

3-8-2001

Scholarship Task Force Report

Lydia Morrow Ruetten

Follow this and additional works at: http://opus.govst.edu/facultysenate_documents

Recommended Citation

Morrow Ruetten, Lydia, "Scholarship Task Force Report" (2001). *Faculty Senate Documents*. Paper 12.
http://opus.govst.edu/facultysenate_documents/12

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship. For more information, please contact opus@govst.edu.

Faculty Senate Scholarship Task Force

Report

March 8, 2001

In Search of Quality & Excellence : Scholarship

Contributors: Ralph Bell, Cynthia Carr, Don Culverson, Adriela Fernandez, Brad Johnson, Marsha Katz, Jacquelyn Kilpatrick, Dave Parmenter. Linda Proudfit, Bruce Wilson, Jun Zhao, Lydia Morrow Ruetten (chair)

INTRODUCTION

Benefits of Scholarship

GSU's primary mission is teaching and service to students. Scholarship/research/professional development is a crucial component of university life because, quite simply, neither teaching nor service can achieve high levels of quality without it.

A faculty member who is not doing sufficient scholarly activity will generally be unable to stay on top of his field and thus will not be providing his students with up-to-date knowledge and skills. Here at GSU, where we emphasize professional preparation in many programs, it is particularly crucial that we be current as instructors. Our students are active in their careers and are therefore really and truly applying what we teach them. It is thus an absolute necessity that the knowledge and skills we provide be at or near the cutting edge.

A faculty member who is not doing scholarship will also have a more difficult time socializing his students to the research process. We often profess at GSU to educate "lifelong learners." To develop into a true lifelong learner a student must first be socialized into the belief that curiosity, investigation and learning are wonderful things. The student must also master the various processes and skills involved in conducting the resulting investigation. To effectively develop this mindset and these skills in students a faculty member must model this behavior himself. A faculty member who is not conducting scholarship activities, who does not demonstrate professional curiosity, who is not working diligently to update his knowledge and skills, simply cannot be an effective role model in this regard.

Note that this argument concerning the importance of scholarship/research/professional development applies to staff and A&P employees just as it does to faculty. Although these employees may not spend much of their time in the classroom, the quality of service that they provide to students is just as dependent upon their level of expertise. In some cases it could be argued that the quality of service a student receives from the Registrar or from Financial Aid may actually have a bigger impact on the student's educational success than the quality of instruction that the student receives

from any individual faculty member. Thus staff and A&P personnel need training and learning opportunities as well.

It is time to start viewing GSU as a system of interdependent parts. For the system to work, these parts need to operate synergistically - all of the parts. Even the world's best faculty would fail to achieve high educational quality if the clerk in the Registrar's Office, the secretary in the Dean's Office, the tutor in Student Development and the Manager of the Bookstore did not do their jobs effectively. All of these employees need the opportunity, the support and the time to learn how to do their jobs more effectively.

A final argument, one that may seem somewhat trivial at first glance, is that scholarship/research/professional development is fun. The opportunity to study questions of interest to learn new skills and to grow professionally enriches the soul and improves morale. Employees who are given frequent opportunities to grow are happier, healthier and more productive. They are also much less likely to look for positions at other organizations. Scholarship/research/professional development develops effective employees who will stick around. And an organization simply cannot achieve high quality if it does not have a large core of effective employees who stick around for the long haul.

CAVEAT

The foregoing discussion, definition and exemplification of Scholarship is not intended to limit or broaden those Scholarship activities that a Division identifies (in its Division Criteria) as research for purposes of retention, tenure, or (PAI). Rather, the foregoing is intended merely to affirm that scholarship is broader than research. It is the responsibility of each division to determine the specific Scholarship activities that fall within the scope of research for purposes of promotion, tenure, or (PAI).

CHARGE

The charge of the Task Force was to come up with ways to make the implementation of scholarship feasible. We agreed that the aim of the task force was to come up with a basic plan and let someone else take over.

METHODOLOGY

We began meeting in November 2000, and met seven times. In the beginning of our discussions, we felt it necessary to come to agreement as to what Scholarship means to each of us. Task Force members developed their own definitions of scholarship and brought them to the group. Although we had difficulty coming to agreement, the common elements of what Scholarship means to the Task Force members brought to light, that our definition should incorporate: quality, knowledge, skill, acquisition, discovery, integration, application, assessment (measurement)/feedback, communication/ assimilation, and reward.

We spent several meetings discussing this topic and determined that, in an effort to move forward, it would be reasonable to start from an accepted definition already in use elsewhere. We expanded Boyer's basic definition and moved forward from there.

We discussed the components necessary for the report in which to make our case for Scholarship. Following you will find sections entitled: definition, types of **scholarship**, activities, ways in which scholarship can be achieved. emphasizing individual achievements. reward, measurement and assessment, suggestions, and a conclusion. Task Force members were encouraged to, and did discuss this topic with their colleagues throughout our discussions.

Preliminary literature searches were done and shared with the task force members. Literature searches also occurred throughout our deliberations, which focused on the works of Boyer. A review of web sites for the American Association for Higher Education, and the Education Council of the States were also consulted. A bibliography of many of the resources used can be found at the conclusion of this report.

Interested members of the Faculty Senate Scholarship Task Force joined members of the Strategic Planning Faculty Research/Scholarship Task Force on March 1, 2001. At that point, the Faculty Senate Scholarship Task Force ceased to exist. The Boyer definition and evaluation of scholarship for the purpose of supporting and affirming the vast array of intellectual activities within which the professoriate participate follows.

DEFINITION

Scholarship is an intellectual activity of inquiry in which results are communicated and validated by peers. Scholarship activities are not limited to one type. Instead, there are various types of scholarship activities (Boyer 1990). (Also refer to Appendix A.)

1. Scholarship of Teaching, Learning and Assessment
2. Scholarship of Integration
3. Scholarship of Application
4. Scholarship of Discovery
5. Scholarship of Artistic Creativity (added by Task Force)

Each type of Scholarship activity has a different objective and means of accomplishment. However, it is common for Scholarship activities to overlap. Universal elements of a Scholarship activity include:

1. Problem posing.
2. Study of the problem through methods appropriate to disciplinary epistemologies.
3. Application of results to practice.
4. Communication of results.

5. Self-reflection.
6. External peer review.

FORMS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship of Teaching, Learning and Assessment

The activity objective for the Scholarship of Teaching, Learning and Assessment is to improve the quality of student learning and the status of teaching through the transformation of knowledge in a way that stimulates active learning in students. Here, the teacher is a scholar, a teacher who is devoted to constant exploration. Also, the scholar is a teacher, where scholarship activities engage research within the context of student learning.

"The work of the professor becomes consequential only as it is understood by others ... As a *scholarly* enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows ... Further, good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners ... While well-prepared lecturers surely have a place, teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but *transforming and extending* it as well. Through reading, through classroom discussion, and surely through comments and questions posed by students, professors themselves will be pushed in creative new directions" (Boyer, 1990).

Scholarship of Integration

The activity objective for the Scholarship of Integration is to draw together and interpret diverse kinds of knowledge from a more global perspective by means of a creative synthesis of disparate disciplines, theories, models and information.

"In proposing the *scholarship of integration*, we underscore the need for scholars who give meaning to isolated facts, putting them in perspective. By integration we mean connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists, too" (Boyer, 1990).

Scholarship of Application

The activity objective for the Scholarship of Application is to discover knowledge through practice by applying knowledge to practical problems.

". . . the application of knowledge, moves toward engagement as the scholar asks, 'How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?'" (Boyer, 1990).

Scholarship of Discovery

The activity objective for the Scholarship of Discovery is to increase or enhance the knowledge base and intellectual climate through the pursuit of new knowledge for its own sake.

..... the *scholarship of discovery*, comes closest to what is meant when academics speak of 'research.' No tenets in the academy are held in higher regard than the commitment to knowledge for its own sake, to freedom of inquiry and to

following in a disciplined fashion, an investigation wherever it may lead"(Boyer, 1990).

Scholarship of Artistic Creativity

The activity objective for the Scholarship of Artistic Creativity is the production of scholarship which interprets the human spirit, creates and communicates new insights and beauty, or develops and refines methodologies (Weiser, 1994).

To further define the various types of scholarship, the Task Force felt it appropriate for us to develop a broad definition of scholarship and let each division further define scholarship and research in its division criteria as well as what activities are appropriate for their discipline.

POSSIBLE ACTIVITIES

However, we felt compelled to offer a listing of possible, non-exhaustive, set of examples for illustrative purposes. All examples provided may be appropriate in more than one category depending on the discipline. For example, service on an editorial board may be something appropriate in one division, but not another. (Also consult Appendix A.)

Scholarship of teaching, learning, & assessment:

- Developing new courses
 - Developing and teaching web-based courses
 - Conducting pedagogical research
 - Developing and teaching cross-disciplinary courses
 - Publishing study guides
 - Engaging in continuing education to improve one's own teaching (e.g., attending workshops, obtaining professional certificates, etc.)
- Incorporating one's own research and consulting activities into teaching
- Developing new/different teaching modalities
- Continuous improvement of course quality
- Student assessment

Scholarship of integration:

- Writing a textbook
 - Conducting meta analysis
 - Developing and teaching cross-disciplinary courses
- Collaborative research
- Publishing study guides
- Publishing book reviews

Scholarship of application:

- Consulting for external organizations using one's academic experience
- Developing an evaluation plan for a community organization
- Assisting with marketing strategies for external organizations
- Engaging in educational programs in the community
- Advising student research projects and publishing/presenting the study at external outlets

Scholarship of discovery:

- Writing grant proposals
- Publishing original work in peer reviewed outlets
- Publishing results from consulting activities in peer reviewed outlets
- Publishing pedagogical/andragogical research in peer reviewed outlets
- Presenting original work at professional conferences
- Engaging in secondary data analysis to advance the field/discipline

Scholarship of artistic creativity:

- Shows, performances, and distribution of artistic products or designs.

Other suggested activities that arose during our conversations included the following:

- Faculty exchange program
- Pro bono consulting (resulting in a publication or conference presentation)
- Developing new delivery/teaching methods
- Creating courses that cross disciplines
- Collaborative research

In addition to suggesting possible activities of scholarship that may be incorporated in division criteria, we discussed ways in which scholarship can be achieved by better utilization of time and resources.

WAYS IN WHICH SCHOLARSHIP CAN BE ACHIEVED

(Utilization of existing/new resources)

The following statements operate under the following three assumptions:

- a. More time, not more cues, are needed for scholarship. Release from classes (so that we can do a better job in the classes that we continue to teach). Overload pay is not what we want. (Note: At its February 2001 meeting, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution requesting that overload cues be paid on a pro rata basis. If UPI is able to achieve this change it will hopefully give the administration additional incentive to avoid using overload.)
2. Having one or two large blocks of time is far superior to having many small blocks of time. The "start-up time" for scholarship is significant. The beginning of each time period devoted to scholarship, whether a weekend or a sabbatical trimester, will generally be devoted to a significant amount of "pondering" time. It is possible to grade statistics homework productively thirty minutes at a time. In contrast, thirty minutes spent on scholarship is likely to lead to absolutely nothing at all.
3. So little time is now devoted to scholarship that even a little increase will be a tremendous benefit. We are not asking to become UI or UIC (most of us would actually be horrified if that were to happen). At a school where the average faculty member gets somewhere between one and three cues per year for scholarship, an increase of three cues (only one course release) will be meaningful.

The following is only a starting point for developing a list of tactics to achieve greater time for scholarship.

1. More effective course scheduling
 - a. Fewer sections - Many of the sections currently offered at GSU are run with few students. There are too many courses in some colleges in which we have at least one evening section and one-day section every trimester, neither of which is even close to being full. We pride ourselves on convenience for the students but perhaps we overdo it. If we were to publish an accurate schedule looking several

years into the future (theoretically a two-year schedule actually exists) and broadcast it with sufficient vehemence to make it well known to our students, it would not be that big of a hardship to them if we offered fewer sections. For example, if an evening student knows that there is an evening section of MGMT XXX scheduled for Fall 2001, he would not mind that there is only a day section in Winter 2001. He will be able to plan appropriately.

- b. Fewer preparations - If there are two sections, have both taught by the same instructor whenever this is reasonable. We tend to push the edge of the envelope not only in terms of the number of classes taught per trimester but also in the number of preparations for the average faculty member.
- c. Increased "clustering" of teaching requirements - Many faculty now teach only one course in Spring/Summer (for Colleges other than BPA it may be a trimester other than Spring/Summer in which faculty tend to take vacation). If that course could be moved to either the Fall or Winter trimester it would allow faculty to have a block of four consecutive months off from teaching. Despite the heavier load in Fall and Winter (possibly precluding any scholarship activity at all during those trimesters), this larger block of time to focus on scholarship should allow much more to be accomplished than is achievable in the collection of hours, half-hours and occasional weekends that are available under the current "unwritten rules" of GSU scheduling.

If it is not possible to give everyone a full trimester off each year, possibly it could be rotated so that every faculty member would get a full trimester off every other year. I believe that enough faculty would prefer either Fall or Winter off that it would overcome the administrators' fears that nobody would be around to teach in Spring/Summer.

2. Use of graduate students

- a. To perform teaching-related duties - For example, grade homework, proctor exams, etc. This would also free more time to engage in scholarship.
- b. To assist with scholarship activities - Procure (and read) articles, enter data, etc. If done properly, this could be a terrific learning experience for the students.

3. Reduction in internal service expectations - Many internal service activities are enjoyable and "make a difference." But we have all been involved in committees/task forces that either have too many members or seem to meet just for the purpose of having a meeting. Our search committees, for instance, often seem to require a

representative from every unit on campus. Less time used in internal service would obviously allow more for scholarship.

The administration frequently cites its desire for service to the community. Class releases or reductions in internal service would free up the necessary time to do external service. Much external service would also fall under the umbrella of scholarship. For instance, a consulting experience that involves significant learning for the faculty member could often be used to generate an article or conference presentation (and some terrific ideas for areas to investigate in future scholarship activities).

4. Hire additional tenure/tenure-track faculty - This may not be a popular suggestion, but it obviously deserves consideration. Filling the courses from which we are released by using additional adjunct faculty simply is not a good idea. The ultimate goal of our increased scholarship efforts is to develop better teachers, not to replace good teachers with under-supervised and often inexperienced adjuncts.

5. Reallocation of funds

a. No new programs should be implemented until the current programs have achieved a notably high level of quality. And a "notably high level of quality" generally requires more scholarship than we are currently allowed to do.

b. We accept smaller pay raises in exchange for having more resources geared toward scholarship, i.e. more funding for conference travel, etc. Obviously, this is a UPI issue.

6. Eliminate the PQP cue - Actually, we do not want to recommend that it be eliminated. We want to recommend that it no longer be focused on University-selected topics. By viewing PQP as professional development, academic freedom is violated. Each faculty member should be free to choose his or her own area of interest. This would represent an "instant" and "painless" increase of one cue directed toward research. It is painless for the administration because the cue is already being "paid for" under the current system (with reluctant faculty attending only the first session of assorted PQP activities in which only a few have any interest). Although the arbitrary standard that one cue represents 45 hours is obviously ridiculous, think of this as an additional week or so per year for scholarship.

One member of the Task Force felt that the PQP cue should not be eliminated because this is an opportunity to see and meet fellow faculty members. However, this may be addressed in the sharing what was learned portion of scholarship.

Other Task Force members prefer the tailor-made approach that scholarship will allow.

7. Upgrade the grant process - No one on the Task Force was very familiar with this process at all. Obtaining more grant money would ease the resource crunch when it comes to paying for increased scholarship. We suspect that there are quite a few GSU faculty who have valuable knowledge in this area. If this knowledge were shared, many of us could benefit. As is unfortunately often the case here at GSU, we do not share well.

One item that may help with the grant process is the proposal submitted by the Director of the University Library for a grants reference librarian. Part of the duties of this person would be as a resource person for the university and help disseminate possible grant opportunities.

Other suggestions that arose during our conversations, which we did not have time to explore, but definitely needs exploration, include:

- ◆The possibility of offering scholarship competitively
- ◆Looking at University Research Grants
- ◆Looking at Faculty Excellence Awards

- ◆Looking at Alumni grants

A universal element of scholarship activity includes the communication of results.

EMPHASIZING INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT

(Sharing what was learned)

For illustrative purposes, a listing of possible, non-exhaustive, set of examples are provided. (Also consult Appendix A.)

Scholarship of teaching, learning, & assessment:

- ◆Developing and distributing (publishing) curricular materials

- ◆Making Presentations locally and at conferences

- ◆Sharing course syllabi and other materials and teaching techniques with colleagues

Scholarship of integration:

- ◆Making presentations at conferences and locally (GSU)

- ◆ Writing for publications and

Scholarship of application:

- ◆ Consulting with community members in businesses, schools, etc.
- ◆ Writing for publications
- ◆ Making presentations to peers locally and at conferences

Scholarship of discovery:

- ◆ Writing for peer-reviewed publications
- ◆ Making presentations at conferences and locally

Scholarship of artistic creativity:

- ◆ Public interest
- ◆ Peer recognition and adoption

Other comments and/or suggestions that emerged from our conversations included:

- ◆ Need to encourage and celebrate one another (faculty salon)
- ◆ Colloquia
- ◆ Teaching interest group
- ◆ Online discussion of themes

REWARD

There was a feeling that something needs to be done in order formally recognize scholarship. There was discussion about a faculty member that continues to teach the same way he did 20 years ago and does nothing to update his knowledge, thereby necessitating the need for scholarship. This may be an area where the Faculty Excellence Award could play more of a prominent role in identifying faculty who are engaging in significant scholarship. Another idea that emerged was the implementation of a system where some type of reward (or credit) is given the following year for an activity that was done the previous year. This area warrants more discussion.

MEASUREMENT & ASSESSMENT

(Evaluation of Scholarship)

According to Boyer, the criteria should be developed for the evaluation of scholarship. The following criteria provide a common conceptual ground for the evaluation of Scholarship:

1. Clear Goals
 - a. Does the scholar:
 - (1) State the basic purpose of her work?
 - (2) Define objectives that are realistic and achievable? (3) Identify important questions in the field?
2. Adequate Preparation
 - a. Does the scholar:
 - (1) Examine the extant scholarship in the field?
 - (2) Have the requisite skills and resources to accomplish the identified purpose and objectives?
3. Appropriate Methods
 - a. Does the scholar:
 - (1) Use methods appropriate to the goals?
 - (2) Apply effectively the methods selected?
 - (3) Modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?
4. Significant Results
 - a. Does the scholar's work:
 - (1) Accomplish her purpose and achieve her objectives?
 - (2) Add consequentially to the field?
 - (3) Expose additional areas for further exploration?
5. Effective Presentation
 - a. Is the scholar's work presented:
 - (1) In a forum that is appropriate for communicating such work to its intended audiences?
 - (2) Effectively organized in an appropriate style?
 - (3) With clarity and integrity?
6. Reflective Critique

- a. Does the scholar critically evaluate her work:
- (1) With an appropriate breadth of evidence?
 - (2) To improve the quality of future work?

We offer a listing of possible, non-exhaustive, set of examples for illustrative purposes. Again, all examples provided may be appropriate in more than one category depending on the discipline. (Also consult Appendix A.)

◆ Possible criteria for evaluation of scholarship of artistic creativity include beauty, originality, impact, duration of public value, scope and persistence of influence and public appreciation.

◆ Assessment can be provided by a report, self-reflection document, a product, or a letter acknowledging the service.

Other questions that arose during our conversations include:

◆ Establish an evaluation instrument?

◆ Should the activities be qualitative or quantitative? Of course, this may depend on the division.

SUGGESTIONS

At this point, we offer a listing of suggestions of areas that need, or will need further exploration:

◆ Revise promotion, tenure, CUE, and division criteria guidelines.

◆ Look at and make revisions to Interim Policy 55, Research Policy.

◆ Enhance and improve the existing mentoring program, including providing training to mentors.

◆ Enhance and improve the existing new faculty orientation.

◆ Get Scholarship included in mission and strategic plan.

◆ Look at additional areas of the UPI Bargaining Agreement to include scholarship.

◆ Open dialog with entire faculty, staff, and students on the issue of scholarship.

◆ Talk to and/or visit other institutions that have implemented Scholarship on their campus.

◆ Further discuss ways in which we can achieve scholarship with the resources we have.

◆ Further discuss ways in which productivity can be measured (outcomes assessment plan).

◆ Discuss the need for a Faculty Scholarship Center and an individual to "manage" the responsibilities of such a Center.

CONCLUSION

With the implementation of scholarship here at GSU, we hope to enhance or reconfigure as you will, the role of faculty work in three ways: as presenter, guide to resources, and assessor of learning; as a coach and discussion leader; and as mentor. We hope to see the implementation of a concept coined by the Faculty Senate Scholarship Task Force, "never-ending sabbatical" which would enrich the lives of our faculty and makes them more valuable to the University and our students.

FORMS OF SCHOLARSHIP MATRIX APPENDIX A

Forms of Scholarship

Scholarship creates something that did not exist before that is validated and communicated to others: new understanding in the minds of students, new knowledge about ourselves and our universe. new beauty that stimulates the senses, new insights, and new technologies and applications of knowledge that can benefit humankind.

	Teaching and Learning	Discovery	Artistic Creativity	Integration	Application
<i>Nature of the Scholarship</i>	With learners, develops and communicate new understanding and insights; develops and refines new teaching content and methods; fosters lifelong learning behavior	Generated and communicates new knowledge and understanding; develops and refines methods	Interprets the human spirit, creates and communicates new insights and beauty; Develops and refines methods.	Synthesizes and communicates new or different understandings of knowledge or technology and its relevance; develops and refines methods.	Develops and communicates new technologies, materials or uses; fosters inquiry and invention; develops and refines new methods.
<i>Primary audiences for scholarship</i>	<u>Learners</u> ; Educator peers	<u>Peers</u> ; Supporters of research; Educators; Students; Publics.	<u>Various publics</u> ; Peers; Patrons; Students.	<u>Users</u> ; Educators; Students; Peers	<u>Users</u> ; Customers; Peers Educators; Peers
<i>Primary means of communicating scholarship</i>	<u>Teaching materials and methods</u> ; <u>Classes; Curricula</u> ; Publications and presentations to educator peers and broader publics	<u>Peer-reviewed publications and presentations</u> ; Patents; Public reports and presentations.	<u>Shows, performances and distribution of products reviews, news reports</u> ; copyrights; peer presentations and juries, publications.	<u>Presentations, publications, demonstrations, and patents.</u>	<u>Demonstrations and presentations to audience</u> ; <u>Patents; Publications for users</u> ; Periodicals and reports; Peer presentations and publications.
<i>Primary criteria for validating scholarship</i>	Originality and significance of new contributions to learning; depth, duration and usefulness of what is learned; lifelong benefits to learners and adoption by peers.	Originality, scope, and significance of new knowledge; applicability and benefits to society	Beauty, originality, impact, and duration of public value; scope and persistence of influence and public appreciation	Usefulness and originality of new or different understandings, applications, and insights.	Breadth, value, and persistence of use and impact.
<i>How scholarship is documented</i>	Teaching portfolio; summaries of primary new contributions, impacts on students and learning; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions.	Summaries of primary contributions, significance and impact in advancing knowledge, new methods, public benefits; communication and validation by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions.	Summaries of primary contributions, public interest, and impact; communication to publics, peer recognition and adoption; evidence of leadership and team contributions.	Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, scope of adoption and application, impact and benefits; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contribution.	Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, significance and scope of use and benefits; commercial and social value; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions.

C.J. Weiser College of Agricultural Sciences, Oregon State University, Corvallis February 3, 1994

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boyer, Ernest L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate. New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cambridge, Barbara (1999). The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Questions and Answers from the Field. *AAHE Bulletin*, December 1999. Retrieved December 7, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.aahe.org/Bulletin/dec9912.htm>

Dirks, Arthur (1998). *The new definition of scholarship: how it will it change the professoriate?* December 4, 1998. Retrieved November 17, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://topcat.bridgew.edu/~adirks/ald/papers/skolar.htm>

Faculty Scholarship Center (at Concordia College). Retrieved December 7, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://kings2.csp.edu/fsc/About/history.htm>

Instruction Sheet: Campus Conversations, Part One. Retrieved December 7, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.aahe.org/teaching/Carnegie/instruct1.htm>

Instruction Sheet: Campus Conversations, part Two. Retrieved December 7, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.aahe.org/teaching/Carnegie/instruct2.htm>

Linking teaching and research. Retrieved November 17, 2000. from the World Wide Web: <http://www.teaching.rmit.edu.au/tlstrat/Linking.html>

The Scholarship of Teaching. Retrieved November 17, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://w-ww.umich.edu/-csic/undergraduate/jason/abstract/scholarship.html>

Slevin, James F. "Engaging Intellectual Work: The Faculty's Role in Assessment. *College English*, Volume 63, number 3, January 2001, pp. 294-298.

Starting the conversation: the "Scholarship of Teaching". Retrieved December 14, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.aahe.org/teaching/Carnegie/handout.htm>

Weiser, Conrad J. *The value system of a University-Rethinking Scholarship*. Retrieved November 17, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.adec.edu/clemson/papers/weiser.html>