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KEN BADLEY & MARC SHELTON
Thank you for your work with us for this final draft of the white paper. To reiterate, this is meant to be a resource document for each of us, one that is in constant revision for improvement more than it is to remain static. So with that reminder, the following executive summary is for the complete document, arranged in the following manner for ease of access:

1. The first part is the narrative section of the document (pp. 1-35) that will serve as the base for Ken and me, hopefully as we present at AERA's Annual Meeting in Vancouver, BC in 2012 with the SIG on Faculty Teaching, Evaluation, and Development.

2. The second is the implications piece of the document (pp. 36-39). Our hope is that we will continue to add to this part with additional journals for publications, additional documentations of service, additional research foci and additional memberships in professional organizations. Our plan is to use this piece to serve as a clearinghouse to connect faculty in the SoE for potential collaboration on scholarship projects.

3. The final section contains the reference and appendixes sections (pp. 40-79) for citations and additional resources for SoE faculty. All faculty received a CD of the 2011 Faculty Handbook at the retreat, but the sections of the Handbook and the Academic Procedures Handbook included in the full version of the White Paper are specific sections related to Faculty Growth & Development, promotion & tenure, portfolio documentation, etc. Only the full text of Appendix C is included in this summary for reference.

Finally, permit us to summarize this work as follows:
Christian scholarship is more than this, but it is also mainly an opportunity to tell our stories to peers in our respective content disciplines - and in telling our stories, we are in fact telling God’s story of partnering with us in his work. We fully intend this White Paper to be used as a resource within the School of Education and as a way of informing groups outside of the SoE about our work as scholarship, or in another way of saying it, about our work as learners - with both humility and service.

Please send comments and suggestions to Marc Shelton, mshelton@georgefox.edu
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Part One: Introduction & Methodology

Introduction of Perspectives on Scholarship

Since the 1990s, faculty and administrators in colleges and universities have reconsidered the relationships between various kinds of academic scholarship. Using a framework offered by Ernest Boyer (1990), many in the academy have recognized that scholarship and research are not synonymous, but that scholarship takes many forms, including research, which Boyer called the “scholarship of discovery.” Faculty also engage in the “scholarship of teaching,” and in service, “the scholarship of application, which some have called the “scholarship of engagement” (e.g., Huyser, 2004). Boyer also identified “the scholarship of integration” which draws, synthesizes and helps others see connections between discoveries made in the academy and the needs of society in evidence outside the academy. We do not comment further in this paper about this category, but we believe with the Apostle that every thought ultimately belongs to Christ (II Cor. 10:5) and that both the natural world and the world of scholarship cohere only because in Christ "all things hold together" (Col. 1:17). With such a solid theological and epistemological foundation, we believe that Christian academics can model inter-disciplinary and integrative conversation for the whole academy, especially for those in institutions naming Christ, a matter of interest to others (Jacobsen & Jacobsen, 2012; Ream, Pattengale, & Riggs, 2012) and one that we could pursue fruitfully at the University.

On Boyer’s account, research adds to the stock of human knowledge but also enriches the instructional environment of the university (a claim forcefully contradicted by a major meta-analysis, Hattie & Marsh, 1996, who found "zero" connection). Boyer himself traces the introduction and subsequent narrowing of the term research between its introduction in the 1870s and 1990, the date of his publication. Boyer and those who have followed in his tradition have
concerned themselves with the tendency of the academy to treat scholarship and research as if the two were co-extensive (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997), an equation that Boyer believes produces a more restricted view of scholarship, one that limits it to a hierarchy of functions. Basic research has come to be viewed as a first and most essential form of scholarly activity, with other functions flowing from it. Scholars are academics who conduct research, publish, and then perhaps convey their knowledge to students or apply what they have learned. The latter functions grow out of scholarship, they are not to be considered a part of it. But knowledge is not necessarily developed in such a linear manner."(Boyer, 1990, p. 15, emphasis his)

The institutional arrangements Boyer describes in this passage have been in place for so long that some might wonder why we should organize our thinking and our institutional rewards systems otherwise. That the citation may appear, on first blush, to make this kind of sense underlines the need for Boyer's argument. Along with the “scholarship of integration,” he wants research, teaching and service to connote separate but related aspects of scholarship. Boyer is not against research; he praises the scholarship of discovery at many points. But he wants to include more than research in the definition of the key term: scholarship.

Turning to teaching and service, Boyer recounts that teaching for the purpose of building moral character marked the first chapter in the history of American education, a view few would dispute (Boyer, 1990). The later 1800s saw a shift in the college’s purpose toward service. Research and teaching were to serve useful ends – to apply to actual problems – resulting in a shift that supplied Boyer with the name he assigned to service: the scholarship of application.
Adoption of German models of the university late in the 1800s meant the eclipse of both teaching and service. The discovery of new knowledge became the highest calling for the university, with "the focus [moving] from the student to the professoriate, from general to specialized education, and from loyalty to the campus to loyalty to the profession" (Boyer, 1990, p. 13). In many institutions, the situation Boyer described remains, and it remains the source of tension for institutions and individual faculty. Large research universities struggle to find ways to meet the obligations they have taken on to teach their own undergraduates. On the other hand, smaller universities and colleges wanting to provide teaching excellence to a primarily undergraduate population struggle against the cognitive stranglehold research has on the academic mindset, what some call upward drift or the pursuit of prestige (O'Meara, 2005). We believe that George Fox may fit this category.

Hundreds of colleges and universities attempted to implement Boyer’s ideas in the 1990s. Early in their efforts they discovered that good intentions did not necessarily indicate how to assess the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application. In response to calls for help with assessment, Scholarship Assessed appeared in 1997 (Glassick et al., 1997; Boyer was involved initially but died before the book appeared). The authors of Scholarship Assessed attempted to hold all four of the kinds of scholarship identified by Boyer to a high and common set of "standards of scholarly performance" (p. 22), while identifying unique ways to assess each of the four domains.

Introduction of Purpose & Objectives

In this paper, we accept and work with Boyer's redefinition and we ask how his suggested categories might offer aid to two groups. First, Boyer's categories may give faculty in the GFU School of Education a more helpful way to frame, fulfill and assess our professorial vocations in the context of the University. Second, Boyer's categories may help members of the
university community to understand more clearly the character of the scholarship done by members of the School of Education.

It is our intent that this document create space for faculty in the University School of Education to continue conversation broadly about how to assess the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of service, and about how specifically to support and assess the important work of conducting and publishing research: the scholarship of inquiry.

On the basis of surveying hundreds of chief academic officers, the authors of *Scholarship Assessed* developed a set of six criteria, which, taken together, offer a single yardstick for assessing any of the four types of scholarship distinguished by Boyer. At the end of a twelve-page discussion of the standards that they believe capture the character of scholarly work, they offer this summary, which we quote verbatim:

- **Clear goals**: Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

- **Adequate preparation**: Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

- **Appropriate methods**: Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

- **Significant results**: Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?
• **Effective presentation:** Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forms for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

• **Reflective critique:** Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work? (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 36)

*Scholarship Assessed* provides helpful commentary on how to document that one's teaching, service, research and integration efforts have, in fact, met the six criteria. We believe, with the authors of *Scholarship Assessed*, that "the campus community must be confident that the institution honors the range of scholarship that supports its mission and that appropriate standards are in fact used" (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 50).

*Scholarship Assessed* has not been the last word in the conversation Boyer began in 1990. Hundreds of articles and books have appeared since its publication in 1997, including a robust literature on how representatives of specific disciplines have approached questions of assessing performance for purposes of promotion and tenure. Examples include librarianship (Benefiel, Miller, Mosley, & Arant-Kaspar, 2001; Best & Kneip, 2010; Park & Riggs, 1993), engineering (Wankat & Oreovicz, 2003), social work (Green, 2008), accounting (Schultz, Meade, & Khurana, 1989), economics (McCabe & Snyder, 2011), and communication (Borisoff, 1998).

One noteworthy contribution to the broader conversation about assessment appeared in answer to a question not addressed by the authors of *Scholarship Assessed*: What activities count? (a term we will make problematic later in the paper, along with others, Crimmel, 1984; O'Meara, 2005). The authors of that title, *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer's Four*
Domains (Braxton et al., 2002) discovered through a survey of hundreds of campuses that many administrators and faculty would deepen their understanding of Boyer's framework if they had examples and illustrations. They provided pages of such examples (which appear as Appendix C in this paper).

**Methodology**

The document of which this is a summary was shaped using a three-pronged investigation: 1) a review of relevant literature about how scholarship is defined and assessed in general, 2) a review of the faculty documents in the School of Education and the larger University community used a part of the peer-review process for promotion and tenure decisions, and 3) a solicitation of statements related to scholarship in education departments or schools in selected CCCU schools.

We intended with this paper to delineate how scholarship is creatively designed, consistently documented, and critically assessed in the School of Education. In our view, the next step in this process will be for each department within the School to use the Boyer framework and the Glassick work on assessment that followed it to provide examples of creating, documenting, and assessing evidence of scholarship for faculty to use in the peer-review process.
**Prompts.** To encourage discussion among our SoE colleagues, throughout our paper we raised questions to prompt our colleagues to explore the links between such matters as these:

- What kind of reputation, good or bad, has the SoE earned at GFU? Does it deserve that reputation?
- To what degree is the rapid growth of the School of Education a factor in its lack of infrastructure to support scholarship and research?
- To what degree is the biography of a typical School of Education faculty member (with origins in the K-12 system instead of in the academy) a factor in that faculty member's success in moving forward in scholarship of discovery, in teaching, and service?
- How can faculty demonstrate that collaborative research and publication, a common pattern in SoE, has the same qualities and rigor as solo research?
- How do faculty find ways to tie the scholarship of discovery to our teaching and service?
- What role do the unit standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), specifically Standard Five (*Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development*) and Standard Six (*Unit Governance and Resources*), play in shaping the expectations for scholarship (teaching, research, service, and integration)?

**Applicable NCATE Unit Standards for Assessing Scholarship**

5a. Qualified faculty
   a) Professional education faculty members have earned doctorates or expertise in assigned areas.
   b) School faculty members are licensed in fields that they supervise.
   c) Higher education clinical faculty members have contemporary professional experiences in their areas.

5b. Modeling best professional practices in teaching
   a) Faculty knows the content they teach.
   b) Faculty helps candidates develop proficiencies in professional, state, & institutional standards.
   c) Faculty helps candidates apply research, theories, & current developments to their fields.
   d) Faculty values candidate learning & assess candidate performance.
   e) Teaching supports candidate reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, & professional dispositions.
   f) Faculty uses a variety of instructional methods.
   g) Faculty integrates diversity & technology into their teaching.
   h) Faculty assesses their effectiveness as teachers, including their effects on candidate learning.

5c. Model best professional practices in scholarship
   a) Faculty demonstrates scholarly work in their fields.
   b) The type of scholarly work is based on the mission of the institution.

5d. Modeling best professional practices in service
   a) Faculty provides service to the university, schools, & community consistent with the mission of the unit & institution.
   b) Faculty collaborates with school faculty & faculty in other units of the institution.
   c) Faculty members are actively involved in professional associations.
   d) Faculty provides education related services at local, state, national, & international levels.

5e. Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance
   a) Systematic & comprehensive evaluation of faculty teaching performance is conducted by the unit.
   b) Faculty evaluations are used to improve teaching, scholarship, & service.

5f. Unit facilitation of professional development
   a) Professional development activities are based on faculty evaluations.
   b) Professional development helps faculty develop their knowledge & skills related to conceptual framework, performance assessment, diversity, technology, & emerging practices.
6c. Personnel
1. Workload policies, including class size & online delivery, allow faculty to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work in schools, & service.
2. Faculty loads generally don’t exceed 12 hours for undergraduate teaching & 9 hours for graduate teaching (per semester).
3. Supervision of clinical practice does not generally exceed 18 candidates for each full time equivalent faculty supervisor.
4. Appropriate use of full-time, part-time, & clinical faculty, as well as graduate assistants, ensures program coherence & integrity.
5. An adequate number of support personnel exist.
6. Adequate resources & opportunities for professional development exist.

- How do we find language that suits our service orientation and that recognizes that sheer volume of output is not what we want (or said another way, is not what God wants or our students’ desire)?
- How does the typical lexicon of research with words such as “impact,” “productivity,” “output,” “prolific,” “effective,” and “expert” fit within a Christian understanding of scholarship? In the words of two professors, "Production speaks to an industrial model that seeks to meet demand and blacken bottom lines (Wiebe & Fels, 2010, p. 17).

Another pair of researchers writes that "academics use research output as market commodities" (Hattie & Marsh, 1996, p. 533). Could GFU’s SoE develop a new lexicon for research with a lexicon that included words such as “reach,” “influence,” “fruitfulness,” and “servant?” Can we nuance or differentiate impact as measured in the academy (acceptance rates of journal, prestige of journal, etc.) to words that incorporate Fox and widely Christian values? Perhaps the School of Education could replace the competitive connotations of racing (from tenure track) with words more suited to collaborative work, such as field (Wiebe & Fels, 2010).

- A growing number of academics are expressing frustration with the frenetic pace of work induced, in part, by the many demands and perceived demands of promotion and tenure (Pente & Adams, 2010; Treanor, 2008). Might George Fox School of Education be in a unique position to point to a better way (given our Christian/Quaker heritage, given that we are opening up the questions right now, given openness to the Boyer model).

- Draw a Venn diagram that shows that opportunistic scholarship is not what we want but that selfless service will not lead to promotion.
- As for the right language, consider our "facing" … is one's face toward recognition by the academy or toward service to the world and the church? How do we combine, nuance, and live into this dissonance? How does our scholarship provide evidence that we love God and love others?
Part Two: Biblical/Theological Foundations of Scholarship

Introduction

We explore several Biblical themes relevant to questions of promotion and tenure in the School of Education. In this summary, we have omitted most of the references and some of the discussion that appear in the larger document.

Work and Vocation

First, serving as a faculty member is work, which we take to be honorable; the creation narratives reveal that God commanded our original grandparents to work (Gen. 1:26-28, 2:15). Various scriptural authors exhort us to do all our work as if we were doing it for God (Eccl. 9:10), with St. Paul distinguishing between doing it for God as opposed to for our earthly masters (Col. 4:23). In short, School of Education faculty have no Biblical quarrel with work. We believe that SoE faculty carry out their work in response to a calling, that teaching here is a vocation.

Justice

We believe that School of Education faculty have a special mandate to carry out scholarship that anticipates or produces a more just world. We take as given that the Christian scriptures call for justice, and we point to both the Old and New Testaments to remind our readers that justice is central to God's agenda. In light of this dominant message in Scripture, we take it as given that our scholarship should serve just ends. We do not mean by this the bare standard that our scholarship should not violate the Biblical principles of justice. Rather, and more strongly, we believe that SoE professors should seek areas of scholarship where we can speak and work for justice. Our scholarship truly should be a means of proclaiming the year of Lord's favor. As Christians, justice (and service) ought to underwrite our research agenda as
strongly as or even more strongly than research itself. That is, research questions would arise out of the actual situations experienced by students and teachers in all kinds of classrooms, not just out of the unanswered questions left by other research. Our research agenda would be driven only partly by the world of ideas, and partly by Scripture itself.

**Humility**

We believe that all our scholarship – research, teaching, service, integration – should be done in a spirit of humble service, a posture Jesus embodied in his own life (and in the full version of our paper comment on several Biblical passages that establish this Biblical theme). We believe that professors adopting this humble posture may end up at odds with the values of the larger academy. Jesus criticized those who wanted their "deeds to be seen by others" (Mt. 23:5) but it is essential for the academic to publicize ideas – to make them public – creating a problem for anyone wanting to be humble while taking seriously the requirements for engagement in the scholarship of discovery.

**Service**

Drawing from a broadly Christian and specifically Quaker heritage, the George Fox University School of Education ought to give special consideration to Boyer's scholarship of application, to service. In 1990, Boyer nuanced his concern with these questions, "How can to knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? How can it be helpful to individuals as well as institutions? Can social problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?" (Boyer, 1990, p. 21) School of Education faculty should find Boyer's questions particularly germane at this time, a claim we illustrate with reference to just three current issues. School districts everywhere face deep fiscal difficulties. An alarming percentage of induction phase teachers leave the profession. Schools and teachers struggle to know what to teach and how to teach it as they find themselves working in a culture of assessment. Perhaps
more than at any other time, SoE faculty have an opportunity to serve educators and students. Were Boyer rewriting *Scholarship Reconsidered* for the George Fox SoE today, we believe he would say that the time for the scholarship of application is now and the place is any school or school district.

**Stewardship of Gifts**

A Biblical approach to scholarship must attend to the Biblical idea of gifts. We believe that all academic gifts come from above (Ja. 1:17; Ps 85:12; John 3:27; I Cor. 4:7; Eph 4:7).

Given the intellectual requirements for faculty work, we believe that Jesus' parable of the talents applies as well (Mt. 25:14-30). In the terms of that parable, we must not – as individuals – hide our intellectual gifts, but we must invest them wisely. We believe that the parable has an institutional aspect as well, that the School of Education and its respective departments should work diligently to help faculty identify their gifts, and should ensure that faculty work in the areas where their gifts are expressed and realized most fully and authentically, a conclusion that we believe fits with Boyer's distinction between four kinds of scholarship. The formal and organic structures in place in SoE should neither deny the exercise of gifts nor ignore the possession of gifts. We see a potential conflict with this parable and the reward and recognition structures in place at GFU, and thus with Boyer's framework, inasmuch as a majority of faculty (in all schools) believe that those structures favor the scholarship of discovery (research) over all other forms of scholarship. If someone has particular gifts of teaching or service or is strongly inclined in those directions, then rewards and recognition at Fox will likely remain out of reach.

Both Paul and Peter identify another aspect of gifts with great relevance to scholarship in the SoE and at GFU as a whole. We do not all have the same gifts or do the same work; we carry out different functions in the community (Ro. 12:4-6, 11; I Cor. 12:4-6), and, within that community, we do not use our gifts for our own advancement, but for good of the whole
community (I Cor. 12:7, 14:26; Eph 4:12, 16), on Peter's account, for the glory of God (I. Pet. 4:11). These ideals fit in a general way with Boyer's distinction between the four kinds of scholarship (1990). But we wish to note a couple of Paul's instructions that go beyond Boyer. In I Cor. 12:23, he writes that "the members of the body that we think less honorable we clothe with greater honor" (NRSV). Given the current hierarchy of values in the academy – research, teaching, then service – in Boyer's terms, that instruction may imply that we should elevate teaching and service. We know that personnel committees do not single-handedly elevate gifts of scholarship, but that most members of the academy tend to accord more honor to those who publish. Interestingly, Paul next notes that "If one member suffers, all suffer together suffer with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it" (I Cor. 12:26). We might take direction from this passage regarding our need to help our colleagues succeed within the reward system in place, and we also might hear Paul's words as an exhortation to celebrate more openly when our members’ succeed.

**Biblical/Theological Questions to Prompt Conversations**

- How are Biblical values such as service in possible opposition to what the academy values?
- Can faculty in the School of Education develop models of research rooted both in Scripture and in real-world classrooms, on this continent and elsewhere? In such models of research, concerns for justice and service would trump concerns for prestige and honor.
Part Three: Scholarship in the School of Education

Introduction

Scholarship as research is one spoke used to assess the performance of tenure-track faculty at George Fox University, and faculty recruited to the academy should “have the preparation necessary for a life of scholarship and have identified scholarly interests” (Handbook, II, B(1)(g)). As is the case in most institutions of higher education, its faculty are expected to teach well, serve well, and to find a specialty area for scholarship. One distinctive at George Fox University is that the hub of the wheel centers on the ability of each faculty member to integrate faith and learning into all three expectations; how does one’s Christian faith inform the content taught, lives lived, and topics researched within respective disciplines? The Faculty Handbook asserts that expectations for quality scholarship include that each tenured or tenure-track faculty member “be engaged in an ongoing study of the integration of (one’s) field with the Christian faith” (Handbook, III, B(2)).

If leadership is the ability to act as a leader, then scholarship could be defined as the ability to act as a learner. In our field of study, it is believed that leadership matters and effective leadership can make a difference in the life of an organization and its members. Likewise, in institutions of higher learning it is important that learning happen in classrooms, is integrated in life applications, and discovered through research that is shared with and evaluated by the broader community. Braxton et al (2002) cite Boyer's work of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching by suggesting that the definition of scholarship be broadened to grant “scholarly legitimacy to the full range of academic work—work defined by application, discovery, integration, and teaching” (p. 13). As its lead investigator, Ernest Boyer (1990) proposes, institutions must differentiate how faculty performance is measured through a review and
alignment of the assessment criteria to the mission of the institution, based on the “essential conditions” as follows:

1. All faculty should exhibit the ability to conduct original research and present it to peers for their review.
2. All academic professionals should keep up with advancements in their academic fields and remain professionally engaged.
3. The highest standards of integrity in teaching and research should characterize the work of faculty members.
4. All academic work of faculty members must be painstakingly appraised. (pp. 27-28).

The Faculty Handbook and Academic Procedures are cited in subsequent pages of the White Paper for extended descriptions of the following aspects of scholarship as defined by Boyer et al.

**Research Taught: Scholarship of Teaching**

There are many roads that lead to effective teaching and engaged learning. Most elements of effective teaching have to do with creating a learning environment that centers on excellence, relevance, respect, clear communication, knowledge of the field, enthusiasm, and a commitment to ongoing professional development to stay current in methods of instructional delivery and appropriate materials for teaching and learning. The Faculty Handbook focuses on four indicators of effective teaching:

1. Self-awareness and adaptation – acknowledge an awareness of strengths and weaknesses in the faculty development plan.
2. Student awareness and adaptation – differentiate to student needs and abilities.
3. Mentoring Relationships – develop relationship for mentor beyond the classroom.
4. Demonstrated Effectiveness – demonstrate knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in student learning and through the faculty evaluation process.

**Research Served: Scholarship of Application and Engagement**

In the Faculty Handbook, sabbaticals are defined specifically to serve as “a leave of absence with pay for the pursuit of professional activities consistent with the Faculty Growth Plan. The purpose of a sabbatical is to provide the faculty member an opportunity for activities that contribute to teaching and scholarship and to the University as a recipient of faculty services (IX, A(1)). In the Instructions for Faculty Growth Plan, there is a more explicit connection between research and service as the Faculty Growth Plan program seeks to foster leadership roles in professional societies, which can often open opportunities to publish in journals associated with that professional organization.

**Research Inquired: Scholarship of Discovery**

The Faculty Handbook identifies three key elements of effective scholarship conducted within the nuances of each faculty member’s content discipline:

To facilitate the development of growth plans and assessment for promotion and tenure, excellence in scholarship is evaluated by the following:

1. A clear plan of action.
2. Validation by peers.
3. A sustained pattern.

The Academic Procedures Handbook outlines how faculty members document these key elements of scholarship in a portfolio (See Appendix B), where faculty can “substantiate claims made in the portfolio essay by attaching complementary information in the form of appendices or exhibits” (See p. 63).

**Research Across Disciplines: Scholarship of Integration**
In addition to faculty research grants with $3,000 stipends and appropriate expenses and granting course load release through leaves up to three hours, the Faculty Development Committee implemented an annual grant of up to $600 for each member of a Publication Writing Workshop; a team of faculty members could propose to collaborate together for the purpose of planning, drafting, editing, and submitting manuscripts for consideration in journals.

**Institutional Support for Development and Growth Opportunities**

The Faculty Handbook defines the University’s commitment to faculty development as a “necessary part of assisting faculty members to steadily work toward becoming the finest Christian teachers, scholars, and servants possible (Handbook IX).” Specific support for faculty research is included in the Faculty Handbook in Part Four: Instructional Services And Faculty Guidelines (Handbook IX, II, G).

**Summary of Faculty Scholarship at George Fox University**

George Fox University has been described as a highly complex small, regional university. Its mission is “George Fox University, a Christ-centered community, prepares students spiritually, academically, and professionally to think with clarity, act with integrity, and serve with passion.” The provost has been known to purport that his vision, “is that George Fox University will be recognized as one of the finest small teaching universities in the Northwest - with the most formative educational experience on the face of the earth” (Allen, 2008). Boyer (1999) insists that the purpose of tenure and promotion reflect the mission of the institution. To the George Fox University faculty this should mean that the elements used to measure faculty effectiveness be expanded from a focus on publishing original research to include engaged learning through effective teaching, applied service, and integrated across disciplines – a sharing of the fruitfulness of one’s learning to a broader audience of colleagues, to promote learning and to affect evaluation by peers.
The Faculty Handbook (2008) documents the expectations and criteria for becoming an “effective faculty member” (Handbook, p. 43). The Faculty Handbook (2008) refers to tenure-track positions that require faculty to “meet high expectations in teaching, scholarship, professionalism, and service” (III, B). This delineation, to which individual faculty members are measured by the dean of each school, is through a two-pronged evaluation process: 1) an evaluation of documentation provided in the faculty member’s professional growth plan, and 2) an evaluation of the level to which a colleague demonstrates meeting the prescribed expectations, as evidenced in a peer-review process. Perhaps, one suggested change would be to the Academic Procedures Handbook in Appendix B, where the portfolio could more closely align with the mission of this institution or the school instead of to another institution as described in the note: Adapted from WSU web page (See p. 66).

The next section focuses on a model that the School of Education can use to honor the work of a faculty member to more broadly demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service.

**A Model for the School of Education**

As presented in Part One, Boyer’s model provides helpful commentary on how to document that one's teaching, service, research and integration efforts have, in fact, met the six criteria: 1) clear goals, 2) adequate preparation, 3) adequate methods, 4) significant results, 5) effective presentation and, 6) reflective critique. This section provides narrative to help the School of Education demonstrate and communicate "that the institution honors the range of scholarship that supports its mission and that appropriate standards are in fact used" (Glassick et al., 1997, p. 50).

George Fox University transitioned from an Education Department to a School of Education in the 2002-03 academic year, mainly to prepare for accreditation with the National
Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); this long-range goal that was realized in 2007. Other priorities included selecting a dean, planning staffing levels, and setting a research agenda. This transition includes an expansion of programs from pre-service preparation and in-service professional development for teachers to preparing school administrators, counselors, and psychologists for service in public and private schools throughout the Northwest and in the world.

**The School of Education Mission Statement**

*With Christ at the center, the School of Education offers practical and challenging programs for professionals in education where excellence, innovation, and professional expertise are modeled by faculty members who continue their journeys of learning, teaching and leading.*

From its Quaker foundations, George Fox University has emphasized the necessity of a genuinely experiential Christian faith. In its earliest statement of mission after its founding in 1891, the academy purposed to prepare Christian men and women to serve as pastors, evangelists, and teachers. The George Fox School of Education builds upon this foundation as it seeks to prepare and support professionals who think critically, transform practice, and promote justice.

The mission of the School of Education is based on a Christ-centered worldview that supports and develops professionals who think critically, transform practice, and promote justice. In alignment with our institutional mission, the School of Education emphasizes a Transformative Model that focuses on the integration of faith, learning, and living based on a Christ-centered worldview.
**The School of Education Conceptual Framework**

*We believe that this theoretical learning perspective provides a conceptual framework from which we can achieve the goal of our programs: to support and develop professionals who think critically, transform practice, and promote justice.*

The School of Education has adopted the following beliefs about supporting and preparing professionals who think critically, transform practice, and promote justice. In one of its earliest seminal documents, the faculty in the School of Education published a vision statement in the Operating Principles for 2002-03, as drafted by Dr. Mark Ankeny:

Excellence, integrity, and a balanced life are hallmarks of the Christian professional educator. Through our character, words, and actions we model servant leadership as we support and challenge our students. “We teach who we are” as we demonstrate the love of God by modeling Christ (Palmer, 1997 p. 1). Our goal is to provide a safe environment for people to explore the roles of the professional educator through a Christian worldview. “To teach is to create space in which obedience to truth is practiced” (Palmer, 1993, p. 69). We believe that all truth is God’s truth, and as seekers of truth we create for our students a space in which learning can flourish. We prepare educators who think critically through multiple perspectives, reflect deeply upon their own practice, and act wisely as agents of change to influence society in supportive, creative, and just ways. We offer integrated programs rich in academic complexity, practical in experience, and challenging in paradigm, thought, and strategy. Our techniques and strategies ultimately reflect our view of the learner, the profession, and our Lord. Together, [as learners], we define excellence in character, innovation, and professional expertise through the light of Christ, as we continue the journey of learning, teaching, and leading. (p. 3)
A Christ-centered worldview is a philosophical view that informs our thinking about the source of knowledge. It is based on the belief that all truth is God’s truth, all are God’s creation, and all creation relies on God’s sovereignty and will for ongoing life.

The document that might be most helpful for faculty to develop and revise plans for teaching, service, scholarship, and integrating faith and learning is the evaluation rubric used by the Dean to review the Faculty Growth Plans for faculty within the School of Education. The FGP is used to document that plan with evidence of and reflection on effectiveness; and to assess the fruitfulness of the plan. Those aspects of the Dean’s evaluation are reproduced in italics after each heading. This is followed by narrative, which members of the School of Education may wish to revise the areas of scholarship below with more specific information from each department, but we view it as a starting point within which to work and to assess our scholarship. We use the list found in Appendix C to help develop a framework or inventory for each of the following sections.

**Scholarship Assessed in Teaching**

- **Teaching:** FGP Assessment shows evidence of reflection and learning from the results of achieving previous teaching goals.

- **Teaching:** FGP shows evidence of thoughtful reading and response to course evaluations, peer reviews, or class visits.

- **Teaching:** Goals address issues of methodology and course content, course design, or curriculum.

- **Teaching:** FGP goals demonstrate a clear plan of action for integration of Faith with teaching.

The major evidence that faculty provide for quality teaching, during the peer-review process, are student evaluations. This evidence could be expanded to incorporate a connection between a faculty member’s recent research agenda and how this research is brought into the classroom. As most of our degree programs have a component of student research, the directing of student research projects as the candidate’s advisor (teaching), could be including in evidence of teaching
related to framing effective research questions, using appropriate statistical methods and analysis, and improving the quality of the student’s writing.

New courses are being developed as with such courses comes new delivery methods (online and hybrid instruction) and teaching strategies. Evidence could be compiled in reflective journals kept by the faculty member, and documenting staying current in one’s area of expertise could be through developing annotated bibliographies listing supplemental readings. The key is to document these assessments as the university documents the student evaluation of a faculty member’s performance. The New Faculty Institute can be helpful in giving time (and 3-hours of load credit) for faculty to begin framing the Faculty Growth Plan and Portfolio essays based on collaboration with others within the department and school, and among colleagues from other disciplines, as well.

**Scholarship Assessed in Research**

- *Scholarship:* FGP assessment describes past scholarly activity, including validation by peers.
- *Scholarship:* FGP goals demonstrate a clear plan of action for future scholarly activity, including mechanism for validation by peers.
- *Scholarship:* FGP assessment and goals show a sustained pattern of regular contribution to the profession.
- *Scholarship:* FGP goals demonstrate a clear plan of action for integration of Faith with scholarship.

There are tensions for new faculty coming into the School of Education where one has lived in the world of being a consumer instead of a producer of research. One way to bridge the gap between the world of teacher leader in the K-12 system and your new found professoriate at George Fox University is to seek out professional organizations that can help with a personal presentation and publication agenda. We have included, in Part Four, a list of the leading professional organizations where faculty can connect, and many of the organizations have as its mission to assist with promotion and tenure considerations of its members.
The key is to make sure that research goals are met by attending state and national conferences to determine the format and landscape for getting a proposal accepted; it is important to not just attend, but to present – in fact, it may be difficult to get this approved as a faculty development activity (at least for travel funding) without being an approved presenter. The next step is to look for networks at the conference to turn the presentation into a publication. Looking for connections as a way to publish one’s dissertation is a start for faculty (Boyer, 1990), but by being connected to and active in professional organizations, or perhaps even serving in a leadership role, will lead to a more focused presenting and publishing agenda. As mentioned, there is a natural place to mine the work that, on the surface, appears to be service to local schools and school district, but with a little more intentionality these service connections can develop into publications, or at least integrating your learning from this service work into scholarship of teaching in the classroom.

**Scholarship Assessed in Service**

- *Service:* FGP assessment documents involvement in service.
- *Service:* FGP goals show service that goes beyond job description.
- *Service:* FGP assessment and goals show sustained pattern of service.
- *Service:* FGP goals demonstrate a clear plan of action for integration of Faith with service.

There are some things we do that we do as service that are influenced by our Christian worldview: service to our local church body where we worship, to the organization where we work, and to others in and outside of the educational community. There are also opportunities available to us due to our mission to work with educators in a range of both private and public school settings, in typically underserved communities. In addition to the list in Appendix C, there are a number of localized examples where grant initiatives have been developed to better serve our partners,
and with it has come opportunities to translate that act of service into presentations and publications, with both state and national organizations.

**Scholarship Across Disciplines**

There are unique ways where departments can work across “disciplines” that other schools at George Fox University may not have available to them. Our location in proximity to the Graduate School of Psychology could lend itself to collaboration, if not directly, through discussions with faculty members on curriculum, assessment, and research. We also have a ready-made opportunity to collaborate with colleagues within our school in other departments who work in pre-service teacher preparation; principal, school counselor, and school psychologist preparation; varying degree programs for people working in our field, within all of these roles, lend themselves to possible professional development for faculty in the area of integrating scholarship.

**Summary of Faculty Scholarship in the School of Education**

We see this section as an ever-evolving guide for faculty in the School of Education. The closer that one aligns the work of teaching, service, and research in an integrated package of scholarship with the mission, conceptual framework, Faculty Handbook, and Academic Procedure Handbook, the more fruit will appear on the branches for better picking. Being purposeful to mine previous connections in schools and future relationships with university/school partners may prove beneficial to engage in a clear, sustained pattern of scholarship, one that provides evidence that can be assessed and validated by one’s peers. It is more about extending the reach and influence of a university and school and believing that the work that we are engaged in can and will make a difference to the calling of teaching and learning – scholarship does matter!
Questions to Prompt Conversations

- What are the current discussions of relative importance of tenure and promotion?

- What is the School of Education ethos regarding teaching, scholarship, and service compared to research?

- What ways can we combine and define components of our work so that SoE faculty can set realistic goals and focus on achieving them?
  - Define what kind of connection to a school district counts as scholarship.
  - How does one bridge scholarship and admin/service in such cases?
  - How does one massage one's courses to contribute to one's research agenda?

- What new structures could we build and what dead or dormant structures could we resurrect?
  - Scholar's forum / intellectual feasts
  - PLCs / writing groups / accountability groups / designated editing partners
  - Practical instruction in nuts and bolts such as a writing for publication course
  - Practical help on how to move the presentation to publication
  - Formal mentoring structure so that new faculty to SoE have a mentor with a specific agenda … structured so carefully that it runs for two years … and the mentor could serve or not on the 3rd year review

- Respond to this scenario that includes a demographic factor with education faculty: So many come from K-12 and live in an essentially humanistic (i.e., want to do good in the world) and pragmatic (i.e., would rather to do good in the world than to talk about how to define the word good). Therefore, many SoE faculty come from K-12, some without a doctorate complete, and they need to figure out teaching in higher education at the same time that they need to get their program of scholarship going.

- What existent support structures could SoE use to enhance scholarship?
  - Through Dean's office especially in conjunction with FGP's
  - Through department and program chairs especially with student evaluations and FGP's

- A listing of programs and structures in place meant to support the doing of and reflection on scholarship:
  - Professional membership money annually through dean's office
  - Travel money apportioned annually through the dean's offices
  - FGP meetings with department chairs and deans
  - Course evaluations from students and discussions of same with department chairs
Part Four: Implications of Expectations and Commitment

During a School of Education meeting on April 1, 2011, faculty were asked to respond to five prompts naming specific items as follows: 1) the journal(s) in which they have published, 2) the preeminent journal in their respective disciplines, based on their perception, 3) groups where individual faculty members have provided service to the university or to the broader community, 4) the focus topic that identifies a specific area of interest with evidence to assess a “clear plan of action, validated by peers, with a sustained pattern of scholarship” (see p. 47), and 5) membership in professional organization(s). The following table provides a summary of the data.

Also included in Table 1 is a sample of an online publication resource site operated by Rice University called Connexions, which includes “lenses” for peer-reviewed manuscripts. The website states, “Connexions is a dynamic digital educational ecosystem consisting of an educational content repository and a content management system optimized for the delivery of educational content. Connexions is one of the most popular open education sites in the world. Its more than 17,000 learning objects or modules in its repository and over 1000 collections (textbooks, journal articles, etc.) are used by over 2 million people per month. Its content services the educational needs of learners of all ages, in nearly every discipline, from math and science to history and English to psychology and sociology. Connexions delivers content for free over the Internet for schools, educators, students, and parents to access 24/7/365. Materials are easily downloadable to almost any mobile device for use anywhere, anytime. Schools can also order low cost hard copy sets of the materials (textbooks).”

Finally, a sample of one journal’s publication rate, review process, and website process is included from the Cabell’s Directory of Publishing Opportunities from the MLRC.
Table 1

Self-report of School of Education Faculty Scholarship of Inquiry and Scholarship of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Journal</th>
<th>Major Journal</th>
<th>Service Activity - Organization</th>
<th>Scholarship Focus</th>
<th>Professional Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring &amp; Tutoring Teachers College Record</td>
<td>Mentoring &amp; Tutoring</td>
<td>Christian school mentoring (teachers &amp; administrators)</td>
<td>Challenges that mentoring programs encounter</td>
<td>International Mentoring Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic &amp; Racial Studies</td>
<td>Ethnic &amp; Racial Studies</td>
<td>SoE Diversity Committee Christian Academy (S Korea)</td>
<td>Immigration &amp; Education</td>
<td>American Ed Research Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>International J of Education</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Calling &amp; Vocation Adult Education</td>
<td>Assoc. for Supervision &amp; Curriculum Dev. (ASCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Issues in Teaching</td>
<td>J of Teacher Ed</td>
<td>Ecuador, China, Guatemala</td>
<td>Int'l experiences in teacher education (immersion for pre-service teachers</td>
<td>Assoc. of Teacher Educators Int'l Reading Association *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Teacher's Record</td>
<td>Salem-Keizer SD for recruiting people of color into teaching</td>
<td>Teacher identity</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Research in Christian Education</td>
<td>J of Int'l Ed</td>
<td>Professional development in Kenyan Quaker schools</td>
<td>Adult learning pedagogy</td>
<td>AERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Teacher Educator</td>
<td>J of Teacher Ed</td>
<td>Student teacher pilot program</td>
<td>Work sample Assessment</td>
<td>ATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>J of Teacher Ed</td>
<td>Practicum experiences working with principals and districts</td>
<td>Reaching at-risk kids through effective practice</td>
<td>ATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Journal</td>
<td>Major Journal</td>
<td>Service Activity - Organization</td>
<td>Scholarship Focus</td>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Leadership Review</td>
<td>Ed Admin Quarterly</td>
<td>University/School partnerships with David Douglas &amp; Lincoln County SD</td>
<td>Teacher leadership</td>
<td>National Council of Prof. of Ed Admin. (NCPEA) AERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW ATE J (NW Passage)</td>
<td>J of Teacher Ed</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>ATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Am Indian Ed</td>
<td>J of Am Indian Ed</td>
<td>Grant evaluator with a Humanities Council</td>
<td>American Indian Ed</td>
<td>National Indian Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Divorce &amp; Remarriage</td>
<td>J of Divorce &amp; Remarriage</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Theory of Carl Jung</td>
<td>Friends of Jung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Counseling &amp; Development</td>
<td>J of Marital &amp;</td>
<td>Equipping counselors/marriage therapists in China, Middle East, Africa, et al.</td>
<td>Integration among schools in MFT field</td>
<td>American Assoc. for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Therapy</td>
<td>See <a href="http://www.telosinternational.org">www.telosinternational.org</a></td>
<td>Spirituality/Counseling MFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford J</td>
<td>J of Psych &amp; Theology</td>
<td>NW EFT Institute</td>
<td>Emotional focused therapy</td>
<td>Christian Assoc. for Psychological Studies (CAPS) Am. Counseling Assoc. (ACA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International J of Play Therapy</td>
<td>J of Counseling &amp; Development</td>
<td>Pro-bono presentations</td>
<td>Play therapy</td>
<td>AAMFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J of Christian Psychology</td>
<td>J of Marital &amp; Family Therapy</td>
<td>Trauma/disaster response – Red Cross, Medical Teams Int’l, Schools</td>
<td>Disaster mental health Supervision Ed &amp; Training</td>
<td>ACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>The Reading Teacher</td>
<td>Observations &amp; co-teaching Secondary teaching as cohort leader</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Writing instruction Christian integration in the public environment Management in secondary teaching</td>
<td>Middle School Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Journal</td>
<td>Major Journal</td>
<td>Service Activity - Organization</td>
<td>Scholarship Focus</td>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published but not in education journals</td>
<td>School Library J</td>
<td>Evaluating school libraries Evaluating preschool teachers</td>
<td>Library collections Preparing well-round school librarians</td>
<td>Am. Library Assoc. (ALA) Am. Assoc. School Librarians (AASL) OASL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Ed Leadership (ASCD)</td>
<td>Diversity in the church</td>
<td>Teacher efficacy</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Ed Leadership</td>
<td>Student management and teacher effectiveness</td>
<td>Instructional supervision of teachers</td>
<td>ASCD COSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>American Ed Research J</td>
<td>Teaching young children &amp; church</td>
<td>Developmentally informed practice in teaching</td>
<td>AERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>TESOL Quarterly Bilingual Research J Intercultural Education</td>
<td>Immigrant population-CCC</td>
<td>Intercultural Rhetoric International Students</td>
<td>Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) National Association of Bilingual Educators (NABE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample online publication site</td>
<td>Connexions - Rice University</td>
<td><a href="http://cnx.org/">http://cnx.org/</a></td>
<td>Click on Lenses to find peer-reviewed submission info</td>
<td>Open Educational Resources (Commons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample for publication</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Organization/Website</td>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>Type of Review/Number of Reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Marital &amp; Family Therapy</td>
<td>American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) / Wiley-Blackwell Publishing</td>
<td><a href="http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/">www.blackwellpublishing.com/</a></td>
<td>11-20%</td>
<td>Blind/3 external Blind/1 internal With reviewer’s comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
http://www.georgefox.edu/offices/academic_affairs/index.html


Appendix A:

George Fox University Faculty Handbook
Scholarship: Promotion & Tenure Sections
Appendix B:
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Appendix C:


Starting on the next page, we present material verbatim from pages 141 – 146 of Braxton, Luckey and Helland's *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer's Four Domains.* The subheadings used in this inventory differ slightly from what some might expect in a list of activities meant to illustrate Boyer's framework. This list was not written for the George Fox University School of Education; its authors meant it as a general list applicable across the academy. We include it as a starting point for SoE conversation and we invite our colleagues to begin discussing and revising it so that it reflects the kind of work we do at George Fox University and with teachers and students everywhere.

**The Inventory of Scholarship**

This inventory groups professional behaviors by their orientation into one of four domains of scholarship delineated by Boyer. These professorial behaviors also fit one of three categories: scholarly activities, unpublished scholarly outcomes, and publications. A distinction between scholarly activities and scholarship undergirds these categories. Scholarly activities use disciplinary knowledge and skill in their performance, whereas scholarship takes the form of unpublished scholarly outcomes and publications. Unpublished scholarly outcomes fully meet the definition of scholarship if they appear in a publicly observable form. By being publicly observable, unpublished scholarly outcomes meet the three criteria for scholarship delineated by Shulman and Hutchings (1998): it must be public, subject to critical review, and in a form that allows use and exchange by other members of the scholarly community. To be publicly observable, unpublished scholarly outcomes need to be in the form of a paper, a taped audio or video presentation, written report, or web site (Braxton & Del Favero, 2002).

**The Scholarship of Application**

**Scholarly Activities**

*Institutional Service/Academic Citizenship*

- Service on a departmental program review committee
- Service on a departmental curriculum committee
- Service on a college-wide curriculum committee
- Self-study conducted for one's department
- Service on a committee engaged in institutional preparation for accreditation review
- Study conducted to help solve a departmental problem
- Study conducted to help formulate departmental policy
Service to the Lay Public

- Introduction of some result of scholarship in a consultation
- Provision of expert witness or testimony
- Engagement in consulting off campus

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- Development of an innovative technology
- Seminars conducted for laypersons on current disciplinary topics
- Development of a new process for dealing with a problem of practice
- Study conducted for a local organization
- Study conducted for a local nonacademic professional association
- Study conducted for local government agency
- Study conducted to help solve a community problem
- Study conducted to help solve a county or state problem

Publications

- An article that outlines a new research problem identified through the application of the knowledge and skill of one's academic discipline to a practical problem
- An article that describes new knowledge obtained through the application of the knowledge and skill of one's academic discipline to a practical problem
- An article that applies new disciplinary knowledge to a practical problem
- An article that proposes an approach to the bridging of theory and practice
- An article reporting findings of research designed to solve practical problems

The Scholarship of Discovery

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- A paper presented that describes a new theory developed by the author
- A paper presented that reports the findings of research designed to gain new knowledge
- A report on research findings to a granting agency

Publications

This list includes only publications associated with the traditional scholar. Such publications best serve the academic system necessary for the dissemination of outcomes of engagement in the scholarship of discovery. For example:

- A book chapter describing a new theory developed by the author
- A refereed journal article reporting findings of research designed to gain new knowledge
- A book reporting findings of research designed to gain new knowledge
- A book describing a new theory developed by the author
- A refereed journal article describing a new theory developed by the author
The Scholarship of Integration

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given on a local radio station
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given a local television station
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local men's or women's service organization
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local business organization
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local nonacademic professional association
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a group of college alumni
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a local high school class
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given for a high school assembly
- A talk on a current disciplinary topic given at a local community college

Publications

- A review of literature on a disciplinary topic
- A review of literature on an interdisciplinary topic
- A review essay of two or more books on similar topics
- An article on the application of a research method borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own
- A book chapter on the application of a research method borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own
- An article on the application of a theory borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own
- A book chapter on the application of a theory borrowed from an academic discipline outside one's own
- A critical book review published in an academic or professional journal
- A critical book review published in a newsletter of a professional association
- An article addressing current disciplinary topics published in the popular press
- A book addressing a disciplinary/interdisciplinary topic published by the popular press
- An article that crosses subject matter areas
- A book that crosses subject matter areas
- A critical book review published in the popular press
- A book published reporting research findings to lay readers
- A textbook published
- An edited book published
- An article on a current disciplinary topic published in the local newspaper
- An article on a current disciplinary topic published in a college or university publication
- An article on the current disciplinary topic published in a national magazine of the popular press
The Scholarship of Teaching

Scholarly Activities

- Directed student research projects
- Preparation of a new syllabus for a course
- Development of examination questions requiring higher order thinking skills
- Development of a set of lectures, learning activities, or class plans for a new course
- Maintenance of a journal of day-to-day teaching activities
- Study problems or questions emerging from one's own teaching
- Construction of an annotated bibliography for course reference
- A lecture on topics from current journal articles not covered in course readings
- A lecture on topics from current scholarly books not covered in course readings
- Development of a new course
- Development of a new set of lectures for existing course
- Introduction of some result of one's scholarship in teaching

Unpublished Scholarly Outcomes

General Pedagogical Development and Improvement

- Presentation about new instructional techniques to colleagues
- Development of a collection of resource materials for one's subject area
- Construction of a novel examination or testing practice

Classroom Research

- Experimentation with new teaching methods or activities
- Development of methods to make ungraded assessments of students' learning of course content
- Trying a new instructional practice and altering it until it is successful

Pedagogical Content Knowledge

- Development of examples, materials, class exercises, or assignments that help students learn difficult course concepts
- Creation of an approach or strategy for dealing with class management problems faced in teaching a particular type of course
- Creation of an approach or strategy to help students to think critically about course concepts

Publications

General pedagogical development and improvement

- Publication listing resource materials for course
- Publication on the use of a new instructional method
Classroom Research

- Publication reporting a new teaching approach developed by the author
- Publication of a method to make ungraded assessments of students' learning of course content
- Publication on the use of a new instructional practice and the alterations made to make it successful

Pedagogical Content Knowledge

- Publication of examples, materials, class exercises, or assignments that help students learn difficult course concepts
- Publication on an approach or strategy for dealing with class management problems faced in teaching a particular type of course
- Publication on an approach or strategy to help students to think critically about course concepts

Sources Cited:
