

I. Statement of Mandate(*charge from the VPAA*).

The standard teaching load at Nazareth College has been 24 credit hours per academic year or the equivalent. Factors external to the College are now impacting the nature of the faculty load. For example, New York State Education Department now stipulates that, for teacher preparation programs, faculty who teach both undergraduate and graduate courses may teach no more than 21 credit hours per academic year. Also, some accrediting agencies have higher expectations for professional publications, presentations, and grant writing than has been typical for Nazareth College faculty who teach 24 credits per year; these agencies require that the faculty-teaching load allow adequate time to engage in such activities.

To ensure fairness and equity in future evaluations of faculty performance, the Committee on Rank and Tenure appointed a Task Force on Scholarship to recommend scholarship standards for faculty who are on reduced teaching loads for non-administrative reasons, and for the means by which this scholarship is assessed

II. Description of Assessment Practices and Criteria at Institutions Surveyed

The Members of the Committee surveyed a number of colleges to find out what criteria, if any were used to evaluate faculty scholarship. It appears that schools can be classified into two categories. The first category evaluates faculty scholarship based on a specified quantity and particular types of scholarship. The quantity required and the types of scholarship vary from school to school. The Committee found that the following colleges could be classified as specific: Brockport, Geneseo, Rockhurst, and Gettysburg. Schools in the second category did not specify any particular quantity or type of scholarship when evaluating faculty. This non-specific group includes: Nazareth, LeMoyne, Roberts Wesleyan, Ithaca, and Niagara.

III. Summary of Literature

Members of the committee reviewed several texts related to faculty scholarship, most notably the works of Ernest Boyer: "*Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*" and "*Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*," and agree with his conclusions that 'campus standards of scholarship have become increasingly restrictive', quantitative rather than qualitative, and 'more

imitative than distinctive.' To avoid a restrictive and imitative standard we propose that any discussion and evaluation of faculty scholarship be organized around four overlapping, yet distinctive definitions of scholarship: *the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching*. Also, we believe this broad definition of scholarship is in keeping with Nazareth's tradition of celebrating the diversity of faculty endeavors.

Defining scholarship

(a) *Scholarship of discovery*: Is traditionally viewed as "research". Discovery is viewed as the quest, the search, the advancement for new knowledge. The heart of academic life is seen through the investigations of scholarly pursuit.

(b) *Scholarship of integration*: Is often seen as 'how to give meaning to the knowledge derived from scholarly pursuits' and is closely related to the scholarship of discovery. While discovery may answer the questions - "what is there yet to find? And what is there that the researcher wishes to investigate?" - the scholarship of integration examines what those answers mean. Integration in one discipline, may mean interpretation or interdisciplinary in another.

(c) *Scholarship of application*: Moves toward engagement as the scholar asks "How can knowledge be responsively applied to consequential problems." (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997, p. 9) Lessons learned in the application of knowledge can enrich teaching, and new intellectual understandings can arise from the very act of application. (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997) Theory and practice intersect and interact and each informs and shapes the other.

(d) *Scholarship of teaching*: Focuses critical attention on teaching and learning, including pedagogical practice, teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes. Teaching and learning become the subject of scholarly study. Teaching, informed by scholarship, enables students to comprehend better and participate more fully in the larger culture. Reciprocal benefits flow as faculty members enrich their teaching by building on what they learn in exchanges with students. (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997)

In keeping with the rich traditions that have surrounded scholarship at Nazareth College, we propose that recognized faculty activities and accomplishments reflect the distinctions that exist among definitions of scholarship, as well as the distinctions that exist in individual disciplines relative to scholarship.

While the richness of faculty talents should be celebrated and embraced, all faculty should be held to the highest standards of academic integrity.

All works of scholarship (regardless of the definition) should be evaluated according to a common process that articulates:

- i. clear goals
- ii. adequate preparation
- iii. appropriate methods
- iv. significant results
- v. effective preparation
- vi. reflective critique

IV. Recommendations

Members of the Committee have chosen not to suggest a quantitative college-wide standard for faculty scholarship. This decision was reached after a reading of the literature on faculty scholarship and productivity that notes significant variation across disciplines in the nature of scholarship, how that scholarship is made public, and the likelihood that reputable disciplinary journals will accept submission for publication. The Committee believes such standards will be most appropriately developed at the departmental level where disciplinary characteristics and the scope of a faculty member's teaching reduction will better inform such standards.

The Committee proposes all scholarly accomplishments including discovery, integration, application, and teaching be assessed through a professional profile. In this document faculty will describe personal scholarly intentions and those negotiated with their departmental chairperson, provide a biographical sketch that contextualizes their endeavors, and offer selected samples of their work. We propose that this profile be structured around the common elements of scholarship as noted in *"Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate"*. These elements are a clear statement of goals, evidence of adequate preparation, documentation of significant results, and a reflective critique. As well, the profile should note the means through which the faculty's work has been made public. This might include but is not limited to publication, presentation of papers, performance, and implementation of curricular/programmatic initiatives.

Appendix

Possible Course Reduction Scenarios

Scenario I: Negotiated course reduction (1 or more courses for negotiated period)

Faculty member presents research proposal, which includes a clear statement of goals and evidence of adequate preparation, to the Department Chair and Dean who review the proposal and act on it.

If the proposal is accepted, at the end of the negotiated period, the faculty member must submit documentation of results and a reflective critique,

Scenario II: Ongoing, mandated course reduction (such as the current New York State Education Department's restriction of course load for faculty in graduate education degree programs) or an ongoing contractual reduction for non-administrative reasons.

As part of the yearly evaluation and goal-setting process with the Department Chair, the faculty member outlines goals and objectives for scholarship for the subsequent year.

The faculty member annually submits to the Department Chair documentation of results and a reflective critique.

The Department Chair provides a summary of departmental scholarship to the Dean on an annual basis.