

As the chair, you will need to help new faculty find ways to translate their applied experiences to the academic world. ▲

Leo P. Herrman is assistant professor of psychology, Betsy L. Leeds is director of the School Psychology Graduate Program, and Jennifer M. Bonds-Raacke is chair of the Department of Psychology, all at Fort Hays State University. Email: lherrman@fhsu.edu, blleeds@fhsu.edu, jmbondsraacke@fhsu.edu

References

Bonds-Raacke, J. M., & Raacke, J. D. (2008). Using Tablet PCs in the classroom: An investigation of students'

expectations and reactions. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(3), 235-239.

Bushong, S. (2009, March 12). Grade inflation continues at varying pace in colleges, says researcher. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Grade-Inflation-Continues-at/42552>

Newman, F., & Scurry, J. (2001, July 13). Online technology pushes pedagogy to the forefront. *The Chronicle Review*, p. B7.

Vanderlaan, K. (2010, April 25). On the tenure track, a marriage made in hell. *The Chronicle Review*, p. B20.

other hand, know that knowledge is no substitute for effectiveness in the classroom. We all have suffered at the hands of scholarly professors who cannot teach.

The teacher-practitioner role is a complex one, surely more complex than the scholar role because it requires a teacher-learner dynamic that is as complex as human beings. *Practitioners* must be experts in learning, not just teaching, meaning they must know how students learn. Here are a few ideas about learning.

Our conception of learning is often wrong or misguided. For example, we take the wrong concept from nature, that of an amoeba assimilating food (knowledge) instead of the more transformational concept of a caterpillar changing to a butterfly. Learning is about the complexity of change. Richard Light (2001) wrote of his hope that "each class by its end will help [students] to become slightly different persons in some way. This hope transcends the subject matter of a class, or a student's background, or even whether the student is a wise old senior or an incoming freshman" (p. 47). The idea here is that we teach more than a subject; we teach people.

Learning is meant to be social, not lonely or isolated. One vital concept that we can take from twentieth-century learning theorists such as Vygotsky, Piaget, Bruner, and others is that learners need interaction not only with the academic structure of knowledge in various forms, but also other people in a variety of contexts. Students need to bounce their thoughts off their teachers and peers. They need to ask questions of their own, which includes taking their teachers' questions and remaking them so that they can "own the knowledge." If we as teachers have not been surprised by our students' questions in positive ways, we perhaps are not connecting to our learners in valid ways. Peers can greatly

Great Teaching Is More Than Academic

by Thomas R. Rosebrough and Ann H. Singleton

What is great teaching? Certainly it is defined by that which can be measured in setting objective outcomes and assessing how well they have been met. Faculty members rightly spend most of their time thinking about their disciplines, their distinctive academic domains of study. We want our students to know what we know, and we want to measure whether our students are approaching that knowledge in a particular course or degree program. But, isn't great teaching more than an "academic" enterprise? Reflecting on questions such as this one is salient to the study and scholarship of teaching.

The major hurdle to jump in higher education is moving from an instructional paradigm to a learning paradigm. Barr and Tagg (1995) famously framed this concept: We tend to think of teaching as based on instructor output instead of student input and learning. Stated another way, as teachers we put the cart of teaching before the horse of learning. We spend too much time on presentation and too little time on thinking how we can base our courses on the

needs of learners, specifically on how our students learn. One of the fundamental principles in educational psychology comes from David Ausubel (1968): Find out what our students know and begin there.

A Pedagogical Framework

One of the ironies in pedagogy is that to be more learner-centered we must first explore the question "Why do we teach?" To ask why we teach requires that we look at the teaching roles we play that are needed to connect to learners. We propose a new pedagogical framework (Rosebrough & Leverett, 2011) for the study of our teaching that is comprised of three roles: scholar, practitioner, and relater.

College professors are very familiar with the roles of scholar and practitioner. *Scholars* are masters of their domains, with reason to have great confidence in their subject matter. They hold advanced degrees in their discipline, have researched and written about their area of expertise, and have presented scholarly ideas and concepts to their peers in a variety of settings. Practitioners, on the

assist students in constructing their own knowledge, and teachers as practitioners must plan for classroom inquiry that includes peer interaction. If we teach by asking questions and allow students to inquire as well, our learners can begin to develop six strategic learning qualities as part of the process:

- *Openness*—a quality that serves learners well in critical self-reflection on previous assumptions
- *Skepticism*—an attitude that begins with openness and allows students to test and apply new perspectives through critical questioning
- *Civility*—a quality that allows learners to respect fellow students and teachers, as well as unfamiliar content that may seem irrelevant to their lives
- *Persistence*—an attitude tied to purpose where learners persist despite obstacles
- *Imagination*—a creative spirit that reaches beyond the senses, taking learning from the objective to the subjective and back again
- *Curiosity*—a quality that encourages learners to freely explore anything and everything, one that must be nurtured passionately by teachers

Learning is not simple. The brain learns through repetition, challenge, novelty, meaning, feedback, and emotion (a mnemonic device is **Resilient Children Need More Fun Everyday**). The meaning and emotion of these six facets are perhaps the most overlooked. A variety of teaching approaches is needed to engage learners because each student brings a different set of experiences, aptitude, and motivation to the classroom. What is meaningful for some is not meaningful to all, and meaning is needed for deeper levels of understanding. Emotion as a learning facet is vastly underestimated. It is the key that unlocks learning in the brain. Joy can be found, for example, through humor, celebrations, physical movement, and enjoyment of nature. Most importantly, the attachment of emotion to

a classroom environment helps students remember what is taught.

Feelings are important in academic settings. Yeats said that education is not filling a pail but lighting a fire. How students respond affectively to a classroom environment is just as important as how they respond intellectually. Professors who first teach to inspire their students stimulate hope and resiliency in their learners, which takes us to the third role in the framework.

The third part of the pedagogical role framework is one we know is there but do not often acknowledge: the teacher-relater. We use the term *relaters* to describe teachers who care about their classroom relationship with students. It is a reach beyond the biological dimensions of learning to the world of the human spirit. Belief in the learner's potential includes how we think about students and how we can illuminate their understanding of the subject at hand. This relationship includes how learners feel as a positive response to their teachers' belief in them. Trust and respect are part of a zone of caring communicated by a transformational teacher. When students and teachers do not trust and respect each other, the dissonance becomes an issue of the human spirit, a dimension that we do not often talk about in teaching.

Consider three dimensions or goals in teaching: academic, social, and spiritual. Academic goals spring from the liberal arts, the constructs of the academic domains. Social goals are designed to better human welfare and involve concepts such as cooperation and responsibility. Spiritual goals are perhaps more personal and deal with the dynamics of human relations and the human spirit, including the transcendent values of hope and self-sacrifice.

Relaters meet social and even spiritual goals in teaching. They have larger purposes in their teaching roles because they are committed to listening and responding to students' true identities. This sensitivity is especially

needed as we teach adolescents. One of the most salient purposes for adolescent learning is achievement of a sense of, and then the reality of, independence. To become more self-directed learners, students need the assistance of teachers who want to transform their lives through a more holistic pedagogical approach.

Conclusion

If we view students only as vessels to be filled with knowledge; if we treat them as means to ends such as raising test scores; if we play "gotcha games" through condescending approaches in teaching; if we fail to model the values of respect, trust, and empathy; or if we fail to honor learners' cultural beliefs and practices, we are guilty of a short-circuited view not just of students but of human beings. When teachers as relaters teach to the social and spiritual goals of relationships as well as to academic goals, they make a difference in practice because they are concerned not just with what they teach but who they teach.

By expanding our vision to a more reflective consideration of who we are teaching in our classrooms, we are forced to consider the ultimate pedagogical question: Why are we teaching? This question places in context other important questions such as: How has my teaching changed over time? How have student evaluations advanced my teaching? What is great teaching? If we believe that our goal is not to just impart information but to make a significant change in the lives of our students, we begin to realize that "informational teaching" can be subsumed and replaced by a broader and deeper concept of transformational teaching. Great teaching is more than academic and allows students to expand their outward horizons by going inward to deepen the meaning of their education. ▲

This article is based on a presentation at the 29th annual Academic Chairpersons

Conference, February 9–10, 2012, Orlando, Florida.

Thomas R. Rosebrough is executive dean and Ann H. Singleton is associate dean, both in the College of Education and Human Studies at Union University. Email: trosebro@uu.edu, asinglet@uu.edu

References

Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning—A new paradigm

for undergraduate education. *Change*, 27(6), 13–25.

Light, R. J. (2001). *Making the most of college: Students speak their minds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rosebrough, T. R., & Leverett, R. G. (2011). *Transformational teaching in the information age: Making why and how we teach relevant to students*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Competencies, Challenges, and Collegiality: A Four-Year Study of Department Chairs

by Robert E. Cipriano and Richard Riccardi

Since 2007 we have been surveying department chairs throughout the country to help define who they are, what they do, what they are expected to do, and, ultimately, what drives them to be in their current positions. The survey questionnaire was designed to elicit responses about demographics (age, gender, rank, how they became chair, etc.), personal information (satisfaction in the chair role, what they will do after serving as chair, etc.), their perceptions of the skills and competencies needed to effectively function as chair, and their reflections on the pleasant or unpleasant nature of the tasks chairs perform. Each year the study has evolved as analysis of the current year's data has brought to light deeper and more complex issues. As research often does, our "answers" to specific questions have resulted in more thought-provoking questions.

In 2007 we surveyed a state university system on the past, present, and future aspirations of department chairs (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2008) and found that they set their own expectations at almost unrealistic levels: a "master of all trades." In 2008 we broadened the survey in scope and distance (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2010a), asking chairs from

across the country about their satisfaction level and reasons why they continue in their roles. In this study we were puzzled to find that more than 85% were either satisfied or very satisfied serving as chair, yet the number one reason they remain in their position is that "no one else will do it." Further qualitative research resulted in modifications to the 2008 survey instrument, as focus groups with chairs brought to light that "making a difference" was a key factor in becoming a department chair. Therefore, as part of the 2009 study (Cipriano & Riccardi, 2010b) comparing current and former chairs, two items were added to the question of why chairs remain in their role: to make a difference and to shape the department's direction. As part of the 2010 study the following two questions were added: What are the challenges in serving as chair? Should collegiality be the fourth criterion for tenure decisions? Overall, in the four years of our research, 1,972 surveys were mailed out; 831 surveys were returned for a 42.1% return rate. What follows is analyses of the 2008, 2009, and 2010 studies, and an analysis of the combined data from the four years of the study.

Results of the 2008 Survey

The message is clear from our many colleagues across the country: no end to the workload, no upper limit to the expectations, and no firm job description or educational training program to fall back on for support. Based on the assumption that no one else wanted to serve as chair, an assumption formulated from the data obtained from this study, the research in 2008 yielded the following results regarding the question: Why do you remain as department chair? (Respondents could choose more than one answer.)

1. No one else in the department will do it: 43.3%
2. More money: 38.7%
3. Stepping stone in career: 32.7%
4. Reduced teaching load: 24.0%
5. Ability to hire faculty: 22.7%
6. Control of budget: 18.7%
7. Prestige: 17.3%
8. Summer pay: 13.3%
9. Released time: 11.3%

Modification of the 2009 Survey Instrument

Based on formal focus groups and informal discussions with chairs, the survey instrument was modified in 2009. The results were significant, both mathematically and philosophically, regarding the reason(s) why chairs remain in this position (respondents could choose more than one response):

1. Make a difference: 85.8%
2. Shape department's direction: 83.1%
3. Career advancement: 39.1%
4. No one else in the department will do it: 35.9%
5. More money: 31.1%
6. Ability to hire faculty: 24.7%
7. Reduced teaching load: 17.4%
8. Control of budget: 12.6%
9. Prestige: 12.1%
10. Summer pay: 11.5%

Collegiality and Challenges: 2010 Survey

In October 2010 we sent the same survey to 286 department chairs; 104 surveys