

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
29(2000), 227-229

Scholarship Reconsidered, Scholarship Assessed: What Boyer's Report Means for Communication

REBECCA B. RUBIN

ERNEST Boyer (1990, p. xi), in the preface to *Scholarship Reconsidered*, asked: "What activities of the professoriate are most highly prized?" He noted that shifting priorities over time have resulted in students who are "the losers" because on many campuses teaching is not well rewarded. He urged academics to develop a new view of the professoriate as one that supports four views of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching.

What this meant, for many colleges who adopted this new schema, was that the traditional "teaching vs. research" system had to be altered in faculty promotion, tenure, and retention documents. Along with changes in these documents had to come (a) a change in attitude about what "counts" as scholarship and (b) an agreement that all forms of scholarship are equal.

This last step has been difficult for faculty who have been raised on the more traditional model. It was even more difficult prior to the publication of *Scholarship Assessed* (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997), because departments had no guidelines for evaluating what seemed to be apples and oranges. However, according to a Carnegie Foundation survey, increasing numbers of colleges are considering additional means of assessing teaching and research (Magner, 1997). Under consideration for teaching effectiveness are peer review methods, learning outcomes assessment, and the impact of teaching on research and applied scholarship. Colleges and universities are also considering additional means of evaluating research and applied scholarship, including the project's impact on teaching and student participation in research and applied projects. Thus, the distinction between research and teaching is increasingly becoming blurred. At Kent State University, the first university to adopt the *Scholarship Reconsidered* model, we learned that when one's university adopts the new system for rewarding scholarship, clear guidelines about what each form means and how its worth can be assessed are needed for informed retention, tenure, and promotion decisions (Magner, 1997).

In 1993, the *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration (JACA)* published a special issue on the theme of Scholarship Reconsidered: Hunt (1993) summarized the general impact of this report on faculty and colleges, Andersen (1993) looked at reward structures, Chesebro (1993) considered the impact of the report on the discipline, Boileau (1993) focused on methods of assessing teaching, and Applbaum (1993) provided insight into why such a report is attractive and what it can do for higher education. Now, seven years later, even though the Carnegie Commission has shifted its emphasis from policy to teaching issues (Leatherman, 1997), we witness increasing acceptance of the Boyer model (Magner, 1997) and think that the time is right for a careful examination of how this "reconsideration" of scholarship affects the way in which it is assessed. This symposium (of papers originally presented at the 1998 National Communication Association conference) focuses on the four reconsidered forms of scholarship: what they are and how they can be assessed.

First, Jean Dobos discusses the Scholarship of Discovery. Typically Discovery is what most consider to be "research"; it involves the creation of new knowledge. Second, Carole Barbato considers the Scholarship of Integration: work that gives meaning to facts by "putting them into perspective" (Boyer, 1990, p. 18), work that connects diverse worlds or perspectives, or work that provides additional understanding to the already known. Third, Rozell Duncan and Mary Anne Higgins describe the Scholarship of Application, which focuses on how knowledge can be used to solve important problems. And fourth, Jerry Feezel and S. A. Welch explain the Scholarship of Teaching and the pedagogical procedures required to qualify teaching as scholarship.

Following these considerations, two viewpoints are offered about this new definition of scholarship and what it means in tenure, promotion, and merit contexts. First, Judith Trent provides a view from administration, and then Alan Rubin offers a faculty perspective. We hope the points raised in this issue and by these articles will assist other universities who are considering changes to their evaluation system.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Rebecca B. Rubin (Ph.D., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1975) is Professor of Communication Studies at Kent State University, Kent, OH.

Andersen, K. E. (1993). Scholarship reconsidered: The changing reward system. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 9-13.

Applbaum, R. L. (1993). Scholarship reconsidered: A reflection. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 25-30.

Boileau, D. M. (1993). Scholarship reconsidered: A challenge to use teaching portfolios to document the scholarship of teaching. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 19-23.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Chesebro, J. W. (1993). Scholarship reconsidered: Its impact on the communication discipline. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 14-18.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hunt, G. T. (1993). Scholarship reconsidered: Role definition and its impact on the faculty. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 3, 1-8.

Leatherman, C. (1997, May 2). The Carnegie Foundation shifts its location and its emphasis. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Magner, D. K. (1997, September 5). Report says standards used to evaluate research should also be used for teaching and service. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A18-A19.