

I Ernest Boyer's 1990 Carnegie report, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, is examined as a "tipping point"—a critical turning point in what is fundamentally valued and rewarded in the scholarly work of faculty members. Special attention is given to the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of engagement.

Beyond *Scholarship Reconsidered*: Toward an Enlarged Vision of the Scholarly Work of Faculty Members

R. Eugene Rice

In the late 1980s serious questions were being raised about how faculty members use their time. Legislators and trustees—even those who had genuinely befriended higher education—were deeply concerned about the quality of undergraduate teaching. Increasingly, the scholarship of most professors was seen as too narrowly specialized and self-referential. In airport bookstores, popular diatribes such as Charles J. Sykes's *ProfScam* (1988) were readily available. On campuses, the old teaching versus research debate raged on ad nauseam. Faculty scholarship was regarded by all too many as fundamentally disconnected from the larger purposes of American society.

By the end of the decade, Derek Bok (1990) would render this stinging indictment:

Armed with the security of tenure and the time to study the world with care, professors would appear to have a unique opportunity to act as society scouts to signal impending problems long before they are visible to others. Yet rarely have members of the academy succeeded in discovering the emerging issues and bringing them vividly to the attention of the public. What Rachael Carson did for risks to the environment, Ralph Nader for consumer protection, Michael Harrington for problems of poverty, Betty Friedan for women's rights, they did as independent critics, not as members of the faculty. Even the seminal work on the plight of blacks in America was written by a Swedish social scientist, not a member of an American university.

After a major social problem has been recognized, universities will usually continue to respond weakly unless outside support is available and the

subjects involved command prestige in academic circles. These limitations have hampered efforts to address many of the most critical challenges to the nation [p. 105].

This was the environment and the set of concerns that gave rise to Ernest Boyer's 1990 Carnegie report.

Scholarship Reconsidered—A “Tipping Point”

More than to review the legacy of *Scholarship Reconsidered* or to celebrate its impact over the past decade, the intent of this chapter is to view the Carnegie report as a “tipping point” phenomenon—a critical turning point in what is fundamentally valued in the scholarly work of faculty members. Malcolm Gladwell's new book, *The Tipping Point* (2000), helps us understand the organizational change process. *Scholarship Reconsidered* was a brief, to-the-point document of less than sixty pages that told us little that we did not already know. However, it did come along at the right time and it addressed the major strains that had developed around the scholarship issue. Most important, it reframed the issue, so that we could get beyond the old teaching versus research debate, rise above the theory/practice hierarchy plaguing higher education, and begin to think in new ways about the alignment of faculty priorities and institutional mission.

In reframing the discussion of what is valued as scholarly work, *Scholarship Reconsidered* may have served as a “tipping point” in the closing decade of the twentieth century, much as was the case with another Carnegie report, *The Flexner Report* (Flexner, 1910), in the opening years of the century. Abraham Flexner's 1910 report on medical education transformed the whole approach to professional education. Schools of medicine were moved into research universities and the scientific component of medical education was markedly increased. Theory and research were given precedence over clinical practice. The 1910 Carnegie report came along at precisely the right time—tipping the balance—and setting in place the hierarchical structure of the key components of professional knowledge for much of the rest of the century. As the other professional fields developed, they adopted the Flexner priorities and followed medicine's suit.

Whether *Scholarship Reconsidered* will have the kind of pivotal influence exhibited by the earlier Carnegie report (Flexner, 1910) will not be fully evident for years to come. It did come along at a very propitious moment, was advocated by a key leader in educational reform at the height of his career, was formulated in response to substantial currents of social and political discontent, and drew on intellectual resources that were circulating around various sectors of higher education but had not been drawn together in a coherent way and focused on the scholarly work of faculty members.

Because I was involved in the formulation of *Scholarship Reconsidered* and later directed a national project committed to its implementation, I have been asked to give my personal assessment of the changes that have taken place in the way we think about and value the scholarly work of faculty members since the publication of the report. I was at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching from 1988 to 1990, when the ideas that went into *Scholarship Reconsidered* were being developed. Following a stint as dean of the faculty and vice president at Antioch College, I moved to Washington, D.C., and I now direct the American Association for Higher Education's Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. My perspective on this topic was profoundly shaped by my direct involvement in the original development of, and then my efforts to implement, the Carnegie report on scholarship. It is a biased perspective that is, I hope, marked by greater clarity because of that direct engagement. This reflects an epistemological assumption that is endemic to the entire report and the work it has stimulated over the past ten years.

In looking at *Scholarship Reconsidered* as a "tipping point," it needs to be made clear that the 1990 Carnegie report was intended from the beginning to be heuristic. It was never intended to impose a particular formulation of the scholarly work of faculty members on American higher education. The report's primary purpose was to reframe the discussion and to open a lively conversation across campuses and disciplines about what faculty members do as scholars on a broad range of fronts. *Scholarship Reconsidered* was a search for new ideas and fresh conceptions of faculty work that would reunite personal and institutional endeavors, bring wholeness to scholarly lives, and, at the same time, meet the broadly diverse and changing educational needs of society.

Scholarship Reconsidered obviously struck a responsive chord. The monograph very quickly became the best-selling publication in the history of the Carnegie Foundation. Colleges and universities across the nation, and across sectors, began to reexamine their tenure and promotion guidelines. Substantive questions about the relationship between faculty priorities and institutional mission began to be raised in a new way.

Ernest Boyer's leadership was pivotal in advancing the reexamination of the faculty role and the reward structure, with special focus on the work of the scholar. No one else had the eloquence, persuasiveness, national visibility, and, frankly, the audacity to take on the task of redefining scholarship. He combined charismatic authority with positional authority in a way that is almost unique in recent American higher education. Furthermore, his insistence that the Carnegie Foundation "speak with one voice" gave the ideas generated out of the institution unusual force. Boyer also brought from his years of political experience in Washington, D.C., and Albany an uncanny sense of timing; nowhere was this talent more fully evident than in the development and release of his 1990 report on faculty

scholarship. Following the publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Boyer committed his very active speaking schedule and writing to the dissemination of the broader notion of scholarship set forth in the report. I have been on more than one university campus where rather heavy-handed provosts and deans were imposing the definitions of scholarship articulated in *Scholarship Reconsidered* and found resistant faculty members complaining of being “Boyerized.”

Moving to the Heart of the Academic Enterprise

Most reports calling for change in higher education—from foundations, associations, and various think tanks—inspire an initial flurry of activity and then disappear. This was not the case with *Scholarship Reconsidered*, in part because the report articulated concerns already visible in the educational climate and drew together ideas ripe for wider attention. To ensure that the broader conception of scholarship set forth in the 1990 Carnegie report would not disappear, however, a new organizational initiative was put into place. Russell Edgerton led the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) (with major support from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) in establishing the AAHE’s Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. In his keynote address at one of the early annual conferences of the Forum, Ernest Boyer (1990a) described how “we are beginning to find a new language, a common language. . . . that will help revitalize research, give dignity to teaching, and help the academy be more responsive.”

Of the many influences supporting the reconsideration of scholarship, none has been more important than the involvement of the various academic disciplines and their professional associations. Those familiar with academic culture know that most faculty members have their identities imbedded in their disciplines and align themselves institutionally with their departments. It was clear early on that any effort to enlarge the conception of scholarly work would have to recognize the disciplinary context within which scholarship is enacted and would need to bring the disciplines into the process of reconsideration. Thanks to the leadership of Robert Diamond and his colleagues at Syracuse University, the professional and disciplinary associations became actively involved in developing guidelines for evaluating and rewarding a broader conception of the scholarly work of faculty members. Professors in the disciplines struggled with the language being used and its relation to the specific field of inquiry. The arts, as might be expected, had the most difficulty with terminology, but they addressed problems—some for the first time—confounding tenure and promotion committees across higher education.

The result of this work with the disciplines is available in two volumes edited by Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam (1995, 2000). In these two books are the statements of twenty professional and disciplinary associations,

completed after long and involved debates across the disciplinary membership and their representative boards. In going to the associations where faculty members have their scholarly identities, this national project advanced the discussion of what counts as scholarship in the tenure process and gave it a legitimacy it would not have had otherwise.

In contrast to most reform initiatives in higher education, where the main thrust of the change effort stays on the periphery of the college or university and gets marginalized, *Scholarship Reconsidered* took the debate to the heart of the academic enterprise—to the definitions of scholarship and to what faculty members are rewarded for doing. Moving the debate on to the disciplines and the departments reinforced its centrality. Over the past decade, it is in the disciplines and the departments that some of the liveliest discussions have ensued and the greatest gains have been made.

AAHE's 2000 Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards marked the tenth anniversary of the publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990b) and took as its central theme "*Scholarship Reconsidered Reconsidered: Up-date and New Directions.*" It was organized around the four forms of scholarship and their interrelationship: the scholarship of teaching, engagement, integration, and discovery. In looking at the new work that has been unleashed since the publication of the 1990 Carnegie report, I want to turn first to the form of scholarly work where the largest advances have been made in the last ten years—the scholarship of teaching. This chapter concludes by examining briefly the "scholarship of engagement"—a form of scholarly work now generating a major upsurge of interest and serious reconceptualization.

The Scholarship of Teaching

When the conceptual framework for *Scholarship Reconsidered* was being constructed, there was already a group of distinguished scholars devoting their professional lives to what later took on the designation "scholarship of teaching." The names William Perry, Joseph Katz, and Lee Shulman stand out. Firm intellectual foundations had been laid for acknowledging teaching as a scholarly enterprise. Without their preparatory contribution, the "tipping point" I have been writing about would not have been reached; the work that is now being conducted under the rubric "scholarship of teaching" would not have moved forward. Their work challenged a number of the terms being considered: the presentation of knowledge was one, and the transmission and dissemination of knowledge were also discussed. All were found to be too one-sided, and did not encompass the interactive character of this aspect of scholarship. They also reinforced the misperception that teaching is merely a packaging and distribution function. All three suggest that teaching and learning stand in a hierarchical relationship. Knowledge is viewed as a finished product; ideas are refined and then passed "down."

Lee Shulman, in a seminal essay “Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform” (1987), reminded us that teaching is a much more dynamic endeavor, transcending the content/process, theory/practice, teacher/student dichotomies that usually shape our thinking. He introduced the awkward but useful term “pedagogical content knowledge” into the conversation. Shulman and his colleagues worked with faculty members in specific disciplines and discovered that there is a knowledge base that is required for effective teaching that is content-specific. It is, in his words, “the capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in an ability and background presented by the students” (p. 5).

In addition to new ways of thinking about teaching and scholarship, there were national projects that, in a practical way, moved the agenda forward. One initiative that proved to be especially pivotal was the AAHE’s peer review of teaching project. Campuses worked together to create new roles for faculty members in improving and ensuring the quality of teaching and learning. Most of the work was organized around disciplines and specific scholarly societies. As with research, where there is a community of discourse and scholarly work is openly shared, critiqued, and evaluated, institutions and disciplines are now beginning to make teaching a public, documented endeavor. Faculty members in specific disciplines work together to develop strategies for reviewing and documenting the intellectual quality of the teaching and whether students are learning what is intended. The participating campuses in the peer review project were for the most part large research universities—for instance, the University of Michigan and Northwestern University. Other institutions with a reputation for taking teaching seriously, such as Alverno College and Xavier University of Louisiana, were included. The peer review of teaching project began with prestigious institutions and faculty leaders with traditional scholarly credentials already intact. As a change strategy, this was intentional.

No longer does the peer review of teaching depend chiefly on the impression of a department chair, the anecdotes of a member of the tenure committee, or one report of a classroom observation. Teaching as scholarly inquiry becomes subject to empirical evidence and the focus of collaborative intellectual inquiry. The peer review of teaching projects generated a wide range of challenging strategies that soon began to be identified as elements of the scholarship of teaching.

Included in the initiatives generated out of the peer review project were teaching circles started at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, and patterned after Japanese quality circles. At the University of Georgia, similar groups meet to grapple with teaching large classes. At Rio Hondo College, faculty members collaborate about teaching on-line and assessing student learning. A teaching circle at Portland State University led the way in developing portfolios for promotion and tenure decisions. Peter Seldin (1997)

reports that as many as a thousand colleges and universities are now using portfolios to provide a fuller assessment of teaching for personnel decision making.

Critical to the establishment and ongoing vitality of the scholarship of teaching was the appointment of Lee Shulman as president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, following the passing of Ernest Boyer. Shulman had provided the intellectual underpinnings for AAHE's peer review of teaching project. In his new position, Shulman established the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) and the Carnegie Scholars program. CASTL is a national network of institutions with teaching academies. This program now has over two hundred colleges and universities wrestling with what the scholarship of teaching and learning means for their campuses. These institutions range from Brown University to Augustana College and from Middlesex Community College to the University of Minnesota. Disciplinary associations are also included in this national initiative. At their annual meetings, the Academy of Management, the American Chemical Society, and the American Sociological Association sponsor symposia on the scholarship of teaching.

As part of a broader view of the scholarly work of faculty members, teaching can be seen as an intellectually challenging task that transcends the exaggerated dichotomies between content and process and between research and teaching. Teaching and learning are emerging as sources of rich, scholarly discourse that have the potential to become the basis for intrinsically rewarding associations and cosmopolitan, public exchange, and they can also be evaluated and assessed with increasing confidence.

The Scholarship of Engagement

Whereas the scholarship of teaching is commanding increased attention and undergraduate teaching has been elevated in the faculty rewards process in many colleges and universities, another form of scholarly work is gaining strength—some would say, renewing its place—as an essential ingredient of scholarship. The scholarship of engagement, as it is now being conceptualized, calls for a major epistemological challenge to the more traditional view of the scholarly work of faculty members and the dominant way knowledge is generated in the academy. The discussion of engaged scholarship today is moving even beyond what was called “the scholarship of application” a decade ago in *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Although honoring what can be learned from practice, the scholarship of application assumes that the established epistemology—where knowledge is generated by faculty members in the university and then applied in external contexts—remains undisturbed and unchallenged. The scholarship of engagement requires going beyond the “expert” model that both informs and gets in the way of constructive university-community collaboration.

The scholarship of engagement being advanced now builds on the important work done by Ernest Lynton (1995) and Lynton and Driscoll (1999). These contributions have advanced our ability to document and promote recognition for faculty work in the application of knowledge. We are now prepared, however, to move beyond those endeavors in fundamental ways. In articulating the scholarship of engagement, faculty members committed to this work are not just calling for “outreach,” as has been the case with the land-grant universities with their agricultural roots. Nor do they want to settle for “service,” with its overtones of *noblesse oblige*. Rather, what is being emphasized is *collaboration*. The learning and instruction will be multidirectional and the expertise will be shared. This represents a basic reconceptualization of faculty involvement in community-based work and will require a concerted effort across disciplines and institutional sectors. It will also involve bringing community representatives into the planning and discussion at the beginning.

Thinking about the scholarship of engagement has benefited enormously from the substantive work of the late Donald Schon (1983) on “the reflective practitioner.” He was an active leader in the reconsideration of scholarship, and his argument that “the new scholarship requires a new epistemology” (1995, p. 27) continues to be very influential. Schon persuasively argued that theory and research, on the one hand, and practice, on the other, had to be realigned, and that in the dominant view of faculty scholarship, theory and practice are hierarchically related, with practice being considered secondary and derivative. He then went on to contend that universities develop an “institutional epistemology” and that “they hold conceptions of what counts as legitimate knowledge and how you know what you claim to know” (1995, p. 34). These theories of knowledge are built into institutional structures and practices—most tellingly in the faculty reward system.

The most recent work on the scholarship of engagement has three components, which parallels the three traditional elements in faculty work: teaching, research, and service. They are engaged pedagogy, community-based research, and collaborative practice.

Engaged Pedagogy. The pedagogical dimensions of the scholarship of engagement require a radically different approach to teaching and learning. If effective learning in such engaged pedagogies as service-learning and learning communities is contextual and social, and if they involve experiencing what it means to be a community—as is claimed—faculty members have to rethink their relationship to students and many of their fundamental assumptions about teaching.

Community-Based Research. In community-based research, the scholarship of engagement calls for a realignment of local and cosmopolitan knowledge. Pure research that is objective, abstract, and analytical is most highly valued and has legitimacy because it can be peer-reviewed by cosmopolitan colleagues, independent of place. Community-based research is of

necessity local—rooted in a particular time and setting. The most knowledgeable peers might well be representatives of the local community and not of the academy. Community-based research calls for shared expertise and challenges established academic criteria. It also needs to be collaborative and requires that the learning be multidirectional, not university-centered and campus-bound.

The profound need—and case—for university-community collaboration has been forcefully articulated by Mary Walshok (1995). There are faculty members across the country and across disciplines who are deeply committed to community-based research and who see the need for engagement as researchers in the larger community but feel restrained by the dominant view of what counts as legitimate scholarship. Nowhere is the clear articulation and support of the scholarship of engagement more urgently needed.

At a time when communities are challenged to improve their capabilities, and colleges and universities must demonstrate their public accountability, community-based research is a way to both strengthen community capacity and respond to the civic responsibility of our institutions of higher education. In contrast with past community research practice, in which community members were simply “human subjects” and passive recipients of information, community-based research—or participatory action research, as it is sometimes called—values the local community perspective and brings it into every phase of the research process.

Collaborative Practice. Work on the third component of the scholarship of engagement begins by taking seriously what Ira Harkavy at the University of Pennsylvania and others have called the Noah Principle: “No more prizes for predicting rain. Prizes only for building the arks.” The focus here is on concrete, protracted community-based problems. Harkavy and his colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania have modeled the kind of local, problem-centered collaborative practice being discussed here in their work with the community issues and public schools in West Philadelphia (the geographic community located adjacent to the University). The strategy being employed here and replicated elsewhere connects school and school system change to a process of democratic community change and development. The strategy is directed at “taping, integrating, mobilizing, and galvanizing the enormous untapped, unintegrated resources of communities, including colleges and universities, to improve schooling and community life” (Benson and Harkavy, forthcoming, p. 2).

The community-higher education-school partnerships, like the ones being developed in West Philadelphia, are the kinds of collaborative practice that are desperately needed. Similar efforts to respond to pressing social needs can be found in local efforts to sustain healthy communities, maintain adequate housing, and combat prejudice. A major stumbling block to active college and university participation in this sort of collaborative work, however, is our inability to attract faculty members who see engagement of this kind as scholarly work that is legitimate, supported, and rewarded.

The scholarship of teaching and learning as part of an enlarged vision of the scholarly work of faculty members has established a firm foothold in the faculty reward systems of many colleges and universities. The scholarship of engagement is only beginning to make a coherent case for recognition that is more than local and idiosyncratic.

“Tipping Point” or “Overloaded Plate”

Reflections on the future of faculty work—and, in this volume, the impact of *Scholarship Reconsidered*—are filled with analogies. I have suggested one: a “tipping point.” Another analogy that has emerged from extensive interviews with early-career faculty members is an “overloaded plate” (Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin, 2000). The first suggests progress, a significant advance; the second, a dire warning. The new faculty members we interviewed reported that, in one sense, it is a new day on campus. Many noted that excellence in teaching is not only expected but is also beginning to be acknowledged and rewarded. Some, though many fewer, see scholarly engagement gaining ground. This is happening, while, at the same time, research and publication retain their dominance in the reward system. There is evidence that what counts as scholarly work is expanding.

An implicit change strategy—an incremental, add-on approach—has been implemented. The scholarly responsibilities of early-career faculty members have not only broadened but have also increased. As our conception of scholarly excellence has become multidimensional, what new faculty members are being held accountable for has enlarged. *Scholarship Reconsidered* has become one of a number of change initiatives escalating what is required for faculty advancement in most colleges and universities. Interviews with new faculty members identified this as a serious problem that must be addressed if we want to attract the best of a new generation into the academic profession. Reconceptualizing and reorganizing the scholarly work of faculty members has only begun.

References

- Benson, L., and Harkavy, I. “Community-Higher Education-School Partnerships as a Strategy to Realize the Democratic Promise of American Schooling and American Society.” *Principal Leadership*, forthcoming.
- Bok, D. *Universities and the Future of America*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1990.
- Boyer, E. L. “The New American Scholar.” Keynote address presented at the AAHE National Conference on Higher Education, San Francisco, Apr. 1, 1990. (1990a)
- Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Menlo Park, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990b.
- Diamond, R., and Adam, B. (eds.). *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1995.
- Diamond, R., and Adam, B. (eds.). *The Disciplines Speak II: More Statements on Rewarding*

- the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.
- Flexner, A. *Medical Education in the United States (The Flexner Report)*. Menlo Park, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910.
- Gladwell, M. *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. New York: Little, Brown, 2000.
- Lynton, E. *Making a Case for Professional Service*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1995.
- Lynton, E., and Driscoll, A. *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1999.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., and Austin, A. E. *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.
- Schon, D. A. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Schon, D. A. "Knowing in Action. The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology." *Change*, 1995, 27(6), 27–34.
- Seldin, P. *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions* (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co., Inc., 1997.
- Shulman, L. "Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform." *Harvard Educational Review*, 1987, 36(4), 1–22.
- Sykes, C. J. *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- Walshok, M. L. *Knowledge Without Boundaries: What America's Research Universities Can Do for the Economy, the Workplace, and the Community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

R. EUGENE RICE is scholar-in-residence at the American Association for Higher Education and director of AAHE's Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards.

Copyright of New Directions for Teaching & Learning is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.