

Finally, Bruno Moser has written an excellent essay on the subject of retirement, a difficult transition for many faculty, especially regarding nonfinancial concerns. He has dealt with a number of issues ranging from retirement planning, alternatives, incentives, and the impact that retirements can have on a department. Faculty approaching this milestone still have much to offer, and, although their roles and contributions may change, they must remain productive department members.

This colloquium focuses on the issues and concerns faculty have during their professional career. These challenges and concerns change during the span of an individual's academic tenure. The presenters

have provided information that can assist individuals and departments to remain productive and accomplish their goals.

Literature Cited

- Anderson, M. 1992. *Impostors in the temple*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Diamond, R.M. and B.E. Adams (eds.). *Recognizing faculty work: Rewards systems for the year 2000*. New directions in higher education no. 81. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Meyer, J. 1993. The stalemate in food and agricultural research, teaching, and extension. *Science* 260: 881, 1007.
- Myers, M. 1993. Higher education's crisis of imagination. *ACE* 42(11):5.

Faculty Scholarship and Productivity Expectations— An Administrator's Perspective

C.J. Weiser¹

Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331

The value system of a university is most clearly described by its promotion and tenure policies, and by the criteria it uses to evaluate faculty members' performance. In American universities, all professors are expected to engage in scholarship, and each professor is also expected to perform other job responsibilities assigned to his or her position. These assigned responsibilities typically include specific teaching, research, extension, advising, or administrative assignments.

The balance of emphasis between scholarship and other assigned duties varies from one faculty position to another—ranging from faculty with few assignments beyond engaging in scholarship, to faculty with extensive responsibilities for other assigned duties who devote a small but significant effort to scholarly achievement.

All faculty members are also encouraged to perform service relevant to their assignment and of value to their institution or profession, but tenure and promotion decisions are typically based on evidence of significant scholarly contributions and effective performance of assigned duties—not on outstanding service. Scholarship and performance of assigned duties are both valued highly at most universities, and faculty members are denied tenure if performance is inadequate in either area. Excellence, not adequacy, is the performance goal for university faculties.

Evaluating a faculty member's scholarly contributions and assessing how well he or she has performed the specific duties assigned to the position seems appropriate and fairly straightforward. Unfortunately, it is often neither simple nor straightforward, in part because:

- Scholarship is undefined and poorly understood at most universities. Scholarship is often oversimplistically thought to be synonymous with research.
- A faculty member's performance is sometimes evaluated by peers without reference to the position description—as if all faculty positions were the same.
- Emphasis on individual achievement in faculty performance is interpreted by some peer evaluators to imply that faculty contributions to team efforts are not valuable and important—as if it were not possible to value both individual achievement and collaborative effort.
- It is easier to document and evaluate form and activities, rather than substance or consequences, in describing and assessing faculty contributions.

There are discussions underway at many American universities of ways to improve faculty evaluations and the processes of promotion

and tenure. These discussions are prompted in part by the limitations mentioned above, but also by growing public dissatisfaction and distrust of universities' values, which are perceived to be:

- primarily focused on research and research funding, rather than on undergraduate education;
- introspective, with communications of faculty accomplishments directed predominantly at specialized peer audiences; and
- overspecialized, discipline focused, and not particularly relevant or responsive to real problems, which tend to be complex.

Publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered—Priorities of the Professoriate* (Boyer, 1990) stimulated much of the discussion of scholarship currently taking place within universities and professional societies. In this book, and in frequent public talks, Dr. Boyer makes an eloquent case for the importance of valuing teaching more highly in assessing faculty performance. He poses the question "Is it possible to define the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates?" and answers it by proposing "that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of *discovery*; the scholarship of *integration*; the scholarship of *application*; and the scholarship of *teaching*."

At Oregon State Univ. (OSU), Dr. Boyer's book *Scholarship Reconsidered* provided the starting point for discussion by a group composed of faculty members in the College of Agricultural Sciences whose primary assignments were in diverse areas, including teaching, research, extension, and international programs. The group's objectives were to develop a collective understanding of what scholarship is, and to describe the nature of scholarship across the university in concise terms that would be understood by faculty in all disciplines and by nonacademics as well.

In the course of a year, this faculty group defined scholarship simply: scholarship creates something new that is validated and communicated. They described five forms of scholarship that were similar to the four proposed by Boyer, except that *creative artistry* was added as a fifth form of scholarship, and learning was added to propose the scholarship of *teaching and learning*. This definition and these concepts were subsequently improved, as described later.

This simple definition and description of scholarship provided the basis for widespread faculty discussion, especially within the College of Agricultural Sciences at OSU. These discussions resulted in five iterations of review and revision, and evolved over a 2-year period into:

- adoption of revised promotion and tenure guidelines for the College, based on the definition and description of *scholarship*;
- incorporation of a *position description* for each faculty member into annual evaluations and into the promotion and tenure process;
- addition of a category on *results of team effort* into the format for faculty documentation of their achievements; and

Received for publication 29 Jan. 1996. Accepted for publication 3 May 1996. The cost of publishing this paper was defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. Under postal regulations, this paper therefore must be hereby marked *advertisement* solely to indicate this fact.

¹Horticulture Professor Emeritus and Dean Emeritus, College of Agricultural Sciences.

- encouragement of departments to assign two peer counselors to new faculty members to assist them in their early career development.

Deans of other colleges at the university participated in describing and defining scholarship, and recommended its consideration by the entire university. Faculty understanding and acceptance of this concept of scholarship was remarkably widespread and enthusiastic. Essentially, all faculty members who considered the matter, and all college deans, were comfortable with the simple definition of scholarship proposed, and with the idea that discovery, application, integration, and creative artistry are fundamental forms of scholarship. One point that troubled a substantial number of faculty was inclusion of teaching as a form of scholarship. Interestingly, faculty members who expressed the greatest reservations about teaching as a form of scholarship included many effective teachers in agriculture with large teaching assignments, faculty members in education departments, and faculty members in departments with large undergraduate teaching loads, such as English and chemistry. Subsequent university-wide adoption of an improved definition and description of scholarship resolved these reservations by considering teaching, research, and extension as vital university activities, not as forms of scholarship.

Another perception that troubled some faculty members (but not the distinguished researchers on campus) was the notion that defining and describing forms of scholarship as discovery, development, integration, and artistry somehow lowered standards or diminished the importance and value placed on research by the university. Most faculty members realized that standards of performance were probably being raised rather than lowered, and that research continues to be highly valued. In a similar vein, one faculty senator expressed concern that recognizing faculty contributions to collaborative team efforts somehow diminished the importance and value placed on individual achievements by the university. Both examples reflect *zero-sum game* thinking that fortunately was rare among members of the faculty.

The definition and policies adopted by the College of Agricultural Sciences were subsequently studied, refined, and endorsed by an Extended Education Transition Committee that was appointed and chaired by the Provost to advise the President on implementation of a major new initiative that established extended education as the university's *third mission*. This initiative required each college and department to develop an *extended education* plan for delivering educational programs beyond the campus. Extension faculty (agents and specialists) are now assigned to, evaluated by, and tenured in colleges and departments—rather than in Cooperative Extension, as was the case previously.

The Provost appointed a Faculty Senate Committee to consider recommendations and propose revisions in the OSU promotion and tenure guidelines.

This highly diverse cross-disciplinary faculty senate committee devoted a year to intensive weekly deliberations to revise promotion and tenure guidelines. The new guidelines were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate in May 1995, and subsequently adopted in June by the university president. The new guidelines drew substantially from concepts developed initially by the College of Agricultural Sciences and the Extended Education Transition Committee, but the Faculty Senate Committee improved on several points, including the definition of scholarship, as described below.

OSU's new promotion and tenure guidelines define scholarship more broadly, value team efforts, and use position descriptions as a basis for evaluating faculty performance. The guidelines have eliminated any need for several separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines previously used to assess faculty performance in library and information services, extension, international development, veterinary medicine, and several other specialized areas. The new guidelines are helping to alleviate the concerns of extension agent faculty members who wondered how well their work would be understood and valued by teaching and research colleagues in campus departments.

Key elements of the newly adopted OSU promotion and tenure guidelines include the following:

- Scholarship is defined as *creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated*.

- Four forms of scholarship are described: *discovery* of new knowledge; *development* of new technologies, materials, and uses; *integration* of knowledge leading to new understanding; and *artistry* that creates new insights and interpretations.
- Recognizes that teaching, research, and extension are vital university activities—that are not scholarship in themselves—but that can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated scholarship in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry).
- Recognizes that peer validation and communication can occur in a variety of ways including, *but not limited to, peer refereed publications*. Emphasizes documenting whether, not how, peer validation and communication has occurred. Emphasizes “communication in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself.”
- Identifies *performance of assigned duties* and *scholarly achievement* as the two primary areas for evaluating faculty performance. Service is considered to be a less important area of performance evaluation.
- Requires that a *position description* identifying assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort in these two areas provide the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance. States that “the responsibilities of individual faculty vary and will be specified in position descriptions developed at the time of initial appointment and revised periodically as necessary. Faculty with assignments in research, extension, international development, information services, student services, diagnostic and analytical services, and administration will be evaluated by the standards appropriate to the field.”
- Recognizes that some faculty positions are devoted primarily to conducting scholarly work, with few additional assigned responsibilities, and that other faculty positions have extensive assigned duties (in areas such as teaching, advising, extension, or administration) and a small but significant expectation of scholarly achievement.
- Affirms that *scholarly achievement is expected of all professional rank faculty members*, regardless of their assigned duties (including administrators such as the university president, provost, deans, and department heads). Administrators' scholarship can be in a subject matter discipline, or in creative intellectual work developing better management methods (that are validated by peers and communicated) in their area of administrative responsibility.
- Recognizes that teachers and extension educators also have the option of focusing their scholarship either in a subject matter discipline or in developing, providing for peer validation, and communicating improved education materials, methods, and programs.
- Recognizes that international disciplinary peers are the primary audience for most types of research scholarship, but that the primary audiences may be regionalized or localized for some of the scholarship in teaching, extension, and field research that is locally adapted. The promotion and tenure guideline language was changed to reflect this reality from “professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship” to “professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession.”
- States that *the University values and encourages collaborative work*, and asks faculty members to report specifically the results of their team efforts in documenting their contributions.
- Recommends that *documentation of achievements* focus (when ever possible) on *what* was accomplished rather than *how* it was accomplished; on *substance* rather than *form*; on *accomplishments* rather than *activities*. In short, documentation should describe what has changed or improved as a result of a faculty member's efforts.

SUMMARY

The definition of scholarship developed and adopted by OSU differs from that proposed by Ernest Boyer. Specifically, Dr. Boyer

described characteristics of scholarship throughout his book (1990), but he did not define scholarship. He proposed "four separate but overlapping functions" of the professoriate as: "the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching." In proposing these four functions as forms of scholarship Dr. Boyer in effect classified most, if not all, important faculty activities as scholarship.

In contrast, the OSU guidelines consider that a university and its faculty perform essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. Scholarship is considered to be creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated, and several forms are described including: *discovery* of new knowledge; *development* of new technologies, materials, and uses; *integration* of knowledge leading to new understandings; and *artistry* that creates new insights and understandings.

This description of scholarship does not assume that most faculty activities are scholarship. It recognizes, in fact, that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not only by university faculty members. It emphasizes the importance of validation by peers to help ensure validity, and of communication to broader audiences to ensure that the results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others. Nonacademics who have reviewed the

new OSU guidelines understand and value this concept of scholarship.

Specifically, the OSU guidelines consider teaching, research, and extension to be important university (and faculty) activities—but do not view these activities as scholarship. The OSU and Boyer approaches are similar in that both achieve the aim of broadening the view of scholarship beyond research, and both articulate, advocate, and provide a mechanism for recognition of scholarship in areas such as teaching, learning, and education. Dr. Boyer does this by proposing that teaching is scholarship. The OSU model does so by recognizing that scholarship in teaching can occur in the areas of discovery, development, integration, or artistry—whenever creative intellectual work in teaching is validated by peers and communicated.

The process at OSU that led to adoption of new promotion and tenure guidelines, and the new concepts and ideas about scholarship and performance that were distilled out of those faculty deliberations may prove useful to others who are interested in these issues.

Literature Cited

Boyer, E.L. 1990. Scholarship reconsidered, Priorities of the professoriate. A special report. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, N.J.

Junior Faculty: Their Needs and Professional Development

L. Dee Fink

Instructional Development Program, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019

Institutions of higher education, like all large-scale organizations, must deal with the task of regularly incorporating new personnel into their systems of operation. Many of these newcomers originate from preparatory programs which, in the case of higher education, are graduate schools; others are experienced personnel who transfer from other institutions. Both groups face the challenge of having to learn quickly how to fit into new roles and how to adapt to the peculiarities of a particular institution.

This process, which takes place every year and continues well beyond the first year, raises a number of questions that have begun to be addressed by research and by new institutional practices. This paper will address four of these questions:

- 1) Why is it important for academic administrators to attend to the professional development of junior faculty?
- 2) What is happening now to new faculty members as they enter new institutions?
- 3) What are the reasons for these problems?
- 4) What is being done and can be done to better assist the professional development of new faculty?

In discussing these questions, I will summarize some of the major research and institutional practices of the last two decades.

IMPORTANCE OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF JUNIOR FACULTY

The prospect of hiring a new faculty member into a department is exciting: it provides an opportunity to bring new ideas and workers into the unit, but it also incurs a major cost for the department. This cost includes the direct cost of advertising the position and transporting candidates for interviews, and the much larger indirect cost of tying up major amounts of faculty time for defining the position, preparing the advertisement, keeping track of applications, reviewing the applica-

tions, creating a short list, hosting and listening to candidates, deciding who to make an offer to, etc. When these two sets of costs are added together, the real total cost of hiring a new faculty member probably runs into tens of thousands of dollars. Limiting the frequency of such costs by reducing unnecessary turnover of unhappy new faculty members is the first reason academic administrators should concern themselves with the welfare and professional development of new faculty members.

The second reason has a more long-term basis. If a new faculty member stays at an institution for his or her whole career, the institution will eventually spend well over \$1 million in salaries and benefits. Some faculty members will make a big return on this investment in terms of high quality teaching and scholarship; others will stagnate after a few years. The difference between faculty members at these two ends of the spectrum stems primarily from their attitude towards and success in working on their own professional development. To ensure that faculty members stay productive over time, it is necessary to start professional development activities early.

The third reason has to do with changing times. It is very easy for academic administrators to think in terms of their own experiences as a new faculty member when working with today's new faculty. The problem with this response is that many of the junior faculty coming into academic today are quite different from those of yesteryear. A significantly larger percentage are women, ethnic minorities, or immigrants. Therefore, administrators need to learn about the felt needs of today's junior faculty.

CURRENT PATTERNS AND PROBLEMS

Researchers have been studying the situation of new faculty members during the last two decades. I have been concerned with what happens specifically during the first year of being a faculty member (Fink, 1984); others have studied what happens during the next 4 to 5 years after that (Boice, 1992a; Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992). I will summarize some of the major points of these studies.

The study of beginning college teachers was one I conducted, collecting data in the late 1970s on 100 people who had just finished graduate school and were in their first year as college teachers. These people came from the major graduate institutions in the United States

Received for publication 29 Jan. 1996. Accepted for publication 25 May 1996. The cost of publishing this paper was defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. Under postal regulations, this paper therefore must be hereby marked *advertisement* solely to indicate this fact.