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The Value System of a University—Rethinking Scholarship

Conrad J. Weiser

Revised promotion and tenure criteria that evolved from extensive faculty deliberations were adopted this year by a major Land Grant university. Scholarship was defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Discovery, development, integration, and artistry were identified as forms of scholarship. Evaluation of a faculty member’s performance will be based upon a position description of assigned duties, appropriate scholarship, service and the relative proportion of effort devoted to each. Changes in promotion and tenure criteria at universities are rare. The process and outcomes described here may be relevant to other institutions.

Many universities are re-examining their values as public confidence in and support for higher education has waned. A university’s values are most clearly described by its promotion and tenure policies, and by the criteria it uses to evaluate faculty members’ performance. In American universities all professors are expected to engage in scholarship, and each is also expected to perform other job responsibilities assigned to his or her position. These assigned responsibilities typically include specific teaching, research, advising, extension, or administrative assignments.

The balance of emphasis between scholarship and other assigned duties varies from one faculty position to another—ranging from faculty whose primary responsibility is to engage in scholarship, to faculty with extensive assigned duties who devote a limited but significant effort to scholarly achievement.

All faculty members are also encouraged to provide service relevant to their assignment and of value to their institution or profession, but tenure and promotion decisions are typically based on evidence of significant scholarly contributions and effective performance of assigned duties—not on outstanding service. Scholarship and performance of assigned duties are valued highly at most universities, and faculty members are denied tenure if accomplishment is inadequate in either area. Excellence, not adequacy, is the performance goal for university faculties.

Professor and Dean Emeritus, College of Agricultural Sciences. Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA.
Oregon State University is a research-oriented Land Grant university, designated as a Research University I by the Carnegie Foundation. The University had three primary missions and its faculty members have three fundamental responsibilities as shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Missions</th>
<th>Faculty Member Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>assigned duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Education (1)</td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Specific duties and the balance of effort among these three areas of responsibility are described for each faculty position.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. The relationship between University missions and faculty responsibilities.

Effective organizations have developed systems for evaluating and rewarding employee performance as it relates to the missions of the organization. In universities, evaluating a faculty member’s scholarly contributions and assessing how well he or she has performed the specific duties assigned to the position seems appropriate and straightforward. Unfortunately it is often neither simple nor straightforward, in part because:

- Scholarship is undefined and poorly understood at many universities. Scholarship is often oversimplistically equated with research.

- A faculty member’s performance is sometimes evaluated by peers without reference to the position description—as if all faculty positions were identical.

- Emphasis on individual achievement in faculty performance is sometimes interpreted by peer evaluators to imply that faculty contributions to team efforts are not valuable and important—as if it were not possible to value both individual achievement and collaborative effort.

- It is easier to document and evaluate form and activities, rather than substance or consequences, in describing and assessing faculty contributions.

Discussions are underway at many American universities seeking ways to improve evaluations of faculty and promotion and tenure processes. These discussions are prompted, in part, by the limitations mentioned above, but also by growing public dissatisfaction and distrust of universities’ values, which are perceived to be:

- unduly focused on research and research funding, to the detriment of undergraduate education;
• inward looking and directed predominantly at specialized peer audiences; and

• overspecialized, discipline focused, and not particularly relevant or responsive to societal problems which tend to be complex.

Scholarship Reconsidered

Ernest L. Boyer’s 1990 book Scholarship Reconsidered—Priorities of the Professoriate (2) stimulated much of the discussion of scholarship currently taking place within universities and scholarly and scientific societies. In his book, and in frequent public talks, Dr. Boyer makes an eloquent case for the importance of valuing teaching more highly in assessing faculty performance. He poses the question "Is it possible to define the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates?" He answers the question by proposing "that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching."

At Oregon State University, Boyer’s book Scholarship Reconsidered provided the impetus for discussion by faculty (3) in the College of Agricultural Sciences whose primary assignments included teaching, research, extension, and international programs. The group’s objectives were to develop a collective understanding of what scholarship implies, and to describe the nature of scholarship at a university in concise terms that would be understood by faculty in all disciplines, and by nonacademics as well.

In the course of a year this faculty group defined scholarship simply: scholarship creates something new that is validated and communicated. They described five forms of scholarship which were similar to the four proposed by Boyer, except that creative artistry was added as a fifth form of scholarship, and learning was added to describe the scholarship of teaching and learning. Fig. 2 illustrates the type of format that was used to describe scholarship in a matrix that fits on one sheet of paper. This definition and these concepts were subsequently improved upon, as described later.
## Forms of Scholarship

Scholarship creates something that did not exist before that is validated and communicated to others; new understanding in the minds of students, new knowledge about ourselves and our universe, new beauty that stimulates the senses, new insights, and new technologies and applications of knowledge that can benefit humankind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the scholarship</th>
<th>Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Artistic Creativity</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With learners, develops and communicates new understanding and insights; develops and refines new teaching content and methods; fosters lifelong learning behavior.</td>
<td>Generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Interprets the human spirit, creates and communicates new insights and beauty; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Synthesizes and communicates new or different understandings of knowledge or technology and its relevance; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Develops and communicates new technologies, materials or uses; fosters inquiry and invention; develops and refines new methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary audiences for scholarship</th>
<th>Learners: Educators; peers.</th>
<th>Peers: Supporters of research; Educators; Students; Publics.</th>
<th>Various publics: Peers; Patrons; Students</th>
<th>Users: Educators; Students; Peers.</th>
<th>Users: Customers; Educators; Peers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials and methods; Classes; Curricula</td>
<td>Peer-reviewed publications and presentations; Patrons; Public reports and presentations.</td>
<td>Shows, performances and distribution of products, services, news reports; copyrights; peer presentations and journals, publications.</td>
<td>Presentations, publications, demonstrations, and patents</td>
<td>Demonstrations and presentations to audiences; Patrons; Publications for users; Periodicals and reports; Peer presentations and publications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Primary criteria for validating scholarship | Originality and significance of new contributions to learning; depth, duration, and usefulness of what is learned; lifelong benefits to learners and adoption by peers. | Originality, scope, and significance of new knowledge; applicability and benefits to society. | Beauty, originality, impact, and duration of public value; scope and persistence of influence and public appreciation. | Usefulness and originality of new or different understandings, applications, and insights. | Breadth, value, and persistence of use and impact. |

| How scholarship is documented | Teaching portfolio: summaries of primary new contributions, impact on students and learning; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, significance and impact in advancing knowledge, new methods, public benefits; communication and validation by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to public; peer recognition and adoption; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users; scope of adoption and application, impact and benefits; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users; scope of adoption and application, impact and benefits; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. |

Fig. 2. Forms of scholarship matrix. Prior to University-wide deliberations, five iterations of discussion and review were focused on completing the cells in this matrix to characterize various forms of scholarship. Fig. 3 illustrates the subsequent evolution of the matrix into a simpler definition and description of scholarship that emphasizes similarities among various forms of scholarship.

## Faculty Discussion

The definition and description of scholarship provided the basis for widespread faculty discussion at Oregon State University beginning in the College of Agricultural Sciences. These discussions resulted in five cycles of review and revision of the Forms of Scholarship matrix (Fig. 2). The matrix format provided a useful initial focus for discussion of the several forms of scholarship. As discussions progressed, however, the taxonomy tended to focus discussion on differences among forms of scholarship rather than on unifying characteristics of all types of scholarship. Over a two-year period the faculty discussions in the College evolved into:

- adoption of revised promotion and tenure guidelines for the College based upon the definition and description of scholarship;
- incorporation of a position description for each faculty member into annual evaluations and into the promotion and tenure process;
• addition of a category labeled *results of team effort* into the format for documentation of faculty achievements; and

• encouragement of departments to identify peer counselors to advise and assist new faculty members in early career development.

During this period of discussion and revision the deans of all other colleges also participated in describing and defining scholarship, and in recommending University-wide consideration.

Faculty understanding and acceptance of this concept of scholarship were remarkably widespread and enthusiastic. Faculty members and college deans who considered the matter were very comfortable with the simple definition of scholarship proposed, and with the idea that discovery, application, integration, and creative artistry are fundamental forms of scholarship. A point that troubled a substantial number of faculty was inclusion of teaching as a form of scholarship. Faculty members who expressed the greatest reservations about describing teaching as a form of scholarship included many effective teachers in agriculture, faculty members in education departments, and faculty members in departments such as English and Chemistry that have substantial undergraduate teaching responsibilities. Subsequent university-wide adoption of an improved definition and description of scholarship resolved these reservations by considering teaching, research, and extended education as vital university missions and activities—not forms of scholarship.

Some faculty members were concerned that defining scholarship and identifying discovery, development, integration, and artistry as forms of scholarship somehow lowered standards and diminished the value placed on research by the University. Most faculty members, including distinguished researchers, understood that standards of performance were likely being raised rather than lowered, and that research would continue to be highly valued by the University. In a similar vein, one person expressed concern during a Faculty Senate discussion that recognition of faculty contributions to collaborative team efforts somehow diminished the importance and value placed by the University on individual achievements. These examples of *zero-sum game* thinking were relatively rare.

The scholarship definition and promotion and tenure policies adopted by the College of Agricultural Sciences were subsequently considered by an Extended Education Transition Committee that was appointed and chaired by the Provost (4). The committee’s assignment was to advise the President on implementation of a major new initiative that reaffirmed extended education as the University’s *third mission* (5). This initiative required each college and department to develop an *extended education* plan for delivering educational programs beyond the campus. In addition, extension faculty (agents and specialists) are now tenured in colleges and departments rather than in Cooperative Extension, as was previously the case.

The Extended Education Transition Committee reviewed, refined, and endorsed the College of Agricultural Sciences’ promotion and tenure policies which were viewed as supportive of the University’s extended education mission, and of the tenuring of extension faculty members in academic colleges and departments. The Committee recommended University-wide consideration of these policies. In response, the Provost appointed a Faculty Senate Committee to review and propose revisions, if appropriate, in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
Faculty Senate Deliberation

A diverse campus-wide Faculty Senate Committee (6) devoted a year to intensive, almost weekly meetings to developing revisions in the promotion and tenure guidelines. The revised guidelines were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate as a whole in May 1995, and officially adopted by the University President (7) in June 1995. The revised guidelines drew from concepts developed initially by the College of Agricultural Sciences and the Extended Education Transition Committee, but the Faculty Senate Committee improved on several points including a definition of scholarship that does not propose teaching as a form of scholarship.

Specifically, Oregon State University's new promotion and tenure guidelines define scholarship more broadly (8), value team efforts, and require that position descriptions provide the basis for evaluating faculty performance. The new guidelines (9) have eliminated need for separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines previously used in library and information services, extension, international development, veterinary medicine, and several other specialized areas. The new guidelines also help alleviate concerns of extension faculty who wondered whether their work and creative scholarly achievements would be understood and valued by teaching and research colleagues in campus departments.

Key elements of the newly adopted Oregon State University promotion and tenure guidelines, as interpreted and modified here, include the following:

- Defines scholarship as: Creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated.

- Describes four forms of scholarship:
  * Discovery of new knowledge;
  * Development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses;
  * Integration of knowledge leading to new understanding; and
  * Artistry that creates new insights and interpretations.

- Recognizes teaching, research, and extended education as vital university missions and faculty activities—that are not scholarship in themselves—but which can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated intellectual work (scholarship) in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry).

- Recognizes that peer validation and communication can occur in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, peer-refereed publications. Emphasizes documenting whether, not how, peer validation and communication has occurred. Emphasizes "communication in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself."

- Identifies performance of assigned duties and scholarly achievement as the two primary areas for evaluating faculty performance. Recognizes service as a less important area of performance evaluation.
• Requires that a position description will provide the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance. The position description will describe assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort among assigned duties, scholarship, and service. States that "The responsibilities of individual faculty vary and will be specified in position descriptions developed at the time of initial appointment and revised periodically as necessary. Faculty with assignments in research, extension, international development, information services, student services, diagnostic and analytical services, and administration will be evaluated by the standards appropriate to the field."

• Recognizes that some faculty positions are devoted primarily to conducting scholarly work with few additional assigned responsibilities, and that other faculty positions have extensive assigned duties (in areas such as teaching, advising, extension, or administration), and a small but significant expectation of scholarly achievement.

• Affirms that scholarly achievement is expected of all professorial rank faculty members, regardless of other assigned duties (including administrators such as the university president, provost, deans, and department heads). Administrators’ scholarship could be in a subject-matter discipline, or in creative intellectual work developing better management methods (validated by peers and communicated) in their area of administrative responsibility.

• Recognizes that teachers and extension educators could focus their scholarship in a subject-matter discipline or in developing improved education materials, methods, or programs.

• Recognizes that disciplinary peers around the world are the primary audience for most types of research scholarship, but that the primary audiences for some types of scholarship may be more localized or regionalized in the case of teaching, extension, and field research that is locally adapted. The promotion and tenure guideline language was changed to reflect this reality—from "professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship" to "professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate’s wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession."

• States that the University values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report specifically their contributions to the results of significant team efforts in documenting their accomplishments.

• Recommends that documentation of achievements focus (whenever possible) on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, on describing what has changed or improved as a result of a faculty member’s efforts.
Summary.

The definition of scholarship developed and adopted by Oregon State University (OSU) differs from that proposed by Ernest Boyer. Specifically, Boyer described characteristics of scholarship, but did not define scholarship 

per se. He proposed "four separate but overlapping functions" of the professoriate as: "the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching." In proposing these four functions as forms of scholarship Boyer in effect classified virtually all important faculty activities as scholarship.

In contrast the OSU guidelines consider that a university, and its faculty, performs essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. Scholarship is considered to be creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated including: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and artistry that creates new insights and understandings. Fig. 3 illustrates the nature of scholarship as described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Nature of Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Forms of scholarship include discovery, development, integration and artistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character of scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences for scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of communicating scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for validating scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of documenting scholarship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. The nature of scholarship.
This description of scholarship does not assume that most activities engaged in or originated by faculty are scholarship in and of themselves. It recognizes, in fact, that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not only by university faculty. It emphasizes the importance of validation to ensure validity, and of communication to broader audiences to ensure that results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others. Nonacademics who have reviewed the new OSU guidelines readily understand and value this concept of scholarship.

The OSU and Boyer approaches are similar in that both achieve the aim of broadening the view of scholarship beyond research, and both articulate, advocate, and provide a mechanism for recognition of scholarship in areas such as teaching, learning, and education. Boyer does this by proposing that teaching is scholarship. The OSU model does so by recognizing that scholarship in teaching can occur in the areas of discovery, development, integration, or artistry—whenever creative intellectual work in teaching is validated by peers and communicated.

The process at OSU that led to adoption of new promotion and tenure guidelines, and the new concepts about scholarship and faculty performance that crystallized out of those faculty deliberations may prove useful to others who are dealing with these issues.
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Finally, Bruno Moser has written an excellent essay on the subject of retirement, a difficult transition for many faculty, especially regarding nonfinancial concerns. He has dealt with a number of issues ranging from retirement planning, alternatives, incentives, and the impact that retirements can have on a department. Faculty approaching this milestone still have much to offer, and, although their roles and contributions may change, they must remain productive department members.

This colloquium focuses on the issues and concerns faculty have during their professional careers. These challenges and concerns change during the span of an individual’s academic tenure. The presenters have provided information that can assist individuals and departments to remain productive and accomplish their goals.
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**Faculty Scholarship and Productivity Expectations—An Administrator’s Perspective**

C.J. Weiser
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The value system of a university is most clearly described by its promotion and tenure policies, and by the criteria it uses to evaluate faculty members’ performance. In American universities, all professors are expected to engage in scholarship, and each professor is also expected to perform other job responsibilities assigned to his or her position. These assigned responsibilities typically include specific teaching, research, extension, advising, or administrative assignments.

The balance of emphasis between scholarship and other assigned duties varies from one faculty position to another—ranging from faculty with few assignments beyond engaging in scholarship, to faculty with extensive responsibilities for other assigned duties who devote a small but significant effort to scholarly achievement.

All faculty members are also encouraged to perform service relevant to their assignment and of value to their institution or profession, but tenure and promotion decisions are typically based on evidence of significant scholarly contributions and effective performance of assigned duties—not on outstanding service. Scholarship and performance of assigned duties are both valued highly at most universities, and faculty members are denied tenure if performance is inadequate in either area. Excellence, not adequacy, is the performance goal for university faculties.

Evaluating a faculty member’s scholarly contributions and assessing how well he or she has performed the specific duties assigned to the position seems appropriate and fairly straightforward. Unfortunately, it is often neither simple nor straightforward, in part because:

- Scholarship is undefined and poorly understood at most universities. Scholarship is often oversimplifiedly thought to be synonymous with research.
- A faculty member’s performance is sometimes evaluated by peers without reference to the position description—as if all faculty positions were the same.
- Emphasis on individual achievement in faculty performance is interpreted by some peer evaluators to imply that faculty contributions to team efforts are not valuable and important—as if it were not possible to value both individual achievement and collaborative effort.
- It is easier to document and evaluate form and activities, rather than substance or consequences, in describing and assessing faculty contributions.

There are discussions underway at many American universities of ways to improve faculty evaluations and the processes of promotion and tenure. These discussions are prompted in part by the limitations mentioned above, but also by growing public dissatisfaction and distrust of universities’ values, which are perceived to be:

- primarily focused on research and research funding, rather than on undergraduate education;
- introspective, with communications of faculty accomplishments directed predominantly at specialized peer audiences; and
- overspecialized, discipline focused, and not particularly relevant or responsive to real problems, which tend to be complex.

Publication of Scholarship Reconsidered—Priorities of the Professorate (Boyer, 1990) stimulated much of the discussion of scholarship currently taking place within universities and professional societies. In this book, and in frequent public talks, Dr. Boyer makes an eloquent case for the importance of valuing teaching more highly in assessing faculty performance. He poses the question “Is it possible to define the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates?” and answers it by proposing “that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching.”

At Oregon State Univ. (OSU), Dr. Boyer’s book Scholarship Reconsidered provided the starting point for discussion by a group composed of faculty members in the College of Agricultural Sciences whose primary assignments were in diverse areas, including teaching, research, extension, and international programs. The group’s objectives were to develop a collective understanding of what scholarship is, and to describe the nature of scholarship across the university in concise terms that would be understood by faculty in all disciplines and by nonacademics as well.

In the course of a year, this faculty group defined scholarship simply: scholarship creates something new that is validated and communicated. They described five forms of scholarship that were similar to the four proposed by Boyer, except that creative aridity was added as a fifth form of scholarship, and learning was added to propose the scholarship of teaching and learning. This definition and these concepts were subsequently improved, as described later.

This simple definition and description of scholarship provided the basis for widespread faculty discussion, especially within the College of Agricultural Sciences at OSU. These discussions resulted in five iterations of review and revision, and evolved over a 2-year period into:

- adoption of revised promotion and tenure guidelines for the College, based on the definition and description of scholarship;
- incorporation of a position description for each faculty member into annual evaluations and into the promotion and tenure process;
- addition of a category on results of team effort into the format for faculty documentation of their achievements; and
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• encouragement of departments to assign two peer counselors to new faculty members to assist them in their early career development.

Deans of other colleges at the university participated in describing and defining scholarship, and recommended its consideration by the entire university. Faculty understanding and acceptance of this concept of scholarship was remarkably widespread and enthusiastic. Essentially, all faculty members who considered the matter, and all college deans, were comfortable with the simple definition of scholarship proposed, and with the idea that discovery, application, integration, and creative artistry are fundamental forms of scholarship. One point that troubled a substantial number of faculty was inclusion of teaching as a form of scholarship. Interestingly, faculty members who expressed the greatest reservations about teaching as a form of scholarship included many effective teachers in agriculture with large teaching assignments, faculty members in education departments, and faculty members in departments with large undergraduate teaching loads, such as English and chemistry. Subsequent university-wide adoption of an improved definition and description of scholarship resolved these reservations by considering teaching, research, and extension as vital university activities, not as forms of scholarship.

Another perception that troubled some faculty members (but not the distinguished researchers on campus) was the notion that defining and describing forms of scholarship as discovery, development, integration, and artistry somehow lowered standards or diminished the importance and value placed on research by the university. Most faculty members realized that standards of performance were probably being raised rather than lowered, and that research continues to be highly valued. In a similar vein, one faculty senator expressed concern that recognizing faculty contributions to collaborative team efforts somehow diminished the importance and value placed on individual achievements by the university. Both examples reflect zero-sum game thinking that fortunately was rare among members of the faculty.

The definition and policies adopted by the College of Agricultural Sciences were subsequently studied, refined, and endorsed by an Extended Education Transition Committee that was appointed and chaired by the Provost to advise the President on implementation of a major new initiative that established extended education as the university's third mission. This initiative required each college and department to develop an extended education plan for delivering educational programs beyond the campus. Extension faculty (agents and specialists) are now assigned to, evaluated by, and tenured in colleges and departments—rather than in Cooperative Extension, as was the case previously.

The Provost appointed a Faculty Senate Committee to consider recommendations and propose revisions in the OSU promotion and tenure guidelines.

This highly diverse cross-disciplinary faculty senate committee devoted a year to intensive weekly deliberations to revise promotion and tenure guidelines. The new guidelines were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate in May 1995, and subsequently adopted in June by the university president. The new guidelines drew substantially from concepts developed initially by the College of Agricultural Sciences and the Extended Education Transition Committee, but the Faculty Senate Committee improved on several points, including the definition of scholarship, as described below.

OSU’s new promotion and tenure guidelines define scholarship more broadly, value team efforts, and use position descriptions as a basis for evaluating faculty performance. The guidelines have eliminated any need for several separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines previously used to assess faculty performance in library and information services, extension, international development, veterinary medicine, and several other specialized areas. The new guidelines are helping to alleviate the concerns of extension agent faculty members who wondered how well their work would be understood and valued by teaching and research colleagues in campus departments.

Key elements of the newly adopted OSU promotion and tenure guidelines include the following:

• Four forms of scholarship are described: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, materials, and uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understanding; and artistry that creates new insights and interpretations.

• Recognizes that teaching, research, and extension are vital university activities—that are not scholarship in themselves—but that can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated scholarship in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry).

• Recognizes that peer validation and communication can occur in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, peer refereed publications. Emphasizes documenting whether, not how, peer validation and communication has occurred. Emphasizes "communication in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself."

• Identifies performance of assigned duties and scholarly achievement as the two primary areas for evaluating faculty performance. Service is considered to be a less important area of performance evaluation.

• Requires that a position description identifying assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort in these two areas provide the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance. States that "the responsibilities of individual faculty vary and will be specified in position descriptions developed at the time of initial appointment and revised periodically as necessary. Faculty with assignments in research, extension, international development, information services, student services, diagnostic and analytical services, and administration will be evaluated by the standards appropriate to the field."

• Recognizes that some faculty positions are devoted primarily to conducting scholarly work, with few additional assigned responsibilities, and that other faculty positions have extensive assigned duties (in areas such as teaching, advising, extension, or administration) and a small but significant expectation of scholarly achievement.

• Affirms that scholarly achievement is expected of all professorial rank faculty members, regardless of their assigned duties (including administrators such as the university president, provost, deans, and department heads). Administrators' scholarship can be in a subject matter discipline, or in creative intellectual work developing better management methods (that are validated by peers and communicated) in their area of administrative responsibility.

• Recognizes that teachers and extension educators also have the option of focusing their scholarship either in a subject matter discipline or in developing, providing for peer validation, and communicating improved education materials, methods, and programs.

• Recognizes that international disciplinary peers are the primary audience for most types of research scholarship, but that the primary audiences may be regionalized or localized for some of the scholarship in teaching, extension, and field research that is locally adapted. The promotion and tenure guideline language was changed to reflect this reality from "professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship" to "professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession."

• States that the University values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report specifically the results of their team efforts in documenting their contributions.

• Recommends that documentation of achievements focus (whenever possible) on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, documentation should describe what has changed or improved as a result of a faculty member's efforts.

SUMMARY

The definition of scholarship developed and adopted by OSU differs from that proposed by Ernest Boyer. Specifically, Dr. Boyer
described characteristics of scholarship throughout his book (1990), but he did not define scholarship. He proposed "four separate but overlapping functions" of the professoriate as: "the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching." In proposing these four functions as forms of scholarship Dr. Boyer in effect classified most, if not all, important faculty activities as scholarship.

In contrast, the OSU guidelines consider that a university and its faculty perform essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. Scholarship is considered to be creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated, and several forms are described including: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, materials, and uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and artistry that creates new insights and understandings.

This description of scholarship does not assume that most faculty activities are scholarship. It recognizes, in fact, that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not only by university faculty members. It emphasizes the importance of validation by peers to help ensure validity, and of communication to broader audiences to ensure that the results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others. Nonacademics who have reviewed the new OSU guidelines understand and value this concept of scholarship.

Specifically, the OSU guidelines consider teaching, research, and extension to be important university (and faculty) activities—but do not view these activities as scholarship. The OSU and Boyer approaches are similar in that both achieve the aim of broadening the view of scholarship beyond research, and both articulate, advocate, and provide a mechanism for recognition of scholarship in areas such as teaching, learning, and education. Dr. Boyer does this by proposing that teaching is scholarship. The OSU model does so by recognizing that scholarship in teaching can occur in the areas of discovery, development, integration, or artistry—whenever creative intellectual work in teaching is validated by peers and communicated.

The process at OSU that led to adoption of new promotion and tenure guidelines, and the new concepts and ideas about scholarship and performance that were distilled out of those faculty deliberations may prove useful to others who are interested in these issues.
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**Junior Faculty: Their Needs and Professional Development**

L. Dee Fink

*Instructional Development Program, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019*

Institutions of higher education, like all large-scale organizations, must deal with the task of regularly incorporating new personnel into their systems of operation. Many of these newcomers originate from preparatory programs which, in the case of higher education, are graduate schools; others are experienced personnel who transfer from other institutions. Both groups face the challenge of having to learn quickly how to fit into new roles and how to adapt to the peculiarities of a particular institution.

This process, which takes place every year and continues well beyond the first year, raises a number of questions that have begun to be addressed by research and by new institutional practices. This paper will address four of these questions:

1) Why is it important for academic administrators to attend to the professional development of junior faculty?
2) What is happening now to new faculty members as they enter new institutions?
3) What are the reasons for these problems?
4) What is being done and can be done to better assist the professional development of new faculty?

In discussing these questions, I will summarize some of the major research and institutional practices of the last two decades.

**IMPORTANCE OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF JUNIOR FACULTY**

The prospect of hiring a new faculty member into a department is exciting: it provides an opportunity to bring new ideas and workers into the unit, but it also incurs a major cost for the department. This cost includes the direct cost of advertising the position and transporting candidates for interviews, and the much larger indirect cost of tying up major amounts of faculty time for defining the position, preparing the advertisement, keeping track of applications, reviewing the applicants, creating a short list, hosting and listening to candidates, deciding who to make an offer to, etc. When these two sets of costs are added together, the real total cost of hiring a new faculty member probably runs into tens of thousands of dollars. Limiting the frequency of such costs by reducing unnecessary turnover of unhappy new faculty members is the first reason academic administrators should concern themselves with the welfare and professional development of new faculty members.

The second reason has a more long-term basis. If a new faculty member stays at an institution for his or her whole career, the institution will eventually spend well over $1 million in salaries and benefits. Some faculty members will make a big return on this investment in terms of high quality teaching and scholarship; others will stagnate after a few years. The difference between faculty members at these two ends of the spectrum stems primarily from their attitude towards and success in working on their own professional development. To ensure that faculty members stay productive over time, it is necessary to start professional development activities early.

The third reason has to do with changing times. It is very easy for academic administrators to think in terms of their own experiences as a new faculty member when working with today's new faculty. The problem with this response is that many of the junior faculty coming into academic today are quite different from those of yesteryear. A significantly larger percentage are women, ethnic minorities, or immigrants. Therefore, administrators need to learn about the felt needs of today's junior faculty.

**CURRENT PATTERNS AND PROBLEMS**

Researchers have been studying the situation of new faculty members during the last two decades. I have been concerned with what happens specifically during the first year of being a faculty member (Fink, 1984); others have studied what happens during the next 4 to 5 years after that (Bozce, 1992a; Olsen and Soricelli, 1992). I will summarize some of the major points of these studies.

The study of beginning college teachers was one I conducted, collecting data in the late 1970s on 100 people who had just finished graduate school and were in their first year as college teachers. These people came from the major graduate institutions in the United States.
Scholarship Unbound for the 21st Century

To provide a conceptual base for reviewing and revising tenure and promotion guidelines a faculty senate task force at Oregon State University undertook the challenge of defining and articulating the core characteristics of scholarship that apply across academic disciplines and university missions. The result was: *Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated—including creative artistry and the discovery, integration and development of knowledge.*

Scholarly achievement and excellence in performing other assigned responsibilities are the primary categories for evaluating faculty performance, but OSU’s new promotion and tenure guidelines describe other aspects of faculty performance that the University values. These include collaborative effort, international perspective and service. Revised tenure and promotion guidelines reflecting these values, and basing faculty evaluation on a position description, were adopted by the University in 1995 with unanimous Faculty Senate support. Numerous universities are considering such changes, but few have progressed this far. Oregon State University will host a national workshop October 1-3, 1998, to provide a forum for exchanging ideas on the nature of scholarship and the reframing of faculty evaluation and rewards that is taking place in American universities.

OSU’s new guidelines eliminated the need for separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines which were previously used to describe scholarship in programs such as extension, international development, veterinary medicine and library and information services where scholarship sometimes does not fit the traditional research model of results published in peer reviewed journals.

In short, Oregon State University’s new promotion and tenure guidelines:

- Reaffirm that scholarship is required of all professorial faculty, and articulate a definition of scholarship that applies across the arts and sciences.

- Require that an annually updated *position description* serves as the basis for evaluating a faculty member’s performance. The position description explicitly describes assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort among assigned duties, scholarship, and service for each faculty position.

- Identify *performance of assigned duties* and *scholarly achievement* as the two primary areas of faculty evaluation.

- Recognize service performed by faculty members which is not part of their assigned duties as a secondary area of performance evaluation. Assigned duties such as administration, extension, outreach and student advising are not viewed as service when they are assigned to a faculty member. By the same token such activities are considered service when they are performed by a faculty member whose assigned duties lie in another area, such as research or teaching.

- Recognize teaching, research, and outreach as vital university missions and faculty activities *that are not scholarship in themselves* but which can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated intellectual work (scholarship) in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry). This is a significant departure from Ernest Boyer’s view of teaching *per se* as scholarship.

- Recognize that peer validation and communication are separate processes that can occur in a variety of ways including, *but not limited to*, peer-refereed publications. When peer validation and communication are accomplished in non-traditional ways it is the faculty members responsibility to clearly describe and document how peer validation and communication were accomplished.
• Recognize that teachers and extension educators can do scholarly work in developing improved education materials, methods, or programs in conducting research in their subject-matter discipline.

• Recognize that the audiences for scholarship in research are disciplinary peers worldwide, but that audiences for scholarship in teaching, extension and site-specific field research are often more localized. The promotion and tenure guidelines language was changed to reflect this reality—from "professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship" to "professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate’s wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession."

• Emphasize that the University values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report contributions to significant team efforts in documenting their accomplishments.

• Recommend that documentation of achievements focus whenever possible on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, on describing what changed or improved as a result of a faculty member’s efforts.

The OSU Promotion and Tenure guidelines acknowledge that the faculty of a university performs essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. The guidelines explicitly describe scholarship as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated including: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and artistry that creates new insights and understandings. This view acknowledges that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not just at universities. It emphasizes the importance of ensuring validity, and of communicating to broader audiences to ensure that results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others, and articulates the fundamental nature of scholarly achievement that applies across all disciplines.

Citizen advisors value OSU’s new guidelines which they feel will recognize and reward faculty efforts that benefit students and citizens in Oregon. Several universities are finding that the Oregon State University definition of scholarship provides a useful starting point for their institution’s deliberations about faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure and post-tenure review. University faculties, and the broader public, seem ready to improve faculty evaluation and reward processes.

Additional information, shown below, can be obtained from: Office of Academic Affairs, Oregon State University, 628 Kerr Administration Building, Corvallis, OR 97331, (541)737-0732 or gigi.bruce@orst.edu.

- Oregon State University, 1995 Revised Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and Dossier Preparation Instructions. http://www.orst.edu (Full-Text Search of OSU, "promotion and tenure")

- Draft paper, 1995 "The Value System of a University—Rethinking Scholarship" by C. J. Weiser describing in more detail the process at OSU and the changes that resulted.
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C. J. Weiser, Dean Emeritus
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
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Broader Visions of Scholarship

—A Comparison of Carnegie Foundation and Oregon State University models

The Nature of Scholarship

Carnegie: Four activities of the professoriate—teaching and the discovery, integration and application of knowledge are described as the categories of scholarship.

OSU: Scholarship is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Four forms of scholarship are described: creative artistry and the discovery, integration and development (application) of knowledge.

Both models view the discovery, integration and application of knowledge as three forms of scholarship. Additionally, the Carnegie model includes teaching while the OSU model includes creative artistry as a fourth form of scholarship.

Implications

Carnegie: Scholarship is determined and described as the things that professors do, hence good teaching is considered to be scholarship. Literary, visual and performing arts are considered to fall under the scholarship of discovery.

OSU: Professors do important work that is not scholarship. Creative teaching or research, for example, does not become scholarship unless and until it is validated by peers and communicated beyond the classroom or file drawer. Creative artistry is viewed as a distinct form of scholarship that interprets the human spirit and creates new insights and beauty. Scholarship can be done by creative knowledgeable people throughout society—not just at universities.

Assessing Scholarship

Carnegie: Scholarly achievements can be assessed (validated) by determining that "phases of an intellectual process" occurred during their development. The six sequential phases of an intellectual process are identified as: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

OSU: Peers validate scholarly achievements in terms of accuracy and the extent to which achievements are original, significant and potentially useful to others.
Assessment of scholarship in the Carnegie model focuses on using a scholarly process to achieve scholarly results. In contrast, the OSU model focuses on peer validation in terms of accuracy, originality, significance and usefulness of scholarly results rather than on the inputs or process used to achieve a scholarly result.

**Similarities and Differences**

Both models place high value on scholarly achievements that result from research, but both envision scholarship as being broader than research results published in peer refereed journals. Both models extend the concept of scholarship to include various types of intellectual work and achievement.

The Carnegie Foundation model basically describes scholarship in terms of the teaching and research activities that faculty members routinely engage in. The OSU model views scholarship as creative work that is peer validated and communicated to others—suggesting that scholarship can occur in all areas of professorial work, and outside of academia.

The Carnegie and OSU models were developed to achieve similar objectives. They travel parallel conceptual pathways in articulating comprehensive visions of scholarship that can provide a basis for recognizing, evaluating and rewarding faculty creativity across university disciplines and missions. These models and others yet evolving will hopefully accelerate progress towards making the missions of universities congruent with the criteria and processes used to evaluate and reward the faculty that carry out those missions.

C. J. Weiser
May 1998
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A faculty senate task force at Oregon State University (OSU) undertook the challenge of defining and articulating the core characteristics of scholarship that apply across academic disciplines and university missions to provide a conceptual base for reviewing and revising tenure and promotion guidelines. The result was: Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated— including creative artistry and the discovery, integration, and development of knowledge.

Scholarly achievement and excellence in performing assigned responsibilities are the primary categories for evaluating faculty performance, but OSU's new promotion and tenure (P&T) guidelines describe other aspects of faculty performance that the University values. These include collaborative effort, international perspective and service. Revised tenure and promotion guidelines reflecting these values, and basing faculty evaluation on a position description, were adopted by the university in 1995 with unanimous Faculty Senate support.

Some may be familiar with the model put forth by the Carnegie Foundation (1990) that asserts that scholarly achievements are assessed by determining whether "phases of an intellectual process" were followed. The phases are clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective preparation, and reflective critique. In contrast, the OSU model uses criteria that focus more on outputs to validate scholarship. Specifically, the criteria are used in assessing the extent to which a scholarly achievement is original, significant, and useful to others.

The Carnegie and OSU models both envision scholarship as broader than results of research published in a peer refereed journal. Both models place high value on scholarly achievements that result from research. Both models extend the concept of scholarship beyond research to include the other types of creative intellectual work and achievement. The Carnegie Foundation model basically describes scholarship in terms of the teaching and research activities that faculty members normally engage in. The OSU model views scholarship fundamentally as creative work that is peer validated and communicated to
others. This view suggests that scholarship can occur in all areas of professorial work as well as outside of academia.

OSU's new guidelines eliminated the need for separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines previously used to describe scholarship in programs such as Extension, international development, veterinary medicine, and library and information services where scholarship sometimes does not fit the traditional research model of results published in peer reviewed journals.

In short, Oregon State University's new (P&T) guidelines:

* Reaffirm that scholarship is required of all professorial faculty, and articulate a definition of scholarship that applies across the arts and sciences.

* Require that an annually updated position description serves as the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance. The position description explicitly describes assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort among assigned duties, scholarship, and service for each faculty position.

* Identify performance of assigned duties and scholarly achievement as the two primary areas of faculty evaluation.

* Recognize service performed by faculty members that is not part of their assigned duties as a secondary area of performance evaluation. Assigned duties such as administration, Extension, outreach, and student advising are not viewed as service when they are duties assigned to a faculty member. By the same token such activities are considered service when they are performed by a faculty member whose assigned duties lie in another area, such as research or teaching.

* Recognize teaching, research, and outreach as vital university missions and faculty activities that are not scholarship in themselves but which can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated intellectual work (scholarship) in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry). This is a significant departure from Ernest Boyer's (1990) view of teaching per se as scholarship.

* Recognize that peer validation and communication are separate processes that can occur in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, peer-refereed publications. When peer validation and communication are accomplished in non-traditional ways it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly describe and document how peer validation and communication were accomplished.

* Recognize that creative work of teachers and extension educators in developing education materials, methods, or programs or in conducting research in their subject-matter discipline will become scholarship if the work is validated by peers and communicated.
* Recognize that the audiences for scholarship in research are disciplinary peers worldwide, but that audiences for scholarship in teaching, Extension, and site-specific field research are often more localized. The P&T guidelines language was changed to reflect this reality—from "professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship" to "professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession."

* Emphasize that the university values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report contributions to significant team efforts in documenting their accomplishments.

* Recommend that documentation of achievements focus whenever possible on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, on describing what changed or improved as a result of a faculty member's efforts.

The OSU P&T guidelines acknowledge that the faculty of a university performs essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. The guidelines explicitly describe scholarship as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated including: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and artistry that creates new insights and understandings. This view acknowledges that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not just at universities. It emphasizes the importance of ensuring validity, and of communicating to broader audiences to ensure that results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others. In addition, it articulates the fundamental nature of scholarly achievement that applies across all disciplines.

OSU has just completed a third year of using the new University P&T guidelines. How the OSU model has affected the Oregon Extension Service was recently outlined by Lyla Houglum, dean and director of the Extension Service. She makes the following observations about changes that have occurred over the past three years:

* All Extension faculty in Oregon (county and campus-based) carry an appointment in an academic college or department. Oregon county agents and specialists have long held professorial rank with full privileges and tenure in Extension. Since 1995 the tenure home of all Extension faculty has become an academic department or college through which they are considered for promotion and tenure along with their on-campus teaching and research colleagues.

* Department and college P&T committees now have broader representation that includes Extension faculty (both county and campus based faculty). Committees have worked hard to appropriately evaluate and value Extension faculty accomplishments. In addition, the dean and director of the Extension Service serves on the University P&T committee.
* Research faculty are accepting Extension faculty as peers within departments and colleges and are evaluating them, and being evaluated by them, through the department committee P&T process. This represents a huge change from the first year of implementation when several researchers balked at evaluating or being evaluated by Extension faculty.

* Academic deans have worked hard to gain the necessary knowledge to evaluate, support, and defend their Extension faculty through the college and university P&T processes.

* There is much more clarity among faculty, department heads, deans, and the university P&T committee about how scholarship is defined. The university committee commonly refers back to the definition when evaluating faculty accomplishments; for example, Was there creative intellectual work? Was the work validated by peers? Was it communicated?

* The quality of all faculty position descriptions has improved significantly. The position description is used as the foundation for annual performance appraisals and for P&T dossier evaluation.

* OSU faculty without Extension appointments are including outreach activities and accomplishments in their dossiers.

Citizen advisors value OSU's new guidelines because they feel the guidelines recognize and reward faculty efforts benefiting students and citizens in Oregon. Several universities are finding that OSU's definition of scholarship provides a useful starting point for their institution's deliberations about faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review. Iowa State University and the University of Idaho have recently adopted broader views of scholarship and revised promotion and tenure criteria to reflect that view. University faculties and the broader public seem ready to improve faculty evaluation and reward processes.

OSU will host a national forum on this subject on campus October 1-3, 1998, entitled "Scholarship Unbound: Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards. Registration forms for this W. K. Kellogg supported workshop, co-sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, may be obtained by writing to Scholarship Unbound Workshop, Oregon State University, 202 Peavy Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331-5707; fax (541) 737-4966; phone (541) 737-2329; or e-mail: duncanp@ccmail.orst.edu.

Other information may be found on the Internet, including OSU's revised tenure and promotion guidelines at http://www.adec.edu/clemson/papers/houlum.html and a draft paper called "The Value System of a University-Rethinking Scholarship", at http://www.adec.edu/clemson/papers/weiser.html

Relevant questions and answers from the authors' participation in a satellite teleconference titled "Position Description: A Key to Scholarship," program #2, October 2,
1997, in a program series titled "21st Century Land Grant University" sponsored by Clemson University can also be accessed at http://www.adec.edu/clemson/questions/program2.html
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SCHOLARSHIP DESCRIBED
Views of Scholarship Evolving at Universities

Tenure and promotion guidelines at most universities only define scholarship indirectly by using the words research and scholarship interchangeably, and by citing peer-reviewed research publications as the prime example for documenting scholarly achievement.

This often leads to a narrow interpretation of scholarship by faculty peers who consider scholarly achievement to simply be synonymous with research results published in a peer-refereed journal. Creative work in areas of professorial responsibility other than research is often not viewed as scholarly; peer validation by means other than anonymous review of a publication are not considered valid; and communication to interested audiences who are not peers, or by means other than refereed publications, are not viewed as being scholarly.

In campus cultures that are shaped by these values faculty members are advised to invest their creative energies and discretionary time in efforts that are valued and rewarded by peers and the institution such as applying for grants, conducting research and publishing results in their disciplinary specialty. In teaching, advising, outreach and some applied research recognition and rewards are ambiguous or lacking. This provides little incentive for faculty members to invest creative energy or effort.

Broader visions of scholarship that are developing at several universities recognize that creative peer-validated scholarly work may be carried out in any area of faculty responsibility or university mission--not just in research. As a result the cultural values at those universities are changing in subtle but powerful ways that will alter how and where faculty members invest their creative energies. Such fundamental cultural changes reshape and determine the nature of institutions.

EVOLVING VIEWS OF SCHOLARSHIP INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- Scholarship is research. Research is scholarship (A prevailing view among faculty members at many universities, 1998).


- “Scholarship is intellectual work that results in new insights in the areas of discovery, integration or aesthetic creation, pedagogy, or application. Dissemination of the work through normally accepted academic venues, following an external peer review process, is evidence of the quality of the work.” (Montclair State University, 1994).

- “Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Forms of scholarship include creative artistry and the discovery, development (application) and integration of knowledge.” (Oregon State University, 1995).
• "Scholarship is an advanced form of learning. It involves the assimilation of experience into concepts and applying of concepts to experience--a transformative experience." "Expressions (forms) of scholarship are the discovery, integration, application and interpretation (teaching) of knowledge." "Scholarship implies superior intellectual, aesthetic or creative attainment." (Portland State University, 1996).

• "The four types of scholarship include discovery, integration, applicaton and teaching." They are "mutually supportive, complementary and often overlapping." (Kent State University, 1996).

• "Scholarship is creative, systematic rational inquiry into a topic and the honest forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. Scholarship includes research, creative activities, teaching and extension/professional practice. It results in a product that is shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product. In short, scholarship includes materials that are generally called intellectual property." (Iowa State University, 1998).

• "Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is communicated and validated." Forms of scholarship include "teaching and learning, artistic creativity, discovery and application/integration." (University of Idaho, 1998).

The 1990 Carnegie Foundation report, Scholarship Reconsidered, authored by Ernest Boyer\(^1\) provided a starting point for these several examples of rethinking scholarship. The cultures and priorities of universities differ. It is appropriate that each university's view of scholarship reflects its missions and vision of itself.

C. J. Weiser, September, 1998
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