In his 1990 landmark report to the Carnegie Foundation, Ernest L. Boyer concluded that higher education needs to redefine what it means to be a scholar. He proposed a broad definition of scholarship that encompasses four separate and overlapping elements: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Since any definition of scholarship has such a profound effect on faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion, it behooves the faculty of the College of Education and Human Development to ensure that the definition of scholarship fairly represents our faculty’s scholarly activity.

In Chapter 2 of *Scholarship Reconsidered*, “Enlarging the Perspective,” Boyer gives the term “scholarship” a “broader, more capacious meaning”, by defining the four elements, each of which he feels should be recognized as legitimate markers of professional achievement.

The scholarship of discovery comes closest, Boyer says, to the traditional definition of scholarly research. It involves investigative efforts that produce new knowledge, new ideas, new understandings that add to the common store of information.

The scholarship of integration, on the other hand, takes as its province the interpretation of existing research through critical analysis. This scholarship, Boyer explains, does not ask, “What is to be known?” or “What is to be found?” but “What do these findings mean?” Documentation of these first two elements of scholarship can include publications, presentations, significant grant or contract funding, performance, or exhibitions.

The scholarship of application asks, “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?” Researchers pursue this domain through service, bringing their research and understanding to clinical activities in the field. “Theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other”. Documentation may include position papers or reports generated by the service, evaluations by those who received the service, grant or contract funding, or evidence of offices held in regional or national professional organizations.

Finally, there is the scholarship of teaching, a dynamic activity which transforms and extends the professor’s knowledge as he or she seeks to share it with others. Documentation can include student course evaluations, peer classroom evaluations, syllabi, and exams, samples of student work, along with attendance at workshops, engagement in curricular revision, engagement in a major personal examination of teaching – including attending professional conferences or workshops on the subject and undertaking a study documenting the effects of changes – or writing about pedagogy.

Through a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar, Boyer concludes, each of these categories can be honored, both as separate undertakings and as parts of the academic endeavor that enrich one another and the university as a whole.

While it is expected that all faculty members will participate in each of the four domains of scholarship, individuals may choose to concentrate on one or two domains. Such specialization is appropriate as a means of balancing the scholarly work of a department whose members reflect a variety of interests and strengths.
Scholarship in all four domains will be evaluated using the following three criteria: Does the scholarship contribute to the production of knowledge? Does it contribute to the transmission of knowledge? Have colleagues at the local and national level confirmed the relevance and value of the faculty member’s scholarship?

Criteria for Judging Scholarship

1. **Production of Knowledge**

   The production of knowledge is characterized by the search for and creation of new knowledge. This process is marked by technical expertise, professional judgement, and intellectual honesty. Faculty members who excel in the production of knowledge make original and useful contributions that are respected and used by their colleagues and peers, both within and outside the university. Through their efforts, they foster other research, influence their profession and/or the constituents of their profession, and otherwise have an impact on scholarship in their area of specialization. They are aware of new developments and strive to broaden and deepen their knowledge and understanding of their field and, where relevant, related fields.

2. **Transmission of Knowledge**

   The transmission of knowledge is characterized by the act of disseminating knowledge by teaching, writing, and speaking. Faculty members who excel in the transmission of knowledge demonstrate command of the subject matter, and present ideas in a clear, organized, and accurate way. They foster intellectual curiosity, and encourage others to challenge and exchange ideas. They show and generate enthusiasm in subject matter, and are recognized by their students and professional colleagues as scholars who influence how others practice their profession. Faculty who excel in the transmission of knowledge influence other members of their profession through a consistent dissemination of their work that represents new knowledge or a synthesis of knowledge or methodologies. They strive continuously to broaden and deepen their knowledge and understanding of their fields of expertise and stay up-to-date with recent developments.

3. **Peer Review**

   Faculty scholarship is work that makes a meaningful contribution to a field of inquiry. Exemplary scholarship contributes to the evolution of a concept, idea, or proposition, or furthers the reputation and professional development of the faculty member. Accordingly, all scholarly work must be peer reviewed or juried. In the usual sense, the written work or performance would be reviewed/evaluated by a group of peers such as an editorial board in the case of a scholarly journal, a panel of reviewers in the case of a book or book chapter, or a group with expertise in the subject matter for a performance. In a broader sense, peer review may include evaluation by the staff of a governmental agency, a panel of external experts, a committee of peers from a professional association, or the hosts of an invited presentation. In addition, scholarly work may be reviewed post publication.
Documentation

It is the responsibility of the candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure to provide written evidence regarding the quality of his/her work using the three criteria for judging scholarship (production of knowledge, transmission of knowledge, and peer review). This written evidence is designed to acquaint reviewers with the faculty member’s scholarship agenda and is to be submitted as a preface to the scholarship section of the Presentation Document. This statement may be used to discuss personal signature value, relationship to teaching, as well as how this scholarship meets the aforementioned criteria.

Guidelines for External Peer Review

All candidates for promotion or tenure must have their scholarly work externally reviewed or juried. This means that the written work or performance will be reviewed/evaluated by a group of peers recognized for their expertise in the field under review, and who can provide an independent, objective review.

Faculty requesting promotion/tenure will submit a list of at least three scholarly works to be reviewed. In addition, the faculty member will provide to the Dean the names of six possible reviewers. All names submitted must be accompanied by written documentation of the reviewer’s credentials. These names must be submitted to the Dean by May 31st of the year that the candidate is requesting consideration for promotion/tenure. The Dean will select the names of individuals to serve as reviewers and assume responsibility for contacting potential reviewers, insuring they receive all necessary material and instructions for completing the review. When letters from reviewers are received, they will be placed in the faculty member’s presentation file.

Direct and Indirect Faculty Involvement

Faculty involvement in the discovery, integration, application, and teaching of knowledge can be either direct or indirect. Direct faculty involvement implies that a faculty member’s activities are directly responsible for the discovery, integration, application, and teaching of knowledge. Some common examples: conducting a research study may represent the direct discovery of knowledge; teaching a graduate seminar may represent the direct teaching of knowledge; and helping to draft a strategic plan for a school district may represent the direct application of knowledge.

Indirect faculty involvement implies that a faculty member’s activities lead indirectly to the discovery; integration, application, and teaching of knowledge. Some common examples: supervising a doctoral dissertation may represent the indirect discovery of knowledge (as well as, perhaps, the direct teaching of knowledge); serving on a department curriculum committee may represent the indirect teaching of knowledge (as well as, perhaps, the direct discovery or application of knowledge); and speaking to a practitioner group may represent the indirect application of knowledge (as well as, perhaps, the direct teaching of knowledge).

In this context it can be understood that a particular faculty activity may contribute directly to one or more domains of faculty responsibility and indirectly to one or more domains as well. For example, in the example cited above, speaking to a practitioner group may reflect the direct teaching of knowledge and the indirect discovery of knowledge. Similarly, serving as an officer in a professional organization may represent the direct application of knowledge and the indirect discovery and/or teaching of knowledge.
Although both the direct and indirect discovery, integration, application, and teaching of knowledge are important criteria, the evaluation process should give more credence to the direct than to the indirect discovery, integration, application, and teaching of knowledge. Direct contributions are easier to assess, more visible, and more central both to the faculty role and the University mission. At the same time, indirect contributions should be recognized as the result of faculty professional activity, where appropriate.

Complex Cases

Professional Activities. There are a number of professional activities that do not fit neatly into the three scholarly categories described in this document. Among these are activities characterized as “service to the field,” an integral part of the faculty role. Examples of such activities are serving as an officer in a professional organization, serving as an editor of a professional organizations, or reviewing manuscripts or proposals for professional bodies or public agencies. These activities are described as complex because the activity is not descriptive of the specific scholarly contribution. Unlike teaching a class, which is readily recognizable as the transmission of knowledge, editing a journal is an ambiguous scholarly activity. It might reflect the production of knowledge (perhaps by shaping the content and quality of published work), or perhaps the teaching of knowledge (by improving the quality of discourse, or helping an author communicate more successfully with a professional audience). The critical point, however, is that the verb “editing” does not describe the nature of the scholarly activity or activities involved in sufficient detail to categorize them. Serving professional organizations, reading manuscripts or proposals, consulting with the field, and being nominated for or receiving professional recognition or awards represent similar difficulties.

In light of this, faculty preparing narratives describing their professional accomplishments may need to pay special attention to the ways in which they describe the scholarly contributions of activities like the ones described above. In the absence of such explanatory material, there is a risk that the scholarly contributions will be misjudged. Moreover, because the faculty are in the best position to explain the nature of such activities, their interpretations of their contributions to the discovery, integration, application, and teaching of knowledge are invaluable. Instances of professional service that are not readily described as scholarly also are important; these should be grouped with institutional service in a faculty member’s narrative.

Evaluation and Faculty Load

As an element of due process and a principle of fairness, faculty should know the bases on which their accomplishments are to be evaluated. In particular, faculty performance should be evaluated in light of load assignments negotiated between the candidate and the Dean. If faculty and the Dean negotiate faculty participation in the specific projects or activities, faculty performance in those projects or activities should be weighted more heavily than their performance in other areas. Individual faculty and the Dean share the responsibility of ensuring that such negotiated load assignments are consistent with the standards specified in this document.

Balance Among Discovery, Integration, Application, and Teaching

The scholarly work of faculty members is as individual as the members themselves. Some faculty focus on discovery while others concentrate on application. Faculty scholarship may be broadly or narrowly focused. Balance among the four domains will not be an evaluative criterion;
scholarly balance is better accomplished at the department and college level.

**Balance Between Merit and Worth**

Merit refers to judgments, scholarly accomplishments of individuals, independent of the institutional context. In contrast, worth refers to judgments about the value of these scholarly accomplishments to the institution. Scholarly accomplishments that are widely valued in a national or international scholarly community, but that do not contribute to a program, departmental, or College mission, may be of little worth to the institution. Similarly, scholarly activity consistent with program, department, or College priorities, and hence reflecting substantial worth in the institutional context, may be of little merit in the eyes of a wider scholarly audience. The evaluation process should take account of both merit and worth. While specific activities may be valued more highly by one scholarly community than the other, the expectation is that the body of faculty accomplishments should reflect at least moderate levels of both merits, judged by a broad scholarly community, and worth, judged by the University of Southern Maine community.
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