SWAP SESSION NEWSLETTER
None of us is as smart as all of us. -Roy Disney

SWAP SESSION: “Scholarship Reconsidered and Assessed”
given by
Dr. Charles Glassick, a co-author of the text “Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of
the Professorate,” a Senior Associate Emeritus of the Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching, and also a former President of Gettysburg College. He
spoke during this encore presentation about how faculty scholarly activity is
assessed.
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Sponsored by the Faculty Exchange for Teaching Excellence

BOYER’S FOUR FORMS OF SCHOLARSHIP
The vocabulary has opened us up to talk about what it is we do!

1. Scholarship of Discovery
   - Research completed and made available for review

2. Scholarship of Integration
   - Overcome fragmentation.
   - Determine what the results mean.
   - Decide what the value is associated with the finding or study?

3. Scholarship of Engagement
   - Does the scholar move toward engagement with the
     consequential problems of our society (i.e., economic, moral,
     political, scientific, environmental, etc.)?

4. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
   - This individual uses what is known about learning and finds
     different ways of promoting, understanding, communicating, and
     teaching, and applies these components to the learning process.
   - In addition, their work must be made public, made available for
     peer review, and must be usable by professionals who wish to
     use it and promote it
Dr. Glassick and his colleagues set out to determine what guidelines people use to define a project as scholarly. They asked: research referees, directors of scholarly presses, and funding agencies, and they found 6 common themes.

What criteria are used to define scholarly work?

1. Clear Goals
   Was the basic purpose clearly stated? Were the goals realistic and achievable? Was an important question defined?

2. Adequate Preparation
   Did the individual demonstrate an understanding of prior scholarship completed in the specific field? Did he/she obtain the resources needed for the project? Did he/she bring a wealth of knowledge to the project?

3. Appropriate Methods
   Were the methods appropriate to the project’s goals? Were the methods used effectively? Were procedures modified to suit changing circumstances?

4. Significant Results
   Were the project’s goals achieved? Does the work make significant contributions? Were new areas indicated for exploration? Were the goals rationale and useful within the field?

5. Effective Communication
   Was the project well written? Will the intended audience understand? Did the researcher(s) use a suitable style and effective organization? Were outcomes presented with clarity and integrity?

6. Reflective
   Did the individual critically evaluate the outcomes? Was there an appropriate breadth of evidence used in the critique? Was a critical evaluation used to improve the quality of future work?
Dr. Glassick Identifies 3 Essential Qualities of a Scholar

1) **Integrity**
   Intellectual work that lacks integrity is **not** scholarly.

2) **Perseverance**
   A scholar must stay in touch with developments in the field. A scholar must know what is available to him/her.

3) **Courage**
   A scholar must be willing to put his/her work in the public domain. He/she must be willing to sometimes take an unpopular position on his/her findings, and he/she must be willing to risk disapproval of and transcend from traditional ways.

Guidelines to Follow When You are Presenting Your Work to an Evaluation Committee:

1. Provide detailed documentation for **quality** (list for quantity if desired).

2. **Document to the standards.**
   - choose artifacts and materials that prove effectiveness

3. **Directly address these statements.**
   - These are my goals.
   - Here’s how I prepared.
   - This is how I arrived at my results.
   - Provide a statement of expectations.
The process of evaluation should be held to the same standards as scholarship itself.

Dr. Glassick emphasized that “reflective critique” should be an essential act of the evaluation committee. The committee should ask themselves, “what can we do now and in the future to make this a more trustworthy process?”

- Inform candidates of the time schedule.
- Present clear goals to the candidates in an effective manner.
- Review the standards from the previous year (i.e., attempt to maintain continuity).

Upcoming Events!

- Dr. Vicki Clegg, Ph.D. “Teaching Tips for Graduate Students (and Their Mentors).” August 21 or 22, 2002, time to be announced.

- Dr. John Bean, Ph.D. “Using Writing To Foster Learning in Your Courses.” October 15 or 16, 2002, time to be announced.