

Boyer, Schulman, and Glassick at Brigham Young University–Hawaii, 2012

John L. Bailey

Brigham Young University–Hawaii

Laie, Hawaii, USA

john.bailey@byuh.edu

Eula E. Monroe

Brigham Young University–Provo

Provo, Utah, USA

This essay begins with a discussion of traditional university faculty evaluation and leads into the reconsideration of the breadth, credibility, and structure of this faculty evaluation as proposed by Boyer (1990). It concludes with a taxonomy that would help one to validate Boyer-type scholarship products as meeting the requirements for acceptable faculty scholarship excellence.

Many universities call their faculty evaluation committee the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee. At Brigham Young University–Hawaii, we call our committee the Promotion Review Committee (PRC). Our university, in line with its liberal arts/comprehensive model, uses the PRC to encourage faculty in their traditional university roles by attaching salary increases to PRC process decisions. Recently, in 2009, we changed the weightings of the players in the review process by giving equal weights to the four-players in the review i.e. the Department Chair, the Dean, the PRC and the Academic Vice-President.

A review of the Continuing Faculty Status (CFS, or tenure) and Rank Advancement policy was undertaken by the Dean’s Council, and the criteria for scholarship were broadened around Boyer’s redefinition of faculty scholarship, as published in his 1990 *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. While faculty members’ success as teachers of the university’s enrolled students and faculty members’ willingness to assist in the work of the university and community through service in varied roles (we label this service as *citizenship*) are critical parts of their work, neither of these, in and of themselves, are the subject of this article.

The focus of this article is on the work of the scholar—scholarship—or, as we have termed it, *scholarship/creative endeavor*. In a university setting, a faculty member is in essence a scholar—one who has an expertise in and an intellectual curiosity about his or her discipline, with a driving passion to learn more and to help others develop a similar level of passion. Hereafter, we use the term *scholarship* to represent our scholarship/creative endeavor.

Traditional University Faculty Evaluation

Traditionally, university faculty members are judged by their teaching, scholarship, and service, typically with a weighting in the percentage ranges of 40-50-10. Satisfactory faculty work usually implies delivering curriculum acceptably, publishing

regularly in refereed journals, presenting at peer-reviewed conferences, and serving on university committees as required. Depending on the nature of the university, faculty are usually first assigned a teaching load and then allocated research time. Service assignments follow as needed. The faculty member is then set free to run on the treadmill of academic expectation, satisfying students in courses, and scrambling to produce writing that will pass external blind reviews to result in publications, thus avoiding perishing at the hands of the RTP committee at the end of the pre-tenure probationary period. For many faculty members, this endeavor can involve up to 80 hours per week on a regular basis.

The purpose of this article, however, is not to dilute the rigor of the faculty evaluation process. Rather, it is to suggest ways that can broaden the range of sources and events from which scholarship can arise and thus increase the range of formats in which this scholarship can be communicated/transmitted and peer-reviewed.

A Broadened Definition of Scholarship

Ernest Boyer, while at the Carnegie Foundation, proposed that the definition of scholarship be broadened from the traditional definition outlined above. His proposal arose from data gathered by the Foundation from more than 5000 members of all types of higher learning institution faculties regarding their work (Glassick, 2000). In his book *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Boyer (1990) presented his view that almost everything done by a scholar could produce scholarship—including teaching/learning, researching/creating (discovery and integration), and service (application). His views were well received but not well understood and have rarely been implemented.

Although the work of Boyer was based on faculty survey data, research conducted more than a decade later revealed that very few universities had aligned their RTP criteria with his framework (Arreola, Theall, & Aleamoni, 2003). Many were still discussing what Boyer had presented and its implications for their universities. After all, in the spirit of “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it,” why move to something that looks subjectively vague and complicated when you can stay with your seemingly objective traditional model—reasonable teaching performance, a scholarly book, and a handful of blind peer-reviewed journal articles—throw in a couple of committee assignments, and you are good to stay? By 2010, 20 years after the publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered* . . . , a few universities had dared to change their RTP criteria to include Boyer’s redefinition (Tate, 2010). *Publish or perish* for them is no longer the only path to tenure.

In 1990, Boyer introduced the terms *the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *the Scholarship of Discovery*, *the Scholarship of Integration*, and *the Scholarship of Application* as separate but overlapping functions of scholarship. New words without obvious links to current understandings often lead to confusion, so let us attempt here to bridge the gaps between his terminology and our traditional understanding. Two words he used carefully are *form* in the sense that the work of the scholar takes the form of teaching, scholarship, and service; and *function* in the sense that the scholar’s work functions as discovery, integration, application, and teaching and

learning. Noting the sense of his use of these two words enables a clearer understanding of his intent.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning implies that we approach our teaching in a scholarly way, i.e., as a research process—perhaps an action research process. We pose an area for change (hypothesize), study instructional design and delivery strategies within our discipline (review the literature), decide on new instructional approaches to increase student achievement (propose a methodology), and then we try them out. We note the effects (gather and analyze data), reflect (draw conclusions), and adjust where needed (make recommendations) for the next semester.

Similarly, we can study the learning processes we ourselves are undergoing along with the learning processes they, the students, are undergoing—we may even include student scholars in this research experience (Morrison, 2012). If we carry out these steps but do not document them, then we are teaching; if we document our work, analyze and reflect on it, and make our findings public, then we become scholars of teaching and learning. Making findings public implies putting the findings in forums where peers can comment on them—ranging from the traditionally expected and widely accepted blind peer-reviewed books, articles, or presentations to the also acceptable workshops, websites, blogs, and other discipline-related forums.

The Scholarship of Discovery

The Scholarship of Discovery is the traditional concept of research in which we as scholars search out new knowledge in our content areas using empirical or qualitative methods. We hypothesize, design studies with due respect to Campbell and Stanley (1963, 1966) and others who have followed, and carry them out with due diligence.

The Scholarship of Integration

The Scholarship of Integration includes combining/adapting scholarly concepts from inside or outside our discipline and studying their feasibility, usability, and/or effect in our work. These ideas may arise from mixed teams or committees of scholars, scholars' writings from inside or outside our discipline, or personal observations and contemplation, among other data sources.

The Scholarship of Application

The Scholarship of Application can be interpreted as a scholarly approach to service, engaging the scholar in addressing society's challenges (Glassick, 2000; Hyman, Gurgevich, Alter, Ayers, Cash, Fahnlone, et al., 2001-2002; Morrison, 2012)—we apply our scholars' knowledge and skills that we have gained in our discipline to campus and community needs in a scholarly way—we hypothesize, suggest, implement as invited, make observations and keep notes, reflect, report, and celebrate successes.

We hold that in discipline-related service, a scholar helps out on campus and also in the community using her or his knowledge and skills to assist. But when the scholar extends themselves to think of ways to improve things for everyone concerned, e.g.,

new ideas, new applications, etc.; disseminate them; and receive reviews of them, this then raises the form of service to a dimension of functioning scholarship.

According to Glassick (2000), "Boyer's lifetime commitment to service as part of education was a natural basis for the scholarship of application" (p. 878). Other leaders in education have viewed service in a similar way. Derek Bok, former president of Harvard, strongly supported the scholarship of application in urging that faculty become involved in addressing the needs of society in their scholarship (as cited in Glassick, 2000). Similarly, Hyman et al. (2001) noted that "application is the engagement of the scholar in extending and applying knowledge to address consequential societal problems and to improve the quality of life" (p. 46). The scholarship of application seeks to ask how this knowledge can be used in the service of solutions to society's most pressing concerns—it asks if and how those problems and concerns can define an agenda for scholarly investigation. Insofar as it is applied, the case may also be that "new intellectual understandings can arise out of the very act of application" (Boyer, 1990, p. 23).

Credibility

Traditionalists are enamored with the simplicity of publish or perish because of its apparent objectivity and rigor as evidenced by its structure, communication process, and blind peer review. Boyer's proposal needed some clarification in this regard, which happily was provided by Schulman (1998), President of the Carnegie Foundation.

For an activity to be designated as scholarship, it should manifest at least three key characteristics: It should be public, susceptible to critical review and evaluation, and accessible for exchange and use by other members of one's scholarly community. We thus observe, with respect to all forms of scholarship, that they are acts of mind or spirit that have been made public in some manner, have been subjected to peer review by members of one's intellectual or professional community, and can be cited, refuted, built upon, and shared among members of that community. Scholarship properly communicated and critiqued serves as the building blocks for knowledge growth in a field. (p. 5)

For those willing to consider the multiple types of scholarship advocated by Boyer, Schulman (1998) not only lends his support and gives characteristics to be considered in evaluating such scholarly products.

Glassick (2000), also of the Carnegie Foundation, proposed six standards of overt progress by which the excellence of scholarship in any of Boyer's four areas can be maintained. These standards address documented evidence of clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. Perhaps these may need some elaboration as we move ahead—we'll see.

So to this point,

- Boyer has broadened significantly for us the scholar's sources of scholarship,
- Schulman has prescribed a minimum process for scholarship, and
- Glassick has recommended six standards for documented rigor.

We now have criteria that help us recognize scholarship in its many different shapes. Boyer's proposal presents that while the *forms* of faculty work are teaching, scholarship and service, the *functions* of scholarship are teaching and learning, discovery, integration, and application. However, from the point of view of a faculty member who is preparing for CFS or rank advancement, while the forms (scholarship, teaching, and service) remain the same, the approach is a little different in regard to the functions. The faculty member is asked to present evidence to demonstrate that he or she is and has been functioning as a scholar (i.e., teaching and learning, discovering, integrating, and applying). This scholar has to show that they have found original ideas from, and communicated or implemented them via the forms of teaching, scholarship, and service/citizenship, gathering positive peer reviews to substantiate, validate, or speak to the quality of this presented work.

Taxonomy

We are ready to propose a taxonomy which includes a range of examples to guide producers and evaluators of Boyer's scholarship. This taxonomy consists of four groups. The first group (Table 1) lists a range of sources or events from which scholarship may arise, the second group (Table 2) lists (in no particular order) communication formats in which this scholarship may be reported, the third (Table 3) identifies formats that peer review can take, and the fourth (Table 4) lists common scholarly roles that are not generally viewed as generating scholarship. This last group is an appendage to the rest of the taxonomy—it serves as a placeholder, since many of the items listed here are viewed traditionally as scholarship but might be more correctly described as roles of service to scholarship.

The faculty member using this taxonomy would identify from the first table an activity in which he or she is engaged and thinking of new ideas, follow the six standards of documentation, select from the second table a form of evidence to use to make her or his scholarship public, and then identify the peer review process to be used to validate the quality of the scholarship (thus avoiding self-promotion as being the only evidence of quality of work). A reviewer would use this taxonomy by taking an item of submitted scholarship and, after identifying its place in the first table, follow through the tables to see that the second and third groups are apparent and fulfilled.

In both the design and use of this taxonomy, Boyer gives breadth. At the same time, Schulman gives credibility and Glassick gives structure.

Table 1

Teaching and Learning	Discovery	Application	Integration
Create new courses or programs	Empirical study	Consultant to industry, external agencies, government	Any of these
Introduce new facets in an existing course	Qualitative study		
Significant new technology involvement	Original creation	Leadership role in professional organizations	
Seminars created and run	Creating infrastructure for future research	Supervision of field activities	
Workshops created and run	Action research	Professional committee assignments	
Webinars created and run	Program evaluation		
Student projects directed	Newspaper articles, radio interviews, television interviews	Discipline-related administrative positions in or out of the university	
Service learning activities in a course			
New instructional structures	Serving on a master's or doctoral committee at another university	Advising/mentoring students	
Modifications in response to peer and student review	Reviewing theses and dissertations when not on committee (because area of expertise was sought)	Collaborative endeavors	
Designing videos for instructional purposes (published)		Community agencies/NGOs	
Writing of curriculum materials for students (textbook series, problem solving series, etc.)	Serving as external reviewer for promotion or CFS for candidates at other universities	Advising in the development of computer programs for commercial companies	
Reviewing testing materials and a multitude of other kinds of educational materials, textbooks, etc.			
Consulting on IEPs for special needs students			

Scholarship: Sources or Events That Can Spark Original Thought

Table 2

Scholarship: Communication Formats

Teaching and Learning	Discovery	Application	Integration
Scholarly books	Invited workshops	Products related to the study i.e., textbooks, art work, music, stories written	Dedicated websites
Scholarly monographs	Project reports Encyclopedia entry		Active blog contributions
Chapters in scholarly books	Book reviews	Study guides	
Refereed journal articles	Paper reviews	Grant applications	
Refereed conference presentations	Panel participant	Public presentations of scholarship—written, oral, visual	
Invited conference presentations		Consultant reports	
Literature reviews			

Table 3

Scholarship: Peer Review Formats

Teaching and Learning	Discovery	Application	Integration
Written reviews by peers in the discipline	Project team reviews	Participant evaluation forms	Grant response letters
Editorial reviews	Conference planning committee reviews	Peer observation reports	Agency/NGO letters of reference
Departmental reviews	Committee reviews	Competitive grant reviews	
	Peer letters of reference	Course evaluation reviews	

Table 4

Roles of Service to Scholarship

Editor	Judge	Board member
Convener	Session chair	Conference organizer
Session reviewer	Technical advisor	

Summary

While traditional scholarship has focused narrowly on empirical research that is published only in scholarly books or blind peer-reviewed journal articles, according to Boyer (1990), almost everything a university scholar does in her or his work can be processed in a scholarly way and thus result in new knowledge for dissemination. This essay has proposed that Boyer's views on scholarship are relevant, logical, and practical and can indeed be implemented effectively in the expectations and review process for faculty productivity, thus encouraging more faculty scholarship. As universities consider working to adopt this model, the next steps might include the development of rubrics and exemplars to guide faculty members and their assessors in calibrating the breadth and depth of the desired scholarly landscape.

References

- Arreola, R. A., Theall, M., & Aleamoni, L. M. (2003, April). *Beyond scholarship: Recognizing the multiple roles of the professoriate*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963, 1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Glassick, C. E. (2000). Boyer's expanded definitions of scholarship, the standards for assessing scholarship, and the elusiveness of the scholarship of teaching. *Academic Medicine, 75*(9), 877-880.
- Hyman, D., Gurgevich, E., Alter, T., Ayers, J., Cash, E., Fahnlne, D., Gold, D., Herrmann, R., Jurs, P., Roth, D., Swisher, J., Whittington, M.S., & Wright, H. (2001-2002). *Beyond Boyer: The uniSCOPE model of scholarship for the*

21st century. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 7(1-2), 41-65.

Morrison, C. D. (2012). 'Boyer reconsidered': Fostering students' scholarly habits of mind and models of practice. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(1), 1-17.

Schulman, L. (1998). The scholarship of teaching. *Change*, 31(5), 11.

Tate, T. K. (2010). Novel policies that reward faculty for work beyond traditional research and publication garner national attention as WCU embraces the Boyer model. *Trailblazing in Academia*. Retrieved from <http://magazine.wcu.edu/2010/09/trailblazing-in-academia/>