ABSTRACT
Identifying indicators and domains of scholarship requires thorough empirical and theoretical explorations. The importance of within-faculty propositions and consensus on indicators has been addressed in order to enhance scholarship, promote teaching portfolios, and ensure discipline-specific knowledge to enrich general models.

We found that faculty, when asked to individually propose statements on scholarship of teaching in the first phase of this modified Delphi-study on consensus-formation in SoTL, suggested statements that could be qualitatively structured into five areas. From the second phase, there was a strong tendency toward consensus within faculty on statements they considered to be good indicators of SoTL. Statements with lower agreement had higher dispersion, indicating more specificity than general qualities.

INTRODUCTION
Previous studies following Boyer’s (1990) principles on scholarship of academic work have explored the scholarship of teaching and learning with the purpose of defining and refining the concepts (e.g., Kreber, 2001, 2006; Smith & Simpson, 1995; Trigwell et al., 2000; Tigelaar et al., 2004). Realizing the need for clear and common contents, frameworks and models on general competencies have been suggested, based on theoretical reasoning and empirical studies of expertise knowledge. Developing scholarship in teaching and learning implies improving pedagogical thinking and skills, from lower-order to higher-order dimensions (e.g., Trigwell et al., 2000; Kreber, 2006). Scholarly growth may still call for a bottom-up approach, due to emerging practises’ influence on general conceptualizations. If the role of frameworks and models is considered to be good indicators of SoTL, the study must let the students take active part of their education. Educational Psychology, 17(4), 373-386.

METHODS
The design follows the procedure of the Delphi-technique, modified for the purpose of studying ideas of scholarship over a time-period of two years (Fig. 2).

RESULTS
A total of 117 statements were extracted from first-phase materials, and arithmetic mean (agreement with statement) and standard deviation (agreement within faculty) calculated for each after second-phase ratings. The overall relationship between means and standard deviation is shown in Fig. 3. The three items with highest mean rating in each domain is reported in Table 1, supplemented in Table 2 by eight other statements from three domains reaching agreement larger than 6.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
Initiating scholarly work presupposes faculty ownership. Several reforms in Norwegian higher education have tired out faculty, so top-down decisions now often meet opposition and resistance. A Delphi-study might therefore be an appropriate method for involving faculty in reflections towards scholarship, giving opportunities also for evaluating substantial changes at an institutional level.

Withdrawal can be a considerable problem in this process, further complicated by a university practice of short-term appointments, and staff mobility.

Also, the question remains on whether consensus is a validation tool in SoTL, and whether developing statements, often excluded from a third round in a Delphi-study, actually may anticipate evolving scholarship, or just express lower-level dimensions in a SoTL-framework.

The connection between abstraction and applicability is a challenge for all faculty members and scholars in this field. Hopefully, our study may contribute to stimulate research on faculty perspectives, to facilitate initiation of scholarship at faculty, and to enrich and elaborate existing models of SoTL.