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Practice What We Preach?: A Review of Journal Publishing Practices Related to Reflective Writing in SoTL

Abstract
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) scholars have long advocated for the inclusion of reflective writing as a legitimate form of scholarship. That said, for those instructors seeking to publish their reflective work, especially scholarly personal narratives (SPNs), there are persistent gaps between the aspirations of the field and the realities of scholarly publishing. The present study seeks to illuminate that gap through a systematic analysis of the policies and practices of academic journals as they pertain to the publication of reflective writing in SoTL. The ultimate aim of the study is to enable editors to close the gap between belief and practice and empower potential authors to share their reflective teaching and learning practices with others.
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Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) scholars have long advocated for the inclusion of reflective writing as a legitimate form of scholarship. That said, for those instructors seeking to publish their reflective work, especially scholarly personal narratives (SPNs), there are persistent gaps between the aspirations of the field and the realities of scholarly publishing. The present study seeks to illuminate that gap through a systematic analysis of the policies and practices of academic journals as they pertain to the publication of reflective writing in SoTL. The ultimate aim of the study is to enable editors to close the gap between belief and practice and empower potential authors to share their reflective teaching and learning practices with others.

INTRODUCTION
Since its inception, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) movement has embraced the value of reflection. Indeed, according to Donald Schön, reflection involves two distinct reflective actions, reflection in action, which takes place in the classroom during instruction, and reflection on action, which takes place after instruction has taken place (Schön, 2017). The latter is most highly represented in SoTL work, enabling teacher-scholars to take stock of their practice in a manner that is both thoughtful and systematic (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; Kreber & Cranton, 2000; Weimer, 2000). It is not a big leap from reflective practice to reflective writing, and many early SoTL advocates frequently included the reflective essay as a legitimate mode for engaging in scholarship related to teaching (Nelson, 2010). The present study seeks to take stock of the current capabilities for publishing reflective writing in SoTL, often referred to as a scholarly personal narrative (SPN).

Reflective Writing in SoTL
In Craig Nelson’s well-known and long-standing typology of SoTL genres, he identifies “Reflections on years of teaching experience (implicitly or explicitly informed by other SoTL)” as a major category, including three sub-categories: “essays developing good ideas”, “integration of larger frameworks with classroom practice”, and last, but not least, “summaries of expert knowledge gained by self-reflection and experimentation in one’s own teaching.” Similarly, Maryellen Weimer’s also widely used typology identified “personal accounts of change” as one of four primary modalities of SoTL (2006). Perhaps the most prevalent term currently used to describe this type of reflective writing is the scholarly personal narrative (SPN), a genre popularized by education philosopher Robert Nash, which he explicitly defines as an alternative to standard modes of scholarly writing (Nash, 2004; Brookfield, 2013; Ingersoll, 2018).

Scholarly Personal Narratives (SPNs)
For Nash and other narrative scholars, the term “mode” is key. As SPNs are intended not only to advance a more authentic scholarly voice but also to serve as the basis of a research methodology, one related to similar narrative approaches, such as auto-ethnography or me-search (Fowler, 2006; Gardner et al., 2017; Nash & Bradley, 2012; Ng and Carney, 2017). In their well-known typology of SoTL theories and methods, for example, Miller-Young and Yeo classify SPNs under the broader heading of narrative approaches, which interpret personal experience through a range of lenses identified as naturalistic, interpretive, and/or critical (2015).

According to Ng and Carney, the SPN can be differentiated from personal reflective writing, such as a diary or journal, because it “leverages the power of reflective practice to understand the interpersonal dynamics of both the classroom and wider academic communities” (2017). Similarly, Eric Blair (2013) makes the case that SPNs can enable the readers of scholarship to experience the myriad of ways in which context influences teaching and learning, which, in turn, serves to deepen their awareness of their own contextual influences. In other words, the SPN can serve as a heuristic that enhances the reflective practice of others.

Because the voice of an SPN tends to be broadly accessible, the mode has also been touted for its ability to break down the conventional silos that often exist between and even among academic disciplines. Reflective essays are inherently rhetorical acts, in which the author is inviting the reader into their private domain with the intention of establishing a relationship between the author and the reader. This means that regardless of the discipline in which you teach, scholarly reflection serves as both a shared practice and a bridge to the teaching commons, i.e., cross- and trans-disciplinary dialogues about the complexities of teaching and learning (Cook Sather et al., 2019; Ng & Carney, 2017).

Legitimizing SPNs
While advocates for SPNs (and related forms of scholarly reflective writing) delineate its benefits and contributions, the mode has struggled to be recognized as a legitimate form of scholarly discourse (Altenmüller et al., 2021; Devendorf, 2022; Harris, 2021). The objections tend to focus on the limitations of both reflective thinking as well as reflective writing. Cook-Sather, et al., describe the persistent belief that reflection itself is not inherently scholarly or me-search (Fowler, 2006; Gardner et al., 2017; Nash & Bradley, 2012; Ng and Carney, 2017). In their well-known typology of
ary format of reflective writing incorporates few of the markers conventionally associated with scholarly rigor or quality, such as explicit implementation of a specific method or design, the evaluation of qualitative and/or qualitative data, and an objective distance between researcher and research. It should be noted, however, that these markers are not universal. Indeed, they are derived largely from long-standing standards within the social sciences and may not be shared across all disciplines, especially, but not limited to, the arts and humanities (Potter & Wuetherick, 2015; Potter & Raffoul, 2023). For a multi- and trans-disciplinary practice such as SoTL, this means that there may be a range of standards by which scholarship may not only be defined but also assessed (Chick, 2013).

Repositioning SPNs

In the context of post-pandemic higher education, there is increasing evidence that scholarly reflective writing may be emerging from the margins and is poised to become a more prominent and accepted form of scholarship (Cruz & Grodziak, 2021). The positionality of this work has shifted with the increasing recognition of student learning as an inherently messy, or super-complex problem that does not lend itself to either simple or generalizable solutions (Bass, 2020; Schrum & Mårtensson, 2023; Smith et al., 2023). Part of this messiness lies in the acknowledgment that learning varies considerably among many factors, including the lived experience of individual students and instructors. The elevation of lived experience as a form of evidence, not only in teaching and learning but across multiple domains (Ellis et al., 2019; Farrell, 2020; Frechette et al., 2020), places SPNs as potential vehicles for social justice, both inside and outside of higher education.

The ability of SPNs to amplify voices, especially those previously under-represented, is perhaps one of the reasons why Nash and others have described SPNs as liberating or liberatory (Nash & Viray, 2013). The same could also be said, to some extent, of SoTL itself, which was intended not only to make the previously largely invisible work of teaching and learning visible to others, but also (perhaps) to serve as a counterbalance to some of the more harmful practices associated with faculty work in the neo-liberal context of contemporary higher education (Godbold et al., 2023; Vithal, 2018). Framed in this context, the SPN in SoTL becomes a vehicle not only for self-expression and social change but also as a potential space for psychological regeneration following the hardships afforded by the global pandemic. If SPNs can be construed as a form of well-being practice (Douglas, 2017; Eardley et al., 2021), this may explain the increasing appearance of collective and/or collaborative reflections, not only focused on teaching and learning but also more integrative aspects of personal and professional identity (e.g., Camarao & Din, 2022).

The SPN Marketspace

The preceding literature review highlights the case(s) that has been made for embracing SPNs as a legitimate and timely mode of scholarship, but what it has not done is demonstrated the extent to which the aspirations of SPN advocates have translated into the reality of academic publishing. Previous reviews of SoTL publishing patterns, for example, have focused almost exclusively on the attributes of empirical studies (e.g., Manarin et al., 2021). One notable exception to this, a large-scale study of published SoTL work by John Braxton and Claire Major, concludes that reflective writing such as SPNs “will most likely be a poor fit for publication consideration” (p. 18, 2021).

Indeed, little is known about how the scholarly apparatus for SPNs functions within the larger marketspace for SoTL. We simply do not know who is publishing this work, who is reading this work, and what standards are being applied for its review and dissemination. To address this gap in both research and practice, the present study explores the question: should a faculty member (or members) wish to garner the benefits of writing an SPN, what kind of reception can they expect to find if they seek to publish their work in a peer-reviewed academic journal?

THE STUDY

Conducted in the fall semester of 2022, this study examined the publishing practices of 556 SoTL journals, all listed in Kennesaw State University’s online directory of teaching and learning journals (Teaching Journals Directory, 2023).

The Teaching Journals Directory

The Teaching Journals Directory (and its sister directory, focused on teaching conferences), were originally created more than two decades ago by Kennesaw State University Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. The contents of the directory are reviewed semi-annually, with new journals added, web addresses updated, and defunct journals removed, as reported by directory users or those responsible for the journals. The directory is limited to academic journals published in English and available to North American scholars, though many journals published outside of North America are represented in the list. The directory includes journals published through academic and commercial presses as well as open-source providers. While effort is made to exclude known predatory publishers the list is not otherwise vetted. This directory is widely regarded as the most current, comprehensive, and searchable (by discipline or topic) listing of teaching-related academic journals available in the United States.

Data Collection

For each entry in the directory, two researchers independently reviewed the content of the journal website linked to the directory. When broken links were encountered, the researchers either located the journal through an open Google search or the journal was removed from consideration, presumably defunct. To be included in the study, journals had to articulate an article type that allowed for personal narrative/reflection of the teacher-scholar, in any format, including poetry and images, but most often taking the form of an essay. It should be noted that other essay types, such as letters to (or from) the editor and/or reflections on an issue within a field (including SoTL), were excluded from further consideration.

For each entry, the website was searched for the following information: publication status (open source, academic press, commercial, organizational), disciplinary focus (disciplinary, super-disciplinary, e.g., STEM, multi-disciplinary, thematic), and description of accepted article types. If the latter included article types related to reflective writing, such as SPNs, the researchers then conducted an archival review of the previous three years of publication (2019-2022) to determine the number of articles in this format published. If no SPN-focused articles were located over this time period, the journal was not included in the final count. After the first review round, minor discrepancies encountered between the two reviewers (n=6) were resolved through ongoing peer dialogue.
FINDINGS

The study began with an initial review of all 556 SoTL journals listed in Kennesaw State’s directory. Of those 556, 109 were excluded from the next stage of the study. Of those excluded, (1) was a duplicate entry, sixty-one (61) appeared to be defunct (i.e. no publications over the previous three years), thirty-five (35) were magazines, digests, or newsletters or other formats without peer review, and twelve (12) did not cover teaching and learning in higher education. Out of the 447 SoTL journals included in the final analysis for the study, 75 (17%) of the journal websites indicated that they both accepted and published SPNs and 372 (83%) did not. This means that slightly less than 1 in every 5 journals included in the directory accepts SPNs or similar types of reflective writing.

Publishing Patterns

Our analysis revealed a number of discernable patterns in the journals that accepted SPNs when compared to the overall list of SoTL journals.

Publisher

All journals from the directory were coded by publisher (academic, commercial, open, organizational). This analysis revealed that journals which accept SPNs are more likely to be published through open-access channels and less likely to be accepted through commercial publishers, the most represented of which included Taylor & Francis (70 out of 177, 40%), Sage (26 out of 177, 15%), Wiley (22 out of 177, 12%) and Springer (21 out of 177, 12%), (see Figure 1). SPNs were slightly more likely to be found in journals published by university presses (category name: academic), such as Johns Hopkins (4), Oxford (6), Penn State (4), and Indiana University (3), though this category was the lowest overall. There was no difference in the number of journals sponsored and published directly by professional organizations (category name: organization) that did or did not publish SPNs, but it should be noted that this latter distinction is fuzzy, as some organizations publish their journals through academic or commercial publishers.

Disciplinary Orientation

All journals from the directory list were coded by disciplinary orientation, whether the journal focused on a single discipline, multiple or super-disciplines (e.g., STEM, humanities), or a particular thematic area (e.g., civic engagement, case studies). The researchers spent time debating how to code journals focused on writing across the curriculum, ultimately choosing “thematic” as the appropriate category. Overall, there were no significant differences by disciplinary orientation between SoTL journals and the journals that accepted SPNs, with both groups reflecting a disciplinary orientation for roughly half of all entries. See figure 2.

Disciplinary Representation

The SoTL journals with disciplinary orientations that did accept SPNs showed clear patterns of representation (see Figure 3). It is perhaps not surprising to see disciplines that place value on reflective practice, such as the health professions and education, well represented. At first, it may appear as if the distribution of discipline is relatively equal, with all major super-disciplinary categories (e.g., STEM) represented, but there are further distinctions to be drawn. For example, the category of “language” primarily includes journals devoted to language learning, especially English language learning, a field that draws from the domain of both education and the humanities. Indeed, the humanities appear to be over-represented in this group, especially if you take into account that the social science journals (n=6) include two journals in anthropology, one in agriculture, and one in geography, all of which are fields that include significant humanities-oriented sub-fields. Most of the largest social science fields---economics, sociology, and political science---are not represented in this list, with the exception of one public administration journal. Finally, there were no super-disciplinary categories in which all journals accepted SPNs, indicative of the fragmented marketspace for reflective work, even within similar disciplinary domains.
Standards for Publication
For all journals that accepted SPNs, the researchers extracted any language present on the website that described criteria for submission and acceptance, including (but not limited to) descriptions of the article type, standards for evaluation, and page or word limits.

Criteria for exclusion
A number of journals not only did not accept SPNs, but they specifically stated why they would not accept SPNs. The reasons provided can be divided into three broad areas: (lack of) generalizability or advancement of the field, (missing) methodological rigor, and the potential for bias. The Academy of Health Sciences Education, for example, provides the following rationale: “the reason [SPNs are not accepted] is simply that the evidence is consistent that people are not capable of accurate self-assessment, so any form of self-assessed improvement cannot be used as an outcome. Self-assessed measures of confidence or competence may well appear to show large differences in response to an educational intervention, but are themselves weak surrogates for actual achievement.” The Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning does not rule out reflection writing altogether but does state “we generally do not publish descriptions of individual programs or reflection pieces that do not move beyond lessons learned through the implementation of established community engagement principles.”

Criteria for inclusion
Length
When available, the researchers noted the desired length of submitted SPNs for each journal. This varied widely from 500 to 7000 words, with an approximate mid-point of 1500-3000 words. While standards for length vary by discipline, this does suggest that a typical SPN is somewhat shorter than other standard academic article types, where 5000-7000 words is often the norm.

Format
In most cases, the journal descriptions provided presumed that the SPN would take the form of a reflective essay. Several journals in educational technology do accept digital formats, such as videos, either in addition to or instead of a written essay and a handful of arts and creativity journals indicated that they would accept other creative mediums, including paintings and photography. The latter was also accepted in the form of photo essays by at least two journals focused on community engagement and outreach.

Labels
In the majority of cases, journals used the words “reflection” or “reflective” to describe the article types in question. Beyond that similarity, however, the range was highly varied. Alternatives included headings such as the following: faculty viewpoints, points of view, notes from the field, perspectives (multiple), practice to research connections, personal views, forums (multiple), scholarly teacher corner, professional development and reflection corner (PDRC), commentaries (multiple), chronicle of [the] profession, tell your story, experience articles, and, last but not least, teaching failures.

Authorship
In most cases, the primary author of the SPN is presumed to be a single instructor, often a faculty member at a higher education institution. In at least five cases, however, the journal’s description explicitly makes space for the participation of other stakeholders, including students (undergraduate and graduate), community members, parents (teacher education), and colleagues. Art History Pedagogy & Practice, for example, states “we encourage submissions from authors at all academic levels, including collaborative projects that include graduate and/or undergraduate students as contributing authors”.

These other stakeholders may choose to co-author with a faculty partner or, in at least four cases, they can also submit SPNs of their own. In addition to student voices, the Journal of Business Ethics Education accepts “real life experience essays by top CEOs and business professionals” and the ejournal of Public Affairs states, “we …want to hear the voices of students and community members about public affairs and civic engagement in their lives”. Several journals explicitly encourage SPNs that reflect global and/or culturally diverse perspectives.

Purpose
The journals that accept SPNs described their primary purpose in a multitude of ways. Perhaps the most common goal could be described as lessons learned from trying a new pedagogical strategy. These could be direct, e.g., “first-person narrative accounts presenting lessons learned from personally challenging experiences in teaching” (Journal of Management Education) or implied “a personal experience, clinical vignette, or teaching moment” (Academic Psychiatry). In some cases, the lessons learned were intended to be directly applicable to others (“in order to help others replicate, refine, or redirect the approach to similar problems in their local environment” -Journal of Dental Education). In others, the application may be indirect, taking the form of either inspiration (“enhances…new developments” –Journal of Legal Studies Education) or advancement of a shared knowledge base (“that supports, extends, and generates practitioner knowledge” -School Science and Mathematics).

Another purpose that arose across several outlets focused on the reflective process itself. The Wabash Center Journal on Teaching, for example, enjoins potential authors to “critically reflect on their teaching practice — surfacing their assumptions, analyzing their pedagogical intentions and designs, and diagnosing challenges to student learning”. English Education calls for essays that “consider[] how individual teacher educators develop, enact, and sustain meaningful personal praxis”. That reflection may not be limited to teaching and learning practice. As Academic Medicine notes, “typically, the author tells the story of an experience related to the art or science of teaching, learning, or practicing medicine, and reflects on the meaning of that experience, as it pertains to her or his life and work”. In some ways, the adjectives used to describe the SPN (or similar form of reflective writing) were more descriptive than the nouns (lessons) or verbs (reflect). For example, Advances in Physiology Education, notes “these essays must be scholarly but can be provocative, pointed, candid, or reflective”.

Criteria for Review
Few of the journals that accepted SPNs provided explicit guidelines regarding how these would be evaluated. In some cases, at least some of the criteria, such as timeliness, can perhaps be inferred from the description (e.g., “the editors value work that invites readers to consider making or teaching theatre in the present moment - Theater Topics). From the few descriptions provided, connecting the work to other literature in the field emerged as
perhaps the most prevalent criteria; e.g. “must be well-grounded in the literature” —Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; “make explicit the conceptual understandings held by the author in order to move the field forward in some way” —International Journal of Academic Development; “narrative reflection to explore where experience is aligned with, extends, or problematizes extant theory and research” —Journal of International Students.

A handful of journals identified relevance (‘their relevance to other designers, educators, or researchers working in the field’ —Journal of Interactive Media in Education) or impact (‘convey a point of view that reviewers would judge to make a difference’ —Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement) as key criteria. Interestingly, in at least three cases, the editor(s) suggested originality or innovation as key factors, e.g., “essays that challenge current practice, encourage experimentation, or draw novel conclusions” —Journal of Teaching and Learning with Technology. It may be worth noting that this potential contribution of SPNs has not been highlighted in previous justifications for its scholarly value.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS
In the interests of full disclosure, the authors wish to extend a bit of their own scholarly personal narrative. The impetus for this study started as a critical moment in our own practice. The first and second authors’ center for teaching and learning hosted a day-long virtual writing retreat in which faculty participants outlined and worked on reflective writing related to teaching and learning using a recently published guide (Greenberger, 2020). The retreat rested on the premise that reflective work, such as SPNs, is an accepted form of engagement in both scholarly teaching and scholarship. Indeed, one of our participants wrote a very personal essay that all of us in the writing group felt was both timely and well-crafted, so we encouraged her to submit it for publication, which she did.

It was through her experience that we were able to witness first-hand just how fragmented and contested the publishing space is for reflective writing in SoTL. Before finally being published, her piece was rejected by a total of five journals, all of which claim to publish reflective essays in teaching. One editor dismissed the work without review, stating it was “too subjective”, two others sent the piece out for review, but ultimately rejected it as insufficiently grounded in either “the standards of qualitative research” or “the philosophy of education” respectively. At the journal that ultimately accepted the piece, reviewers praised both her courage and the broad applicability of the insights drawn. All in all, this was a long, confusing, and often disheartening journey for the author, who is unlikely to want to repeat her experience in the future (or encourage others to do so).

This descriptive study, a systematic content analysis of SoTL journal information, largely affirms the subjective experience of our colleague and suggests that there are significant gaps between the aspirations of the field of SoTL (to embrace reflective writing such as SPNs) and the academic outlets willing and available to disseminate and, ultimately, recognize SPNs as a legitimate form of scholarship. The analysis presented further affirms the fragmented, at times even contested, reception for this form of writing and the lack of clear or consistent standards or procedures by which it should be evaluated (and by whom). This conclusion begs the question of what can be done to stimulate more reflection on both the ideal and reality of reflective writing in SoTL, and by whom, with possible candidates ranging from individuals, institutions, professional organizations, even entire disciplines.

We do acknowledge, however, that we looked only in one place—peer-reviewed academic journals from the Kennesaw State database—for evidence of the reception of SPNs. Because the data were drawn exclusively from the Teaching Journals directory, the constraints of that data source have the most direct potential impact on the current study. As noted above, while KSU CETL staff have attempted to exclude predatory and pay-to-publish journals in the directory, entries are not otherwise vetted for quality. In addition, while the directory was crafted to be comprehensive and multidisciplinary, new entries are mostly user-suggested and thus are constrained by the disciplines and knowledge base of its users. This could mean that certain disciplines—perhaps the humanities, which were over-represented in our findings—are over-emphasized in the directory, as the heavy users tend to suggest more new entries from their respective fields.

It is also possible that SPNs may be better suited to other outlets, or types of outlets, that were not covered by this study. For example, in the field of Engineering, a large number of smaller-scale teaching and learning studies are published as conference proceedings, accessible only to members of professional societies such as the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE). Given current standards in engineering education research, it seems unlikely that engineering faculty are publishing large numbers of SPNs, but if they were, those would not have been discoverable through our process. The same could be said for books, book chapters, and additional scholarly outlets that are not journals.

It seems more likely that SPNs are being published in other more public domains, taking forms such as blog posts or zine articles. If so, this begs the question of what the line of demarcation should be (if any) between SPNs that appear in peer-reviewed journals and those that are oriented toward wider audiences. On one hand, it could be argued that SPNs in academic journals may need to be held to higher, or at least different, standards than those that appear on, say, Medium (a popular platform for social journalism). On the other hand, it could be argued that academia should shift how it values public scholarship, especially about a subject so readily relatable as teaching and learning (Chick & Friberg, 2022). As discussed previously, one of the primary values of SPNs is that they can connect across multiple disciplinary audiences, but perhaps they can also cross over other persistent divides, including the currently fractured relationship between the broader public and higher education.

It is also possible that reflective writing is being co-opted, as evidenced by the increasing popularity of qualitative research methods that incorporate reflection and reflective writing, such as individual and collective auto-ethnographies, which have also started to pop up in the fields of both SoTL and the Scholarship of Educational Development (SoED). While there is no single format or standard for how an auto-ethnography is conducted, there are sufficient guidelines that differentiate it from the more literary forms usually adopted with SPNs. This co-option into qualitative research places reflective writing in what some might argue is a more legitimate space, but it also has the potential to devalue those aspects of SPNs that seek to embrace and empower voices that reflect a plurality not only of experiences but also epistemologies.
Our findings suggest that SoTL journals can, and arguably should, do more to elevate reflection as a scholarly act and reflective writing as scholarly discourse. We acknowledge, however, that journals, and their editors, are not fully autonomous. Indeed, they are ethically bound to uphold the standards of the constituencies they serve, so the question becomes the extent to which the tail wags the dog. A potentially constructive first step might be for disciplinary organizations (and related entities that sponsor journals) to consider the adoption of consistent, but flexible, definitions and standards that could readily be added to existing journal practices. While our study revealed some loose commonalities in how SPNs (and related forms of reflective writing) are described by the journals; this perspective could be productively paired with a study of how they are described and implemented by their authors, i.e., a content analysis of previously published SPNs in SoTL.

It may also be possible to harness the increasing popularity of these forms of scholarly expression to rethink how academic work is valued and disseminated more broadly. Rather than trying to fit a round peg of reflective writing into the square hole of conventional publishing practices, perhaps it’s time to rethink both the hole (the journal) and the peg (SPNs). A handful of SoTL journals have already begun experimenting with new types of articles, metrics that emphasis application over impact (Medina & Draugalis, 2019), and alternative forms of peer review. The International Journal of Students as Partners, for example, recently debuted a section known as “Voices from the Field”, which features a collection of short, crowd-sourced reflections on timely topics in teaching and learning. In their fall 2023 issue, Transformative Dialogues premiered a new “Dialogues” section, in which authors are encouraged to represent ongoing conversations in which the peer reviewers may participate. Framed in this way, perhaps the challenge of SPNs can contribute meaningfully to ongoing and broader conversations about how academic publishing can be re-imagined as a more inclusive and generative space.

Through this study, we (the authors) sought to identify pathways through which instructors who wish to engage in scholarly reflection can share their work with others. This act of sharing what are often deeply personal insights affirms beliefs that lie at the heart of the SoTL movement, including the value of reflection, the exchange of practice, the fostering of cross-disciplinary dialogue, and the cultivation of community. We call upon the editors, the reviewers, and the readers of these journals (and other related outlets) to take proactive steps so that we can more closely align SoTL’s signature pedagogies with the realities of academic publishing.
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