

Portfolio for Sarah Robbins

**Nominee of Kennesaw State University
For the Regents' Research in Undergraduate Education Award
Regional and State Universities**

**Transforming Learning in Thought and Practice:
Building Communities through the Scholarship of Teaching**

“[T]he scholarship of teaching and learning is characterized by a transformational agenda. . . . The scholarship of teaching and learning might then be defined as scholarship undertaken in the name of change, with one measure of its success being its impact on thought and practice.”

**From
Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Report on Case Studies Sponsored by the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of
Teaching and Learning**

I often tell teacher education students that I was engaged in the “scholarship of teaching” before I knew about the term. I make this point with examples from my own K-12 teaching days to demonstrate that such important scholarly work can actually go on informally, as Pat Hutchings has said, at the kind of “brown-bag lunch” where colleagues talk about “their classroom practice.”¹

I tell these stories partly to suggest how the pre-service educators and long-time practitioners I teach can cultivate habits of shared reflective inquiry themselves. At the same time, I tell such stories to model how my students can move, as I have, from seeking answers to questions about teaching a particular class, to forging organized opportunities for collaboratively investigating learning.

I write *this* story about my own scholarship of teaching with a similar dual purpose in mind. I hope to demonstrate how I use narrative as a methodology for studying my own teaching. But I also intend to show how my work has progressed through still-unfolding stages, consistent with recent analyses by the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Overall, my story traces how my coming to lead the Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project (KMWP), a scholarship of teaching community, has impacted my own and others’ learning in deep, significant, and lasting ways.

Finding “What Works”: Laying Groundwork for KMWP Approaches

In the *Opening Lines* report on eight Carnegie-supported case studies on teaching, Pat Hutchings suggested that this body of research has, by now, identified several questions recurring in the field. The first of these Hutchings designates as the “what works” question, a point “where many faculty begin—seeking evidence about the relative effectiveness” of teaching approaches.

This kind of inquiry was, in fact, where I began my own work in the scholarship of teaching. Whether instructing community college composition classes in a Midwestern General Motors town or leading humanities courses at an independent K-12 school, I was informally experimenting with and documenting my own efforts to improve teaching. However, like the scholarship of teaching field itself, my efforts to study teaching in the late ‘80s and early ‘90s were not yet systematic. I barely imagined that my own efforts to improve my teaching could have an impact beyond my own classroom. That changed when I returned to graduate school in 1990, just as the scholarship of teaching movement was emerging from its infancy. Convinced that I needed to renew my knowledge about the humanities and about how to teach them, I enrolled in an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program in English and Education, where I assumed I would acquire a clear roadmap. What I found instead, at the University of Michigan, was an array of inquiry communities using diverse approaches to study teaching. Participating in several research teams there, I slowly began to accept the complexity inherent in such work. But I still longed to know “what worked” in teaching, especially since I was about to begin a new career as a professor focusing on English Education.

Arriving at Kennesaw State in the fall of 1993, I met Jean Ketter, another new faculty member, whose interest in studying teaching complemented mine. Assigned to develop a new subject-specific

¹ Pat Hutchings, “Approaching the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,” Introduction to *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, online at: <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/eLibrary/approaching.htm>. (Subsequent references are to the same online edition and appear within the essay.) Hutchings quotes Mary Huber to argue that “the scholarship of teaching and learning” is actually a continuum ranging from informal, yet productive exchanges between teachers who reflect on their practice to the more traditional version of educational research using an experimental model. I would associate Hutchings’ view of informal reflection on teaching with Patricia Lambert Stock’s argument that the “anecdote” about teaching practices which is usually at the center of “teacher talk” can hold insights as valuable as more quantitatively oriented scholarship on teaching. Accordingly, this essay on my scholarship of teaching is presented as an anecdotal narrative, using stories from my practice as a teacher researcher to convey my goals, theories, and scholarly methods. See “The Function of Anecdote in Teacher Research” *English Education* 25 (1996): 173-87.

methods course for pre-service middle grades teachers, we did a “what works” study of our first class. Having both researched the use of reflection for assessing learning, we placed student portfolios at the center of our shared class. Throughout the term, using what Hutchings has called “methodological pluralism,” we evaluated not only our own teaching but also our students’ learning through our portfolio program. With anonymous written reflections and focus group exit interviews, for instance, we tracked students’ views of their own progress. Later, inviting several students to join us, we wrote about our research for *English Education*, the major journal for language arts educators.

In a methods class I developed for preservice high school teachers the same year, I used many of the same techniques for promoting reflection. But for the high school class I had the added advantage of connecting with a school administrator eager to involve her staff in collaborative professional development. When Athena Vachtsevanos invited me to “place” our methods students at Sprayberry High, she set the stage for a shared commitment to teacher education—one linking undergraduates, practitioners, and university faculty—positioning the scholarship of teaching as a linchpin of our partnership. This collaboration anticipated and shaped the KMWP’s founding.

Along with the Sprayberry teachers, I designed a field experience requiring collaborative research projects to study “what worked” (or did not work) during the students’ time at the school, and I connected this project to reflective analysis of learning back on campus. Viewing the practices of classroom life as sources of significant information, we drew on Geertzian ethnographic techniques to study both the “microteaching” students did before their field placements and their teaching in the schools. Drawing on reflective writing assessments by scholars such as Peter Johnston, we saw the students’ course portfolios as both evaluation instruments and tools for professional growth. Making the course itself a shared object of analysis, all of us—teacher mentors, undergraduate students and me—evaluated the class critically at the end of each term, asking ourselves (in questionnaires, oral debriefings, and written reflections) how it could “work” better.

In an email I received recently from one of the students in those early ‘90s classes, I saw clear evidence that the habits of reflective analysis these studies of teaching were designed to promote did take hold. Connecting her own current East Paulding High instruction with her training in our class, Linda Templeton observed: “Even though I’ve been teaching seven years, I still reflect on my teaching, never using a cookie-cutter approach, always changing and improving on the lessons taught, the strategies used, and the lessons learned. . . . I even ask my students their opinions and ask them what I should continue using and what needs improving, as we did in methods class. In an effort to help others as you helped me, I encourage my fellow teachers to reflect on their own classroom practice, in hopes of making all of us better teachers for our students.”

I think part of what prompts Linda to continue asking herself “what works” is the experience of having been included, while still a student, in the process of evaluating learning. As NCTE president-elect Patricia Stock observed in a published commentary on the significance of the scholarship Jean Ketter and I were doing in the early 1990s, our commitment to involving students in studying their own learning “erase[d] the distinction between the researcher and the researched,” forging a new kind of scholarly partnership that could live on well beyond the end of a course.²

Describing “What It Looks Like”: Defining Shared Learning Projects

Like Hutchings’ “what works” kind of question, descriptive studies of pedagogy have been crucial to my development as a researcher of undergraduate teaching and learning. Playing a different

² In her review of her tenure as editor of *English Education*, Stock selected the article Ketter and I wrote with our students as one of the journal’s key contributions to the field during that period. See “Post-modern Scholarship: Contributions from a Practice Profession” 28 (1996), especially 236-38.

role than research exploring teaching effectiveness, Hutchings explains, descriptive studies can offer systematic analysis of learning in action—not just what is taught but its impact on students. In my own work, I have found that scholarship exploring the constituent features of a field of knowledge as students experience it can highlight opportunities for collaborative revision of (inter)disciplinary content itself. After all, students are more likely to see themselves as able to create new knowledge if they understand fields they study as having been socially constructed (and therefore subject to change and growth).

Let me illustrate with another anecdote from my informal studies of teacher education in action. During my first years at KSU, when much of my time was devoted to observing student teachers, I noted that they sometimes encountered resistance to their efforts to introduce new content knowledge into the classroom. I listened closely to the rationales being cited by practitioner colleagues who discouraged student teachers from developing new content. From patterns I identified in their comments, I gradually realized that some experienced teachers' visions of the field they taught were more static than dynamic, and that they were, therefore, striving with sincere dedication to safeguard bodies of knowledge in which they were highly invested. This informal research, in other words, led me to recognize the benefits of constantly updating schoolteachers' knowledge. Pragmatically, the more up-to-date area teachers are in their fields of study, the better off our undergraduate teacher education students will be. In addition, faculty in undergraduate courses will find their students better prepared when the university commits resources to improving teachers' content knowledge.

With these broad goals in mind, in the mid-1990s I developed a second area of emphasis in my scholarship of teaching—to study collaboratively *with* area educators the content of humanities fields where major expansions in knowledge had occurred in recent years. This ambitious agenda was spearheaded by the founding of our National Writing Project (NWP) site, the Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project, in 1994. The KMWP, which I direct, sponsors a month-long summer institute annually, inviting 15-20 teachers to campus to study their own teaching of writing, i.e., to study together “what [the field] looks like” in their classrooms and others.’ By including college-level writing instructors in our institutes, consistent with the NWP’s K-20 model, we have had a direct impact on undergraduate as well as K-12 instruction.³ Meanwhile, distinctive among most NWP sites, the KMWP has also secured major funding for studying teaching of literature, history, and other humanities subfields, in addition to cross-disciplinary writing. (See my *vita* for examples.)

First, in 1995-96, Professor Dede Yow and I assembled a group of 25 area history and English teachers to collaborate with KSU and nationally renowned faculty from other institutions in “Domesticating the Canon,” a month-long NEH workshop and school-year follow-up program in the scholarship of teaching. Studying nineteenth- and twentieth-century women’s writing together, we developed strategies for revising our course syllabi to include more women’s texts (i.e., texts written by women), but also to approach our study of literature through feminist theory, e.g., asking ourselves how women readers in particular historical moments used specific texts in their lives.

Like our 25 schoolteacher participants, I radically revamped several of my own literature courses, then studied the impact the changes had on student learning in my classes. For example, in 1996 I developed a course including students’ individualized research on neglected women authors. I used “before” and “after” written reflections by students to track not only how their knowledge of authors and literary works shifted through the course, but (more importantly) how their understanding of “literature” and “American literature” as fields of study changed dramatically. I also created an

³ Besides having a number of KSU undergraduate writing instructors take part over the years, the KMWP institute has also included instructors who worked or now work at Chattahoochee Tech, Dalton College, Brenau University, Georgia State, and the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

offering in Multi-ethnic American literature which drew extensively on women authors. In the latter course, drawing on feminist strategies for leading discussion which our NEH group had explored together, I experimented with writing careful “prompts” for a listserv to supplement class discussion of literary texts, and at the end of the term I invited class members to help me evaluate how the listserv had functioned. After presenting the results of my discourse analysis and student interviews at an international conference on teaching, I later corresponded with faculty from other institutions who had applied my approaches and had positive experiences in their own undergraduate courses.

I was certainly not the only KSU faculty member who improved my undergraduate teaching as a result of that first NEH-funded project. As Dede Yow wrote later in an analysis of “Domesticating the Canon” for *American Quarterly*, “hosting the NEH program and its offspring has clearly had an impact on the culture of our University” both “organic” and “multidimensional.” Using her own teaching as an example, Yow chronicled how her teaming with Tom Scott from the KSU History Department to teach a Georgia History/Georgia Writers course became “a more self-consciously ‘public’ pedagogy” after the NEH program. For example, they now “think constantly about the larger implications of working with pre-service teachers in our classes.”⁴ Ann Pullen and I have shared a similar experience, as is described below and in her support letter. Overall, in fact, the scholarship of teaching institutes which the KMWP began to offer in the mid-1990s through NWP, NEH, and Georgia Humanities Council funding helped move my own work and that of other faculty beyond the stage of studying the fields we teach, to *re-making* them. That is, these experiences led a number of us to Pat Hutchings’ third area of investigation, imagining new “visions of the possible” in teaching.

Studying “Visions of the Possible”: Reforming Teaching to Transform Learning

My collaborative research with Professor Ann Pullen of KSU’s history department provides a case study-like example of how the scholarship of teaching initiatives of the Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project have impacted undergraduate education at our institution. Immediately after that first NEH-funded program, both Dr. Pullen and I revamped courses we were teaching individually—hers in women’s history and mine on women’s writing. (See above.) More significantly, however, the opportunity to think critically (along with the “Domesticating” project’s schoolteachers) about possible connections between women’s studies in history and in English classes prompted us to imagine re-designing our two courses into one interdisciplinary experience for undergraduates. Starting in 1997, we have mounted three very different offerings of our joint course. Our scholarship of teaching on each of the classes has addressed different inquiry questions, always framed to imagine new possibilities for interdisciplinary teaching about “women’s work.”

Our first venture, supported by a Regents’ technology grant, investigated how the field of women’s studies might be re-invented through new technologies. Using video distance learning (GSAMS) and a listserv, we linked our students at KSU with a parallel group at Armstrong Atlantic. We had imagined an idealized cross-site “conversazione” modeled on the nineteenth century study often located in educated women’s parlors. We sought to enliven our cross-site conversazione through a number of presentation technologies, such as PowerPoint shows and display of artifacts with an in-

⁴ See “Linking the Secondary Schools and the University: American Studies as a Collaborative Public Enterprise,” *American Quarterly* 50 (September 1998): 783-808. This article, which I wrote collaboratively with several faculty members and schoolteachers involved in “Domesticating the Canon,” was the first such essay to appear in *AQ*, the flagship journal of the American Studies Association. In her survey of the field for her ASA Presidential Address in November 1999, in fact, Mary Kelley singled out the “Domesticating the Canon” project as a model for university outreach and collaborative scholarship. See the reprint of her comments in “Taking Stands: American Studies at Century’s End,” *American Quarterly* 52 (March 2000): 1-22. Kelley praised the project’s “lasting impact”: “partnerships initiated by scholars and teachers, which have continued to the present and now include students in the teachers’ classrooms” (14-15).

room camera. As our published reports on this experiment have shown, we had a “mix of setbacks and successes” with our approach. However, by involving our students in critique of the course’s overall strengths and weaknesses, we were able to clarify “that our implementation of specific technological tools was sometimes at odds with our feminist teaching philosophy, at other times consistent with it.” We analyzed not only “what worked” but how our students came to perceive the field of interdisciplinary study and technology tools for learning. For example, as Randy Bass noted in his highly positive review of our scholarship for the Crossroads project report, our analysis highlighted “the need to make [our] rationale (rooted both in the nature of the technology and its embedding in a particular perspective) clear to students.”⁵

We have followed a similar path of imagining “visions of the possible” yet being open to ongoing re-vision in our second and third offerings of the course. In each case, we have learned more about interdisciplinarity itself and about our students’ learning processes. This progression has led us to a fundamental redirection of our teaching to promote students’ own making of new knowledge, while emphasizing learning processes as much as products.

We have made great progress since our first attempt to re-imagine women’s studies at KSU as a collaborative, interdisciplinary enterprise. But we are still drawing constantly upon the praxis-oriented theories and methods for studying teaching that we first learned as members of the national faculty investigative team of the Crossroads Teaching with Technology Project. Cross-institutional collaborations like Crossroads help us re-imagine not only our own classes but also the very frameworks for teaching and learning in which those courses are conceived and delivered. Thus, our scholarship imagining “visions of the possible” can influence others teaching in the humanities, especially when we make our teaching public.⁶ Placing our scholarship of teaching in conversation with others’ has also made the work more rigorous and productive and has prepared members of the KMWP’s interconnected learning communities of schoolteachers and KSU faculty to take on leadership in a wider public arena studying learning, thereby moving us to Hutchings’ fourth stage.

“Formulating New Conceptual Frameworks”: The KMWP’s Activist Model-Making

Hutchings has singled out for special praise a fourth category in the scholarship of teaching—producing “new models and conceptual frameworks [that] generate new questions” leading the movement itself to “extend its boundaries.” Bemoaning the fact that such models/frameworks “for shaping thought about practice” are, as yet, “under-represented” in the scholarship, Hutchings calls for increased efforts in this area.

While I agree with Hutchings that this fourth dimension for researching teaching has been slower to develop than the other three, I would argue that communities like those fostered through the Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project are, in fact, disseminating such work in ever-expanding venues. A primary example would be the KMWP’s second NEH-funded scholarship of teaching project, “Making American Literatures” (MAL). The 1997-99 MAL program focused on American literature as a changing field of knowledge and pedagogy, as suggested by the term “Making” in the project title. A teacher research team from our National Writing Project site collaborated with groups from the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Michigan for initial study at UC-Berkeley

⁵ Randy Bass and Bret Eynon, “Teaching Culture, Learning Culture, and New Media Technologies,” *Works and Days* 31/32 (1998): 27.

⁶ For instance, in a review within the *Works and Days* volume, Kimberly Wallace-Sanders singled out our project as making significant contributions to the emerging scholarship on teaching with new technologies. See “Navigating the Net,” where she praises our “excellent model” of a “feminist, computer-enhanced ‘conversazione’” as a “challenging site of collaborative teaching and learning” (452).

one summer, follow-up during the school year, and then a second summer offering a similar regional session at KSU for teachers from around Georgia. One major goal of our scholarship was to study ways for connecting the teaching of American literature in high school and in undergraduate courses. In regional and national presentations, as well as a recently-published anthology of essays about teaching American literature, we have extended the impact of this work to many audiences.

I am currently directing an even more ambitious effort to generate and assess a collaborative framework for (studying) humanities teaching. “Keeping and Creating American Communities,” our third multi-year NEH scholarship of teaching project, has brought together KMWP educators with colleagues from several other NWP sites around the country to explore writing-centered, interdisciplinary approaches for researching community cultures. In the project’s first year, with the support of KSU faculty from several disciplines, teachers worked in research teams themselves to try out strategies for community-based inquiry (e.g., gathering oral histories, “reading” public spaces, studying material culture). In the second year, we have moved to more self-conscious study of how our interdisciplinary framework promotes student learning. In year three, we will focus on evaluation and refinement of our model.

Although we have just passed the midway point for this project, its impact on learners in classes at KSU and elsewhere is already quite striking. (See support letters from composition instructor Linda Stewart and from undergraduate students Marty Lamers and Stacie Janecki.) Perhaps more importantly, because we consciously constructed a “disseminate-as-we-go” delivery model, we have already begun to share our “work in progress” at local, regional, and national conferences sponsored by professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the American Studies Association. Just this week, I received an email from an historical society director in Minnesota, who attended our November workshop in Washington, D.C., and who is basing a new project in his city on one of the school-community partnership examples we shared. Terming our session “inspiring,” his email reaffirmed our commitment to extending the community envisioned by our model into networks of educators committed to activist, student-centered learning, with an emphasis on the collaborative construction of new, shared knowledge.

Despite the pleasure we are taking from such praise, our entire project team of almost three dozen educators is nonetheless aware that more challenging dissemination responsibilities lie ahead. Committed to having a deep, significant, and lasting impact on learning, we are refining our approaches for teaching others about our model. This goal, as our national advisory board member Randy Bass and others have reminded us, has spurred us to generate and analyze multiple “metacognitive records” of our work in action—e.g., student and teacher written reflections, periodic whole-group self-critiques and evaluators’ reports. Turning such tentative data into meaningful analysis for others will require that we integrate all four of Hutchings’ types of work in the scholarship of teaching—accounts of “what works”; descriptions of the interdisciplinary fields of study our students are exploring and redefining; discussions of how our new visions for humanities teaching shape our students’ learning; and critical analysis of our framework itself. Fortunately, building on the KMWP’s past collaborations in the scholarship of teaching, our team is already at work on a website presenting our framework (<http://www.kennesaw.edu/english/kmwp/AmerCommunities/index.html>); a print collection of sample lessons with student work and teacher reflections; workshop curriculum for teachers interested in our framework; and a collection of teacher narratives based on reflective classroom practice. All in all, in the KCAC initiative and numerous other programs, the Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project is breaking new ground as a community-building scholarship of teaching enterprise integrating multiple approaches for studying and supporting learning.

Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae

Sarah Robbins

Associate Professor, English Department, Kennesaw State University

Overview: This c.v. focuses on work in the scholarship of teaching and thus highlights collaborative projects studying teaching in a variety of contexts, as well as my writing about teacher research in my own classroom and about shared studies of teaching. This c.v. excludes a large body of more traditional scholarship (e.g., peer-reviewed articles) in American literature, women's studies, and literacy studies.

Recent Awards and Grant Support for Scholarship of Teaching

President's Award for Community Engagement, Kennesaw State University	2001
Kennesaw State University Faculty Incentive Grant [with Ann Pullen]	2001
Kennesaw State University Master Teacher Grant [with Ann Pullen]	1999
Constance Rourke Prize (awarded by the American Studies Association for the best article in <i>American Quarterly</i> in a given year)	1998
Regents of the University of Georgia Teaching with Technology [with Ann Pullen]	1997-98
Scholar as Mentor Award, Kennesaw State	1997
KSU Faculty Development Grant	1996

Directorships for Grant-Funded Projects involving Scholarship of Teaching:

National Endowment for the Humanities, "Keeping and Creating American Communities," three-year project to study interdisciplinary teaching about local/national/ international community interactions; \$245,000

National Endowment for the Humanities, for "Making American Literatures," a 1997-99 project linking teacher-researchers from 3 National Writing Project sites in collaborative research and development with university scholars; \$235,000

Georgia Humanities Council, "What It Means to Be An American," Collaborative study through shared teaching of a summer honors program, \$19,900

Georgia Humanities Council, "The Journey from Childhood to Adulthood," Collaborative grant for studying theme-based teaching of literature; \$16,000

National Endowment for the Humanities, "Domesticating the Canon," a 1995 Summer Institute and study of school-year teaching offered for secondary American literature and history teachers using women's writing; \$57,000

National Writing Project, site director for the Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project, serving K-20 teachers of writing in northwest Georgia with an annual budget of at least \$60,000 from federal, university and school funds; \$30,000 annual grant

Project Outreach, local director for team involved in national project developing leadership among teacher educators affiliated with the National Writing Project, supported by the DeWitt-Wallace Readers Digest Fund; \$24,000

Write For Your Life, local site director for multi-site national project studying literacy instruction through development of health-centered writing programs

Selected Publications on the Scholarship of Teaching:

"Afterword: Where Do We Go from Here? Future Work for Making American Literatures." In *Making American Literatures*. Eds. Anne Ruggles Gere and Peter Shaheen. Urbana: NCTE Press, 2001.

"Location, Location, Location." In *Making American Literatures*. Gere/Shahen.

- “Promoting a Relevant Classroom Literacy,” In *The Relevance of English*, ed. Robert Yagelski. Urbana: NCTE, 2001.
- “Weaving the Personal and Communal Together in English Classrooms,” In *The Relevance of English*, ed. Robert Yagelski. Urbana: NCTE, 2001.
- “Re-designing the Conversazione: How Can Twenty-First-Century Instructional Technology Foster Feminist Teaching about Nineteenth-Century Women’s Work?” *Works and Days* 31/32 (1998/99): 115-144.
- “Linking the Secondary Schools and the University: American Studies as a Collaborative Public Enterprise.” *American Quarterly* 50.4 (December 1998): 783-808. [first author with multiple co-authors]
- “Beginning a ‘Conversazione’ about Technology and Women’s Work,” Portfolio of Case Studies: On-Line Publications of the ASA Crossroads Research Project: www.georgetown.edu/crossroads/conversations/cases/index.html. [with A. Pullen]
- “Assessment through Collaborative Critique.” In Stephen Tchudi, Ed. *Alternatives to Grading Student Writing* Urbana: NCTE, 1997. 137-161. [first author for a piece co-authored with two National Writing Project teacher consultants]
- “Revising the Language of Classroom-based Assessment: Multiple Perspectives on a Portfolio Experiment in Teacher Education.” *English Education* 28.2 (May 1996): 77-108. [first author of a piece co-authored with three former KSU undergraduate students and a colleague from the College of Education]
- “Collaboration as Dialogue: Teachers and Researchers Engaged in Conversation and Professional Development.” *American Educational Research Journal* 33.1 (Spring 1996): 193-232. [co-authored with several colleagues]
- “Negotiating Authority in Portfolio Classrooms: Teachers’ Use of Assessment Theory to Critique Practice.” *Action in Teacher Education* 17. 1 (Spring 1995): 40-52. [first author with several co-authors]
- “Using Portfolio Reflections to Re-form Instructional Programs and Build Curriculum.” *English Journal* (November 1994): 71-78. [first author with several co-authors]
- “Writing Across Institutional Boundaries: A K-12 and University Collaboration.” *English Journal*. (March 1994): 68-74. [co-authored with two colleagues who helped facilitate email exchanges between K-12 and university students participating in a shared list-serv]
- “(De)constructing Monday Morning: Conversations about Teacher/Author(ity).” *English Journal* (February 1993): 21-26.

Website Dissemination (Writing/Design) for Scholarship of Teaching Projects:

<http://www.kennesaw.edu/english/kmwp/AmerCommunities/index.html>

<http://www.kennesaw.edu/english/kmwp/> (See especially “Ongoing Projects” section.)

<http://www.kennesaw.edu/hss/wwork/overview.htm> (under construction)

Selected National-Level Presentations on the Scholarship of Teaching:

“Making American Literatures: Overview of a Collaborative Curriculum Study Project,” NCTE annual national convention, November 2001

“Engaging Multiple Publics through a Collaborative NEH Project: Stories from the

- Keeping and Creating American Communities Program*,” American Studies Association annual national convention, Washington, DC, November 2001 (presenters including a former KSU undergraduate student).
- “Introducing Beginning Graduate Students to Composing Communities,” CCCC, Denver, Colorado, March 2001
- “Taking Difficult Journeys toward Teacher Leadership,” NCTE annual convention, Milwaukee, November 2000.
- “Seeing the World in Our American Studies Classrooms: Teaching Immigrants in the 21st Century,” American Studies Association convention, Detroit, October 2000.
- “Schoolteacher as Border-Crosser,” paper presented at the American Studies Association annual convention, Montreal, October 1999.
- “Unfinished Business in Key Contact Zones: 1990s' Women's Studies Speaking About/To Girls' Public Literacies,” paper presented at the MLA convention, San Francisco, December 1998.
- “Re-making American Literatures,” paper presented at the NCTE convention, Nashville, November 1998.
- “The Teacher as Public Intellectual,” paper presented at the American Studies Association annual national convention, Washington, October 1997 (with former KSU student as one co-presenter)
- “Team-Teaching a Distance Learning Women's Studies Course,” workshop presented at the American Studies Association annual convention, Washington, October 1997.
- “Opening the Door to Authentic Social Literacy,” workshop led at the NCTE Spring Conference, Charlotte, April 1997 (former KSU undergraduate co-presenting)
- “Collaborative Mentoring Stories,” panel presentation at the NCTE Annual Convention, Chicago, November 1996 (on studying how undergraduate teacher ed students are mentored by classroom teachers and college supervisors)
- “Making Curricular Choices in Varying Local Contexts,” 19th-Century American Women’s Literature in the 21st Century, Conference sponsored by the Harriet Beecher Stowe Center, Trinity College, June 1996 (on changing curriculum for women’s literature courses based on NEH-funded study)
- “Resistance in the Classroom: Defining and Responding,” an interactive presentation at NCTE, San Diego, November 1995.
- “Under Scrutiny, Under Re-vision: Defining Individual Agency within the Process of Accrediting Teacher Certification Programs,” paper presented at the NCTE Annual Convention, Orlando, November 1994 (with several KSU undergraduates as co-presenters)
- “The Effects of Portfolio Learning Experience during Teacher Education on the Pedagogy of Student Teachers,” paper presented for the Research Strand of the NCTE Annual Convention, Orlando, November 1994 (with undergraduate co-presenters)
- Professional Service (including peer reviews) in the Scholarship of Teaching:**
- Member, National Writing Project site directors' task force, 1996-98
- Member, NCTE Commission on English and English Studies, 1994-1998
- Co-Chair, American Studies Association committee on Secondary Education, current

National Endowment for the Humanities, Education Division (major grants), 2001
Book series: University of Nebraska; Blackwell Press; Teachers College Press
English/Language Arts Standards, Atlanta Public Schools, winter, 1998
National Endowment for the Humanities, Focus Grant Program, fall 1996
English Education (top national journal for English Education), 1994-current