Dead Ideas in Teaching and Learning Podcast Series
Season 3, Episode 5: Learning Innovation and the Future of Higher Education with Joshua Kim and Edward Maloney
Center for Teaching and Learning, Columbia University

Catherine Ross (00:00):

Hello, and welcome to Dead Ideas in Teaching and Learning, a higher education podcast from the Center for Teaching and Learning at Columbia. I'm Catherine Ross, the center's executive director. Let's get started.

Catherine Ross (00:22):

I'm speaking today with Dr. Joshua Kim from Dartmouth and Dr. Edward Maloney from Georgetown. As a quick reminder to our listeners, in this podcast series we are exploring dead ideas in teaching and learning. In other words, ideas that are widely believed, though not true, and that drive many systems and behaviors in connection to teaching, exercising what Diane Pike called, "the tyranny of dead ideas."

Catherine Ross (00:50):

Dr. Joshua Kim is the Director of Online Programs and Strategy at the Dartmouth Center for the Advancement of Learning, and he is a senior fellow for academic transformation, learning and design at the Center for New Designs in Learning and Scholarship at Georgetown. Josh is also the author of Inside Higher Ed's Learning Innovation blog.

Catherine Ross (01:14):

Dr. Edward Maloney is the executive director of the Center for New Designs in Learning and Scholarship and a professor of the practice of narrative literature and theory in the department of English at Georgetown University. He is also the founding director of the Program in Learning Design and Technology. And together, Josh and Eddie are co-authors of two books, "Learning Innovation and the Future of Higher Education," which came out in February, 2020, and "The Low Density University: 15 Scenarios for Higher Education," which came out in August, 2020. A very productive year for these two colleagues.

Catherine Ross (01:57):

All right, we will dive into questions. So Eddie, in your book, "Learning Innovation and the Future of Higher Education," you offer a brief history of what you call a turn to learning, that you cite as, "long in the making, but with a noticeable push forward since 2012." Would you give our listeners a brief summary of that history behind this turn to learning?

Dr. Edward Maloney (02:31):

Absolutely. First, I just want to say thank you for having Josh and me on the podcast this morning. We're really excited to be here, chatting with you. When we talk about a turn to learning, we're starting with an assumption, and the assumption, I think, is one that we've seen worn out at colleges and universities across the country and maybe across the world. And that is that for a long time, some of the attention at colleges and universities were focused on things that were other than what happened in the classroom. And by attention, we mean resources, so in terms of what an institution might spend in terms of supporting the classroom activities, the teaching and learning activities, but also strategy, what it meant for college and university to really start to think of the core mission of teaching to our students, as fundamental to the strategy of the institution.

Dr. Edward Maloney (03:22):

So we can think about all of the other things that have been both co-curricular, but also fundamentally institutional, that have turned attention away from learning that have happened over the past 7500 years in colleges and universities. Probably in the past 30 or so years, maybe even back to the mid 1980s, we really started to see, I think, a kind of shift where there was a little bit more attention being paid to how students learn, how we learn as human beings. And we started to see that actually start to manifest itself in classroom practice.

Dr. Edward Maloney (03:55):

SO you can think about the student centered classroom, for example, as one of those moments in which we saw a turn to learning where we really started to pay attention to the classroom dynamic, trying to move away from the lecture, for example. In 2012, we mark a moment where that turned to learning really had a presence on campus, in part because of the nascent MOOK revolution, the fear and the anxiety of what industries other than higher ed might bring to the teaching and learning space for our students.

Dr. Edward Maloney (04:27):

And that sense of the potential for disruption, but the anxiety that that brought really started to in certain places refocus, we think, or at least focus maybe, that turn to learning we mark in the past 30, 35 years into the space of higher ed, where we started to see an attention being paid to how students were learning. And so we mark that moment and say, okay, well, we did it. We've started to make this turn, we started to look at how the classroom practice has shifted and changed. And in 2012, we really started to see a moment where we could really pay attention to what was happening in teaching and learning, not only in the classroom, but online as well and the modalities in between. And our concern, our interest in this book is trying to maintain that momentum and actually to increase the momentum and increase the focus on teaching and learning.

Dr. Edward Maloney (05:19):

And I think we saw in the last year, last 15 months or so, that turn to learning paid dividends at institutions that had paid attention to what was happening in the classroom that built up support infrastructure. But even if an institution didn't have the resources to do it, I think we also saw that as an industry, as an ecosystem, the effect of that turn to learning was widespread and we really saw an important need to pay attention how our students were thriving in the classroom, were being resilient in the face of the pandemic. And we're learning at a moment where everything else at the institutions of higher ed, colleges and universities across the country, was being pushed aside so we could really focus in on that teaching and learning activity. And for us, that's the important piece, but it's also important that we continue to pay attention to it and think about it going forward. Josh, I don't know if you want to add to that.

Dr. Joshua Kim (06:13):

Yeah. I can add to that. First, Catherine, it's really great to be here with you and for us to be together. One of the things we taught a great deal in the first book is how we've really together been developing this discipline of advancing learning, and evolving our institutions to advanced learning. And just thinking about over the past 18 months or so, we just haven't been physically together and being here with you now, I know I'm looking at you because we're on Zoom, but everyone else is just hearing us.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([06:49](#)):

It really makes me think how much I miss us being in the room together to talk about these kind of issues. I was thinking about how we got to know each other and Catherine, you did an external review for Dartmouth. We got to know each other through the organizations that we come together to talk about centers for teaching and learning. So I think one of the things in our learning innovation that Eddie and I talk about is how important our colleagues in this community is of academics or advancing learning at our institutions.

Catherine Ross ([07:21](#)):

Well, I couldn't agree with you more, Josh. That is so true. And I think I feel a little bit spoiled because I get to do this podcast and so I can reach out to colleagues like you. And even though we're not in the room together, we're seeing other, and we're having a conversation and that is such a treat. So thank you for that. And thank you for that summary, Eddie. That was really interesting. And it sounds like you would say that turn to learning was really evidenced and made more visible by the pandemic, by all the things that happened in the pandemic. So I think I would totally agree with that. It sometimes felt like the first time some people at the university actually thought about teaching and learning. So I guess if we could say there's a silver lining there, that might be it.

Catherine Ross ([08:23](#)):

So I found a quote in your book very striking. Let me read the quote for our listeners. "We have no shortage of knowledge about how learning works and how this knowledge can be applied to advanced teaching. What we lack is an understanding of the conditions in which learning science propagates through institutions to change organizational structures and teaching practices." So I have a couple questions about this quote. What is needed to discover these conditions? How do we get there? And would culture change? You know, something like the value that institutions assigned to teaching, for example, be one of those conditions necessary for this kind of change? Josh, do you want to kick us off on this one?

Dr. Joshua Kim ([09:22](#)):

Sure. First of all, for Eddie and I as scholars, people who wrote this first book, it's really rewarding to have a peer and a colleague read back something that you wrote, it's a great feeling. So thanks for doing that. And yeah, that was a pretty good quote. In listening to that quote, I don't know if it's totally true, the first thing we said. I think there's a lot more we can learn about learning science and teaching methodologies and that kind of thing. So I think we're nowhere near the end of our learning about how teaching works and how learning science works. But I think it really is true, and we try to explore this in depth, that we're not really sure how universities structure their organizations around what we know about learning science.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([10:14](#)):

What we do know, and I think this has been the case at your university, is that over the last decade or so, there's been so much change, so much organizational change. What we identified is that many institutions where what used to be distinct and really distributed across campus have come together into what we term "integrated teaching and learning centers." And these are CTLs which do the traditional CTL work of educator and educational development, but often add elements of learning design or online programs, degree and non-degree, work on other issues such as equity, inclusion and diversity, work on issues of maybe writing, preparing future scholars all under one roof. Media, media

educators is kind of a big thing. And over the last decade, this has happened at many centers, but it was almost always independently.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([11:18](#)):

It was schools coming, saying, well, we have all these non-faculty educators around the institution. Maybe we should bring them under one roof, under one organization because they can have more impact. But it's been very different at every school, the way it's been funded, the way it's been organized. And one of the thing that Eddie and I are trying to do is try to make sense of, well, why is it that this trend is happening across institutions? What are the common drivers and not every school's done that.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([11:51](#)):

Now Dartmouth still has separate institutions where Georgetown was very early in this integrated through CTLs. So we're trying to figure out what were the reasons? And then what will happen going forward? I think what we've tried to identify is we really do need to study this. We need to understand this and try to be systemic and systematic, try to build some theory about why this is happening and then look at the implications. Eddie, how do you think about this?

Dr. Edward Maloney ([12:21](#)):

That's a great answer, Josh. I think you're exactly right. And I think one of the things that we explore pretty heavily in the book; I think one of the places where we actually don't give enough attention to in the book on this particular question is the way in which institutions were likely structured with the wrong sense of how students learn or how we learn as human beings. And so I think we approach that question from the perspective of we need to do more to try to think about how our institutions could be structured, to encourage a particular kind of engagement with students that would have the deepest and the most resonant impact with our students.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([13:02](#)):

But I think it's likely the case and [inaudible 00:13:06] and graphs makes I think a really good case that's our institutions are structured in exactly the wrong way, based on exactly the wrong sense of how people learn and that what we're trying to do and what we're I think in dialogue with, as we think through this process, is what could we do to make sure that the institutions have the right structures in place, both at the curricular level also at the accreditation level and the expectations that are existent on institutions.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([13:35](#)):

And then as Josh is talking about on the support structures that help to encourage a particular approach to teaching and learning that we know is a lot more complex today in part because of technology. In part because a growing student body, there are a lot of things that are actually making that work of teaching and learning much more difficult. So I think in some sense in the book, we probably started from a position of we're trying to do our best, but we can do better.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([14:02](#)):

I think there's probably a really good argument to be made that, well, we didn't do a very good job at all, and we need to rethink how we were doing what we were doing and that that needs to really refocus. And by that, by not a very good job, I mean in terms of a very narrow structure of what we think about

in teaching and learning, not necessarily the larger context of higher ed, which I think both Josh and I think is incredibly important and valuable, and we're not necessarily trying to suggest that what we need to do is tear everything down and start a bunch of bootcamps everywhere. But rather, we need to think about the good, and we need to really focus in on this problem and this question of teaching and learning, how that plays out in higher ed.

Catherine Ross ([14:44](#)):

Yes. I think your point resonates with me very much because in fact, this whole fall season of podcasts is sort of trying to look at those systems, right? We have a lot of legacy systems that I think sometimes in the category of unintended consequences, actually make it harder for us to do the work we do and make it harder for instructors to change in some ways, when you think about systems of evaluation, systems of accreditation, systems of credentialing for students. I think that's a really powerful point to be made. Thank you for that.

Catherine Ross ([15:32](#)):

I'm wondering if you could please expand on your vision of how the scholarship of learning innovation, and I'm going to quote here from their book, "relocates the unit of analysis of the conditions that support or inhibit student learning from that of the individual student to the scale of the institution and to everywhere in between," end of quote. Aren't institutions already doing this kind of research?

Dr. Edward Maloney ([16:07](#)):

Well, maybe. I think there are certainly pockets of work happening at different institutions across the country where people are trying to understand some of these questions, but I think the point of the book and what Josh and I are trying to get at in general as we think through this problem, is that we are not doing enough to try to understand the dynamic that has shifted from the faculty relationship to students as a one to many relationship that is now much more complex, again part because of technology, but there are a variety of factors more about our students. We certainly have a growing student body and a shifting demographic in our student body and so on that we're trying to pay attention to, to help achieve their greatest success in the teaching and learning mission at institutions.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([17:01](#)):

What we're really interested in is that shift from faculty member walking into the classroom and simply teaching as a control of her domain in that space and expectation that that is all that really is required in order to generate the best possible teaching and learning experience for our students. That's kind of the assumption. You bring an expert in the field, the greater the expert, the greater the teaching and learning experience is partly the assumption, which is why we hire maybe first and foremost scholars often rather than great teachers, but we hire people with the expectation that that expertise is going to somehow be carried to our students, whether that's through lectures or even in a shifting dynamic to a more student centered, active learning classroom.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([17:49](#)):

Our argument's in whether or not the research is happening, but the fundamental argument is that that dynamic, that faculty member to student dynamic requires a much greater infrastructure and support network, whether that's at the institution alone, so you start to think about the kinds of structures that Josh was just talking about in terms of support for teaching and learning, or the larger scholarly space in which we learn more and understand more about what's happening in that dynamic, in that teaching

and learning dynamic. Or will we get to things like institutional infrastructure to support innovative classrooms, to support the technologies that become necessary for full modality teaching?

Dr. Edward Maloney (18:33):

All of those things we think are important that institutions start to pay attention to, not in piecemeal, which I think happens at a lot of institutions, okay we need to invest in this thing now, we need to pay attention to a learning management system, we need to pay attention to Google apps or something along those lines. Rather, or to think about that strategically, to think about that as part of the direction that an institution needs to understand if they're going to be ready for what's coming in the next 10, 20, 50 years of higher education.

Dr. Joshua Kim (19:02):

Yeah. And think that's very well said. And Catherine, I want to bring this back to one of the things that you said earlier about the pandemic, that COVID-19 has been such an interesting time for people in our profession. At no time have centers for teaching and learning been more central to the resilience and ongoing operations of our colleges and universities. For all of us, our life has been completely crazy for the past 18 months or so, as so much of what's happened at universities has had to run through university CTLs.

Dr. Joshua Kim (19:41):

We've never been so busy because all of a sudden we had to work with every instructor, either training or consulting, or communities of practice to help make this transition overnight from residential to remote. And I think the schools that have invested in organizations that bring together all these learning capabilities and that have built that up pre-pandemic, were in a much better situation to actually make that transition so we could do quality remote learning.

Dr. Joshua Kim (20:25):

The expertise were there, the non-faculty educators, the educational developers, the media educators, the instructional designers. They had those relationships with many faculty. And really, the methods that we would take to say do online or blended education could then extend so we could have this complete shift to remote education. So I think the question is that since we've demonstrated how important the learning organizations are on campus for the resilience of our institutions, we've demonstrated that during COVID.

Dr. Joshua Kim (21:02):

What is going to happen in the months and years to come? Will institutions keep making those investments in these types of organizations, or will we have a snap back where everyone just wants to come face to face and not work with non-faculty educators, not use all these tools. I think this is something we need to study and really get on the table. It's been difficult because we're all so stretched and tapped out making it through our days.

Catherine Ross (21:33):

I think those are really interesting questions. And I think a term I have come to dislike quite a bit is the term of "going back to normal" or a "new normal." Because as Eddie said earlier, the normal wasn't always so great for a lot of learners. So I don't think we want to go back to normal. We want to go back to better, but it's very hard to know, as you just said, Josh, what the appetite for that would be from

instructors who also have had a very tumultuous 18 months. And people reach a sort of limit, I think, on learning new technologies, new ways of teaching. So it's hard to know. It will be an interesting fall semester, I think, in that regard.

Catherine Ross ([22:31](#)):

I want to get to my next question, because it's one of my favorite parts of your book. I loved the conceptualization you offered of the quote "magical provost." You described this magical provost as, quote, "the one who can knock down bureaucratic barriers and find the funding for new organizations and initiatives aimed at dramatic improvements in student learning." End of quote. And this is a really familiar scenario, I think, for a lot of teaching centers, having that magical provost make it happen for you. But what I hear you saying is that having a magical provost, while it may be a good thing in general, it's not necessarily our best hope for achieving the kind of change that you're encouraging people to think about in your book.

Catherine Ross ([23:28](#)):

We need that organizational, that institutional change and a magical provost may not be sufficient to make that happen. I think your ideas about what this kind of organizational change would look like are, I would say, pretty exciting and maybe even a little bit radical. So I would love for you to talk us through the change you're imagining, and I think some of these changes have already happened at Georgetown. So it'd be very interesting to hear your perspectives on this.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([24:03](#)):

Sure. I'll start here. This idea of the magical provost, I think many of us experienced this over the past decade or so, that there was some person at the institutional leadership level that for whatever reason, came into strong alliance with the people who are running the centers for teaching and learning or people who are running continuing education or online education and said, oh, I kind of get that. It's better if you're together. And I get that you really should be well funded, at least some more consistent funding. And Eddie and I, we tried to trace why that happened. You know, we look at the MOOK bubble as one of the reasons, and there are some other reasons behind that, but we also talk about it in the book -

Dr. Joshua Kim ([24:56](#)):

we say that's a fragile way to run in institutional strategy because as we know, provosts, presidents, they move on. So we try to look for ways that we could actually have that institutional strategy where you invest in learning with faculty and non-faculty educators working together with a more stable foundation. And in the book, we suggest some ways of doing that. And we're very realistic that we have to think about in this era of scarcity when the very challenging demographic trends and cost trends, that those of us in the teaching and learning world, people like us who are learning science geeks, we also have to really understand university budgets, university operations. We have to understand ways that we can bring in dollars, actually to fund our mission. One of the things that we talk about is that a lot of the operations that universities have started to outsource, particularly in the online learning world, if we can actually build those capabilities, we can keep those dollars in house and build those capabilities.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([26:07](#)):

I think that that Eddie at Georgetown's really been a leader in this, in terms of over many years, he's built this integrated center and he's also shown through Georgetown that it's possible to bring in

resources that can go to the entire mission, dollars that can go into the residential classroom as well as the online classroom. So I think that's one of the things that we try to stress in this book, that places like Georgetown and maybe others, are trying to move into this model. And we've got to really talk about that more. Eddie.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([26:42](#)):

Thanks, Josh. I think that's a great answer and a great look at what we were trying to get at. I think one of the things we didn't do in the book is talk about the other end of the spectrum if you don't have the magical provost, or even if you do, what it means to help that... I keep thinking of a leprechaun all of a sudden, I don't know why. This is the magical version of a provost that's coming to my mind, because the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. But even if you do have that person, there are probably a bunch of different kinds of roles that people have to play. At Georgetown we often see that as a gadfly role where you have to irritate enough to try to get change to happen, or a pirate role, like you're just trying to go off to the side and trying to create something that's not going to fit into the mainstream, but is going to allow you to do what you think is the right thing for the institution, even if the institution hasn't quite caught up in that.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([27:40](#)):

And in my experience, that's been a part where I've been able to maybe be somewhat helpful, is seeing the things that are not quite central yet, sort of not quite seen as part of the vision. Proving that they actually matter and can be important, and then getting institutional investment afterward. So that's a lot of work. You have to have someone who is willing to take that risk to be entrepreneurial and say, okay, these are the directions that we need to go in, and then hope that they're making the right decision, which we don't always make the right decisions in that space, but hope you're making the right decision and the rest of the institution, or at least the leadership, will come along and help support that.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([28:19](#)):

That's also not sustainable. I think in many many ways, that's as unsustainable as this notion of a magical provost. You're really relying on personalities. You're relying on how people work in order to make things happen. And so I think one of the things that we're really hoping, and our next book is actually trying to really look at this sense of the strategy, or the lack thereof, that institutions have around this question of learning, and really try to understand what it means to develop a strategic direction that makes this investment in teaching and learning core to the mission of the institution. It's very rare, as far as we can tell in our initial research.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([29:00](#)):

It's generally rare that institutions have institutional-wide strategies. These are often dependent on initiatives, fundraising, certain kinds of expectations around delivering those services, but not necessarily a larger strategy. And that it seems even rarer that those have at their core, an investment in teaching and learning, which goes against often the institutional mission that you will read at a lot of institutions that these do not necessarily align with say, the lack of strategy or the strategies that are in place that are driven by fundraising that are driven by really trying to create a context for students to be there rather than an emphasis and an energy in teaching and learning.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([29:38](#)):

So there are a lot of really rare pieces at play, it seems, in this dynamic that we're trying to highlight and make an argument that if we're going to be sustainable, if we're going to provide a higher education for the next 50 to 100 years that is responsive to changing workforces, changing demographics, that is responsive to a changing environment, that we need to be thinking forward, not necessarily in a fully disruptive way, but in an evolutionary way that really follows a strategic direction.

Dr. Edward Maloney (30:13):

And we want to give some folks some sense of what we think is important about that strategic direction. It's just disappointing to look back and realize that there are so few strategic directions that actually align with that sense of what's important. And what we learned was so important in the past year.

Catherine Ross (30:28):

Yeah. If I recall correctly, one of your recommendations was that people like us, who do this work in teaching centers maybe should have different kinds of roles. The center should maybe not be a center per se, am I recalling that correctly? It should be more like an academic department. And I think that's the sense I get of a change that's happened at Georgetown. Would that be right?

Dr. Edward Maloney (31:00):

Yeah, we've certainly tried. It's hard, given the institutional structures that are in place. And the really, I think, definitive dividing line between academic and administrative structures, that institutions in part, because of the funding structures that are in place to support those, but at Georgetown I started with the question, why is it that we do not add institutions of IRN, leverage the expertise that we have in our academic departments to help think about the future of those institutions? We have faculty governance, which is often a different problem, or a different sort of part of the institutional dynamic, but we don't, for example, think about the folks in our School of Business, who are the greatest experts in this space, helping us to think about our financial structure and what we're doing. We don't often think about the academic spaces as turning inward and looking at the success of the institution, not from just the department space, which is where it often happens for an academic, but the institution as a whole.

Dr. Edward Maloney (32:05):

And so what would it mean for us to have a dynamic where we had teaching and learning happening that was also seeing the university as a laboratory itself, and then that was leading into and supporting the service component of the work that we do, and really trying to see a cross pollinating and mutually reinforcing dynamic there. It runs into all sorts of pickups, again, institutional funding and politics and different kinds of ways of thinking about what it means to do that work. But I still think that that's maybe our best hope in higher ed to think about how we actually do have a faculty governance model that is writ large at the university level, not simply focused in on what happens in individual departments.

Catherine Ross (32:46):

Yeah. I think that would be pretty radical, actually. I like the idea of it's evolving, it's not disrupting, but I do think it's a significant change in the way things have been done. And it's tough. These legacy systems have been in place for so many years and it's hard. I don't think it's really any one person's job to look at those legacy systems and say oh, hey, maybe we need an update here. So I very much appreciate the work that you both are doing in this realm. It gives me hope, and I think probably a lot of other people in teaching centers as well, that things will evolve in that direction. And I know it's hard work, so I'm

wondering as we close, if you would share with us what it is that keeps you inspired and motivates you to believe in the possibility of change in higher ed. Because I know we are all tired. It's been a long, long, 18 months. So how do you stay motivated in this space?

Dr. Edward Maloney ([34:02](#)):

Yeah, that's a great question. So Josh goes on vacation and he comes back and tells me I have to do a whole bunch of stuff. So he gets rested and then he pushes me. So that's how I stay motivated. No, I think we care and believe, we want to do good work. We think this is for many of us, or at least for me, I got into higher ed because I believed in the space, I believed in the work. It was transformative for me when I was younger. And it still I think is transformative for me as I get older. And so we really want to have a positive impact on that kind of transformation that could be fundamentally effective for all of our students.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([34:43](#)):

I think it's an exciting opportunity, not just to think about what happens in the classroom, but to think from my perspective of just about what higher ed is and the role that it plays in our society, the role that it plays for our students, what it means to think about this really complex dynamic of research and teaching, and then all of these other co-curricular activities that help in the formation of young women and men as they make their way through higher ed.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([35:09](#)):

And then to think about the larger ecosystem that is two year schools and four year schools, privates and public and research focused and liberal arts focused and so on. And just trying to understand that dynamic, which is a really amazing thing in a society that is so driven often by dollars rather than any kind of civic investment. And so I like having that contribution if possible.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([35:35](#)):

Yeah. So Eddie and I are now writing the Learning Innovation blog on Inside Higher Ed together. It's been a great platform and we had some pieces that were working on online program management and some of our concerns, so I hope people checked it out. Catherine, I think your question's great, and it was nice to get it beforehand to reflect on this question a little bit. I think the three of us are doing something, I think maybe something a little bit different in higher ed, is that we're practitioner-scholars. I I think, Catherine, in you doing this podcast, it's one way that we add knowledge to our field. So you're doing all the work that normally do in running a center, and I'm sure your life's absolutely crazy, but you're also taking the time to bring these conversations together, to try to build knowledge. Eddie and I are in this situation where we're trying to navigate these academic careers where there's so much going on at our institutions, because learning is now central.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([36:37](#)):

Like with COVID, we've learned that the thing that has to keep going is teaching and learning. We have to keep educating our students. And so it's made our work busier than ever. And we're also trying to understand what's going on, how our institutions are changing. And I think that role as practitioner scholars is incredibly exciting. It's dynamic, you learn new things, you also build this great community. Catherine, going back to how we talked about, we know each other really well across the institutions, we share a lot of information. Eddie, and I think that we're really building an academic discipline. It's

new, it's nascent, but we're all doing this together. And I think the fact that we're doing it together, that we have these practitioner-scholar colleagues, is what is so motivating and makes this such a great job.

Catherine Ross ([37:34](#)):

Well, I'm right there with both of you. I could geek-out for hours on these questions that we've all been discussing and being able to have conversations with my colleagues like you is what keeps me going. You know, the podcast is a lot of extra work, but it feeds my passion for the work. So I think you're absolutely right and I'm right there with you.

Catherine Ross ([38:04](#)):

So I'd like to thank you both so much for taking this time to talk with us today and for sharing your work and all your deep thinking around these big questions and for helping all of those of us in this realm who are trying to move higher education teaching and learning to a new and better place. So thanks so much, Josh and Eddie.

Dr. Joshua Kim ([38:34](#)):

Thank you, Catherine.

Dr. Edward Maloney ([38:36](#)):

Thank you, Catherine.

Catherine Ross ([38:39](#)):

If you've enjoyed this podcast, please visit our website where you can find any resources mentioned in the episode, ctl.columbia.edu/podcast. Please like us, rate us, and review us on Apple podcasts or wherever you get your podcasts. Dead Ideas in Teaching and Learning is a product of Columbia University Center for Teaching and Learning and is produced by Stephanie Ogden, Laura Nicholas, Abie Seidel and John Hanford. Production support from Kate Pigott. Our theme music is "In the Lab" by Immersive Music.