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 applica-
tion; and the scholarship of teaching." In proposing these four func-
tions 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 under-
standings; 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.
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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.

IMPORTANT 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 mem-
bers 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 immi-
grants. 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
teachers 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
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and went to a variety of colleges in North America and a few other countries. I collected questionnaires from the faculty members at different times throughout the first year, collected other questionnaires from their chairs and colleagues, had a course evaluation instrument administered in one of their courses, and had site visits and interviews with about one-third of them.

These people varied greatly in terms of how well they fared during that first year. Four major problems had a significant impact on the majority of new teachers:

Teaching Load. The first problem was the teaching load they were given. Most new teachers ended up with a load similar to that of other faculty members, meaning two to four courses per term, depending on the institution. This arrangement is problematic because most, and sometimes all, courses taught by beginning teachers are “new preparations.” “New preparations” are courses being taught for the first time. These courses generally take twice as much time to teach well, because one is finding and organizing material, and preparing tests and assignments, all for the first time. Hence, these courses have a workload equivalent that is twice as heavy as for a course that has been taught three or more times. Thus, new faculty members, who were still trying to become familiar with their new institution and the full range of responsibilities, had a teaching load that was twice the work load as that of their more experienced colleagues.

What effect did this have on the quantity and quality of their faculty work? First, it had a major impact on the quality of their teaching. Several factors (e.g., class size and total number of sessions per week) affected the end-of-semester student evaluations of these new teachers. But none had the dramatic effect of the number of separate subject matter preparations (Table 1).

How often was this a problem? Over half (56%) of the new teachers in this study had four or more separate subject matter preparations during their first year (Table 2). Assuming that most, or nearly all, of these were new preparations for these teachers, this means the majority of them had the work load equivalent of eight or more courses during their first year! This is clearly a problem that academic administrators need to address.

Heavy teaching loads also had an adverse effect on other scholarly activities. When the study sample was divided into groups, based on the size of their teaching load, the teachers with heavier loads understandably were less successful in submitting articles for publication, submitting grant proposals, and preparing papers at national conferences. Surprisingly, teachers with heavy teaching loads were somewhat more successful at finishing their dissertations if they left graduate school without having these finished (Table 3).

Intellectual Companionship. A second common first-year problem involved relationships with professional colleagues. During the site visits, I met a new faculty member who was depressed because he had been given a classroom closet for an office and had not been invited to departmental faculty meetings, to field trips with visiting professionals, or to supper by any other faculty member (this was in a small, rural Midwestern town). Consequently, I later asked all participants in the study to indicate in a questionnaire whether they had “found intellectual companionship with their colleagues.” Nearly two out of three said they had not (16%), or had, but only to a limited degree (48%).

Other studies (Sorcinelli, 1988; Boice, 1992a) have found that the prospect of being in a profession where people regularly get together to share ideas intellectually was a major reason many people entered the academic profession. But the lack of substantial contacts with their colleagues was frequently a major source of disappointment and stress. Many new professors feel lonely and isolated.

Relating to the Institution. A third common problem had to do with a factor I eventually called “identification with the institution.” It seems some people easily identify with the kind of institution they are in and others do not. My awareness of this factor again came from my site visits. One of the people I visited had been a “not too serious” student as an undergraduate. But when he attended a well-known, intense private research university as a graduate student, he got very excited about doing research and personally-driven inquiry. But he was teaching in a small church-related institution, and he just did not find the same concern here for research that had so excited him in graduate school.

At first I thought the issue was whether one’s present institution was similar to or different from one’s graduate school. But at the very next site visit, I encountered a person who had gone to a large state-supported research university and was teaching at a small liberal arts college. During the interview, I discovered that, although he had successfully completed his graduate studies at the large university, he never felt as comfortable there as he had at his undergraduate institution—a small liberal arts college much like his present institution.

This new information suggested that people vary in how they “identify with” diverse kinds of institutions. Therefore, I proceeded to ask all participants to indicate (a) of the institutions they had attended as a student, which they “most identified with” and (b) whether their present institution was similar to or different from the one they

Table 1. Effect of number of course preparations on course evaluation scores
(from Fink, 1984, Table 12, p. 42).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of concurrent preparations during term of evaluation</th>
<th>Average course evaluation score (Scale: 1–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of course preparations during first year (from Fink, 1984, Table 9, p. 40).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of separate course preparations during the first year</th>
<th>Percentage of all new teachers in study (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Effect of teaching load on other scholarly accomplishments (from Fink, 1984, Table 34, p. 92).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching load</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Grant proposals</th>
<th>Finished dissertation*</th>
<th>Made presentations at national meetings (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light 64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy 43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very heavy 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These categories were based on the number of courses and the number of different preparations each teacher had.

Table 4. Identifying with the institution: Effect on teaching performance (from Fink, 1984, Table 14, p. 46).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution identified with and present institution are</th>
<th>Average course evaluation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very different</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More different than similar</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More similar than different</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Teacher-student similarity: Effect on teaching performance (from Fink, 1984, Table 22, p. 58).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dimensions of teacher-student similarity</th>
<th>Average course evaluation score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 (Very similar)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Very different)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>