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The teacher’s thinking is authenticated only by the authenticity of the students’ thinking. The teacher cannot think for his students, nor can he impose his thoughts on them. Authentic thinking, thinking that is concerned about reality, does not take place in ivory tower isolation, but only in communication. If it is true that thought has meaning only when generated by action upon the world, the subordination of students to teachers becomes impossible.


If faculty are students, then they deserve the best learning environment that we can create for them, and as with students, the best learning environment will both ask more of them and reward them more richly.


Just as Paulo Freire (1968/1990) informs us in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* that “only through communication can human life hold meaning. The teacher’s thinking is authenticated only by the authenticity of the students’ thinking” (pp. 63-64), faculty development garners its meaning only in tandem with the engagement of teachers it serves. CTLs aim, then, to pulse through their institutions, to operate in a dynamic rather than, as Freire would warn “in ivory tower isolation,” emerging only to impose their thoughts (or someone else’s thoughts) on teachers (p. 64). Any CTL worker who has stared at the empty chairs facing a guest speaker or who has had to extend due dates for teaching awards in response to a dearth of applicants has wondered how their CTL might integrate more with the life’s blood of its school. At the same time, CTL workers must wonder always what faculty will find most relevant to their work and how a CTL might not only inform but also be informed by this sense of relevance. Faculty developers discern
that relevance in communication with teachers, in a dialogue that is, above all, concerned with their reality and not what a CTL might predetermine to be their reality.

Contributors to this issue of *JCTL* report on ways they have generated meaningful work alongside other educators at their institutions, moving beyond descriptions of content they might bring to faculty and suggesting instead ways CTLs might bring faculty into dialogues that develop, sustain, and transform the work of CTLs themselves. Sweet, Carpenter, and Blythe, in “Utilizing Foundation Professors,” for example, discuss ways faculty developers might include experienced faculty in program design; and Mary Jo Finney, in “‘Relevance,’ the Agora, and Directing a Center for Teaching and Learning,” reflects on ways administrators and senior faculty, among others, served as the speakers/authors who drove events and publications geared to shape her school’s CTL in the form of a public meeting space. Other works, Laura C. Edwards’s “The Craft of Infusing Critical Thinking Skills” and Cotton, Atwell, and Ombres’s “New Adjunct Faculty Outreach,” describe in detail the types of studies that solicit feedback on programs that enhance teachers’ approaches to critical thinking and shed light on the specific ways increased communication can result in adjunct faculty’s greater participation in CTL functions. In this issue’s concluding article, “Reaching Those Faculty not Easily Reached,” Sweet, Carpenter, and Blythe speak directly to the need for CTLs to increase discrete faculty participation. The authors describe interrelated programs they have developed—a program that invites faculty innovators into leadership roles and another that crafts online development programs—to overcome a shortage of personnel, to share pedagogical insights, and to extend to faculty the responsibility for sharing those insights across their university.

Collectively, the works in this volume reflect a conception of CTL work congruent with Freire’s dialogic approach: one in which CTL workers teach but are also taught, and one in which faculty continue to develop but also teach, not only on behalf of the CTL but also in terms of how they come to teach faculty developers. This approach to faculty development reflects as well the framework for CTLs described in John Tagg’s (2010) piece, “Teachers as Students: Changing the Cognitive Economy Through Professional Development.” Tagg asks that faculty developers think about their work not in isolation but in the context of their institutions’ cognitive economies. As would Freire, Tagg favors development of a hot cognitive economy, which “encourages students to take a deep approach to learning rather than a sur-
face approach (p. 9). He writes, “professional developers are uniquely situated to change some features of the cognitive economy and to raise productive questions about how to heat up the cognitive economy overall” (p. 10).

In light of this issue of JCTL—through which CTL workers generate productive insights in response to coordinated studies (Cottom, Atwell, & Ombres; Edwards), collaborations between the CTL director and a junior faculty member (Finney), and programs that involve student consultants (Edwards), as well as productive insights in regard to the increased participation of their most senior faculty and administrators (Finney; Sweet, Carpenter, & Blythe, “Utilizing”), adjunct faculty (Cottom, Atwell, & Ombres) and other faculty who might otherwise find themselves at the margins of pedagogical discussions (Sweet, Carpenter, & Blythe, “Reaching”)—readers will recognize the groundwork necessary to heat a cognitive economy, to turn up the temperature on dialogues that not only generate new insights about teaching and learning, but also expand the number of those who generate them and benefit from them.
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