

St. Olaf College
Department of Romance Languages
Statement of Significant Professional Activity

Introduction¹

The statement which follows, intended for multiple audiences, including newly-hired faculty, candidates for tenure and promotion; departmental colleagues preparing letters of evaluation regarding candidates for re-appointment, tenure and/or promotion; members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee; the Dean and the President of the College; and outside reviewers. The statement sets forth general expectations, guides the shaping of Department members' plans, and provides criteria for the evaluation of performance. While all the components of professional activity discussed below are important, it is important to realize that their significance may be relative to the individual situation. We therefore emphasize the need to read and to apply this document in a flexible way.

The Department of Romance Languages seeks to attract and maintain a distinctive faculty committed to undergraduate teaching. We thus affirm the expectations of faculty stated in the Faculty Manual: "While the College gives primary emphasis to effective undergraduate instruction, it holds that high quality teaching is inseparable from scholarly and creative effort, and it expects that members of its faculty will ground their teaching in research, scholarship, and creative activity" (p. 4-14). While the statement which follows speaks only to significant professional activity, it should be understood in the context of a department member's involvement in the other two areas where the college stipulates standards for faculty evaluation: effective teaching and other contributions to the purposes of the college. We emphasize the importance of this context, for the Department has a tradition of high expectations for committed teaching and for involvement in activities outside the department, including participation in interdisciplinary programs. Moreover, exceptional service to the college may be part of public professional activity at some points in an individual faculty member's career.

As is to be expected at a liberal arts college, a faculty member teaching French and/or Spanish has a diverse course load which always involves the considerable demands of teaching large sections of first- and second-year language. (In these courses, we have pioneered the development of a novel content-based methodology, which, while extremely effective, is nonetheless very labor intensive for faculty. The context in which we work and details concerning our expectations of faculty in the area of teaching are found in Appendix A.) A full-time faculty member in the department will teach six courses per year, which will typically include four different preparations (one of which might be a January term course taught abroad). Approximately two-thirds of the six courses will be in first-and second-year language; a significant portion of a faculty member's teaching will be outside his or her area(s) of specialization. Nonetheless, each member of the department is expected to engage in public professional activity, as stipulated in the Faculty Manual, section VII.B.1, and also to pursue the other components of professional activity identified in sections VII.B.2 and B.3 of the Faculty Manual: "ability to relate scholarship, research, and creative activity to effective teaching"; and "success in stimulating the intellectual development of one's colleagues through disciplinary or interdisciplinary work." While these latter two components of professional activity are not easily objectified or quantified, we nevertheless view them as important to the contribution a faculty member makes to students, colleagues, and the college. Consequently, an assessment of these two components is important to the evaluation done for tenure, promotion, and salary review. However this will not be the focus of this document; instead, it is to the descriptions of public professional activity that we devote the remainder of this statement.

¹ The following introduction is inspired by and borrows freely from the Statement of Professional Activity prepared by the St. Olaf English Department.

Evaluation of Professional Activity

The Department intends that its faculty be true teacher-scholars for whom teaching and scholarship are inseparable. Nevertheless, we believe that our particular situation as a department is, in some respects, different from that of some departments at St. Olaf and that these differences must be reflected in the types of professional activity considered appropriate and in the way that professional activity is assessed. In contrast to departments in which all or a large portion of faculty members' courses lie within their area of specialization and research, faculty in Romance Languages rarely teach their fields of expertise. Whereas some departments may justifiably place considerable emphasis on a single facet of professional activity (e.g., scholarly publication), we believe it inappropriate for us to do this. In fact, we believe that the ongoing success of our program requires that we adopt a wider, more diverse, more flexible view of professional activity. In other words, while seeking to recognize and applaud "traditional scholarship," we choose to expand the range of professional activity we hold appropriate to a department such as ours to include conference presentations, grant-writing, consulting, and service in professional organizations. Further, we do not wish to rank these activities with respect to each other.

The Department sees the professional activity of its members falling in six distinct categories: publications; presentations; leadership in professional organizations; grants; consulting and translating; and honors, awards and other. The diagram found on the next page represents a model of public professional activity we consider to be both reflective of the professional work engaged in by teacher-scholars in our field and appropriate to the institutional context in which we carry out our work.

We call attention to the following features of this model:

1. The model, whose general outlines are influenced by the work of the MLA Commission on Professional Service² and the Boyer Commission³, is non-hierarchical in nature. The three areas of professional activity to be evaluated (the column heads) are those identified in the Faculty Manual (p. 4-13); from left to right, they are listed in descending order of importance (p. 4-12).
2. Faculty are expected to demonstrate achievement in all three areas: public professional activity; the ability to relate scholarship, research, and creative activity to effective teaching; and the ability to stimulate the intellectual development of colleagues through disciplinary or interdisciplinary work. "The priority given the three areas is not binding with equal force in all cases; exceptions may be justified by unusual circumstances" (p. 4-12).
3. The categories of professional activity found under Public Professional Activity (the left-hand column) are listed in alphabetical order. All categories are of equal value. Faculty may focus their energies on the areas they deem best suited to their particular scholarly and other professional interests. There is, however, one qualification: for promotion to associate professor and to professor, publication is expected.
4. Although the overall model is non-hierarchical, specific items listed under each of the sub-categories of Public Professional Activity are listed in order of decreasing importance.
5. The model makes no distinction between single author work and collaborative work; we value both.
6. The model makes no distinction between "scholarly work" and "applied work;" in other words, we do not view publications in critical theory as being superior to those in second language acquisition, or to textbook publishing, or to editing, or to work in pedagogy, or to translation.

² *Making Faculty Work Visible: Reinterpreting Professional Service, Teaching and Research in the Fields of Language and Literature*. Report of the MLA Commission on Professional Service, December 1996. The conclusion of the report is reproduced in Appendix B.

³ Cited in Glassick, Charles E., et. al., *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Jossey Bass, 1997. An overview of the Boyer scheme for evaluating professional activity is found in Appendix C.

7. Although the model posits writing for publication as the one form of professional activity that is required of all faculty, it views publication in the context of the whole of the faculty member's professional life; in other words, publication is viewed not as an isolated activity but rather as being informed and supported by other types of professional activity (as well as by one's teaching).

Taken as a whole, the public professional activities represented in the model are to be evaluated from two perspectives: their extent and their excellence (Faculty Manual, p. 4-15). The term "extent" includes both the amount of activity and the level at which such activity is undertaken (e.g., local, state, regional, national or international). "Excellence" embraces not only the nature and quality of the activity in and of itself, but its scope and probable impact on the profession beyond St. Olaf as well.

Applying these two criteria to the evaluation of professional activity within a particular category is, in the majority of cases, self-evident: we judge activity undertaken at a national or regional level to be more significant than activity undertaken at a state or local level. (For example, we rank service as president of the National Association of Teachers of French [AATF] or of Spanish and Portuguese [AATSP] higher than service as president of the state chapters of these two organizations.) The ordering of activities under each category reflects their decreasing significance.

Assessment of activity across categories is similarly straight-forward, since, apart from publication which stands alone as a necessary professional activity, none of the other categories is considered to have more significance than the others; they are all of equal worth.

Since the current Faculty Manual makes a distinction between the criteria governing tenure and those governing promotion to associate professor, we shall do likewise, attempting to articulate our understanding of the requirements for each.

Tenure: Candidates for tenure must demonstrate that they meet high standards of professional competence in their discipline and that they possess the ability and interest to ensure continued growth (Faculty Manual, p. 4-16).⁴ Candidates for tenure must have demonstrated professional growth during their probationary period at St. Olaf. They will typically have given several presentations at national or regional conferences, and produced in virtually final form scholarly paper(s) of good quality (which may or may not have been accepted for publication). In terms of other contributions to the College, candidates for tenure will have established a record of contributions to the work of the section and/or the department or the Faculty of Humanities (e.g., placement testing, proficiency testing, French/Spanish House, French/Spanish conversation table, activities, etc.) as well as more limited contributions outside the department (e.g., service on standing committee or task force, etc.)

Promotion to associate professor: Candidates for promotion to associate professor are expected not only to meet all of the requirements for Tenure (listed above), but to exceed them.⁵ They must demonstrate a more extensive record of public professional activity than was required for tenure, including conference presentations and published writing.

Promotion to professor: While review of faculty for promotion to associate professor normally requires consideration of six to ten years of professional activity (in addition to teaching and other contributions to the College made over a similar period of time), review of faculty for promotion to professor is likely to involve consideration of a much longer period of professional activity. In evaluating faculty in Romance Languages for promotion to professor, it may therefore be helpful to consider several different "profiles" of professional activity that might be occasioned by the model we propose. In one profile, faculty devote the bulk of their professional career to a particular area or endeavor (e.g., literary criticism, linguistic analysis, cultural studies or pedagogy). Another profile involves a network of diverse but related activities in which faculty pursue a particular area of

⁴ In the case of teaching, candidates must have a documented record of "very good" to "excellent" teaching (as measured by criteria listed in the Faculty Manual [pp. 4-12 and 4-13], by designated peer reviews of teaching, by other colleagues' visits to classes, and by student evaluations).

⁵ Their teaching should continue to be in the "very good" to "excellent" range (using the same measures as for tenure). In terms of other contributions to the College, they must have a documented record of contributions beyond the section or department, including service on standing committees or task forces.

research over time that eventually culminates in substantial evidence of accomplishment (lengthy article or monograph, book, major grant proposal). A third profile is based on an evolutionary pattern in which faculty concentrate their professional activity for a time in a particular area, then move to a second, and perhaps a third, area. A fourth profile involves simultaneous pursuit over time of a variety of professional activities, which may or may not be directly related to one another. Regardless of the profile faculty members choose to pursue, promotion to professor requires a record of public writing and scholarship; the amount of publication required will depend on the range of activity undertaken as well as on the significance of such activity.

As a department, we do not ascribe greater relative value to one of these profiles over the others, but cite them simply to suggest the diversity of options embraced by our model for the evaluation of professional activity. Our model is neither lock-step, nor is it cut-and-dried; on the contrary, we view the flexibility and diversity it seeks to encourage and reward as one of its primary strengths.

Faculty in Romance Languages have the option of concentrating their entire professional lives on a single area—literary criticism, linguistic analysis, cultural studies or pedagogy—or on several areas; they may focus their professional activity on a single type of activity—e.g., research and writing in literature or cultural studies or linguistics, consulting, textbook writing—or they may engage in a variety of different types of activities. The choice of area and of type of activity is the individual faculty member's to make. The only hard and fast requirement is that there be a record of professional writing and publication. Nevertheless, while expressing our expectation that a record of professional writing is required for advancement in rank, we also affirm that our primary concern in evaluating professional activity is the establishment, over time, of *a consistent pattern of high quality public professional activity that may or may not be related to one's teaching*.

Approved: May 7, 2001

Appendix A

Context: The Place of Language and Culture Study in the Liberal Arts

Language and culture study have long been considered an essential part of a liberal arts education. However, as academic institutions are subjected to market influences, academic departments, including foreign language departments, experience increasing pressure to provide students with practical language skills à la Berlitz. While we seek to provide our students with language skills that will enable them to survive in cultures where the target language is spoken, we view our work as far more than imparting a set of skills required by today's marketplace; similarly, we view the study of foreign cultures as far more than the acquisition of a set of facts. In terms of the goal and purpose of language and culture study, we are persuaded by the arguments set forth by Martha Nussbaum⁶ and by Peter U. Hohendahl⁷ who suggest that the over-arching purpose of language programs is to provide students an education that includes exposure to and exploration of a broad world of cultures, groups, and ideas, an education for democracy that will allow them to function effectively in a civil society. We concur with Nussbaum's judgment: "People who have never learned to use reason and imagination to enter a broader world of cultures, groups, and ideas are impoverished personally and politically, however successful their vocational preparation" (297).

The over-arching objective of our work with students is a lofty one: we seek to cultivate in them what Gerald Graff refers to as "the life of the mind"⁸; we strive to build in them over the long term "a culture that is both deliberative and reflective."⁹ In other words, we seek to teach not only vocabulary and grammar and the structure of the language, but also, like other humanities fields, to help students develop particular attitudes and habits of mind: curiosity, openness, the ability to reflect critically on texts and ideas and to express with confidence and effectiveness, both orally and in writing, the fruits of their reflections. We do not separate the learning of language from the learning of culture but seek instead to integrate the two. This means that we do not view any of our courses as "remedial" or "service" courses but rather see our first- and second-year courses as pre-requisites to more advanced levels of cultural and literary analysis. Our beginning- and intermediate-levels courses lay the linguistic and cultural foundation needed to communicate effectively in face-to-face interactions in the target language. In addition, students learn to explore different types of primary texts written in the target language from a linguistic as well as a cultural standpoint, and they begin to develop the ability to become critical thinkers.

Although, at the upper level, our courses eschew the notion of coverage, we nevertheless seek to expose students to the wealth and breadth of literary, artistic and cultural production relative to French and Spanish through the study of particular issues or problems as seen in literary and non-literary texts, including the essay, the novel, poetry, theatre, film, and journalistic prose. Our intention in courses at this level is to initiate students into "the discussions and debates of an intellectual community"¹⁰ composed of readers and interpreters of texts. Our task is thus to impart the skills of close reading and precise analysis, to teach recognized forms of exposition, to mentor young writers in their use of bibliographic and other conventions, and above all to inspire in them a lasting interest in the cultural legacy of French and Spanish speakers of the past, present and future. Finally, at all levels of our curriculum, we integrate an emphasis on linguistic and sociolinguistic skills with an emphasis on critical reading and interpretation of texts which represent a cultural view different from the native perspective.

⁶Nussbaum, Martha. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Harvard Univ. Press, 1997.

⁷Hohendahl, Peter U. "After Three Decades of Crisis: What is the Purpose of a Ph.D. Program in Foreign Languages?" *PMLA* 115, 5 (Fall 2000): 1228-1238.

⁸Graff, Gerald. *Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts Can Revitalize American Education*. New York: Norton & Co., 1993, p. 86.

⁹Hohendahl, op cit, p. ?

¹⁰Graff, op. cit., p. 85.

Second Language Learning and Acquisition

Research into the processes involved in second language learning and acquisition carried out during the past three decades has resulted in a change in the way teacher-scholars understand the manner in which languages are taught and learned today. Results stemming from research on—but not limited to:

- the role of the learner in receiving linguistic input (cf. Van Patten, Gass, Krashen)
- the role of the learner in producing output (cf. Swain)
- native language interference (cf. Gass and Selinker, Kellerman and Sharwood-Smith)
- learner styles (cf. Chamot, Oxford)
- culture (Bennett, Byram, Kramersch)
- interlanguage—i.e., learner's-language—(cf. Krashen, Tarone, Selinker)
- sociolinguistics (Preston, Tarone)
- the role of the combination of these factors on language acquisition enable the teacher-scholar to implement pedagogies that place the student at the center of the language learning process

Because the student is viewed as an active participant who acquires language through the negotiation of form and meaning in face-to-face interaction with classmates and with the teacher, the teacher's task is that of providing opportunities for students to create meaning in real-world, culturally-authentic situations, often growing out of the close reading and analysis of texts of various sorts (maps, charts, photos, literary texts, etc.) written in the target language and intended for a native audience.

As the preceding paragraph suggests, second language acquisition is an extremely complex phenomenon involving a large number of variables. The changes that have occurred in our profession over the past 10-15 years as a result of the growing data base in second language acquisition are numerous and far-reaching. These changes have had a dramatic effect on the preparation of teacher-scholars, on their day-to-day work, and on their on-going professional development. Teacher-scholars in the field(s) of second languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures are more than ever required to become—and remain—“Renaissance scholars” who, in addition to a sound understanding of the principles of second language acquisition, also possess significant expertise in another field (e.g., the Latin American novel, Spanish linguistics, contemporary Quebec theater, the French Middle Ages). We identify below some of the characteristics we believe scholar/teachers in our field must possess.

(1) Teacher-scholars of second languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures must be linguistically and sociolinguistically proficient in the target language in order to provide accurate, contemporary models of native-speaker discourse in the classroom. Maintaining a high degree of linguistic competence is a challenge for both non-native and native speakers who work and reside in an English-speaking environment. It necessitates frequent and in-depth immersion in the language and cultures one teaches and studies through extended stays, study, and continuing access to a wide range of authentic materials, including not only scholarly journals, but current magazines, periodicals, videos, television broadcasts, etc.

(2) Teacher-scholars of second languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures must be well informed about the diverse cultures in which the language they teach is spoken. They must possess knowledge of both the past of these cultures and their present and be able to interact effectively and empathetically with native speakers, both in the target culture(s) and in the U.S. Teacher-scholars are familiar with the range and diversity of cultural expression as well as the political, economic, social, and historical phenomena which, taken together, are critical to cultural understanding.

(3) Teacher-scholars of second languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures must be skilled analysts of a wide variety of texts (including, but not limited to, literary texts). As programs become more interdisciplinary in nature, teacher-scholars must be competent in analyzing a variety of different discourses associated with fields beyond the traditional areas of language and literature.

(4) Teacher-scholars of second languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures must be able to do more than disseminate textbook knowledge and impart specific skills; they must understand theories of language acquisition and the theoretical framework of textbooks used at different levels of the curriculum not simply to use such textbooks in teaching, but especially to create appropriate and effective instructional materials for student use.

(5) Teacher-scholars of second languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures must be able to present the theories and findings of their field in a manner appropriate to undergraduate students.

(6) In order to teach texts emanating from a variety of historical and cultural periods, largely unfamiliar to our students, teacher-scholars of second languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures must amass a broad range of knowledge, solidified through wide reading of primary and critical texts, membership and participation in scholarly associations, the collection and creation of pedagogical materials, and, depending upon the interests of the faculty member, ultimately, the publication of innovative critical scholarship intended to foster greater awareness of and interest in the field.

We conclude this description of the teacher-scholar in our field with an attempt to debunk the myth which views teaching as an inspired art to which some are called and others not. Teaching may, indeed, be an art as well as a science; and good teaching may, indeed, grow out of and reflect some degree of inspiration; however, inspiration alone does not suffice. High quality teaching requires knowledge as well as effort; it is very much a work of scholarship. This is why we affirm the fundamental link between teaching and research. Both teaching and research require not only natural intelligence, but also hard work, the acquisition of new knowledge, interpretive skill, collegial exchange, and more. Teaching that is uninformed by scholarship is arid and without content. Teaching, when it is done well, produces an ongoing reconfiguration and generation rather than mere transmission of knowledge. Scholarship itself is a form of teaching, for it must instruct its reader and select and organize information and ideas.¹¹ Similarly, teaching, even if it does not result in publication, is a form of scholarship; there also exists a scholarship of teaching. The relationship between teaching and scholarship, therefore, is symbiotic, each grounding and enriching the other.

¹¹Donahue, Patricia. "Evaluating Teaching," *ADE Bulletin* 126 (Fall 2000): 47.

Appendix B

Making Faculty Work Visible: Reinterpreting Professional Service, Teaching, and Research in the Fields of Language and Literature

REPORT OF THE MLA COMMISSION ON PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

December 1996

Conclusion

Our intent throughout this report has been to suggest ways that we might rethink the contexts of faculty work. Although our charge was to focus on faculty service, we saw from the beginning that such a focus was impossible without considering the entire range of faculty activity. In reflecting on this activity, we discovered that we often misidentify what we value. Frequently, in fact, faculty work is invisible because it is not well understood. Our basic argument has been that the conventional categories used to characterize faculty work—teaching, research, and service—often fail to represent adequately what faculty members do. Because faculty work takes its meaning now—and so becomes visible or invisible, respected or disdained, supported or neglected—from the status of the institutional sites where it happens, our report’s purpose, in part, is to expand the range of sites that secure visibility, respect, and support.

The model we have proposed, therefore, emphasizes seeing and interpreting things in different and more complicated ways. Our case studies illustrate that understanding faculty work is a complex interpretive practice, and the model we propose for rethinking this process, while it does not abandon the traditional categories, seeks to clarify the nature and value of faculty work in new ways. In our view, faculty members serve higher education in a wide variety of institutional locations—the journal, the classroom, the faculty meeting room. Serious intellectual work of the kind and quality crucial to the mission of higher learning can find a public expression in activities as diverse as publishing an article or developing a curriculum or directing a graduate program or conducting a collaborative program with local school teachers. As a consequence, we strongly recommend that institutions and professional organizations recognize a wide range of possibilities for types of achievement and for the audience of intellectual work.

We believe that all institutions should analyze and reflect on the issues our report has raised. Reflective analysis and conversation are central to the study of language and literature, and our report is, among other things, a call for faculty members themselves to enter the conversation. Our report parallels the national discussion about faculty responsibilities, and it is not unrelated, of course, to the debate about the institution of tenure. Failure to engage in these dialogues will doubtless mean that others will define our roles for us and determine their worth. Part of the larger debate centers on the assessment of faculty work, and one of the obvious implications of the model we propose is that higher education will be called on to rethink the evaluation and rewarding of faculty activity.

If the interpretation of faculty work is, as we argue, more complex than the conventional, tripartite model assumes, the assessment and rewarding of that work are no less complex. Our report maintains that assessment and reward should be related directly to intellectual work and citizenship activities that are professionally significant, and the case studies suggest how faculty work that falls outside the conventional model can be documented, interpreted, and evaluated.

The means of assessing faculty work will tend to be what they have always been: peer review; written and oral testimony from administrative superiors, colleagues, students, and alumni; scores from standardized tests; portfolios; self-evaluations; data from citation indexes; public response; and the like. Similarly, the criteria for

judging the value and excellence of faculty work in all three sites can be established. The model we propose, however, calls for the involvement of more constituencies (e.g., legislators, other policy makers, trustees, students, employers, and higher education associations) than evaluation has required in the past. Furthermore, we believe that the entire assessment process should take account of the changing nature of higher education. Documenting, interpreting, and judging the quality of faculty work is, of course, time consuming and difficult. The application of the model can assist institutions in classifying activities, but the model will not generate anything automatically, which is why we stress that its schematic representation is a heuristic device, intended to promote different ways of thinking.

Models for re-conceiving faculty work and for developing new contexts for assessment and reward must be, we think, dynamic, flexible, and negotiable. They will have to recognize different institutional missions and changing needs. They will have to see assessment and reward as a negotiated process, one that makes more explicit the dialogue among faculty members, chairs, deans, and experts in the field and that is broadened to include the interests of the constituencies noted above. As institutions develop their own means of assessment, they should consider the wide range of activities that require faculty members' professional expertise. These would include, in addition to activities more traditionally recognized, inter- and cross-disciplinary projects, teaching that occurs outside the traditional classroom, acquisition of the knowledge and skills required by new information technologies, practical action as a context for analyzing and evaluating intellectual work, and activities that require collective and collaborative knowledge and the dissemination of learning to communities not only inside but also outside the academy.

Institutions should recognize that intellectual work and citizenship activities change over the course of a faculty member's career and that faculty roles change over time—that faculty members are called on at different stages of their careers to perform different tasks. In this regard, the commission believes that faculty members must have the freedom to negotiate the balance among different kinds of faculty work commitments at any given time and to change this balance in their career development. In particular, we believe that faculty members, especially junior faculty members, have a continuing right to help formulate clear guidelines within which they can effectively pursue their intellectual projects and develop their professional careers.

In the final meeting of our commission we observed that a large part of our work had centered, without any conscious intent, on the metaphor of sight, suggesting no doubt our desire to see things in a new way—to revise. We also reminded ourselves that much of our discussion had focused on discussion itself, reflecting our desire to foster a profession-wide conversation about the issues raised in our report. We now offer this report to our colleagues in the fields encompassed by the MLA as part of the continuing dialogue about our work in language and literature and with the invitation to those colleagues to join us in rethinking what we do and how we value it.

pp. 52-54

Appendix C

Synopsis of *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*

Ernest L. Boyer, Carnegie Foundation, 1990

1. Origins of the American Higher Education
 - Colonial colleges – moral education of the next generation
 - Land grant colleges – service to society
 - German universities – research specialization

2. Systemic Change in Priorities:

<u>Past</u>	<u>Current</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faith in authority • Loyalty to the campus • Emphasis on moral leadership • Education of an intellectual elite 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliance on scientific rationalism • Loyalty to the discipline • Emphasis on research accomplishments • Education of the masses

3. Current Definition of Scholarship: “Scholars are academics who conduct research, publish, and then perhaps convey their knowledge to students or apply what they have learned.

4. Reconsidered Definition: Scholarship has “four separate, yet overlapping functions. These are in the scholarship of *discovery*, the scholarship of *integration*, the scholarship of *application*, and the scholarship of *teaching*.”

Definition of Scholarship Reconsidered

<p>Scholarship of Discovery Investigation Knowledge for its own sake Freedom of inquiry Contribution to university intellectual climate Heart of academic life</p> <p>What is yet to be known?</p> <p>Scholarship of Application Service Relates scholarship to larger community Direct flow from special field of knowledge Dynamic interaction between theory and practice Defines agenda for further investigation</p> <p>How can knowledge be responsibly applied?</p>	<p>Scholarship of Integration Synthesis Connecting across disciplines Integration into a larger context Bringing new insight to original research Educating nonspecialists</p> <p>What do the findings mean?</p> <p>Scholarship of Teaching Education Bridge between teacher understanding and student learning Transmitting, transforming, and extending knowledge Knowing and learning as communal acts Enticement of future scholars Creative teaching is a lifetime challenge</p> <p>How can knowledge be acquired by the next generation?</p>
--	---

Clear Goals

Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

Adequate Preparation

Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

Appropriate Methods

Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

Significant Results

Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?

Effective Presentation

Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

Reflective Critique

Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future works?

Glassick, Charles E., Mary T. Huber and Gene I. Maeroff
Scholarship Reconsidered
Jossey Bass (1997)
p. 36