

The boundaries we imagine dividing research, teaching, and scholarship are more fluid than we might think – teaching can lead to research and research to teaching and either can lead to scholarship. There are, however, distinctions that matter in terms of how we define and recognize various professional activities.

Teaching often involves doing research on the subject matter itself or on the way in which that subject matter can best be delivered to students. At the secondary school level, how this research is “counted” largely does not matter because teachers are judged by their institutions primarily on the basis of their teaching performance, not on what goes into creating it. At the college level, though, professors are typically judged on the basis of both teaching *and* scholarship and therefore it is tempting to see this classroom-related research as connected to scholarship. How this activity “counts,” therefore, often matters for issues of promotion, tenure, and so on.

What should not be confused, though, is the research that goes into effective teaching and the research that becomes scholarship. Scholarship, as I am using the term here, is something new – a contribution to the field – and something that is accessible to others through publication in the form, for example, of a book or an article. It is peer reviewed and has a purpose, function, and audience that is not defined by the parameters of one’s teaching. Researching to teach a new course may involve a great deal of time and effort, but its “product” is not scholarship and it should not be counted as such. A peer reviewed and published annotated Latin or Greek text, despite its possible connection to teaching, could be.