

Scholarship at St. Ambrose University: A Report of the Promotion, Tenure, and Standards Subcommittee on Scholarship at St. Ambrose University Fall 2002

Introduction

A subcommittee of the Promotion, Tenure, and Standards (PTS) Committee was appointed spring 2002 to examine how “research” is evaluated at St. Ambrose University. Members of the subcommittee included Sandy Cassady, Monica Forret, Rick Jerz, and Paul Koch, and we respectfully submit this report.

The PTS Committee formed a subcommittee on research evaluation as the PTS Committee was being asked in the faculty evaluation processes outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* (specifically section 3.6.2.2) to evaluate the research contributions of St. Ambrose University faculty members, particularly those working at the graduate level for whom there was an expectation of scholarly productivity. The PTS Committee sought additional guidance in order to fully address the issue of research, broadly defined, in the promotion and tenure process.

The subcommittee was guided in their work by Ernest Boyer’s (1997) writings on defining scholarship in the academy and by professional associations (e.g., ACBSP, AOTA, CAPTE, and CSWE). Based on the writings of Boyer and others and information provided by professional associations, it quickly became clear that the term “research” was too narrow and limiting a term to describe the range of scholarly activities that take place at St. Ambrose University. As such, the subcommittee adopted the approach recommended by Boyer and others that replaces the term “research” with “scholarship” and divides scholarship into four categories that are not necessarily mutually exclusive (see below).

What is Scholarship?

Activities meeting the definition of scholarship are generally recognized as meeting a critical level of academic rigor and may be distinct from activities that are considered to be best practices in teaching or service. Scholarly activities should be appropriate to St. Ambrose University’s mission and should be open to review by peers or practitioners. In determining whether an activity reaches the level of scholarship, it is recommended that the evaluator be guided by the six standards suggested by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997).

1. *Clear goals*: basic purposes clearly stated, defined objectives realistic and achievable, important questions in a field identified
2. *Adequate preparation*: evidence of an understanding of existing scholarship, necessary skills present, necessary resources available
3. *Appropriate methods*: methods used appropriate to the goals, methods applied effectively, procedures modified in response to changing circumstances
4. *Significant results*: goals are achieved, consequentiality to the field added, additional areas for further exploration identified
5. *Effective presentation*: suitable style, organization and forums used to present work to intended audiences; message presented with clarity and integrity

6. *Reflective critique*: own work critically evaluated, appropriate breadth of evidence brought to own critique, evaluation used to improve the quality of future work

Types of Scholarship

Following a brief description, examples of each type of scholarship are provided. The examples provided are intended for guidance only and in **no way** are the examples intended to be firm criteria for evaluation.

1. *Scholarship of Discovery*. Aimed at the development and creation of new knowledge, this form of scholarship is realized through inquiry and research within the fields and disciplines. This is the closest to what we think of as traditional “research”.

Examples

- Conduct and publish peer-reviewed research for the development of new knowledge.
 - Conduct and publish case study research for theory development purposes.
 - Supervise/serve as a committee chair for graduate student research.
 - Design, implement, and assess the effectiveness of an instrument using appropriate methodology
 - Give a refereed/peer-reviewed presentation based on one’s research
2. *Scholarship of Integration*. This form of scholarship involves the critical analysis and review of knowledge within disciplines and may extend to the creative synthesis of insights contained in different disciplines or fields of study. This category of scholarship allows us to add meaning to information already available.

Examples

- Conduct and publish a peer-reviewed model-building, conceptual development, or research synthesis work.
 - Publish a literature review on a topic.
 - Conduct a workshop based on research/publications.
 - Give a refereed/peer-reviewed presentation based on extensive literature review.
 - Engage in multidisciplinary research endeavors.
3. *Scholarship of Application*: Scholars use knowledge in solving real problems in the professions, industry, government and the community.

Examples

- Study the effectiveness of a treatment procedure in the practice setting.
- Give a refereed presentation based on one’s research findings.
- Perform case studies to diagnose problems and design interventions.
- Consulting where the consulting involves problem solving based on bridging the gap between theory and application.

- Consulting which involves the development of materials related to organization success.
 - Write and publish practitioner articles.
4. *Scholarship of Teaching*: This form of scholarship involves the critically reflective dissemination of teaching and learning to all stakeholders. Scholarship of Teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching (Hutchings and Schulman 1999). Investigators frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning. Attributes associated with the Scholarship of Teaching include classroom assessment and evidence gathering, current ideas about teaching in the field, and inquiry and investigation centered around student learning.

Examples

- Develop and/or test new instructional methods
- Using a research design, compare and contrast two different teaching methods and determine which strategy best promotes learning.
- Publish or make presentations on teaching pedagogy.
- Write and publish teaching cases.
- Design and conduct teaching workshops.
- Work with students on required research projects.

Recommendations

Academic Deans, Department Chairs, Program Directors, and any others involved in the evaluation of faculty members for whom scholarly productivity is a condition of employment must be aware of and sensitive to any final guidelines that are used for evaluation of such faculty members. More importantly, faculty members for whom scholarly productivity is a condition of employment must be made aware of these guidelines. Ideally, those involved in the initial interview process will make potential faculty members aware of these guidelines. The Promotion, Tenure, and Standards Committee should also remind faculty members of these guidelines during the initial faculty interview.

References

1. Boyer, E. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers, Ch 3.
2. Glassick C., Huber M, and Maeroff G (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers, Ch 2.
3. Hutchings, P. and Shulman, L.S. (1999). *The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new development*. *Change*, 31, p.10-15.