Smart, 2009; Walters & Jewson, 1988). After open sessions at the 1984

and 1985 annual NCFR meetings wherein there was debate over the merits of various disciplinary names, the taskforce adopted the name *family science* (Walters & Jewson, 1988).

Despite NCFR's official adoption of family science as the name of the discipline dedicated to the advancement of family, many departments adopted variations of the family science label. Across 217 academic units, Hans (2014) found 103 different department names all dedicated to family science, with family science and family studies being among the most common. Hans (2014) posits that variation in discipline name is likely an artifact of the interdisciplinary roots of family science. In its earliest forms, an array of scholars including anthropologists, sociologists, home economists, psychologists, and social workers to name a few, carried out family science (Hamon & Smith, 2014). However, as a result of this deviation in nomenclature, many family science scholars have expressed concerns about the need to better articulate a professional identity (Hamon & Smith).

This lack of collective professional identity disadvantages the field of family science, especially now that public scrutiny of higher education is heightened. One possible way to strengthen our collective identity is with greater focus on SoTL as a defining characteristic of our profession. Family science scholars would not be alone in this endeavor. Other fields, notably psychology, are focusing increasingly on SoTL to enhance their disciplines. As such, it is imperative we understand how family science scholars are currently using SoTL and how departments and universities are evaluating and supporting SoTL as we strive for consensus around the utility of SoTL in family science as a possible unifying characteristic of our discipline. Adoption of SoTL as a defining characteristic would go far to advance the position of family science in higher education, given that the SoTL process's underlying evaluative nature aligns nicely with society's demand for greater accountability in college teaching.

Expectations in Higher Education

At no other time in history has there been a greater call for transparency in and realignment of the U.S. higher education system. Current reforms seek to strengthen instruction and increase college accountability in the face of "rising tuitions and troubling evidence that many students are earning course credits without acquiring much knowledge" (Silva, White, & Toch, 2015, p. 12). Increased college accountability often takes the form of assessment. Gordon (2010) and McKinney (2006) posit that SoTL and assessment, while historically seen as incongruent, actually share many parallels. Gordon (2010) argues that the major barrier prohibiting individuals from seeing the parallels of the two resides in differences in motivation. Specifically, Gordon (2010) postulates that historically, SoTL has been conducted for intrinsic purposes (i.e., desire to improve as a teacher) whereas extrinsic purposes (i.e., measuring standards) drive assessment.

The parallels start to become clear when one begins examining what each entails. Both SoTL and assessment may be done in a variety of methods, may be discipline-based, and may be conducted on the classroom-, course-, or program-levels. Furthermore, the value and rewards associated with SoTL and assessment vary by context, though both tend to be given less

recognition than is warranted (McKinney, 2006). Considering these similarities, SoTL-active faculty have the experience and expertise investigating and measuring student learning required for assessment, and often even have valuable data that could be used for assessment (Bernstein, 2013). As such, standardization and evaluation of our higher education system often emphasizes evidence-based self-assessments and reflective analyses, which are inherent to principal tenets of SoTL (Gordon, 2010).

However, drawing such parallels becomes more complicated because many departments and universities devalue SoTL while conversely requiring increased scrutiny of departmental processes and curricula to ensure students are achieving at or above expected levels. Indeed, whereas the traditional college or university requires faculty members to be proficient in teaching, research, and service, good teaching is increasingly expected but not privileged (Walker, Baepler, & Cohen, 2008). Many have also documented that SoTL is seen as merely acceptable scholarship and not acknowledged as equal to discipline-specific research (McKinney, 2006; Walker et al., 2008).

Problematic in the worth of SoTL is uncertainty concerning where the products of such work should be counted. For example, Secret, Leisey, Lanning, Polich, and Schaub (2011) found that most faculty members they surveyed at their institutions considered the same SoTL examples as being relevant to both the research and teaching sections of a promotion and tenure dossier. Maurer and Law (2016) suggest that confusion over the distinction between scholarly teaching and SoTL may contribute to this problem (cf. McKinney, 2003; Richlin, 2001; Shulman, 2000). Such ambiguity speaks to the need for each field to articulate specifically where SoTL resides, thereby assigning value and worth to such work.

Now seems like the ideal time for universities and disciplines to begin these conversations as faculty increasingly attempt to do more (e.g., teach, research, and innovate more) with less under increasing pressure to evaluate each step of the way. As such, SoTL research would best serve faculty if it were recognized as research and valued equally with traditional disciplinary research. Such recognition would thereby ensure that faculty members are able to conduct SoTL research without concern for how SoTL would be received. Recognizing SoTL as research is necessary to ensure that family science scholars devote the time, attention, effort, and resources needed to conduct SoTL research on par with disciplinary research and that such research answers important questions in teaching and learning in family science.

SoTL in Other Fields

Social sciences appear much more inconsistent in their use of and support for SoTL compared to many professional and natural science programs (Witman & Richlin, 2007). Witman and Richlin posit that the reason for the consistency within professional and natural science programs resides in their “teaching of” emphasis as illustrated in their requirement of continuing education. Although some inconsistencies were noted in those fields, greater inconsistency was noted within the social sciences.

For example, psychology offers a nice point of comparison since it shares many similarities to the family science field. Gurung, Ansborg, Alexander, Lawrence, and Johnson (2008) examined the state of SoTL in psychology to ascertain the degree to which psychology departments and institutions enacted SoTL. The current study is modeled after this work by Gurung and colleagues (2008). Much to their surprise, Gurung et al. found that many respondents failed to endorse prevailing sentiments of support at the department or institutional level for systematic, literature-based inquiry into processes and outcomes involved in teaching and learning. However, despite the lack of support, Gurung et al. point to other, comparative studies to highlight that while current levels of departmental and institutional support for SoTL may not be ideal, awareness of SoTL among psychologists and psychology departments is better than it is in many other academic disciplines.

Furthermore, family science is not alone as a field without a systematic review of how SoTL fits within the overall discipline. For example, the professional associations in political science and sociology have begun to promote SoTL in their respective fields. Such promotion includes creation of and/or focusing on SoTL via publications and at annual conferences (Witman & Richlin, 2007). Similar promotion has been established in family science with varying degrees of success. SoTL bastions in family science include the Family Science Association's Teaching Family Science Conference, *Family Science Review*, and individual scholars and departments across the field of family science. However, as is the case with political science and sociology, it is not known how the family science field as a whole views or values SoTL work. This is especially problematic because the family science field, like many other fields currently, changes to meet shifting demands of administrators and communities. A clear sense of the position of SoTL in family science is needed. The current study offers the first in-depth investigation of these issues.

The Current Study

Now appears to be the time for family science scholars to collectively take the step to embrace, endorse, and support SoTL as it can serve to enhance our discipline. However, to do this, it is important to first ascertain where the field of family science is in regard to SoTL. The purpose of this study is to examine how family science scholars are currently using SoTL and how family science departments and the institutions in which they are housed are recognizing SoTL. Exploratory in nature, this study is the first systematic investigation of the state of SoTL in family science. We examine the degree of support for SoTL at departmental and institutional levels, the presence of SoTL within the family science field, and family science scholars' experiences with conducting SoTL research.

Methods

Recruitment

We recruited participants from the NCFR section email listservs and the Family Science Association membership email listserv. NCFR has ten sections, organized around specific interests and goals. NCFR requires individuals to be members of the specific section listserv they desire to email. Collectively, the authors were members of nine of the ten sections, meaning that we were unable to recruit from one of the email listservs. However, many NCFR members belong to more than one listserv, so we are confident that most NCFR members received recruitment emails inviting them to participate.

In the recruitment email, we defined SoTL using Potter and Kustra's (2011) definition, and explained the purpose of the study was "to determine how activities that promote SoTL in Family Science are valued across higher education institutions." We invited faculty members and administrators in family science in higher education to complete the online Qualtrics survey via an anonymous link; we sent reminder emails one week after the initial request. Many people in the target audience are members of multiple NCFR section listservs and may belong to the Family Science Association, making it difficult to determine how many unique potential participants received the survey and to subsequently assess the response rate accurately.

Participants

In total, 51 family science faculty members and administrators completed the survey (78% female, 22% male). All participants identified either as White (96%) or as Black or African American (4%), and all participants who identified their ethnicity identified as being Non-Hispanic or Latino/Latina (four participants chose not to respond). The participants' ages ranged from 28 to 65 years ($M_{age} = 46.67$).

Teaching experience among the sample ranged from 2 to 33 years, with a mean of 16.92 years of experience ($SD = 9.86$). The teaching ranks among the sample were widespread including Affiliate/Adjunct Professor (6%), Assistant Professor (25%), Associate Professor (35%), and Full Professor (24%). Five participants indicated they did not fit into these traditional categories, and identified as a Sessional Instruction, Associate Dean & Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor, Senior Instructor, or reported there was no ranking at his or her institution. About two-thirds (61%) of participants indicated they had no administrative roles at their institution, while about a third (29%) indicated they did have administrative roles such as Director, Department Chair, or Associate Dean. On average, participants reported being expected to teach 0% - 100% of their time ($M_{\%} = 47.94$, $SD = 21.21$), engage in scholarship 0% - 90% of their time ($M_{\%} = 29.63$, $SD = 20.14$), participate in service 0% - 33% of their time ($M_{\%} = 11.98$, $SD = 8.05$), and serve in an administrative role 0% - 100% of their time ($M_{\%} = 11.63$, $SD = 20.29$). See Table 1 for participant demographic characteristics.

Survey

Our measures were adapted from those used in three similar previous studies: Gurung et al. (2008), Wuetherick & Yu (2016), and Wuetherick, Yu, & Greer (2016). All three studies used modified versions of the original Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning survey that Cox, Huber, & Hutchings (2005, as cited by Huber & Hutchings, 2005) developed. For this study we adopted some questions verbatim and re-ordered, re-phrased, or otherwise revised other questions to represent a comprehensive attempt to assess the state of SoTL in family science.

We organized the survey in four broad dimensions: (a) level of support for SoTL at the departmental level, (b) level of support for SoTL at the institutional level, (c) presence of SoTL within the discipline of family science, and (d) participants' experiences with conducting SoTL research. We also included eleven demographic questions and an open-ended question asking participants to share additional insights or comments they had about SoTL or its evaluation in family science.

In the survey's first section we provided Potter and Kustra's (2011) SoTL definition and included four broad questions that assessed the extent to which participants received support for SoTL at the departmental level. The first question included four statements such as "My department chair has actively encouraged involvement in SoTL." Participants indicated agreement or disagreement with each statement on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The second question included five sub-questions that asked participants to consider SoTL's role in personnel decisions within their department. For example, we asked participants, "What role did the candidate's level of activity in SoTL play in your department's most recent hiring decision?" Response options included *no evidence of activity in SoTL submitted*, *unsure of role played*, *weakened the case*, *had no impact on case*, *strengthened the case*, and *not applicable*. The third question assessed whether and how SoTL is explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in the participant's departmental evaluation guidelines. The final question in the first section asked participants to estimate the percentage of their departmental colleagues actively involved in SoTL.

We organized the second section in a similar manner as the first, including three broad questions about level of institutional support for SoTL. The first question included five statements, such as "There are adequate campus-level funding opportunities for SoTL projects at my institution." Participants indicated agreement or disagreement with each statement on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The second question assessed if and how SoTL is explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in the participant's institutional evaluation guidelines. The final question in the second section asked participants to estimate the percentage of their institutional colleagues actively involved in SoTL. Immediately following institution-specific questions was a final question about departmental- and institutional-level support for SoTL (e.g., "Some of my colleagues find my work in SoTL problematic"). We asked participants to consider their department and their institution and to

indicate agreement or disagreement with ten statements on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*.

In the survey's third section, we included two questions evaluating the broader presence of SoTL within the discipline of family science. We asked participants to judge how the number and quality of sessions about SoTL at family science-related conferences has changed over the past five years. Response options for each question included *not changed over the past five years*, *increased in number over the past five years*, *decreased in number of the past five years*, and *not sure about changes*.

In the fourth section, we again provided Potter and Kustra's (2011) SoTL definition and asked participants if they had conducted SoTL research fitting that definition. If participants selected *yes*, then they continued with questions related to their SoTL research. If participants selected *no*, they were automatically taken to the demographic questions. Six questions in the fourth section assessed participants' experiences conducting SoTL research, including for how many years they have been engaged in SoTL research, how participants have disseminated their research, how often they collaborate on SoTL research and with whom, and what percentage of their scholarly work is SoTL research. We also included an open-ended question on what obstacles at the department and institutional level exist for faculty who want to engage in SoTL research. See the Appendix for SoTL in Family Science survey questions.

Results

Departmental Support for SoTL

Results indicate support for SoTL in family science departments varies greatly, as Table 2, Table 3, and Table 5 show. Over half of our sample (64%) reported they agreed or strongly agreed that their department chair has actively encouraged participation in SoTL, and that their department views applicants' interests in SoTL positively when hiring new faculty (62%). The role of SoTL in departmental personnel decisions was a bit unclear, however, as many participants either indicated they were unsure of the role SoTL played in their department's most recent hiring decision (29%), tenure decision (33%), or promotion decision (35%), or, in about 10% of cases in all personnel decisions, the candidate did not submit evidence of SoTL activity. Of the participants who reported the candidate did submit evidence of SoTL activity and were aware of how it impacted the department's decision, most participants reported candidates' work in SoTL strengthened their overall cases (see Table 3).

Although more than one-third of participants (38%) indicated SoTL was not explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in their department's evaluation guidelines, 29% reported SoTL is considered only as a teaching activity, while 3% reported SoTL is viewed as only a research activity, and 22% reported SoTL counts toward teaching and research activity requirements. Several participants (7%) indicated "other"; one such participant also stated, "both 'count' as rewarded activities, but we all know that research is by far given heavier weight".

When asked to estimate the percentage of their departmental colleagues actively involved in SoTL, participants' responses ranged from 0% to 100%, with a mean of 30% ($SD = 25.83$). Findings also suggest explanations as to why only about one-third of participants' departmental colleagues are involved in SoTL. More than one-half (58%) of participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that departmental norms encourage participation in SoTL, with 55% of participants agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement that some department colleagues find their work in SoTL problematic. Perhaps this lack of department support for SoTL can be explained, in part, by participants' perceptions that their departments have not carefully considered SoTL's role in recent years, as only about one-third of participants (36%) reported agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement that within the past five years, their department has reexamined its approach to rewarding SoTL (see Table 4).

Institutional Support for SoTL

Echoing findings at the department level, results indicate support for SoTL at the institutional level is greatly varied, as Table 4 and Table 5 show. Similar to how SoTL is perceived at the departmental level, findings suggest SoTL is perhaps overlooked or excluded as a rewarded activity at the institutional level. Almost half of the participants (48%) indicated SoTL is not explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in their institution's evaluation guidelines, whereas 22% reported SoTL is considered as only a teaching activity, 4% reported SoTL is viewed as only a research activity, and 20% reported SoTL counts toward teaching and research activity requirements. Several participants (6%) indicated "other," and provided comments similar to the same question related to departmental support.

When asked to estimate the percentage of their institutional colleagues who are actively involved in SoTL, participants responses ranged from 0% to 100%, with a mean of 29% ($SD = 20.64$). Many participants (62%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that top-level academic leaders at their institution have taken significant steps to support SoTL, even though equal numbers of participants (43%) agreed and disagreed that SoTL is integrated into other institutional priorities and initiatives. Over half of the participants (54%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that their institutions have adequate campus-level funding opportunities for SoTL projects, and that support for SoTL at their institution is widespread (55%). See Table 4.

Presence of SoTL within the Discipline of Family Science

Participants' responses related to the presence of SoTL within the family science discipline also paints a fuzzy picture. When asked about how the number of sessions about SoTL at NCFR and other family science-related conferences has or has not changed within the past five years, almost three-quarters of participants (71%) indicated being unsure about the changes in numbers, with another 15% reporting that the presence of SoTL in family science had not changed. Far fewer participants (12%) reported perceiving an increased presence of SoTL in family science, while one participant (2%) identified a decreased presence of SoTL in family science over the past five years.

Consistent with perceptions of the number of sessions about SoTL at family science-related conferences, participants' perceptions of the quality of SoTL-related sessions at such conferences was also inconclusive. Most participants (72%) indicated being unsure about the changes in quality of SoTL sessions, with another 14% reporting that the quality of SoTL sessions had not changed. Similar to results on the presence of SoTL in family science, far fewer participants (12%) reported perceiving an increased quality of SoTL sessions, while one participant (2%) identified decreased quality of SoTL sessions at family science-related conferences over the past five years.

Participants' Experiences with Conducting SoTL Research

Using Potter and Kustra's (2011) SoTL definition, we asked participants if they had conducted SoTL research. About two-thirds of participants (63%) reported yes, while the remaining 37% reported no. Of the participants who had conducted SoTL research, they reported having done so for 2 to 25 years, with a mean of 9.07 years ($SD = 6.66$). Rank seemed to play an important role in participants' experiences with SoTL; most Associate Professors (83%) and Full Professors (58%) reported they had conducted SoTL research, compared to just over one-third (38%) of Assistant Professors. Furthermore, 70% of participants who indicated they had administrative roles reported having conducted SoTL research.

Most participants (97%) disseminated their research by discussing it with colleagues in their department, discipline, or institution, while 67% presented their work at a teaching and learning conference and 60% presented their work at a family science conference. Other fairly common methods of dissemination included publishing findings in a refereed teaching and learning publication (57%), or publishing findings in a refereed family science publication (40%). Notably fewer participants reported dissemination via posting content to a blog, website, or social media account(s) [e.g., Twitter] (20%); publishing in a non-refereed teaching and learning publication (17%); publishing in a non-refereed family science publication (17%); or writing a peer-reviewed book or publishing in a peer-reviewed edited volume (10%).

Of participants who indicated they had conducted SoTL research, a plurality indicated they rarely (34%) collaborated with colleagues, while equal percentages (16%) reported they collaborated either less than half the time or about half the time. Some participants (19%) reported that they did regularly collaborate on SoTL research, but far fewer participants reported collaborating more than half of the time (9%) or always (6%). Participants tended to collaborate with faculty from their own departments (39%) over faculty from other disciplines at their institution (26%), while 20% of participants reported working on SoTL research with colleagues from their discipline at other institutions. Only a small handful of participants (4%) reported collaborating with faculty from other disciplines at other institutions.

When asked to estimate the percentage of their scholarly work in SoTL research, participants' responses ranged from 2% to 85% with a mean of 33% ($SD = 25.41\%$). Though many participants reported engaging in SoTL as scholarly activity, participants also noted a

Regarding time, many participants who listed this as an obstacle simply stated “time.” One participant expanded a bit more and stated, “Given the time demands for my basic and applied research program I find time better spent on that program so I can mentor doctoral students in ways I think will help them be most marketable. That can be done with SoTL but I find it hard to do both.” Moreover, several participants described inadequate training as being problematic to conducting SoTL research, with statements like, “(not) knowing how,” and “Most of us weren't trained in it, so we're outside our expertise.”

In addition to funding, time, and training, one of the major barriers to conducting SoTL research lies in the perception of what SoTL is and its inherent value (McKinney, 2006). One participant captured the difficulty of this obstacle, stating, “There is no value for SoTL in my department. ... Faculty merit as teachers or as researcher of teaching and learning doesn't exist.” Another participant echoed this sentiment, saying, “(SoTL) is not seen as adequate or valuable research. It is often overlooked or considered not valuable.”

Discussion

Given recent increased attention to SoTL in related disciplines (e.g., Gurung et al., 2008; Witman & Richland, 2007), the aim of this research was to determine the extent to which the family science field has embraced SoTL. In this exploratory study, we examined the state of SoTL in family science on four dimensions:

1. Level of support for SoTL at the department level
2. Level of support for SoTL at the institutional level
3. SoTL presence within the discipline of family science
4. Family science scholars' experiences with conducting SoTL research

Departmental and Institutional Support for SoTL

Similar to previous research (Gurung et al., 2008), most participants in our study indicated that their department supports SoTL research and encourages involvement in SoTL. Less than half of the participants reported that a person's level of involvement in SoTL strengthened personnel decisions, such as hiring, promotion, and merit pay. These findings suggest that SoTL is not routinely valued and faculty members are not commonly rewarded for SoTL activities. However, the results propose a more complicated conclusion, considering about a third (36%) of participants reported a person's level of involvement in SoTL strengthened the most recent tenure decision, but nearly two thirds (67%) indicated that faculty members in their department have earned tenure based on SoTL, in part. This presents a confusing and contradictory message – how is faculty members' involvement in SoTL supported and valued if they are not rewarded with a job offer, tenure, promotion, or merit pay? Behavioral economists note that people respond to incentives (Levitt & Dubner, 2005) and that offering support or encouragement for SoTL without attached incentives is unlikely to change behavior. Faculty have limited time to devote to all the different aspects of their jobs; A verbal “we support and encourage you to do this,” is not likely to be sufficient incentive for family science scholars to

take significant time, energy, and other resources from their teaching and/or disciplinary research and invest it in SoTL research.

Furthermore, despite this documented departmental encouragement to engage in SoTL, most participants indicated that in the past five years their departments had not reexamined their approach to rewarding SoTL or broadened their criteria for assessing teaching performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL. Nor had these departments reexamined their approaches for assessing research performance to reflect SoTL principles more fully. These results must be framed with consideration to our sample, however, as 75% of our sample indicated they were from doctoral institutions. This number is three times that obtained in previous research (Gurung et al., 2008), which may be explained by the majority of family science programs existing at comprehensive or doctoral institutions rather than at community colleges or small liberal arts institutions, as psychology programs commonly are. Since so many family science scholars are employed at institutions where disciplinary research is a clearly stated priority and the rewards system is structured to value that research, changing tenure and promotion evaluation measures and decisions cannot take place solely in the family science field. A shift such as this requires change at the institutional level in terms of what is valued and rewarded. However, it is also possible that change at the institutional level may be easier than change at the disciplinary level. An institution with a particularly SoTL-focused or SoTL-friendly upper administration could shift institutional priorities in an attempt to become “the institution” known for SoTL and focused on student learning (Gunn, Kurtz, Lauridsen, Maurer, & Steele, 2010). SoTL active family science faculty at such institutions would be ideally positioned to assist with that transition.

Presence of SoTL within the Discipline of Family Science

The majority of participants’ responses suggested they had limited awareness of the presence of SoTL in family science. Most of our sample indicated they were not sure about the number or quality of SoTL presentations at NCFR and other family science-related conferences over the past five years. Given the very small number of SoTL-related presentations at NCFR in the past decade (DiGregorio, Maurer, & Pattanaik, 2016), this suggests that most of our respondents have not attended these sessions and are likely not “keeping up” with family science SoTL presentations. Moreover, more participants in our sample disseminated their SoTL work at teaching and learning conferences than at family science conferences, and more participants published in refereed teaching and learning publications than in refereed family science publications. This could suggest to SoTL-active family scientists that traditional family science scholarly outlets have little room for SoTL.

This also means that these important exemplars of what SoTL in family science looks like are not being shared with fellow family scientists, but instead with the broader interdisciplinary SoTL community. Although this is beneficial to the larger community and brings excellent visibility to family science within that community, it separates findings of family science SoTL research from the very people who could most benefit from it: other family science teachers and their students. This is not just a problem for SoTL-active family scientists

looking for outlets for their scholarship; it is a crisis for the field of family science that our best research on teaching and learning *in family science* does not appear welcomed in our own scholarly outlets. Although SoTL research may occasionally appear in the pages of journals like *Family Relations*, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, and, more often, in *Family Science Review*, none of these publication outlets exclusively publishes family science SoTL research. Perhaps this suggests a long-term goal: to bolster development of SoTL family science scholars so much that there will be a demand for a SoTL in family science-specific publication outlet (as we have seen in other, related disciplines, such as psychology's *SoTL in Psychology*). In the meantime, however, we need a better mechanism for existing family science SoTL scholars to publish in family science outlets, where other current family science teachers and SoTL scholars would be more likely to read their work. We call upon NCFR to investigate this issue and specifically designate "welcome" areas to SoTL at both the annual conference and in their journals.

However, we also recognize notable attempts to elevate SoTL's presence in family science, such as "The SoTL and Family Science: Creating disciplinary specific SoTL projects" symposium at the 2015 Teaching Family Science conference (Trask, Berke, Gentry, Hamon, & Smith, 2015) and "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) in Family Science Academic Careers" symposium at the 2015 NCFR conference (Trask, Hamon, Berke, Gentry, & Smith, 2015). The Family Science Association is continuing to lead the way in bringing awareness of and stirring energy around SoTL in family science by publishing this special issue of *Family Science Review*, and by identifying "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Family Science" as the theme for the 2017 Teaching Family Science conference.

Participants' Experiences with Conducting SoTL Research

About two thirds (63%) of our sample indicated they had conducted SoTL research, a number which is promising because it suggests we, as a field, have begun taking steps to embrace SoTL. However, if we know that the majority of family science scholars interested in SoTL have been engaged in SoTL research and that empirically examining teaching and learning is highly valuable (Hutchings et al., 2011), why are so few family science scholars presenting and publishing in family science-specific outlets? Consistent with previous research (McKinney, 2006; Walker et al., 2008), our findings suggest that one of the largest barriers to conducting SoTL is perception of what SoTL is, its legitimacy, and its inherent value. When tenure and promotion decisions are based so heavily on disciplinary research, teaching, and service, enhancing SoTL research's inherent value requires a change in institutional culture. Such a change, however, may rely on a dramatic shift in our disciplinary culture.

Historically, tenure and promotion decisions have been based, at least in part, on the impact of one's scholarship. Thus, the field of family science is in a prime position to uplift SoTL work through greater dissemination in widely recognized and reputable journals with high impact factors. If a family science scholar wished to publish SoTL research in an NCFR journal, for example, which journal would house their work? Clarifying SoTL's place in peer-reviewed journals in family science and promoting inclusion of SoTL research may serve to reinforce SoTL's legitimacy and its value to the field.

Along with not publishing in family science outlets, SoTL research appears to be a somewhat solitary endeavor, which is unusual for the field. The majority of our sample indicated that they collaborated on SoTL research occasionally, and that when such collaborations occurred, they were within the discipline. Since only a minority of collaborations were interdisciplinary, it is likely that most family science SoTL work focuses on family science questions. Furthermore, participants indicated that only about one-third of their departmental colleagues were engaged in SoTL. It may be unknown to family science SoTL scholars—especially those new to SoTL—who is doing SoTL in their departments, or even who understands and appreciates SoTL. Generally, identifying leaders of specific disciplinary content areas, such as a particular area of research or theory, is fairly easy. For the most part, one can simply peruse family-focused publications considered to be classics or browse through current articles in family journals, such as *Family Relations*, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, or *Journal of Family Theory and Review*. Identifying colleagues, either in our own departments and institutions or across departments and institutions who are engaged in SoTL or interested in collaboration, is considerably more difficult. This difficulty is only compounded by the fact that many SoTL-active family scientists disseminate their work outside family science outlets, as noted above.

Limitations

There are, of course, limitations to this study. Since this study used an online questionnaire and all data were self-reported, respondents may not have been truthful or they may have interpreted a question differently than we intended. Further, participants self-selected into the study. Although we targeted our recruitment at all faculty members in family science departments in higher education, it is possible that our results do not capture a group of faculty who may have opted out of participating for various reasons. Therefore, our results may be polarized and may only reflect responses from those participants who are unusually aware of or engaged with SoTL.

Fifty-one family science scholars participated in our study. Though this number may be small when compared to studies conducted in related disciplines (e.g., Gurung et al. [2008] examined the state of SoTL in psychology and had 142 participants), family science is a much smaller field than psychology. The relatively small sample size is not necessarily surprising, given our findings on limited institutional recognition and rewards and limited family science dissemination outlets. It is worth highlighting, however, that the sample included a notably high percentage of respondents who were senior faculty and/or administrators, which is a strength as well as a potential limitation of this work. It is a strength because senior faculty are most likely to be familiar with their institutions, departments, and colleagues as well as keenly aware of what is valued for hiring, tenure, promotion, and merit. It is a potential limitation because such faculty members are often afforded more flexibility to pursue new or developing research areas (since SoTL is an area of research one often discovers after earning a doctorate) with less concern for potential institutional ambiguities compared to their pre-tenure peers.

Implications and Future Directions

Interestingly, there was a very high proportion of Full Professors in our sample (24%). This is meaningful not just because the majority of the sample were senior faculty, but because Full Professors make up a relatively small percentage of faculty in any field. Compared to Assistant and Associate Professors, Full Professors have substantially more power to “change the system” and institutional culture (e.g., to better recognize, reward, and value SoTL). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2015), of the 1.5 million U.S. college faculty, only 181,530 (12.1%) were Full Professors in 2013. The ratio of Full Professors in family science is likely comparable. If so, and if our sample is indicative of the general population of family science scholars, there may be a critical mass of senior faculty necessary to begin to make changes to integrate SoTL meaningfully into family science.

Additionally, nearly a third of our participants indicated they had administrative roles, such as a Director, Department Chair, or Associate Dean. Although institutional-level change related to recognizing and rewarding SoTL may be difficult to effect, family science scholars in administrative positions may be able to review their departments’ evaluation measures and incentivize SoTL activities in meaningful ways. Encouragingly, 70% of participants who indicated they had administrative roles also reported engaging in SoTL research. Leadership in administration at the institutional level may be more likely to carefully examine university-level tenure, promotion, and merit pay criteria if they observe successful models of recognizing and rewarding SoTL at the departmental or college levels. Future research might examine what family science administrators have done to promote or reward SoTL activities at the department, college, or university level. Focus groups might shed additional light on which efforts to enhance recognition of SoTL research have been successful and which efforts have been slow-moving or were met with skepticism.

In addition to better understanding efforts of family science scholars in administrative roles, follow-up studies that explore barriers to SoTL in family science could be helpful. Our findings suggest that family science faculty members are more likely to disseminate their SoTL research in teaching and learning outlets than in family science outlets. Why? There may be meaningful implications here for how family science can more fully support SoTL. Similarly, for those participants who indicated there was some change/reward structure at their institutions—what does it look like? Might we be able to glean a “best practices” list from a research project like that to help other departments promote SoTL? How would such a list align with SoTL research in other disciplines/interdisciplinary work on how to promote SoTL?

Conclusion

What we have offered in this exploratory study is a start to understanding how the relationship between SoTL and family science can be a successful marriage. Perhaps our most important contribution to the field is underlining the current the state of SoTL in family science and identifying new areas for future investigations.

References

- Bernstein, D. (2013). How SoTL-active faculty members can be cosmopolitan assets to an institution. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1(1), 35-40. doi: 10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.35
- Burr, W. R., & Leigh, G. K. (1983). Famology: A new discipline. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 45, 467-480.
- Chick, N. L. (2013). Difference, power, and privilege in the scholarship of teaching and learning: The value of humanities SoTL. In K. McKinney (Ed.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in and across the disciplines* (pp. 15-33). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Chick, N. L. (2014). "Methodologically sound" under the "Big Tent": An ongoing conversation. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), Article 1. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol8/iss2/1>
- DiGregorio, N., Maurer, T. W., & Pattanaik, S. (2016). Documentation of scholarship of teaching and learning trends at National Council on Family Relations annual conferences, 2006-2015. *Family Science Review*, 21(1).
- Gordon, G. (2010). SoTL and the quality agenda. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 4(2), Article 3. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol4/iss2/3>
- Groves, E. R. (1946). Professional training for family life educators. *Marriage and Family Living*, 8, 25-26.
- Gunn, C., Kurtz, G., Lauridsen, K., Maurer, T.W., & Steele, G. (2010). Evolution and engagement in SoTL: Today, tomorrow, and internationally. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 4. Retrieved from <http://w3.georgiasouthern.edu/ijstl/v4n2.html>
- Gurung, R. A., Ansbarg, P. I., Alexander, P. A., Lawrence, N. K., & Johnson, D. E. (2008). The state of the scholarship of teaching and learning in psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 35, 249-261.
- Hamon, R. R. & Smith, S. R. (2014). The discipline of family science and the continuing need for innovation. *Family Relations*, 63, 309-322.
- Hans, J. D. (2014). Whither famology? Department name trends across four decades. *Family Relations*, 63, 323-332.

- Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hutchings, P., Huber, M. T., & Ciccone, A. (2011). *The scholarship of teaching and learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Levitt, S. D., & Dubner, S. J. (2005). *Freakonomics: A rogue economist explores the hidden side of everything*. New York: William Morrow.
- Maurer, T. W., & Law, D. (2016). The scholarship of teaching & learning in family science. *Family Science Review*, 21(2).
- McKinney, K. (2003). What is the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) in higher education? *Teaching/Learning Matters*, 33(1), 6–7.
- McKinney, K. (2006). Attitudinal and structural factors contributing to challenges in the work of the scholarship of teaching and learning. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 129, 37-50.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015, March). Table 315.20. Full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2009, fall 2011, and fall 2013. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_315.20.asp
- NCFR Task Force on the Development of the Family Discipline (1988). What is family science? *Family Science Review*, 1, 87-101.
- Poole, G., & Simmons, N. (2013). The contributions of the scholarship of teaching and learning to quality enhancement in Canada. In G. Gordon & R. Land (Eds.), *Quality enhancement in higher education: International perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Potter, M. K., & Kustra, E. D. H. (2011). The relationship between scholarly teaching and SoTL: Models, distinctions, and clarifications. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(1), Article 23. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol5/iss1/23>
- Richlin, L. (2001). Scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 86, 57-68. doi: 10.1002/tl.16
- Secret, M., Leisey, M., Lanning, S., Polich, S., & Schaub, J. (2011). Faculty perceptions of the scholarship of teaching and learning: Definition, activity level and merit considerations at one university. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 11, 1-20.

- Shulman, L.S. (2000). From Minsk to Pinsk: Why a scholarship of teaching and learning? *The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1, 48-52.
- Silva, E., White, T., & Toch, T. (2015). *The Carnegie unit: A century-old standard in a changing education landscape*. Stanford, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Simmons, N., Abrahamson, E., Deshler, J. M., Kensington-Miller, B., Manarin, K., Moron-Garcia, S., & Renc-Roe, J. (2013). Conflicts and configurations in a liminal space: SoTL scholars' identity development. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1(2), 9-21. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.2.9>
- Smart, L. S. (2009). Family science: The emergence of a new discipline, 1982-2007. *Family Science Review*, 14, 118-128.
- Trask, B. S., Berke, D. L., Gentry, D. B., Hamon, R. R., & Smith, S. R. (2015, June). *The SoTL and Family Science: Creating disciplinary specific SoTL projects*. Presentation at the 2015 Teaching Family Science conference, St. Augustine, FL.
- Trask, B. S., Hamon, R. R., Berke, D. L., Gentry, D. B., & Smith, S. R. (2015, November). *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) in Family Science Academic Careers*. Presentation at the 2015 National Council on Family Relations conference, Vancouver, B. C.
- Walker, J. D., Baepler, P., & Cohen, B. (2008). The scholarship of teaching and learning paradox: Results without rewards. *College Teaching*, 56, 183-189.
- Walters, J., & Jewson, R. H. (1988). *National Council on Family Relations: A 50 year history*. Minneapolis, MN: National Council on Family Relations.
- Witman, P. D., & Richlin, L. (2007). The status of the scholarship of teaching and learning in the discipline. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol1/iss1/14>
- Wuetherick, B., & Yu, S. (2016). The Canadian teaching commons: The scholarship of teaching and learning in Canadian Higher Education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2016 (146), 23-30. doi: 10.1002/tl.20183
- Wuetherick, B., Yu, S., & Greer, J. (2016). Exploring the SoTL Landscape at the University of Saskatchewan. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2016 (146), 63-70. doi: 10.1002/tl.20188

Table 1. Participant Demographic Characteristics (N = 51)

Characteristic	n	%
Gender		
Male	11	78
Female	40	22
Race		
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Asian	0	0
Black or African American	2	4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0
White	49	96
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino/Latina	0	0
Not Hispanic or Latino/Latina	47	92.2
Teaching rank		
Visiting professor	0	0
Affiliate/adjunct professor	3	6
Assistant professor	13	25
Associate professor	18	35
Full professor	12	34
Professor emeritus/emerita	0	0
Other	5	10
Field of highest degree		
Family Science or a similarly named program (e.g., Human Development and Family Studies)	40	78
Not Family Science, but an affiliated/allied field (e.g., Psychology)	9	18
Neither Family Science nor an affiliated/allied field (e.g., Higher Education Administration)	2	4
Current academic discipline		
Family Science or a similarly named program (e.g., Human Development and Family Studies)	45	88
Not Family Science, but an affiliated/allied field (e.g., Psychology)	6	12
Neither Family Science nor an affiliated/allied field (e.g., Higher Education Administration)	0	0

Institution level		
Community college	0	0
Baccalaureate college	9	18
Master's college or university	4	8
Doctorate-granting university	38	75
Other	0	0
Institution type		
Public	38	76
Private, not for profit	12	24
Private, for profit	0	0
Administrative role		
Yes	20	39
No	31	61

Table 2. Percentage of Responses to Items Referring to Departmental Support of SoTL

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My department chair has actively encouraged involvement in SoTL	8.5	27.1	42.4	22.0
When hiring new faculty, my department regards applicants interest in SoTL favorably	8.5	28.8	45.8	16.9
Other departments provide more support for SoTL than my department does	10.3	55.2	24.1	10.3
Faculty members in other departments at my institution are actively involved in SoTL	1.8	12.3	66.7	19.3

Note. SoTL = scholarship of teaching and learning

Table 3. Percentage of Responses to Items Referring to Departmental Personnel Decisions Related to SoTL

Item	No evidence of activity in SoTL submitted	Unsure of role played	Weakened the case	Had no impact	Strengthened the case
What role did the candidat(s)' level of activity in SoTL play in...					
...your department's most recent hiring decision?	25.0	28.6	1.8	16.1	28.6
...your department's most recent hiring decision?	9.1	32.7	1.8	20.0	36.4
...your department's most recent promotion decision?	7.3	34.5	1.8	16.4	40.0
...your department's most recent merit pay decision?	13.3	37.8	2.2	22.2	24.4
...your department's most recent post-tenure review decision?	7.3	43.9	2.4	14.6	31.7

Note. SoTL = scholarship of teaching and learning

Table 4. Percentage of Responses to Items Referring to Institutional Support of SoTL

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Top-level academic leaders at my institution have taken significant steps to support SoTL	5.5	32.7	43.6	18.2
Faculty members in formal leaderships roles (senate, president, department chair, and so on) have actively supported SoTL	3.6	38.2	43.6	14.5
Support for SoTL at my institution is widespread	7.3	47.3	30.9	14.5
SoTL is integrated into other institution priorities and initiatives	5.6	42.6	42.6	9.3
There are adequate campus-level funding opportunities for SoTL projects at my institution	11.1	42.6	37.0	9.3

Note. SoTL = scholarship of teaching and learning

Table 5: Departmental and Institutional Support: A Comparison

Item	Department Support				Institutional Support			
	SD	D	A	SA	SD	D	A	SA
Other faculty members are actively involved in SoTL	6.1	30.6	53.1	10.2	2.1	18.8	73.0	6.3
Norms encourage participation in SoTL	8.0	50.0	24.0	18.0	4.2	39.6	50.0	6.3
Some of my colleagues find work in SoTL problematic	4.1	40.8	49.0	6.1	4.3	34.0	53.2	8.5
The criteria for teaching awards are consistent with the principles of SoTL	10.4	31.3	47.9	10.4	6.4	36.2	44.7	12.8
The criteria for promotion decisions reflect the principles of SoTL	10.2	36.7	44.9	8.2	8.3	35.4	50.0	6.3
The criteria for tenure decisions reflect the principles of SoTL	10.2	36.7	44.9	8.2	12.5	31.3	50.0	6.3
Faculty members have received tenure based at least in part on SoTL	12.5	20.8	50.0	16.7	8.3	27.1	52.1	12.5
Within the past 5 years, we have reexamined our approach to rewarding SoTL	25.5	38.3	29.8	6.4	12.5	41.7	39.6	6.3
Within the past 5 years, we have broadened the criteria for assessing <i>teaching</i> performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL	21.3	36.2	31.9	10.6	12.8	51.1	29.8	6.4
Within the past 5 years, we have broadened the criteria for assessing <i>research</i> performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL	20.8	41.7	27.1	10.4	14.6	56.3	18.8	10.4

Note. SoTL = scholarship of teaching and learning, SD = strongly disagree, D = disagree, A = agree, SA = strongly agree. All numbers are percentages.

Appendix

SoTL in Family Science Survey Questions

Please keep the following definition of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) in mind as you answer the questions:

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) involves “the systematic study of teaching and learning, using established or validated criteria of scholarship, to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviours, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning, and/or develop a more accurate understanding of learning, resulting in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community.” (Potter & Kustra, 2011, p. 2).

The questions in this section are concerned with the level of support for SoTL at the departmental level.

Q1. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My department chair has actively encouraged involvement in SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When hiring new faculty, my department regards applicants' interest in SoTL favorably.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other departments provide more support for SoTL than my department does.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty members in other departments at my institution are actively involved in SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. For this section, please consider the role of SoTL in personnel decisions within your department. What role did the candidate(s)' level of activity in SoTL play in...

	No evidence of activity in SoTL submitted	Unsure of role played	Weakened the case	Had no impact on case	Strengthened the case	Not applicable
Your department's most recent hiring decision?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your department's most recent tenure decision?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your department's most recent promotion decision?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your department's most recent merit pay decision?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your department's most recent post-tenure review decision?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3. Is SoTL explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in your department’s evaluation guidelines?

- Yes, as teaching only
- Yes, as research only
- Yes, as both teaching and research
- Yes, Other (please describe): _____
- No

Q4. Please estimate the percentage of your departmental colleagues who are actively involved in SoTL.

_____ Percentage of departmental colleagues

The questions in this section are concerned with the level of support for SoTL at the institutional level.

Q5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Top-level academic leaders at my institution have taken significant steps to support SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty members in formal leadership role (senate president, department chair, and so on) have actively supported SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for SoTL at my institution is widespread.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SoTL is integrated into other institution priorities and initiatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are adequate campus-level funding opportunities for SoTL projects at my institution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6. Is SoTL explicitly mentioned as a rewarded activity in your institution's evaluation guidelines?

- Yes, as teaching only
- Yes, as research only
- Yes, as both teaching and research
- Yes, Other (please describe): _____
- No

Q7. Please estimate the percentage of your institutional colleagues who are actively involved in SoTL.

_____ Percentage of institutional colleagues

The questions in this section are concerned with the level of support for SoTL at both the departmental and institutional levels.

Q8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below for your department and your institution.

	Departmental Level				Institutional Level			
	SD	D	A	SA	SD	D	A	SA
Other faculty members are actively involved in SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							
Norms encourage participation in SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							
Some of my colleagues find work in SoTL problematic.	<input type="radio"/>							
The criteria for teaching awards are consistent with the principles of SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							
The criteria for promotion decisions reflect the principles of SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							
The criteria for tenure decisions reflect the principles of SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							
Faculty members have received tenure based at least in part on SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							
Within the past 5 years, we have reexamined our approach to rewarding SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							
Within the past 5 years, we have broadened the criteria for assessing teaching performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							
Within the past 5 years, we have broadened the criteria for assessing research performance to more fully reflect the principles of SoTL.	<input type="radio"/>							

The questions in this section are concerned with the broader presence of SoTL within the discipline of Family Science.

Q9. The number of sessions about SoTL at NCFR and other Family Science related conferences has:

- Not changed in number over the past 5 years
- Increased in number over the past 5 years
- Decreased in number over the past 5 years
- Not sure about changes in number

Q10. The number of sessions about SoTL at NCFR and other Family Science related conferences has:

- Not changed in quality over the past 5 years
- Increased in quality over the past 5 years
- Decreased in quality over the past 5 years
- Not sure about changes in quality

For this questionnaire, we have defined the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) as “the systematic study of teaching and learning, using established or validated criteria of scholarship, to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviours, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning, and/or develop a more accurate understanding of learning, resulting in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community.” (Potter & Kustra, 2011, p. 2).

Q11. Using that definition of SoTL, have you conducted SoTL research?

- Yes
- No

If No is selected, then skip to Q18.

The questions in this section are concerned with your SoTL research.

Q12. For how many years have you been engaged in SoTL research?

_____ Number of Years

Q13. How have you disseminated your SoTL research? Please read all of the items and indicate all that apply.

- I discussed it with colleagues in my department, discipline, or institution.
- I posted content to my blog, website, or social media account(s) [e.g., Twitter].
- I published my findings in a non-refereed teaching and learning publication.
- I published my findings in a non-refereed Family Science publication.
- I published my findings in a refereed teaching and learning publication.
- I published my findings in a refereed Family Science publication.
- I published my findings by writing a peer-reviewed book or publishing in a peer-reviewed edited volume.
- I presented my work at a Family Science conference.
- I presented my work at a teaching and learning conference.

Q14. How often do you collaborate on SoTL research?

- Never
- Rarely
- Less than half of the time
- About half of the time
- More than half of the time
- Almost always
- Always

Q15. If you collaborate on SoTL research, who are your collaborators? Indicate all that apply.

- Faculty from my own department
- Faculty from other disciplines at my institution
- Faculty from my discipline at other institutions
- Faculty from other disciplines at other institutions

Q16. In your opinion, what percentage of your scholarly work is SoTL research?

_____ Percentage of scholarly work that is SoTL

Q17. Thinking about both your departmental and institutional levels, what obstacles--if any--are there for faculty who want to do SoTL research?

Q18. In your role, what percentage of your time are you expected to do the following?

_____ Teaching
_____ Scholarship
_____ Service
_____ Administration

Q19. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other

Q20. Please indicate your race (check all that apply):

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

Q21. Please indicate your ethnicity.

- Hispanic or Latino/Latina
- Not Hispanic or Latino/Latina

Q22. What is your age?

_____ Age in years

Q23. Which of the following best describes your rank?

- Visiting professor
- Affiliate/adjunct professor
- Assistant professor
- Associate professor
- Full professor
- Professor emeritus/emerita
- Other (please describe): _____

Q24. How many years have you been teaching?

_____ Number of years

Q25. Which of the following most closely describes the field from which you obtained your highest degree?

- Family Science or a similarly named program (e.g., Human Development and Family Studies, Child and Family Development, Marriage and Family Therapy, etc.)
- Not Family Science, but an affiliated/allied field (e.g., Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Early Childhood Education, Nutrition, etc.)
- Neither Family Science nor an affiliated/allied field (e.g., Higher Education Administration, Art, Chemistry, etc.)

Q26. What is your current academic discipline?

- Family Science or a similarly named program (e.g., Human Development and Family Studies, Child and Family Development, Marriage and Family Therapy, etc.)
- Not Family Science, but an affiliated/allied field (e.g., Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Early Childhood Education, Nutrition, etc.)
- Neither Family Science nor an affiliated/allied field (e.g., Higher Education Administration, Art, Chemistry, etc.)

Q27. Please indicate which of the following best describes your institution.

- Community college
- Baccalaureate college
- Master's college or university
- Doctorate-granting university
- Other

Q28. Please indicate which of the following best describes your institution.

- Public
- Private, not for profit
- Private, for profit

Q29. Do you have an administrative role at your institution (e.g., department chair, dean, etc.)?

- Yes (please indicate your role): _____
- No

Q30. In the space provided below, please share any additional insights or comments you have about SoTL or its evaluation in Family Science.