



Volume 60 | Issue 2

Article 4

12-1-2017


Current State of Scholarship in Christian Liberal Arts Schools A Study of CCCU Teaching Faculty and Librarians

Craighton T. Hippenhammer
Olivet Nazarene University, chhammer@olivet.edu

Garrett Trott
gtrott@corban.edu

The Christian Librarian is the official publication of the Association of Christian Librarians (ACL). To learn more about ACL and its products and services please visit <http://www.acl.org/>

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/tcl>

 Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hippenhammer, Craighton T. and Trott, Garrett (2017) "Current State of Scholarship in Christian Liberal Arts Schools A Study of CCCU Teaching Faculty and Librarians," *The Christian Librarian*: Vol. 60 : Iss. 2 , Article 4.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/tcl/vol60/iss2/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Christian Librarian by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

Current State of Scholarship in Christian Liberal Arts Schools A Study of CCCU Teaching Faculty and Librarians



**Craighton Hippenhammer, formerly Digital Initiatives Librarian
Olivet Nazarene University**

**Garrett Trott, Librarian
Corban University**

ABSTRACT

This is the first of two articles that explains the results of an in-depth research study of teaching faculty and librarian scholarship within the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). This article examines the nature and extent of that scholarship and the article examines its necessity.

Introduction

The two authors of this study are members of the Association of Christian Librarians (ACL), where they began discussions as to whether there was much serious wide-ranging scholarship being accomplished at Christian colleges and universities. Contact with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) revealed that a full research study of CCCU scholarship had not yet been undertaken. Therefore, this research study as it developed sought to determine how academic deans and library directors of CCCU schools would perceive their institutions' attitudes toward scholarship and whether faculty scholarship was encouraged.

Literature Review

Ernest Boyer's influential work, *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*, published in 1990, traced the reward structures for scholarship that had developed over the years to evaluate faculty's efforts in research, teaching, and service. At the time of Boyer's writing, the publication of research at secular universities trumped teaching and service (Bucher & Patton, 2004, p. 4), which had become the dominant yardstick by which scholarship, and therefore faculty, were measured (Boyer, 1990, p. xii). One of the primary purposes of his work was to urge that teaching and service be equally prized with publishing. "After all," he argued, "it's futile to talk about improving the quality of teaching if, in the end, faculty are not given recognition for the time they spend with students" (1990, p. xi).

Boyer pointed the way for both secular and Christian schools to adopt various versions of his model. Trudeau and Herrmann argue that with Boyer advocating for more holistic approaches to scholarly activity, Christian higher education institutions should be especially receptive to Boyer's whole-person focuses (2014, p. 61). They also assert that it is now widely recognized within higher education that good teaching is important, as is seen with the proliferation of "Centers for Teaching and Learning" that now exist on many, if not most, campuses, as well as conferences and workshops that abound for the improvement of teaching. "Most sectors of higher education are at least exploring their reward structures in order to find ways to better recognize, compensate, and motivate good teaching" (2014, p. 67).

To develop "a more comprehensive, more dynamic understanding of scholarship" beyond "the rigid categories of teaching, research, and service," (1990, p.16), Boyer developed four domains of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching. The scholarship of discovery means research: a commitment to the uncovering of new knowledge. His scholarship of integration involves those tasks that give meaning to isolated facts. While the scholarship of discovery asks, "What is to be known?" the scholarship of integration asks, "What does this new discovery mean?" (1990, p. 19), which includes literature reviews and conceptual frameworks, explaining how past studies fit together and into what is already known.

Boyer's third domain, the scholarship of application, asks: "how can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?" (1990, p. 21). Professional association activity, for example, can apply disciplinary expertise to social issues and institutional problems through group efforts. His fourth domain, the scholarship of teaching, has widely been recognized as needing more emphasis (Hutchings, 2000). Gurung and Wilson state that "the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) is getting popular ... (t)here is a brand new journal for it coming out almost every year" (2013, p. 1).

Diamond and Adam gathered statements in two works from a variety of scholarly and professional associations regarding their perceptions of scholarship (2000; 1995). They made two observations that held true through the vast majority of the disciplines. First, no single definition of scholarship works easily across all disciplines; and second, local schools' definitions of scholarship continue to evolve as scholar roles are rethought. Hundreds of colleges and universities throughout the United States have been updating their tenure and promotion policies to align their scholarship practices with the Boyer model (O'Meara, 2006).

While there has been much agreement with Boyer's scholarship principles, there have also been questions related to its functionality. Having colleges and universities agree with his four levels of scholarship is different from seeing them actually

employ his standards when it comes to promotion and tenure. Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002) analyzed Boyer's four domains of scholarship and assessed how differing institutions have integrated them. They described three differing levels of institutionalization: structural, procedural, and incorporation. "Structural integration" is where faculty know what a particular domain of scholarship is but it is not practiced by faculty or the institution. "Procedural integration" happens when faculty behaviors are impacted by Boyer's four domains, and "incorporation integration" takes place when the domains of scholarship are incorporated into the organization's culture. Their research showed that all four domains of scholarship had reached the structural level of institutionalization, but faculty rated only the scholarship of discovery as having achieved the incorporation integration level. Their suggestion that there is an attitude of superiority acquainted with the scholarship of discovery aligns well with other studies (O'Meara, 2005, 2010; Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007)

McGowan and Dow reviewed librarian struggles over several decades to define scholarship appropriate to library science (1995). During the 1970's and 80's, they say, there was much discussion throughout the profession about the desirability of academic librarians having faculty status, and in 1992, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) "published rigorous and detailed guidelines for faculty status for academic librarians" (McGowan & Dow, 1995, p. 345). These guidelines continue to be updated and contain standards that support faculty status, such as governance forms and responsibilities similar to other campus faculties, similar salaries and benefits to teaching faculty, tenure coverage, eligibility for sabbatical and other research leaves and funds, academic freedom protections, etc. (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2011). In recent years, the advisability of librarian faculty status had become controversial, particularly in places where a publish-or-perish environment reigned. Librarians do need to have time to get their practical library work done, but it is also hard to see how quality library literature will get studied, examined, and added to if there are no scholarship of discovery requirements. However, the ACRL faculty-status standards still stand.

ACRL responded to Boyer's challenge in a document, "Academic Librarianship and the Redefining Scholarship Project" (St. Clair, Miller, & Fiander, 2000). This redefinition project was the foundation of ACRL's scholarship definitions for librarians that appeared in Diamond and Adam's work, "The Disciplines Speak II" (2000). St. Clair *et al.* (2000) took Boyer's four scholarship domains and gave specific examples for each as to how librarians' scholarship fit within them. For example, they included librarian research activities within Boyer's inquiry/discovery domain such as their research on the organization of information, user information needs, and preservation and access issues, as well as further delineating his three other scholarly categories.

Lowry continued the librarian scholarship discussion that used the Boyer categories (2004). This article points out that librarians excel particularly at Boyer's scholarship of integration, combining the techniques and content of many disciplines, such as computer science, pedagogy, management, organizational theory, and so forth, reflected in working papers, technical reports, and many other types of literature that librarians produce regularly that advance their daily functions, as well as peer-reviewed research. Librarian scholarship is also reflected in website and technological development, bibliographies, exhibitions, and case studies. Boyer's scholarship of teaching, according to Lowry, is more like a "sub-discipline" in librarianship. Public service and instruction librarians, who teach research thought processes and techniques, typically practice instruction, including the unique vagaries of scholarly database distinctions.

Boyer's more interdisciplinary, human-connecting methods seems especially appropriate for librarians as well as the whole-person approaches to academia that Christians take. However, empirical models that examine the actual practice of Christian institutions of higher education enlarging their scholarly integration and discovery activities are rare and incomplete, so little is known about how scholarship is actually being practiced within the CCCU. Four such studies were discovered for this inquiry, all of them partial at best.

1. In a 2004 study Mallard and Atkins noted that although research release time was the strongest indicator of productivity at CCCU schools, very few respondents were actually on any type of release time at the time of the study. They called on administrators to have a long-term plan that will help faculty know what sorts of encouragement exist. Faculty also need to know that their scholarship activities are valued. A major conclusion of the Mallard and Atkins study was that academic deans should expect their faculty to do more scholarship (2004, p. 384).
2. Harris and Lumsden studied tenure practices within the CCCU schools and found that over two-thirds of them offered tenure (2006). They discovered that the protection of academic freedom is the number one reason that CCCU schools give for offering tenure even though the schools' tenure policies mandate that their academic freedom and tenure guidelines operate within limits.
3. In another more recent study of tenure out of Point Loma Nazarene University, which examined 38 CCCU institutions, the authors found that more male faculty (43%) had earned tenure than women (30%) and twice as many women (24%) were in full-time non-tenure track faculty positions than men (12%). Also, 50% of this CCCU study's respondents agreed that tenure attracts the best minds and also reported that the level of stress associated with the demands of research and publishing on CCCU faculty is less than their counterparts (non-CCCU schools) nationally (Railsback, Williamson, & Hamilton-Bunch, 2012).

4. In 2013 the CCCU studied how their members deal with science and religion issues, and that such interdisciplinary studies are clearly buoyed by the warm collegiality across disciplines and shared purposes among their faculty, which bodes well for future collaborative work. Also noted in the study were the challenges “in mediating between advocacy of faculty academic freedom and mitigating against possible alienation among key stakeholders such as students, parents, trustees, and donors” (Burdett et al., 2013, p. 96).

The impact of the Boyer model that calls for balance in academic scholarship efforts has influenced secular and religious universities and colleges differently. While the model originally targeted schools, particularly research institutions, and their associated reward systems that emphasized scholarship of discovery over scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990, p. 16), it has also been documented recently that teaching colleges and universities have also been seeking greater balance by encouraging more scholarship of discovery (O’Meara, 2006, p. 80).

Empirical studies are needed that systematically study how Christian colleges and universities produce scholarship. Discerning with more precision how Christian institutions encourage or discourage scholarship will not only contribute to higher education’s basic knowledge about faculty’s struggle to balance teaching and publishing, but also has the potential to lead to improved policies that will better support Christians to be active scholars and leaders in their fields of expertise. Therefore, this research study aims at addressing this gap in the literature.

Methodology

To answer the research need, we designed a survey to collect the perceptions of academic deans and library directors’ regarding scholarship at their CCCU schools as related to both teaching faculty and librarian participation. Because of the mass of survey data produced, and the limitation of journal article length requirements, two analyses were written: 1) this article which examines the survey participants’ perceptions as to the scholarship policies and expectations of scholarship at their institutions, including how tenure affects scholarship; and 2) a forthcoming article about how teaching faculty and librarians engage in discovery and what their hindrances to publishing are, including the nature of any available academic freedom. For some questions, we further split out the results between how librarian respondents answered differently from non-librarians. Some questions came from Boyer’s national survey of faculty (1990), some from the Glassick, Huber and Maeroff survey (1997), some from the Vesper and Kelly survey (1997), and some that were original. We conducted a content validity test of the survey with six librarians and two faculty-scholars acting as subject-matter experts. Based on the analysis, several items of the survey were rephrased or removed in order to insure appropriate measures. The final survey resulted in 33 questions, including five questions related

to demographics. The questions were a mix of multiple choice and Likert scale questions with optional open-ended comment fields available for respondents to further explain their answers. The official survey was conducted online using SurveyMonkey, and an invitation to participate was sent with the link by email to 282 academic deans and library directors of CCCU schools in the fall of 2015 after passing the Institutional Review Board which included examination of the required associated informed consents at the lead author's CCCU member school. Follow up emails were sent twice to encourage survey participation. The survey was open for four weeks. Survey responses were anonymous in the sense that we did not ask for participants' names or their institutions, but we did ask for the participants' job titles. Email addresses we used to send the survey link were not connected to survey responses.

Results

Of the 282 emails that were sent, 141 surveys were completed. This response rate (50%) is just under the average survey response rate of 52.7% (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). We considered this acceptable as the average response rate in published articles is right at 50% and is declining (Fulton, 2016). Respondents included 54 academic deans and other academic administrators, 73 library directors, and 14 who did not identify their titles. A grant-hired expert analyzed quantitative data using SPSS. Qualitative data were managed by coding at two levels. The first was to code the data aligned with Boyer's model (1990) and the second was to further code the data into emergent themes (Merriam, 2001; Popping, 2015).

Scholarship Policy

The survey included several questions that asked respondents about their perceptions related to their school's expectation of scholarship and whether their institution's efforts in the area were perceived as encouragement. When asked whether their schools had policies for what is expected for faculty scholarship, 58% ($n=76$), answered yes, 23% ($n=30$) answered no, and 19% ($n=25$) said they did not know. Ninety percent of the respondents felt that scholarship was encouraged at their school ($M = 4.18$, $SD = .83$), but only 57% said that their school required scholarship ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.14$), $t(140) = 8.35$, $p = .000$, $d = .70$). Those who responded that their school had a scholarship policy ($M = 4.34$, $SD = .70$) were more likely to say that scholarship is encouraged at their institution than participants who said their school did not have a policy ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.02$; $t(128) = 4.23$, $p < .017$), and more likely to say it was required ($M = 3.84$, $SD = .102$, $M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.04$, $t(128) = 16.77$, $p < .000$).

Qualitative data suggest that informal policies also influence the perception of scholarship. One respondent shared, “Some programs do [have scholarship policies], but most have more informal measures at the departmental or program level, not at [the] institutional level.” Another said, “The policy is part of the faculty handbook and is simply a statement of encouragement and not a policy of requirement.” Other respondents shared their frustration with the lack of a consistent message related to scholarship. One stated, “Too complex, too many schools and policies” and another added, “Yes we do have a policy but it is in flux at this time. Faculty are unsure as to what the demands or even the definition of scholarship are.”

The number of ways that scholarship is encouraged varied by institutional policy defining scholarship, $F(2, 127) = 7.74, p = .001, \eta^2 = .11$. Tukey’s post hoc procedure indicated that institutions that have policies that define what scholarship is expected of faculty implement more ways of encouraging scholarship ($M = 3.42, SD = 1.44$) than institutions that do not have a policy that defines what scholarship is expected of faculty ($M = 2.63, SD = 1.50$).

We asked respondents how their school encouraged both teaching faculty and librarians to pursue scholarship. While an exact statistical comparison between these two groups cannot be made due to their “select all that apply” nature, a general sense comparison can note that only 5% ($n = 7$) said their school did not have ways to encourage scholarship for faculty at all, but 23% ($n=30$) said their school did not encourage scholarship for librarians at all. While 53% ($n=75$) offered release time for scholarship work for faculty, only 21% ($n=28$) offered it to librarians. The same pattern followed for offering institution-funded research grants: 57% ($n=80$) to faculty but only 23% ($n=30$) to librarians. Covering conference fees for teaching faculty was widely adopted (89.4%, $n=126$), as well as for librarians (71.8%, $n=94$). However, all other ways for supporting scholarship, such as having a best-scholar/top-scholarship annual monetary award, a scholarship week to celebrate and publicly report about completed scholarship, stipends for published work, and endowed chairs for research within a specific discipline were less adopted. That said, there is a significant positive relationship between the total number of ways that an institution encourages teaching faculty to pursue scholarship and the total number of ways that an institution encourages librarians to pursue scholarship, $r(139) = .37, p < .001$.

The next category of questions was related to aspects of the job on which faculty were evaluated. Results show that evaluating teaching has been a category used for faculty evaluation for a long time, as is service to the school (see Table 1). Of those scholarly work categories recently put in place, research had the strongest showing at 13.49%.

Table 1

Scholarly Work Categories Used for Evaluating Faculty

Categories	No	Under consideration	Recently put in place	In place for some time	Total	Weighted average
Teaching	2.27% 3	0.00% 0	0.76% 1	96.97% 128	132	3.92
College service	7.63% 10	1.53% 2	6.11% 8	84.73% 111	131	3.68
Service to the profession	9.16% 12	5.34% 7	12.21% 16	73.28% 96	131	3.50

Research	14.29% 18	2.38 3	13.49% 17	69.84% 88	126	3.39
----------	--------------	-----------	----------------------------	--------------	-----	------

Community service	13.28% 17	6.25% 8	13.28% 17	67.19% 86	128	3.34
Creative Work	18.75% 24	3.13% 4	12.50% 16	65.63 84	128	3.25
Advising	25.20% 32	6.30% 8	4.72% 6	63.78% 81	127	3.07

Sixty-nine percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty at your institution.” However, academic deans ($n=54$) were more likely to agree with this statement than librarians ($n=73$), $M=3.56$; $SD=0.93$; $M=3.98$; $SD=1.04$; $df=125$; $t=-2.40$; $Sig=.018$.

We also asked how librarians actively supported scholarship efforts at their schools. Survey responders selected interlibrary loan (94%), teaching research skills (92%), service to the institution (88%), and helping faculty with copyright (81%) in high numbers (see Table 2). Just under 47% of survey respondents saw librarians as open access advocates and approximately 40% thought librarians supported scholarship by being active scholars themselves.

Table 2

Ways Librarians Encourage Scholarship

Answer Choices	Percent Responses	Number of Responses
Interlibrary loan	93.98%	125
Teaching research skills	91.73%	122
Through service to the institution	88.72%	118
By helping faculty with copyright	81.20%	108
Being open access advocates	46.62%	62
By being active scholars themselves	39.85%	53
By creating and/or publishing bibliographies	30.08%	40
Digital publishing of scholarship	26.32%	35
By helping faculty with publisher contracts	11.28%	15
Don't know	0.75%	1
Total Respondents: 133		

Tenure and Rank

Next, the survey was used to determine if scholarship at CCCU schools was tied to promotion and tenure. Sixty-two percent ($n = 86$) responded that tenure was available for teaching faculty at their school and 36.7% ($n = 51$) said tenure was not available. However, when asked whether tenure was available for librarians at their institutions, most participants ($n = 96$; 72.2%) said that it was not. There is a significant relationship between tenure being available for faculty at CCCU institutions and tenure being available for librarians ($X^2(1, N = 130) = 29.72, p = .000$, Cramer's $V = .48$).

Fifty-nine percent ($n = 80$) responded that scholarship was tied to receiving tenure at their school, and 41% ($n = 56$) said it was not. When asked if scholarship expectations were tied to advancement in title or rank at their school, 82.7% ($n = 115$) said it was and 17.3% ($n = 24$) said it was not. There was a significant relationship between scholarship expectations being tied to tenure and scholarship expectations being tied to advancement in title or rank at an institution, $X^2(1, N = 135) = 14.19, p = .000$, Cramer's $V = .32$. More people said "No" than "Yes" in response to tying expectations to receiving tenure where scholarship expectations were not tied to advancement in title or rank, $X^2(1, N = 24) = 6.00, p = .014$. However, where

scholarship expectations were tied to advancement in title or rank, participants were more likely to indicate that scholarship expectations were tied to tenure decisions, $X^2(1, N = 111) = 12.33, p < .001$.

Qualitative data showed that there were a wide variety of explanations of the connection between tenure, promotion, and other incentives to scholarship. Out of the 50 open-ended responses, 33 (66%) responded with answers that described in detail, even quoting from handbooks, how scholarship policies are tied to promotion and tenure. A number of the schools implemented a version of Boyer's Model (1990). Some included participating in professional organizations and contributing to their field through publication and presentations. One respondent shared how their school is intentionally working on clarifying this for its faculty:

We just revised our faculty manual to distinguish scholarship as a faculty performance criteria distinct from professional development, and faculty now must demonstrate accomplishments in the area of scholarship in order to be awarded tenure. The defined expectations in the manual are intentionally broad, and academic departments are in the process of providing discipline-specific lists of accepted examples of scholarship.

Some schools promote scholarship by offering extended contracts instead of tenure or promotion.

Participants were also asked, on a 5-point Likert scale with endpoints from 1 (strongly disagree), to 5 (strongly agree), whether it is difficult for a person to achieve tenure and/or promotion if he or she does not publish. The average for this statement was 3.16 ($SD = 1.06$), 72.86% of the responses being either neutral or above (see Table 3).

Table 3

Achieving Tenure without Publishing is Difficult

	Frequency	%	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative %
Strongly Agree	13	9.29	140	100.00
Agree	44	31.43	127	90.71
Neutral	45	32.14	83	59.29
Disagree	29	20.71	38	27.14
Strongly Disagree	9	6.43	9	6.43
	N = 140	100.00		

Gender was compared on all of the continuous variables in the data set. Though there were 18 comparisons, only one comparison was significant. Males ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 1.08$) were more likely than females to say that it is difficult for a person to achieve tenure and/or promotion if he or she does not publish ($M = 2.80$, $SD = .96$), $t(128) = 3.17$, $p = .002$, $d = .57$.

Discussion

Academic deans and library directors were chosen as survey respondents for this study because of an underlying assumption that they have a wider view of scholarship at their school than teaching faculty, who view scholarship related mainly to their discipline or department. Both academic deans and librarians speak regularly with faculty across the disciplines, and so the belief was that they would speak intelligently about the perceptions and behaviors of a wide range of faculty relating to scholarship. As shown in this study, librarians have a big impact on supporting scholarship conducted in colleges and universities. There was also the matter of almost one-third of the questions of this survey being about librarians.

The academic deans and library directors of CCCU liberal arts schools view their faculty scholarship policies and the implementation of those policies in a variety of ways. We will first discuss the findings of the survey related to scholarship policy and then concerns centered on tenure.

Scholarship Policy

Defining scholarship is important. Boyer states that “the scholarship of discovery, at its best, contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also the intellectual climate of a college or university” (1990, p. 17). This study not only corroborates previous findings for encouraging the scholarship of discovery in CCCU schools but also contributes new findings to the literature.

Scholarship is encouraged when there are policies in place that describe the vision of what and how much scholarship the university expects from faculty. Mallard and Atkins say that administrators need to develop a long-term plan [a scholarship and/or tenure policy] that emphasizes financial support in the way of grants and release time if they want their faculty to be more regularly engaged in research, because otherwise faculty at CCCU schools do not believe their institutions actually value scholarship (2004). They found that “the lack of a plan or a strategy on most small college campuses was frustrating to many of the focus group participants” (2004, p. 385). Our data support these observations. The fact that 19% of our respondents said they did not know whether their school had a policy may indicate that not much thought had gone into defining scholarship expectations for faculty at those schools or that defining scholarship at their school might be an area of growth, as some of

our data suggested. And since only 58% reported that they actually had a scholarship policy should give pause since our study showed that faculty at schools with policies, even where no tenure is offered, felt that administrators supported scholarship more than faculty at institutions which had no such policies. Our data results also indicated that institutions that have a policy use more ways of encouraging scholarship and value publishing more, further showing the importance of having scholarship policies in place. Even faculty at secular universities struggle with balancing scholarship of discovery, teaching, and meeting department expectations (Franz, 2009). Without policies in place, it is unlikely that CCCU faculty will prioritize the scholarship of discovery if they are not rewarded for doing so. Our results show that being encouraged to do scholarship is not enough to motivate faculty to publish. They need tangible support such as time release and grant money, confirming Hollister (2016), as well as rewards such as tenure and promotion. Therefore, our study shows that having a scholarship policy that includes such incentives is an important first step to encouraging faculty to conduct research.

Tenure and Rank

Having the availability of a tenure system encourages scholarship. Harris and Lumsden studied tenure practices within the CCCU schools and found that 68% of them offered tenure to teaching faculty (2006, p. 342), which compares favorably with the 62% that our study found. Scholarship, they said, was encouraged when scholarship expectations were connected to advancement in rank or advancement in rank plus tenure (2006, p. 348).

Wolverton reported that at research universities “gaining tenure – or the fear of not gaining it – is a significant extrinsic motivator for faculty” (1998, p. 63), and so therefore junior faculty who have not yet gained tenure are more productive than senior faculty that have already gained tenure. The Boyer study reported that 54% of their respondents felt that it was difficult for faculty in the wide range of higher education institutions they surveyed to achieve tenure if they did not publish (1990). Even with greater emphasis at CCCU schools upon teaching over publishing, 41% of the respondents of this study also felt that it would be difficult for their faculty to achieve tenure if they did not publish, and 59% of them indicated that scholarship expectations at their institutions were tied to receiving tenure.

Our study found that teaching has been the longest-standing work category followed closely by college service, findings that are unsurprising. In fact, 69% of our respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the primary criterion for promotion of faculty should be teaching effectiveness. However, the “recently put in place” scholarly work category of Table 1 is important, because it shows recent reorientations or changes between the types of scholarly work that are being emphasized and/or practiced. And since publishing research was the highest scoring

“recently put in place” category, it appears that the scholarship of discovery in CCCU schools is growing, confirming O’Meara’s findings for teaching-oriented schools in general (2006), but this is the first data evidence that such growth is happening in CCCU schools. It is noteworthy that the Harris and Lumsden study of CCCU schools’ tenure policies for schools that have tenure (part 2) mentions scholarship many times (2006), but part 3 that examines CCCU schools that do not offer tenure does not mention the word “scholarship” once (2007).

Unfortunately, many CCCU librarians do not have access to tenure that teaching faculty have. A new finding of our study shows that there is a significant relationship between tenure being available for faculty at CCCU institutions (62% available) and tenure not being available for librarians (72% not available). More of our survey respondents agreed that tenure was available for teaching faculty at their institution than disagreed, but more stated that tenure was not available for librarians than said that it was. In fact, though it was more common for faculty to have tenure but not librarians, it did not happen once that librarians had tenure when faculty did not. This is in direct conflict with the standards put out by ACRL which states, “Librarians should be covered by a stated tenure policy” (2011, sec 5).

Key for librarians being eligible for tenure is having faculty status. Much discussion in library literature of this issue occurred as early as the 1960’s and continues to this day. English surveyed secular research institutions in 1982, for example, and found that 61.4% of state institutions granted librarians faculty status, but only 18.7% of private colleges had done so (1983). A 1993 study of research, comprehensive, liberal arts, and two-year institutions found that an average of 67% of librarians had faculty status (Lowry, 1993, p. 165), which showed gradual increases in librarian faculty status over time. Our survey results compares favorably with these findings with 68.7% of CCCU librarians being reported as having faculty status.

Of the eight ways listed that CCCU institutions support scholarship, including: release time from work, institution-funded scholarship grants, “Best Scholar” top scholarship annual monetary award, stipends for published work, institution covers conference fees (within limits), “Scholarship Week” or other celebration where faculty and librarians can publicly report about their scholarship, endowed chairs for research within one’s discipline, and sabbaticals; librarians were less supported than teaching faculty in every way, even institution-covered conference fees, the scholarship help most often offered to librarians by CCCU schools. This also conflicts with ACRL standards that say, “Sabbatical and other research leaves should be available to librarians consistent with campus standards. Librarians should have access to funding for research projects and professional development consistent with campus standards” (2011, sec. 7). As Coker, van Duinkerken, and Bale noted about the secular major universities they studied, “Library faculty members are on par with teaching faculty members in regard to scholarship and service” (2010, p. 417). This

may be true of those librarians, but we now know that whatever scholarship CCCU librarians are doing, they are doing it with much fewer resources than teaching faculty, as our study clearly shows. Particularly devastating is the release time and institution-funded grants that librarians are not eligible for in so many CCCU institutions, a significant finding because these two elements are known to heavily encourage scholarship (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002, p. 15; Havener & Stolt, 1994, pp. 25, 35).

Our study confirmed previous research regarding the importance of librarians in supporting the research of others, especially at the graduate level (Exner, 2014). Librarians add much to the scholarship process, from providing interlibrary loan services, teaching research skills, to helping with tricky copyright questions. We also showed that librarians are now recognized for being open access advocates (a new and developing area of library science that offers a new model to supplant the failing traditional way of publishing scholarly material), an activity that has been perceived as supporting scholarship in new ways (Crawford, 2011, pp. 53–62; Suber, 2012, p. x, 41).

Summary

A consistent theme throughout this study has been that scholarship is being encouraged to some extent but not usually required at most CCCU schools. Our study supports previous findings that indicate that when scholarship policies are in place, faculty – even those at small Christian colleges – are able to be engaged teacher-scholars (Mallard & Atkins, 2004, p. 385). This study shows that scholarship could be strengthened by more policies in more places that allow for time and money to further persuade faculty and librarians to spend more time in scholarship. While many CCCU schools are working on further clarifying their expectations for scholarship, there is still much room to grow, particularly in relation to librarians.

The culture in which librarians work and the support structures they receive have considerable influence on their motivation to produce research (Hollister, 2016, p. 374). Our study showed that CCCU librarians have less tenure, less defined scholarship guidelines, and less support in all categories of scholarship support, such as travel funds, research grants, and release time than are offered to teaching faculty in CCCU schools. Each of these items have been shown to be important if they are to be encouraged as scholars (Hollister, 2016, p. 374; Perkins & Slowik, 2013, p. 153). The lack of support felt and experienced by librarians regarding research in our study is important for administrators to consider. The benefits of having librarians who conduct research not only benefits the individual scholar-librarian, but also the library, the profession of library science, and the teaching faculty throughout the university.

Implications for Supporting Scholarship

CCCU schools can have a wide positive societal impact beyond local campuses if institutions will more clearly define expectations for faculty and incentivize faculty for developing in the area of scholarship of discovery. It may be wise for administrators who wish to make changes towards increasing research and publishing to take them in incremental steps and over considerable time. Schools should develop a scholarship policy if one is not already in place. Starting with policy will have the greatest impact on how faculty view scholarship support. A second step is to make sure that librarians have faculty status and that the institutional scholarship policy applies equally to teaching faculty and librarians unless the needs of each conflict. Subsequently, tenure needs to be tied to advancement in title or rank. This study as well as others has shown that offering tenure increases faculty activity in discovery and publishing. Encourage faculty to plan towards doing at least two major empirical research projects during their career. Provide competitive scholarship grants with clearly defined requirements, including time release. Clear time and space for research, such as scholarly writing retreats (Kazer, 2013, pp. 215–216). Ensure that any scholarship support that is given to teaching faculty is also given to librarians. Show interest in the research projects of your faculty. Ask about them. Faculty need to know that their scholarship is valued (Mallard & Atkins, 2004, p. 384).

Establish a Scholars Week where faculty and advanced students can report to your school community about their scholarly work. Count teaching and learning projects as scholarship. Create a Center for Teaching and Learning, run by a dean, who can administrate scholarship funds and activities as well as how-to-teach sessions (with lunch provided). Consider offering distinguished chairs for research and teaching excellence. Make a doctorate required to be promoted to a full professor, including for librarians, should they wish to pursue it. Although scholarship projects may not be required for administrators, lead by example.

Work with librarians to support an institutional repository where scholarly material, archival records, institutional history, and conference sessions can be hosted. Be sure your library has a reconsideration process and form to be ready for challenges and other censorship attempts against your library collections. Academic deans and presidents should keep in mind to recommend scholarly support, such as private grants for release time, research projects and related scholarship activities, when out talking with giving-oriented institutional supporters who have assets to share. Be aware of what librarians do for scholarship. As this study showed, their activities in the area are numerous.

Suggestions for Further Research

Although many CCCU institutions have scholarship policies that apply identically to both faculty and librarians, some have different policies for each. Further research needs be done to uncover what those policy differences are and the reasons for them.

There needs to be more examination of the difficulties in doing Christian scholarship. Assuming CCCU faculty enjoy the emphasis on teaching (or else they would go to a publish/perish school), how do CCCU faculty perceive their position in academia intellectually? If time and money were not an issue, do Christian faculty and librarians have philosophical reasons why they do or do not contribute to furthering knowledge in their field? What sorts of support do Christian professors seek? How can presidents and their vice presidents better communicate to constituents how important it is to have active Christian scholars who work at knowing the world? Continued research to explore issues of scholarship policy and tenure and rank within CCCU schools could influence positive societal change by engaging teaching faculty and librarians in faith-integrated scholarship activities. †

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Craighton Hippenhammer, was formerly the Digital Initiatives Librarian at Olivet Nazarene University in Bourbonnais, IL. He retired in 2016. He can be contacted at chhammer@olivet.edu. Garrett Trott is the Librarian at Corban University in Salem, OR. He can be contacted at gtrott@corban.edu.

REFERENCES

- Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(1), 5–17.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2011). *Association of College and Research Libraries standards for faculty status for academic librarians [Professional standards]*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/standardsfaculty>
- Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human Relations*, 61(8), 1139–1160. doi:10.1177/0018726708094863
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W., & Helland, P. (2002). *Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (Vol. 29:2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bucher, G. R., & Patton, J. J. (2004). What would Boyer do? *About Campus*, 9(2), 2–7. doi:10.1002/abc.92
- Burdett, M., Rosenberg, S., Roche, J., Rine, P. J., Bussema, K. E., & Mahurin, R. P. (2013). *Balancing perspectives: Science and religion research and teaching within the member institutions of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities final report*. Washington DC: Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. Retrieved from http://www.scio-uk.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Balancing-Perspectives-Report_Full.pdf

- Coker, C., van Duinkerken, W., & Bales, S. (2010). Seeking full citizenship: A defense of tenure faculty status for librarians. *College & Research Libraries*, 71(5), 406–420.
- Crawford, W. (2011). *Open access: what you need to know now*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (1995). *The disciplines speak: rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (2000). *The disciplines speak II: more statements on rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- English, T. G. (1983). Librarian status in the eighty-nine U.S. academic institutions of the Association of Research Libraries: 1982. *College and Research Libraries*, 44(3), 199–211.
- Exner, N. (2014). Research information literacy: Addressing original researchers' needs. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(5), 460–466.
- Franz, N. K. (2009). A holistic model of engaged scholarship: Telling the story across higher education's missions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement*, 13(4). Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/nancy_franz/2/
- Fulton, B. R. (2016). Organizations and survey research: Implementing response enhancing strategies and conducting nonresponse analyses. *Sociological Methods & Research*. doi:10.1177/0049124115626169
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: evaluation of the professoriate* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gurung, R. A. R., & Wilson, J. H. (2013). Advancing scholarly research on teaching and learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2013(136), 1–6. doi:10.1002/tl.20071
- Harris, S., & Lumsden, D. B. (2006). Tenure policies and practices of American evangelical colleges and universities. Part 2: Institutions granting tenure. *Christian Higher Education*, 5(4), 341–364.
- Harris, S., & Lumsden, D. B. (2007). Tenure policies and practices of American evangelical colleges and universities: Part 3: Schools not granting tenure. *Christian Higher Education*, 6(1), 1–13.
- Havener, W. M., & Stolt, W. A. (1994). The professional development activities of academic librarians: Does institutional support make a difference? *College & Research Libraries*, 55(1), 25–36.
- Hollister, C. V. (2016). An exploratory study on post-tenure research productivity among academic librarians. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(4), 368–381. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2016.04.021
- Hutchings, P. (Ed.). (2000). *Opening lines: Approaches to the scholarship of teaching*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Publications.
- Kazer, M. (2013). Time to publish, not perish. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 34(4), 215–216.
- Lowry, C. B. (1993). The status of faculty status for academic librarians: A twenty-year perspective. *College & Research Libraries*, 54(2), 163–172.
- Lowry, C. B. (2004). Research and scholarship defined for portal: Libraries and the academy. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 4(4), 449–453.
- Mallard, K. S., & Atkins, M. W. (2004). Changing academic cultures and expanding expectations: Motivational factors influencing scholarship at small Christian colleges and universities. *Christian Higher Education*, 3(4), 373–389. doi:10.1080/15363750490507384
- McGowan, J., & Dow, E. (1995). Faculty status and academic librarianship. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 21(5), 345–350.
- Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does It Make a Difference? *Research in Higher Education*, 46(5), 479–510. doi:10.1007/s11162-005-3362-6

- O'Meara, K. A. (2006). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Have academic cultures really changed? *New Directions for Institutional Research*, (129), 77–95. doi:10.1002/ir.173
- Perkins, A. H., & Slowik, A. (2013). The value of research in academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 74(2), 143–158.
- Popping, R. (2015). Analyzing open-ended questions by means of text analysis procedures. *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 128, 23–39. doi:10.1177/0759106315597389
- Railsback, G. L., Williamson, R., & Hamilton-Bunch, J. (2012). Faculty perceptions about tenure at private Christian liberal arts colleges. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 21(2), 132–152.
- Schnaubelt, T., & Statham, A. (2007). Faculty Perceptions of Service as a Mode of Scholarship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(1), 18–31.
- St. Clair, G., Miller, R., & Fiander, P. M. (2000). Academic librarianship and the redefining scholarship project. *The Serials Librarian*, 38(1–2), 63–67. doi:10.1300/J123v38n01_07
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open access*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Trudeau, C. S., & Herrmann, T. W. (2014). Ernest L. Boyer, the Christian college, and the uneasy tension between the curriculum and the cocurriculum. *Christian Higher Education*, 13(1), 61–73. doi:10.1080/15363759.2014.856652
- Vesper, V., & Kelley, G. (Eds.). (1997). *Criteria for promotion and tenure for academic librarians*. Chicago: College Library Information Packet Committee, College Libraries Section, Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Wolverton, M. (1998). Treading the tenure-track tightrope: Finding balance between research excellence and quality teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 23(1), 61–79. doi:10.1023/A:1022972530179