Trent W. Maurer, GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY, tmaurer@georgiasouthern.edu
Cherie Woolmer, MOUNT ROYAL UNIVERSITY, cwoolmer@mtroyal.ca
Nichole L. Powell, EMORY UNIVERSITY, nichole.powell@emory.edu
Carol Sisson, TAYLOR UNIVERSITY, crsisson@taylor.edu
Catherine Snelling, UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE, catherine.snelling@adelaide.edu.au
Odd Rune Stalheim, INLAND NORWAY UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES,
odd.rune.stalheim@inn.no
Ian J. Turner, UNIVERSITY OF DERBY, i.turner@derby.ac.uk

Sharing SoTL Findings with Students: An Intentional Knowledge Mobilization Strategy

ABSTRACT

This paper critically examines the reasons for and processes of sharing SoTL findings with students. Framed by our commitment to SoTL's role to make teaching "community property," we interpret sharing SoTL findings with students as an act of knowledge mobilization, where SoTL might be disseminated, translated, or co-created with the student as a legitimate knowledge broker. We connect these knowledge mobilization processes with four primary reasons why faculty might want to share SoTL findings with students. Finally, we provide examples of knowledge mobilization that use different "voices" found in contemporary communication settings and that reach various student audiences in micro, meso, macro, and mega contexts.

KEYWORDS

sharing SoTL, knowledge mobilization, social media, students

INTRODUCTION

For over two decades, the notion of SoTL as "community property," that "going public" is a key requirement of what makes SoTL scholarship, has been central to definitions and conceptualizations of SoTL (Hutchings and Shulman 1999). Some discussions have been broadly inclusive in their language about sharing SoTL, allowing for the possibility of multiple potential audiences or communities. For example, Felten (2013, 123–24) has argued, "Because SoTL inquiry typically is iterative and highly contextual, the most appropriate ways to go public should capture and reflect the evolving nature of this form of research. In many cases, that is not possible in a traditional scholarly journal." Expanding beyond traditional scholarly journals, whose readership is primarily other academic scholars, would allow for other avenues to share SoTL with students. Similarly, Potter and Kustra (2011, 2) have argued that SoTL should be "publicly shared for critique and used by an appropriate community." Others have explicitly called for students to be part of the community with which SoTL is shared. Kreber (2007, 6) has argued, "the very nature of SoTL impels us to choose venues for disseminating our work that reach

those audiences that are most likely to appreciate and build on it—and most importantly, it would seem that the audience would have to include students." Similarly, McKinney (2012a, 3) has argued that SoTL scholars should view students as a primary audience for SoTL research because the focus of SoTL is ultimately on student learning and by sharing the findings of SoTL scholarship with students we can, "help them reflect and apply those findings to their own efforts to improve learning." By following through on this suggestion to help students become better learners, teachers carry out an ethical imperative to care for students and their learning. Students may consume discipline-specific scholarship (e.g., journal articles, creative productions, etc.) and some may even attend a conference in their discipline, but it is likely many will never have an occasion to know about or delve into SoTL literature directly. Unless a teacher has an interest and/or a learning objective related to teaching students how they learn, then most likely students will not even be alerted to, let alone assigned and reinforced to, consume SoTL scholarship. Providing opportunities to "bring students into the conversation" when sharing SoTL not only helps improve their learning, as suggested by McKinney (2012a), it also signals to students that they are valid and valued stakeholders and agents in the educational process.

Encouragingly, there is a growing commitment to bring students into contact with SoTL, highlighted in student engagement and students as partners literature (for example, Eady and Green 2020; Healey, Flint, and Harrington 2014). In response to this growing commitment to work with students in SoTL, we seek to delve into and unpack what "sharing SoTL with students" might look like in practice. Specifically, we contribute to the existing literature by

a) interpreting sharing SoTL with students as an act of knowledge mobilization, where SoTL might be disseminated, translated, or co-created with the student as a legitimate knowledge broker;

b) connecting these knowledge mobilization ("sharing") processes with the reasons why faculty might want to share SoTL with students; and

c) identifying some examples of knowledge mobilization ("sharing") that reach various student audiences in micro, meso, macro, and mega contexts (Wuetherick and Yu 2016). We authors are seven SoTL scholars from a diverse range of contexts. In response to the emergent examples in the literature and informed by our ways of and reasons for sharing SoTL with students, we explored the opportunities we have as practitioners for sharing SoTL with students, and for them to engage with us. What follows are a series of proposals, conjectures, and illustrated examples that outline ways in which sharing SoTL, as an act of knowledge mobilization, links fundamentally with the practices of being a SoTL scholar and conceives of students as legitimate knowledge agents. We intend for the framing we draw upon and the illustrations we use to provide impetus for future research, including empirical research, in this area.

To enable systematic reflection and engagement with relevant literature, we asked ourselves the following questions:

• What types of sharing of SoTL do I currently do with students?/What is the purpose of my sharing (is it to disseminate, inform translation into practice, or provide opportunities to co-create next steps with students, or a combination of these)?

• What are my reasons for sharing SoTL with students (Care, Disruption, Reflection, and/or Quality in my teaching practice)?

• What are the voices used and the audiences and contexts for this sharing?

These questions have, in turn, provided the structure for our explorations and suggestions.

SHARING SOTL WITH STUDENTS: FORMS OF KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION

Our initial aim for this paper was to provide a range of practices that showed how SoTL was being shared by faculty with students. We quickly realized that a more fundamental question lay in front of us: what would faculty hope to achieve as a result of sharing? For example, would it be that they would want students to be aware of how SoTL research has informed and influenced the teaching strategies used in class? Or provide potential for students to translate findings from a study to influence their own engagement? Or might the aim be to create opportunities for students to design, conduct, or analyze part of the SoTL study itself? The answers to these questions are not mutually exclusive and neither, we contend, are the aims and purposes of sharing SoTL. To help frame our discussions, it is useful to draw upon approaches to knowledge mobilization of research. Knowledge mobilization (sometimes referred to as knowledge translation in fields such as medicine and science) is foundational to research in today's global higher education context. Major research councils require explicit statements regarding a researcher's intention to define and engage relevant audiences, through appropriate mediums, of research outputs. Depending on the disciplinary focus, this might involve efforts to support knowledge exchange or translation between industry or community partners. It might also, in some cases, directly involve other stakeholders in the direction and interpretation of the research itself. A commitment to knowledge mobilization in research is ultimately a commitment to intentionally engage those who may make use of, or be affected by, the research undertaken.

Phipps, Cummings, Pepler, Craig, and Cardinal (2016, 31) define knowledge mobilization (in the context of working with community partners) as follows:

> Knowledge mobilization helps make academic research accessible to non-academic audiences and supports collaborations between academic researchers and non-academic partners such as community-based organizations. Knowledge mobilization is a process that supports action oriented research and finds novel approaches to persistent social, economic and environmental challenges.

Many national research funding councils provide their own definitions, for example, the Social Science and Humanities Research Council in Council (2019) in Canada defines knowledge mobilization as:

> an umbrella term encompassing a wide range of activities relating to the production and use of research results, including knowledge synthesis, dissemination, transfer, exchange, and co-creation or co-production by researchers and knowledge users (para 4).

We suggest there is much to be gained from marrying the ideas of knowledge mobilization of SoTL, which we describe hereafter as "sharing SoTL," with students as knowledge generators, brokers (where individuals facilitate access to other members of their group or cohort), and end users. Furthermore, we suggest there are three possible ways in which "sharing SoTL" with students can be characterized, each with a discrete aim:

- sharing as *dissemination*

- sharing as *translation*
- sharing as *co-creation*

Each of these forms of sharing not only denote different aims and purposes behind the action of sharing, they allude to different positionality between faculty and student and the agency a student has in the process and outcome of sharing. For example, sharing as dissemination could be exemplified by providing students with outcomes of SoTL research (our own or others'), positioning students as recipients of knowledge or, in knowledge mobilization terms, as the "end user." Translation, on the other hand, has an explicit intention to effect change in the context of teaching and learning, with the student involved with the teacher to apply that knowledge to effect learning. Depending on the type of SoTL undertaken, translation might involve discussions with students about the implications of that research as it applies to student learning and it may or may not involve students in deciding a course of action as a result of sharing the SoTL research (e.g., for course redesign). Co-creation, in contrast, could include the active involvement of students as co-inquirers in SoTL endeavours where they influence the process of generating as well as sharing and co-owning the outcome of SoTL. Co-creation places students as knowledge generators and knowledge brokers. Although opportunities to involve students as partners in all aspects of SoTL research, writing, and presentation processes are becoming increasingly valued, these opportunities are still relatively infrequent, small scale, and involve relatively small numbers of students (Mercer-Mapstone et al. 2017). Sharing as dissemination and translation are likely to co-occur in some settings; for example, many teachers who would choose to share with their own students would probably also unpack that research either in discussions or reflections.

Applying these three ways of sharing, we examined peer reviewed and grey literature for examples of practices that made reference to disseminating, translating, or co-creating SoTL with students. Within peer reviewed literature, we found a growing body of work that provided examples of involving students in SoTL (Bovill and Woolmer 2020; Felten et al. 2013; Mercer-Mapstone et al. 2017) and a small number of references to knowledge mobilization of SoTL (McClurg, MacMillan, and Chick 2019; McKinney 2012b). However, we noted that the student audience of most of the journals we found were likely postgraduate or upper-level undergraduate students who are interested specifically in SoTL-related research or publishing their own SoTL work. Lastly, we undertook a search for non-journal outputs of SoTL that might be more "user-friendly" or accessible to students and which shared SoTL in alternative formats. We examined blogs (via Google search), podcasts (via iTunes), YouTube, Twitter, student chat rooms, and the magazines of several (UK) subject-based professional or regulatory bodies. We used a range of keywords such "pedagogy," "SoTL," and "learning" in the modes suggested (e.g., pedagogy + podcast). Searches were limited to the first 20-25 links/hits consistent with a surface keyword web search (Georgas 2014). Despite this growing number of online communication and dissemination channels, a surprisingly small number of "hits" demonstrated a specific intention to share SoTL with students as either knowledge end users, brokers, or co-creators. There was an extensive and diverse range of higher education blogs that focus exclusively (or in part) on SoTL, but these sites are almost exclusively aimed at academic or professional service staff. Such sites often use a mixture of blogs and podcasts (often featuring guests). The review revealed some examples of individual blogs or podcast episodes on these sites that involved students, but once again, the aim, from a knowledge mobilization perspective, was to inform other educators. We consider that these contemporary platforms are ideal for sharing SoTL with students in a format they are comfortable with and access more often.

WHY SOTL FINDINGS SHOULD BE SHARED WITH STUDENTS

Building on the work of scholars such as Felten, Kreber, and McKinney, we present four key reasons for sharing SoTL (in all the forms we describe above). These include: a) Care: care for students and their learning, b) Disruption: disrupting traditional hierarchies and power structures between teachers and students, c) Reflection: developing reflective practice and a scholarly approach to teaching, and d) Quality: enhancing the quality of SoTL scholarship. In our discussions of these four reasons, we have paid attention to the ways in which these reasons interact with commitments to sharing SoTL as either dissemination, translation, or co-creation.

Care for students and their learning

Care for students and their learning is an ethical imperative for teachers. As such, this is the most fundamental reason why SoTL findings should be shared with students. This imperative can be situated within the broader literature on "pedagogy of care" models to teaching and learning, which, although not explicitly focused on sharing SoTL findings with students, still provide rich opportunities and meaningful reasons for doing so.

Pedagogy of care models are evidence-based approaches to teaching and learning that embody humanism and openness and are consistent with contemporary best teaching practices (Anderson et al. 2020; Papadopoulos 2017; Walker and Gleaves 2016). Using a pedagogy of care requires both the teacher and the student to be active participants in the teaching and learning process. MacNeil and Evans (2005, 46) describe this pedagogy as connecting at "the student and faculty member teaching-learning interface on a human-human basis, sharing ideas and feelings." Sharing SoTL findings thus has a natural fit in this context, bringing students into the conversation about SoTL as part of the larger sharing of ideas. For example, Walker and Gleaves (2016, 67) describe caring teachers as fostering student success when they "carefully articulate their philosophies and practices." To the extent that those philosophies and practices are based on a scholarly teaching approach informed by the SoTL literature (McKinney 2003), only minimal additional effort would be required to explicitly share the findings that inform those philosophies and practices with students.

Additionally, McKinney's (2012a) call to help students apply SoTL findings to improve their own learning—sharing as translation—is consistent with a pedagogy of care approach. It invites students to broker the knowledge produced from SoTL to affect their learning context. Sharing the findings of SoTL with students could help them improve their metacognition, self-efficacy, learning strategies, and overall learning. For example, when students believe that the most ineffective learning strategies are the most effective and invest considerable time using these strategies, good teachers have a golden opportunity to empathetically guide and support their students. Mindfully sharing the findings of SoTL research on the effectiveness of different learning strategies, and teaching students to use more effective strategies, has the potential to significantly improve their learning (Morehead, Rhodes, and DeLozier 2016; Persky and Hudson 2016).

Disrupting traditional hierarchies and power structures between teachers and students

There is a growing interest in working with students as partners in the scholarship of teaching and learning in the last decades (Diaz et al. 2015; Healey and Healey 2018). Diaz, Hill, Jenkins, Kay, Pye, Morley, and Gravito (2015) emphasize that co-creation involves active learning, which creates potential for student engagement, employability skills, and empowerment. According to Diaz et al.

(2015), positioning students as partners helps develop students' metacognitive awareness and personal development, which supports Barnett's (2004) calls for an open, bold, and engaging epistemology of higher education.

Engaging students in discussions about SoTL not only has potential to improve learning; it also opens spaces for new types of dialogue between teacher and student. Providing opportunity for more collegial conversations with students about approaches to enhancing teaching and learning can increase opportunities for student agency and ownership in actions taken and position faculty as co-inquirers with their students (Bovill and Woolmer 2020). Furthermore, it positions students as knowledge generators and brokers, as well as end users when considering the reasons for sharing SoTL.

The involvement of students in the production as well as consumption of SoTL has been described as one of the more radical developments underway in higher education at present (Ryan and Tilbury 2013). There is a growing body of literature related to students as co-inquirers in SoTL with compelling evidence that this model of conducting research on teaching and learning affords opportunities for individuals to participate in a new form of "radical collegiality" (Fielding 1999), working in less hierarchical ways, with shared responsibility for the SoTL study in question. This literature offers powerful and persuasive arguments for conducting SoTL in partnership with students. Nonetheless, these opportunities remain available to a relatively small number of individuals (Mercer-Mapstone et al. 2017) involved in localised, small-scale projects. The aim of creating new scholarly conversations between instructors and students that traverse traditional hierarchies enables students to have greater agency and opportunity to use SoTL research to understand, enhance, and critique their learning experiences and enact a different form of scholarly dialogue with their faculty regarding teaching and learning.

Developing reflective practice and a scholarly approach to teaching

As there is an ethical imperative that teachers care about students, so too is there an ethical imperative for teachers to try to improve their teaching practice continuously in order to help promote student learning to the best of their ability. These efforts to improve teaching are bolstered by a scholarly approach to teaching, which ideally involves reflective teaching practice (Trigwell 2012). Palmer (1983) refers to knowing and learning as communal acts, which suggests the importance of dialogue not just about the content, but about the learning process, and not just within the professoriate, but between the teachers and students.

Embedded within the scholarship of teaching is reflective practice or critical reflection, which Potter and Kustra (2011) contend contributes to one's identity as a "scholarly teacher." Danielson (1996, 2013) identified reflective practice as essential to student learning. A reflective teacher is one who "constantly thinks back over situations to analyze what they did and why, and to consider how they might improve learning for their students" (Hoy 2019, 10). More generally, reflective practice is concerned with the thinking over the learning process, which has the fundamental purpose of improving and developing learning in a way that both meets desired learning outcomes as well as enhances the learner's experience (Rushton and Suter 2012).

The benefits of reflective practice are not limited to either the faculty member or the student. Findings from studies directed more to individual and classroom feedback (e.g., Juwah 2004) could improve opportunities to expose students to SoTL findings beyond the classroom (e.g., dissemination). It could provide the impetus to promote awareness of and dialogue about ways of learning within and

across disciplines, as a way of not just transmitting knowledge, but as Murray (2008) wrote, to transform and extend it as well (e.g., translation). The sharing of SoTL can promote conversations and applications about how students learn best; how teachers can teach more effectively; why particular assignments, processes, or practices can be beneficial; how to transfer learning strategies to other courses and disciplines; and how students can help promote learning in others. This communal act of dialogue would not need to be limited to the individual student reflection or the classroom space, but could extend to other areas as a way to promote not only scholarly teaching, but scholarly learning.

Enhancing the quality of SoTL scholarship

Sharing the findings of SoTL with students also has the potential to improve the inquiry process, the scholarly products, and may even be the best or the only way to answer essential SoTL questions. Like with participatory action research that involves knowledge users in iterative ways to enhance the legitimacy and quality of research, so too can this be achieved by involving students with SoTL. The process of "going public" invites discussion, review, and critique of our SoTL work. Sharing SoTL findings with students can improve the recursive inquiry process by broadening the diversity of feedback and input obtained and allowing the inclusion of diverse perspectives and experiences (Felten et al. 2013). In this way, students can also be positioned as knowledge generators and knowledge brokers, involved in the co-creation of SoTL scholarship.

Snowball and McKenna (2017) report a course-level SoTL project in which they detail the value of student voices in their project involving student-generated podcasts to improve learning in an economics class at a South African university. Students were involved as knowledge generators and knowledge brokers, with particular forms of legitimacy. The process allowed the course, led by white faculty and comprised of students from diverse racial and socioeconomic backgrounds from South Africa and surrounding countries, to examine topics such as income and race, which are sensitive issues in a post-apartheid climate. The student-generated podcasts were shown during appropriate moments of the course lectures, thereby bringing students' voices, views, and prior experiences into the course, and linking theory to real-world experiences. The materials are being used in the lectures of later cohorts even as those students develop new podcasts.

Students' voices and perspectives can also be useful in addressing or minimizing potential gaps or overlooked factors, particularly with iterative investigations or replications in different contexts. Students bring their expertise at being students, their own experiences, and their own diverse identities. Programs such as Students as Learners and Teachers at Bryn Mawr College in the US help to develop practices for participatory design around the inclusion of student voices (Cook-Sather 2014). These strategies also contribute to the development of theories and models that incorporate Design-Based Implementation Research (DBIR) (Fishman 2014). Keeping in mind the context-dependent nature of SoTL, we should be cautious of overgeneralization (Healey and Healey 2018). Thus, sharing SoTL research with students allows students to bring their perspective and experience to the interpretation and application of those studies to enhance both the teaching and learning process.

SHARING SOTL WITH STUDENTS: EXAMPLES OF KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION

We considered three broad thematic areas representing the different "voices" used for communication in contemporary settings: a) academic voice (e.g., traditional scholarship including articles, book chapters, conference presentations, etc.), b) curricular voice (e.g., syllabi, assignments,

activities, pedagogical choices and framing, etc.), and c) social media voice (e.g., blogs, videos, podcasts, social media platforms). We also drew upon Wuetherick and Yu's (2016) framework to consider these voices in a range of contexts that differ by scale: a) micro (e.g., a single semester-long course/class), b) meso (across individuals in the same department or basic academic organizational unit), c) macro (across individuals in the same institution), and d) mega (globally). Informed by the principles of evocative autoethnographic methods (Ellingson and Ellis 2008), we provide vignettes drawn from some of our personal practice and contexts that arose from answering our questions through the frames described here to illustrate ways in which we share SoTL with students.

Vignette 1: Sharing as translation in the classroom (Maurer)

I organize my Introduction to Family Science undergraduate course around sharing the findings of SoTL with students (i.e., micro scale). These pedagogical decisions (i.e., "curricular voice") are intended to help translate key SoTL findings for students to empower them to be more efficient and effective learners. My reasons for sharing SoTL with students flow primarily from Reflection and Care. For Reflection, I have always taken a scholarly teaching approach to this course and have explicitly invited students into the conversation about how I can teach the material more effectively and how I can help them learn the material more effectively; sharing with students what is known from the SoTL literature is a logical component of this process. For Care, the idea that I can help students to apply SoTL findings to improve their own learning as knowledge end users and brokers is at the very heart of why I choose to be a SoTL scholar and a teacher.

To provide context for this example, the institution where I teach is a US, public, regional, research university with an enrolment of approximately 27,000 students across three campuses. It is a primarily undergraduate institution and many of the students are first-in-family to attend higher education. For this course, typically 90% or more of the enrolled students identify as women, with roughly the same percentage in the "traditional" college age range of 18-24 years. About half of the students are in their first two years at the university and half are in their final two years. This semester, I am teaching this course for the 51st time at this institution.

The approach I use in this course is adapted from James Lang's (2016) *Small Teaching: Everyday Lessons from the Science of Learning.* Each learning activity I use in the course corresponds to one or more of the nine "lessons" Lang identifies that are drawn from the SoTL literature: a) retrieving, b) predicting, c) interleaving, d) connecting, e) practicing, f) self-explaining, g) motivating, h) growing, and i) expanding. Although I used these activities long before I read Lang's book, it was his organizational structure that spurred the idea to more explicitly share why I do these things with my students (i.e., that they are each based on research findings for specific best practices). On the first day of class, I explain this organizational approach along with a brief description of what each of Lang's lessons is about and how the SoTL research supports it. Every time we do a learning activity in the course, I explicitly identify which of Lang's lessons the activity corresponds to in order to make the connection transparent to students and reinforce that this approach is based on the SoTL literature. For example, when I have students practice applying a specific theoretical perspective to a real-world situation I label it "Practicing" and re-explain that the research shows that by practicing, this helps students to develop skills in applying what they've learned to practical contexts. One of the most interesting consequences of this approach has been that on both my informal and formal student evaluations of teaching, students

have spontaneously identified how these different "lessons" have helped them to learn the material. That is, not only is this approach beneficial to their learning directly (as documented in the SoTL literature), but it has also empowered them with a new language to describe how different elements of the teaching and learning environment contribute to their success.

Vignette 2: Sharing as dissemination and translation in the classroom (Snelling)

I teach in an undergraduate health science program at a public university in Australia. Each year has around 35 students that are predominantly females aged 18-30 years, where usually 25% are straight from high school. Many have come from the work force or have transferred in from other tertiary courses. In 2014, I began using social media to share SoTL findings with students. Like many academics, I was initially reluctant to use this platform as a communication tool in my work. I regarded social media as being outside of the educational context but came to recognize the ubiquitous role it plays across society. However, my adoption of platforms such as Facebook, Wikis, and blogs appears to be "typical" as there is growing acceptance of faculty using social media in their scholarly activities (Rowan-Kenyon et al. 2016). Gruzd, Haythornthwaite, Paulin, Gilbert, and del Valle (2018, 477) report academic use of social media is effective in "exposing students to practice; extending the learning environment; and promoting a social, collaborative approach to learning."

Driven by a desire to translate my educational inquiry into practice, as well as to harness the power of the student-voice to provide valuable feedback and potential co-creation, I have been using Facebook to communicate SoTL findings and research to students. This has become an integral part of my scholarship. I have led research projects on pedagogies such as the flipped classroom and have incorporated many active approaches in my teaching. I use the private class Facebook page to share evidence that supports this approach and am delighted when students upload information they find on flipped learning. This generates plenty of discussion and comments from students about the impact on their engagement with course material. The course Facebook page facilitates informal feedback on new approaches I am using in class and the impact on their overall learning experience. Based on comments in course evaluation over several years, the students really enjoy being involved in new SoTL initiatives I am trialling and provide "on the spot" feedback—I see this as example of the pedagogy of care that is central to my teaching practice. Students' input could be considered a form of alpha testing before further research and dissemination, thus enhancing the quality of the SoTL initiative.

There is no connection with the class Facebook page and the university's learning management system. Contributions to the social media platform are not assessed nor is there any obligation to participate. However, analytics from the Facebook page show a high level of student engagement and contribution to posts related to SoTL topics. Keeping the group private has limited the scale of sharing, but the posts are always related to the members' learning environment creating a personal and highly interactive context.

Vignette 3: Sharing as co-creation at conferences and in publications (Woolmer)

My research and practice involves working with students as partners in a research-intensive university in Canada. I conduct SoTL research with undergraduate and graduate students, I co-host a blog and Twitter account that seeks to disseminate various scholarship on student-faculty partnerships with students, and I support the delivery of a large institutional Student Partners Program that works with over 200 faculty, students and staff in my institution.

SoTL-focused conferences and journals offer opportunities for students to engage directly as consumers of SoTL work (as attendees and as readers) but these spaces have traditionally been focused on faculty and staff. I frequently build in opportunities to co-present and co-author with student partners as this is an integral aspect of my own scholarship and practice. Partnering with students to co-present or co-author is, for me, an extension of partnership throughout all phases of the research process, enhancing the quality and legitimacy of the work as well as operating to disrupt traditional research hierarchies. It provides access for students to join formal academic/scholarly conversations (considered in our framing as 'academic voice') at a mega (national and international) level. For some students partners, presenting at an international conference or co-authoring a paper might be a novel opportunity and so attention needs to be given to scaffold the process and "check in" with a student partner's expectations and comfort levels with "going public" in such fora. Such opportunities can have significant impact for students, giving legitimacy to their voices and enabling them to join the conversation (Felten et al. 2019). However, opportunities to engage with such conferences and journals are potentially limited and faculty partners remain powerful gatekeepers.

There are a growing number of examples where students have opportunities to contribute as authors, presenters, and/or reviewers of SoTL work—positioning them as knowledge generators, brokers, and, in some instances as knowledge gatekeepers. There are a number of SoTL-focused journals that publish student authored or co-authored work (e.g., *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, *Teaching in Higher Education*) and more recently, examples of journals involving students as editors and reviewers as well as authors (e.g., *International Journal for Students as Partners*, *Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal*). I have been mindful, though, of the barriers to participating in such arenas. Increased funding to attend conferences and remuneration for time spent authoring and reviewing would be necessary to increase student participation in these forms of SoTL knowledge mobilization. For example, ISSOTL offers scholarships for student presenters and co-presenters to attend its annual conference. Such opportunities provide more radical forms of sharing SoTL findings with students; it expands not only where and how we share SoTL findings but also who is involved in the sharing of SoTL findings.

DISCUSSION

The case for why faculty and staff might want to share SoTL findings with students as intentional acts of knowledge mobilization is manifold; it demonstrates an ethic of care and commitment to reflect on the professional practice of teaching. Engaging directly in conversations with our students also enables more collegial spaces for conversations about teaching and learning when students have the opportunity to inform, discuss, and decide on next steps as a result of engaging with the findings of SoTL studies. Taken together, care, reflection, and disruption of hierarchies have potential to improve the quality of SoTL studies as student participation increases agency, relevance, and resulting actions.

In our discussions regarding reasons why faculty and staff should share SoTL findings with students, we acknowledge there may be barriers that prevent us from doing so. In contemporary higher education, time-poor faculty face a myriad of challenges just to survive. In addition, universities' organizational structures and systematic processes can create challenges (e.g., lack of recognition of SoTL scholarship in annual research reporting for faculty), even perceived personal risk in sharing SoTL findings with students. We concur with emerging literature that reflects how working to disrupt

hierarchies between faculty and students to discuss, shape, and contest SoTL may be unavailable and/or riskier for some faculty than others (Kupatadze 2018; Marquis et al. 2020; Woolmer 2018).

The practice of sharing SoTL findings with students as an intentional part of knowledge mobilization would require a paradigm shift for many—the current drivers for academic success and promotion at many institutions are centred on traditional scholarly outputs such as publication and peer-reviewed presentations with faculty being the assumed audience. However, this focus is not driven by the pedagogy of care and may actually run counter to it. As Felten (2013) has noted, peer-reviewed academic publications may not always be the best way to disseminate SoTL in terms of achieving its purposes of influencing teaching and learning. By only recognizing and rewarding SoTL that fits into narrow pre-existing definitions of "good scholarship" we fail to recognize its impact beyond the journal article and retain very traditional and narrowly focused conceptions of knowledge mobilization for our work. The consequence is that it disincentivizes faculty from sharing SoTL through other media, such as workshops, online fora, and social media, which may have more success in reaching a wider student audience. When conceiving of students as knowledge users of SoTL, only concentrating on academic fora for sharing SoTL, such as journal articles, seems limited and reifies particular knowledge production and knowledge gatekeepers. By considering the forms and fora for sharing SoTL with students we have opportunities for students to engage in discussions about scholarly teaching and for faculty to reciprocate in conversations about scholarly learning. University administrations could help facilitate such shifts by promoting, encouraging, and rewarding multiple forms of knowledge mobilization of SoTL scholarship, including the incorporation of SoTL findings into academic coursework and other venues.

We recognize that the reasons why the SoTL community may want to share SoTL findings with students may stretch well beyond those we have listed here and we encourage further reflection and debate in the community on this topic. After all, context is a key consideration for any SoTL study (Felten 2013) and we are also acutely aware that all the authors of this piece are from the Western world with all the limitations and biases that entails. Understanding the broadest range of reasons why we want to share SoTL findings with students and conceiving of this as our commitment to knowledge mobilization of SoTL will enable us to understand better how we might do this. Connections with other contemporaneous issues are also warranted. How, for example, does sharing SoTL findings with students pave the way for more forms of relational pedagogy (Felten and Lambert, 2020)? How does it transform the position of faculty and staff when they become learners as well as instructors? How does involving students in discussions about SoTL findings challenge and reshape consumerist, satisfaction-driven narratives of higher education?

Additionally, one reviewer noted that there are also challenges to students in the sharing of SoTL findings. For many students, not only do they need to manage their academic coursework, but they are also balancing work obligations, family obligations, and many other demands on their time. Thus, the added challenge for faculty and staff who want to share SoTL findings with students is how to do so in ways that would not create additional responsibilities or anxieties for the students, which circles back to the ethical obligations of a pedagogy of care approach. In addition to the examples in the vignettes, one recent example of how to embed the sharing of SoTL findings mindfully with students within existing teaching and learning activities can be found in Maurer and Shipp (2021). Their faculty-student, co-inquiry partnership evaluated the effectiveness of an in-class intervention to teach students the successive relearning study strategy to learn course content more effectively and efficiently. In

essence, their translational approach to knowledge mobilization took findings from the SoTL literature and guided students through how to use those findings to change their own study habits with the goal of improving their scores on course examinations. Other similar interventions could capitalize upon student needs and motivations for the improvement of learning without making the sharing of SoTL findings an "add-on" (Zhao et al. 2014).

Returning to our explanations of "sharing" in the context of knowledge mobilization, we have attempted to capture existing examples where SoTL findings are communicated with students with a purpose to either disseminate information (e.g., reporting back the outcome of a SoTL study), translate into practice (discuss what the implications are for approaches to teaching and learning, curriculum design, etc.), or where they are co-created with students (in the process of co-inquiry, co-authoring, and co-presenting).

Again, we do not intend for these examples to be interpreted as an exhaustive list, nor do we seek to make claims about them being the most effective ways to engage in knowledge mobilization of SoTL (further research is required on this). What we do hope to generate is further discussion in the SoTL community on other means of sharing SoTL with students. We encourage all scholars to self-reflect on how they share SoTL findings with students using the questions used to generate the vignettes included in this paper.

Intentional discussion about what type of sharing we are engaging with and connecting this to knowledge mobilization efforts, how and where this sharing takes place, and situating it meaningfully with considerations about care, quality, disruption, and reflective practice begin to describe a web of interconnections. As we develop a fuller picture within the field of how colleagues (including students themselves) are sharing SoTL findings with students, we hope the discussion we present here provides a jumping off point for others to consider their own practices.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND FURTHER RESEARCH

We intend for our work here to contribute to the ongoing discussion about the aims of SoTL to improve student learning. In exploring the facets of sharing SoTL findings with students we have returned to Shulman's (1993) idea of "teaching as community property." Within this frame, there is space for thinking broadly about our ways of sharing SoTL with students. Ultimately, yes, we intend for SoTL to improve student learning. But when defined broadly, sharing SoTL with students means creating new dialogic spaces to discuss, frame, co-own, and contest SoTL, not merely feed back outcomes to students. It requires an acknowledgement of students as knowledge agents in SoTL. Thinking about the range of ways, spaces, and places in which SoTL is (or could be) shared with students offers a tangible way to engage with Shulman's vision of making teaching community property and it sees students as key generators, brokers, and end users of the knowledge produced in this work. By seeing students as a legitimate, important, and even necessary audience for SoTL work, we have to see them within this community and thus that they have claim to call SoTL their "property" too. They have a stake in what happens.

Our paper makes modest attempts to make the abstract idea of what teaching as community property might be more concrete. We call on members of the SoTL community, including students, to:

- build upon the examples provided, adding to and expanding the examples of how sharing SoTL occurs with students' communities;

- examine where there might be more opportunities in classrooms for "conversational scholarship" (Werder et al. 2010) to discuss SoTL findings (either from one's own research or that of others');
- promote opportunities in journals and conferences for faculty to develop submissions that explicitly identify students as the target audience rather than assume they will be drawn to the topic through a special interest;
- conduct research into the benefits of and barriers to sharing SoTL findings with students; and
- examine whether the type of sharing undertaken reaches whole classes/cohorts or select groups of students.

REFLECTIVE CRITIQUE

A strength in this process was the multitude of positions and perspectives we each brought in when thinking about the value of sharing SoTL findings with students. This means that our respective routes "in" to this conversation likely reflect the complexity and multiplicity of experiences in the SoTL community. We are an authorial team of faculty, a current student, and a recent graduate. Our experiences and perspectives mean that we have each been able to share thoughts and examples from our practices and ways that we have worked with students to share SoTL findings.

Early discussions in our group led us to consider the places where we have an opportunity to share SoTL outcomes in our own practice and to connect these to ideas of knowledge mobilization that we had not done before. It required us to think broadly and innovatively and consider contemporary technologies as well as traditional means and the role each plays in helping to disseminate, translate, or co-create SoTL with student audiences in mind. We hope that our work will help to jumpstart a long overdue conversation within the broader international SoTL community about sharing the findings of SoTL with students and that this piece will provide some considerations and provocations for that ongoing conversation.

Throughout our many discussions and the extensive writing process focused on encouraging the expanded sharing of SoTL findings with students we were cognizant of particular limitations that could not be addressed in this paper, but could offer opportunities for future research. First, it would be helpful to have empirical data to analyze the impact of particular ways that SoTL research is being shared broadly and systematically through programs or within institutions. We did not have any empirical data beyond our vignettes, so a discussion about widespread student and/or institutional impact of our suggestions was of interest but was beyond the scope of this paper. Future research could include interviews with instructors about experiences with sharing findings with students, which could inform and supplement knowledge beyond our discussions in this paper. We would also welcome studies that focused on students' voices about sharing findings that could give relevant perspectives for how to facilitate practice, provide student driven reasons about why we should (or when we should not) share, and identify possible outcomes for the students. Finally, following the former issues are the questions about impact on student learning, behavior, and/or attitudes. In order to fully determine if and how our ideas of sharing findings would impact students, both currently and in their future learning, we would need a more robust impact matrix and further studies. Such findings could offer ideas about which methods are most useful, practical, and engaging, and perhaps show us the expanded impact on the field of SoTL.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Trent W. Maurer is a Professor of Child and Family Development at Georgia Southern University (USA). He teaches courses in Family Science, Child Development, and the University Honors Program. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5460-9872.

Cherie Woolmer is Assistant Professor and Canada Research Chair (SoTL) at the Mokakiiks Centre for SoTL, Mount Royal University (CAN). At time of writing, she was a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Paul. R. MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation, and Excellence in Teaching at McMaster University (CAN). https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3173-7657.

Nichole Powell is an Associate Professor of Chemistry at Oxford College of Emory University (USA).

Carol Sisson is an Associate Professor of Education at Taylor University (USA).

Catherine Snelling is an Associate Professor at Adelaide Dental School at the University of Adelaide (AUS). https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7453-0512.

Odd Rune Stalheim is an Associate Professor of Innovation and Pedagogy at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences (NOR).

Ian J. Turner is a Professor of Learning and Teaching at the University of Derby (GBR) and National Teaching Fellow. He has a research interests in game-based learning and gamification. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5070-6621.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Vivienne, Rafaela Rabello, Rob Wass, Clinton Golding, Ana Rangi, Esmay Eteuati, Zoe Bristowe, and Arianna Waller. 2020. "Good Teaching as Care in Higher Education." *Higher Education* 79, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00392-6.

Barnett, Ronald. 2004. "Learning for an Unknown Future." *Higher Education Research & Development* 23, no. 3: 247–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436042000235382.

Bovill, Catherine, and Cherie Woolmer. 2020. "Student Engagement in Evaluation: Expanding Perspectives and Ownership." In *A Handbook for Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theory Into Practice*, edited by Tom Lowe and Yassein El Hakim, 83–96. Routledge.

Cook-Sather, Alison. 2014. "Multiplying Perspectives and Improving Practice: What Can Happen When Undergraduate Students Collaborate with College Faculty to Explore Teaching and Learning." *Instructional Science* 42, no. 1: 31–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9292-3.

Danielson, Charlotte. 1996. *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Danielson, Charlotte. 2013. *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument: 2013 Edition*. Princeton, NJ: The Danielson Group.

Diaz, Anita, Jennifer Hill, Rhiannon Jenkins, Alison E. Kay, Andrew Pye, Dawn Morley, and Natalia T. Garavito. 2015. "A SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) Evaluation of University Student-Staff Partnerships in Co-creating Educational Resources, Peer Support and Research within STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics) Subjects." *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports* 5, no. 2: 161–70. https://doi.org/10.9734/JSRR/2015/14498.

Eady, Michelle, and Corinne Green. 2020. "The Invisible Line: Students as Partners or Students as Colleagues?" *International Journal for Students as Partners* 4, no. 1: 148–54. https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v4i1.3895.

Ellingson, Laura L., and Carolyn Ellis. 2008. "Autoethnography as Constructionist Project." In *Handbook of Constructionist Research*, edited by James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium, 445–65. New York: Guilford.

Felten, Peter. 2013. "Principles of Good Practice in SoTL." *Teaching and Learning Inquiry* 1, no. 1: 121–25. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.121.

Felten, Peter, Sophia Abbot, Jordan Kirkwood, Aaron Long, Tanya Lubicz-Nawrocka, Lucy Mercer-Mapstone, and Roselynn Verwoord. 2019. "Reimagining the Place of Students in Academic Development." *International Journal for Academic Development* 24: 192–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2019.1594235.

Felten, Peter, Julianne Bagg, Michael Bumbry, Jennifer Hill, Karen Hornsby, Maria Pratt, and Saranne Weller. 2013. "A Call for Expanding Inclusive Student Engagement in SoTL." *Teaching and Learning Inquiry* 1, no. 2: 63–74. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.2.63.

Felten, Peter, and Leo M. Lambert. 2020. *Relationship Rich Education: How Human Connections Drive Success in College*. John Hopkins University Press.

Fielding, Michael. 1999. "Radical Collegiality: Affirming Teaching as an Inclusive Professional Practice." *Australian Educational Researcher* 26, no. 2: 1–34.

Fishman, Barry J. 2014. "Designing Usable Interventions: Bringing Student Perspectives to the Table." *Instructional Science* 42, no. 1: 115–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9298-x.

Georgas, Helen. 2014. "Google Vs. the Library (Part II): Student Search Patterns and Behaviors When Using Google and a Federated Search Tool." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 14: 503–32.

Gruzd, Anatoliy, Caroline Haythornthwaite, Drew Paulin, Sarah Gilbert, and Marc E. del Valle. 2018. "Uses and Gratifications Factors for Social Media Use in Teaching: Instructors' Perspectives." *New Media & Society* 20: 475–94. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444816662933.

Healey, Mick, Abbi Flint, and Kathy Harrington. 2014. *Students as Partners in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*. York, UK: Higher Education Academy.

Healey, Mick, and Ruth Healey. 2018. "'It Depends': Exploring the Context-Dependent Nature of Students as Partners Practices and Policies." *International Journal for Students as Partners* 2, no. 1: 1–10. https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v2i1.3472.

Hoy, Anita W. 2019. *Educational Psychology*. 14th Ed. New York: Pearson.

Hutchings, Pat, and Lee S. Shulman. 1999. The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments. *Change* 31, no. 5: 10–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091389909604218.

Juwah, Charles. 2004. *Enhancing Student Learning through Effective Formative Feedback*. York, England: Higher Education Academy (Generic Centre).

Kreber, Carolin. 2007. "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: No One Way." *Interchange: Newsletter of the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment at the University of Edinburgh*, 1–6.

Kupatadze, Ketevan. 2018. "Course Redesign with Student-Faculty Partnership: A Reflection on Opportunities and Vulnerabilities." *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education* 24. Retrieved from https://repository.brynmawr.edu/tlthe/vol1/iss24/2.

Lang, James M. 2016. *Small Teaching: Everyday Lessons from the Science of Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

MacNeil, Melanie S., and Marilyn Evans. 2005. "The Pedagogy of Caring in Nursing Education." *International Journal for Human Caring* 9, no. 4, 45–51. https://doi.org/10.20467/1091-5710.9.4.45.

Marquis, Elizabeth, Rachel Guitman, Elaina Nguyen, and Cherie Woolmer. 2020. "'It's a Little More Complicated for Me': Faculty Social Location and Experiences of Pedagogical Partnership." *Higher Education Research and Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1806789.

Maurer, Trent W., and Catelyn Shipp. 2021. "Challenges of Shaping Student Study Strategies for Success." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 9, no. 1.

McClurg, Caitlyn, Margy MacMillan, and Nancy Chick. 2019. Visions of the Possible: Engaging with Librarians in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 7, no. 2: 3–13. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.7.2.1.

McKinney, Kathleen. 2003. "What is the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) in Higher Education?" *Teaching/Learning Matters* 33, no. 1: 6–7.

McKinney, Kathleen. 2012a. "Increasing the Impact of SoTL: Two Sometimes Neglected Opportunities." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 6, no. 1: Article 3. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2012.060103.

McKinney, Kathleen. 2012b. "Making a Difference: Application of SoTL to Enhance Learning." *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 12, no. 1: 1–7. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/josotl/article/view/1971.

Mercer-Mapstone, Lucy, Sam L. Dvorakova, Kelly E. Matthews, Sophia Abbot, Breagh Cheng, Peter Felten, Kris Knorr, Elizabeth Marquis, Rafaella Shammas, and Kelly Swaim. 2017. "A Systematic Literature Review of Students as Partners in Higher Education." *International Journal for Students as Partners* 1, no. 1. https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i1.3119.

Morehead, Kayla, Matthew G. Rhodes, and Sarah DeLozier. 2016. "Instructor and Student Knowledge of Study Strategies." *Memory* 24, no. 2: 257–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2014.1001992.

Murray, Rowena. 2008. *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Palmer, Parker J. 1983. *To Know As We Are Known*. New York: Harper & Row.

Papadopoulos, Irena. 2017. "Intercultural Compassion in Higher Education. In *The Pedagogy of Compassion at the Heart of Higher Education*, edited by Paul Gibbs, 73–84. New York: Springer.

Persky, Adam M., and Shelby L. Hudson. 2016. "A Snapshot of Student Study Strategies Across a Professional Pharmacy Curriculum: Are Students Using Evidence-Based Practice?" *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning* 8, no. 2: 141–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2015.12.010.

Phipps, David, Joanne Cummings, Debra Pepler, Wendy Craig, and Shelby Cardinal. 2016. "The Co-produced Pathway to Impact Describes Knowledge Mobilization Processes." *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship* 9, no. 1: 31–40. http://jces.ua.edu/the-co-produced-pathway-to-impact-describes-knowledge-mobilization-processes/.

Potter, Michael K., and Erika D. H. Kustra. 2011. "The Relationship between Scholarly Teaching and SoTL: Models, Distinctions, and Clarifications." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 5, no. 1: Article 23. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2011.050123.

Ryan, Alex, and Daniella Tilbury. 2013. *Flexible Pedagogies: New Pedagogical Ideas*. York: Higher Education Academy.

Rowan-Kenyon, Heather T., Ana M. M. Alemán, Kevin Gin, Bryan Blakeley, Adam Gismondi, Jonathan Lewis, Adam McCready, Daniel Zepp, and Sarah Knight. 2016. "Social Media in Higher Education." *ASHE Higher Education Report* 42, no. 5: 7–128. https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.20103

Rushton, Ian, and Martin Suter. 2012. *Reflective Practice for Teaching in Lifelong Learning*. Maidenhead, U.K.: McGraw-Hill Education.

Shulman, Lee S. 1993. "Teaching as Community Property: Putting an End to Pedagogical Solitude." *Change* 25, no. 6: 6–7.

Snowball, Jen D., and Sioux McKenna. 2017. "Student-Generated Content: An Approach to Harnessing the Power of Diversity in Higher Education." *Teaching in Higher Education* 22, no. 5: 604–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2016.1273205.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. (2019, June 17). "Guidelines for Effective Knowledge Mobilization." Retrieved August 26, 2020 from https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/policies-politiques/knowledge_mobilisation-mobilisation_des_connaissances-eng.aspx.

Trigwell, Keith. 2012. "Scholarship of Teaching and Learning." In *University Teaching in Focus: A Learning-Centred Approach*, edited by Lynne Hunt and Denise Chalmers, 253–67. Melbourne, Australia: ACER Press.

Walker, Caroline, and Alan Gleaves. 2016. "Constructing the Caring Higher Education Teacher: A Theoretical Framework." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 54: 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.013.

Werder, Carmen, Cora Thomas, Luke Ware, and Erik Skogsberg. 2010. "Students in Parlor Talk on Teaching and Learning: Conversational Scholarship." In *Engaging Student Voices in the Study of Teaching and Learning*, edited by C. Werder and M. Otis, 16–31. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Woolmer, Cherie. 2018. "Exploring Dimensions of Risk in Pedagogical Partnerships in Higher Education." *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education*, no. 24. https://repository.brynmawr.edu/tlthe/vol1/iss24/1/.

Wuetherick, Brad, and Stan Yu. 2016. "The Canadian Teaching Commons: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Canadian Higher Education." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 2016, no. 146: 23–30.

Zhao, Ningfeng, Jeffrey G. Wardeska, Saundra Y. McGuire, and Elzbieta Cook. 2014. "An Effective Tool to Promote Success in College Science Learning." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 43, no. 4: 48–54.