

1000 0001 6487

QUEST, 1996, 48, 2
© 1996 National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education

From *Scholarship Reconsidered* to *Scholarship Assessed*

Ernest L. Boyer

Ernest Boyer (1928-1995) delivered the following keynote presentation to the 1995 conference of the National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education. In his presentation Boyer revisited his report *Scholarship Reconsidered* and outlined the general framework for the follow-up report *Scholarship Assessed*. In *Scholarship Assessed*, Boyer proposes a set of guidelines that would put in practice the theories articulated in *Scholarship Reconsidered*.

Thank you, Steve, for that generous introduction. I hate to be critical, but you forgot to mention that I was president of my eighth-grade class. For 2 consecutive years I was president of the eighth-grade class! I am delighted to be here. It's Palm Springs. I'm especially pleased to meet with this national association and to see good friends . . . and dealing with Steve, who returns to New York in Cortland, which within the State University of New York system has for decades had an outstandingly distinguished program in physical education and recreation.

I'm also deeply touched to have my informal remarks made in dedication of Dean Pease. I did not know his work except indirectly, but to the anecdotes you just heard, you relived in memory a symbol of excellence that clearly is an exemplar for us all. What a courageous memory to carry on, that life is engagement, even to the last moment of one's breath. And so, our inquiry for the next 2 hours, it seems to me, is not just a trivial exercise, another conference, but is the time to take our mission as educators to heart and to find ways for us to improve both our standards and our performance on behalf of students.

I have been asked, as you know, to reflect on the matter of scholarship. And as your conference title suggests, beyond *Scholarship Reconsidered*. It may be appropriate to begin by reflecting on the fact that for more than a decade at the Carnegie Foundation one of the top priorities, certainly during my tenure, has been the role of undergraduate education. Our effort began in 1980 with a little monograph entitled *Quest for Common Learning*, in which we inquired into the meaning of general education. In 1985 we released a report entitled *College: The Undergraduate Experience*, in which we examined the whole scope of the quality of education at the post high school level. And then in 1989 we released a small monograph entitled *Campus Life: In Search of Community*, in which we tried to inquire into the relationships that bond us all together, asking, Can we sustain in

Ernest L. Boyer was with The Carnegie Foundation, 5 Ivy Lane, Princeton, NJ 08540.

higher education a sense of stability and common purpose? Finally, in pursuing all of these reports, we kept coming back to one central place: All of these exhortations will really be inconsequential unless we examine the role of the professoriate itself. It made no sense to talk about creating a better campus life, to give more attention to classroom instruction, or to create a sense of renewal for incoming freshmen unless faculty themselves were actively engaged. It can not be done simply by exhortation from the Dean of Students.

And so, in response to this central and most essential aspect of renewal within the Academy itself, we prepared, several years ago, a small monograph entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered*. The goal of this report was to confront head on the matter of faculty roles and rewards. We began by recalling that throughout the history of higher education in the United States we have had three great traditions. First there was what we called the "Colonial College Tradition" with the founding of Harvard in 1636. In the colonial college, teaching was a central, even a sacred, function; and in those days the highest accolade a professor could receive was the famous one extended to the clerk at Oxford when they said of him, "Gladly would he learn, and gladly teach." And even as late as 1867, Charles Elliot, in his inaugural address at Harvard College, said, "The essential business of the professor is regular and assiduous class teaching."

But change was in the wind, and early in the 19th century a second great tradition was beginning to emerge in American higher education. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute was founded in 1824 in Troy, New York, and RPI's mission was, according to historian Fred Rudolph, "the building of a nation." Rudolph said that America needed, at that time, railroad builders, bridge builders, builders of all kinds; and it was the role of the college, so RPI thought, to help in the building of a new nation. The Land Grant Act of 1862 linked higher learning to America's industrial and technological and agricultural revolution. When Thorstein Veblen, the social critic, visited Madison in 1909 he said that in Wisconsin, "the university is as close to the industrious farmer as his pig pen and his tool house." David Stark (Jortan???) had just become president of the brash new university on the West Coast called Stanford, and he declared at the turn of the century, and listen carefully, that "the mission of American higher education . . . was practicality and utility." Charles Elliot, incidentally, was still hanging on at Harvard after 40 years (some presidents never learn) and is quoted as having said, "The role of the modern university is to serviceability." Fascinating: from class teaching to serviceability. And I find it absolutely remarkable that just 100 years ago in this country the most distinguished academics were declaring that service was the central mission of higher learning; even at the elite campus of Princeton, Woodrow Wilson, who was president, said, "Princeton, in the nation's service." To put it quite simply, the tradition of teaching in this country had been joined by the scholarship of building.

Meanwhile, a third great tradition was emerging. It began, perhaps most visibly, in the mid-late 19th century when some of America's most distinguished academic leaders studied at the great German universities of Heidelberg and Humboldt and were profoundly influenced by the emerging scholarship of science. The landmark event, of course, occurred in 1867 when Daniel Coyt Gillman founded what's been called the first true university in the United States, Johns Hopkins, which was modeling itself after the German model. Gillman stayed there

for 20 years and built the university from scratch. Incidentally, in the first master plan at Johns Hopkins there were no undergraduates included. Following the German model, undergraduate education was an anachronism. At the last minute they did include undergraduates, presumably to help pay the bills, a tradition that lives on to this day.

Twenty years later Gillman retired with great distinction, and the main speaker at that event was Woodrow Wilson, who was still president at Princeton; and he declared at this farewell address that Johns Hopkins is "the first university in America where the scholarship of discovery has become more important than mere teaching." When I read that quotation a year or two ago, it occurred to me that this may have been the first moment at which the teaching versus research debate actually began: when a distinguished academic juxtaposed the discovery of knowledge with something called "mere teaching." Let the record show, however, that well into the 20th century Johns Hopkins' model remained the exception and not the rule. Most colleges and universities in this country still paid primary allegiance to the traditions of teaching, and secondarily to service.

As everyone over 30 in this room surely knows--let me recast that--everyone over 50 knows, World War II provided a watershed for American higher education; we live in the afterglow of that period even as we meet. Following World War II, through the GI Bill American higher education almost overnight went from an elite to a mass system--to quote my friend Marty Treaux at Berkeley--and we expanded, building a new campus at almost one a week. Some of us recall the heydays of the 1950s, ~~when I was in California and I did spend time at the University of California Santa Barbara~~ I saw that campus almost overnight being transformed from a former teacher training and home economics institution to a campus of the UC (University of California) system. The faculty who had been hired to fulfill one mission suddenly were being held accountable to another academic culture, and there was traumatic conflict as faculty tried to realign the educational purposes that they were expected to fulfill.

Since that time, I've been intrigued to think about the fact that we really had two revolutions on collision course. In terms of social policy and access, we were moving increasingly toward an egalitarian system. Open the doors, let many in. Diversity became the shibboleth of the system. But in terms of academic culture, the system was becoming increasingly elitist. I find it hugely ironic that at the very time we were multiplying access ~~and multiplying diversity admission~~ we were narrowing the definition by which faculty should be rewarded. So we said we will have many missions, but you will be rewarded only on the basis of a unitary model. And while the catalogue of every campus represented in this room, I'll wager, still pays allegiance and lip service to teaching, research, and service, the simple truth is that the reward system has been limited to honor only those engaged in research and publication.

This introduces an absolute contradiction, and in some respects an ethical violation of what our pronouncements are all about. The truth is that it became far better for most professors to deliver a paper at the Hyatt in Chicago than to teach undergraduates back home. Frankly I find it hugely ironic that in thinking about the priorities of the scholar we give more attention to those who fly away and teach their peers than to those who stay home and inspire future scholars in the classroom. It is educationally and ethically a pattern that has to be confronted.

And so, driven by that imperative, we at the Carnegie Foundation prepared a report called *Scholarship Reconsidered*. We said the time had come to review the priorities of the professoriate. The time had come to reconsider our own three great traditions, which we had neglected; to confront the tired old teaching versus research debate; and to try to give to scholarship a broader, more efficacious meaning. Reflecting not on teaching versus research, but, rather, the more interesting question, "What does it mean to be a scholar?" we concluded that scholarship is really not a single-part function, but is a four-part function with all parts inextricably interlocked. We said that, of course, the university will continue to acknowledge, necessarily and with enthusiasm, the scholarship of discovery knowledge. If there is any single criterion that defines the intellectual life, it is the idea that cutting-edge inquiry opens up new ideas. That is a given, *sine qua non*, for what scholarship is all about, the scholarship of discovery.

But it occurred to me that that is not the ending, it is only the beginning. If you have "scholarship discovered" and do not find a way to integrate it, then you have pedantry. And that led to the second criterion, the scholarship of integration. Scholars not only discover knowledge, they have to find a place for it and integrate it into the larger pattern. Now momentarily, you can have an isolated fact, but scholarship's aim is to place discovery into a larger context. For if there is anything that is failing in the academy today, it is that there are fragments of knowledge without larger pattern. So we develop our own special categories and speak only to ourselves, and we fail to give any sense of purpose or larger perspective to our students.

Now I am intrigued that the world famous physicist, Victor Weiskopf, when he was asked on one occasion "What gives you hope in troubled times?" he replied, "Mozart and quantum mechanics." There is something about the beauty of both. Quantum mechanics and Mozart, believe it or not, have some things in common. Aesthetic discoveries are at the heart of scientific inquiry: Science and art are in fact interlocked. In the academy we pretend that they are in two separate worlds and departments where we talk to one another. Yet I am convinced that in the 21st century we are going to have new paradigms of knowledge, simply because the new questions don't fit the old boxes. Some of the most interesting work going on today is what Michael Polanyi at the University of Chicago calls the "overlapping academic neighborhoods."

That is where the really exciting stuff is going on, and, in my view, those of you in this room represent one of the true integrated disciplines that increasingly looks at the whole of the human body and the human mind and the human spirit. If we don't bring knowledge base into the reality of life we will be increasingly irrelevant.

Then it occurred to me that the scholarship of discovery, which leads inevitably to the scholarship of integration, is still insufficient. In the end, scholarship has to be applied. And so we developed the scholarship of application, because if we don't apply knowledge then we become irrelevant. Scholarship ultimately must be useful: useful spiritually, useful physically, useful economically—useful. And we argued strongly for a reaffirmation for what our colleagues in the 19th century affirmed as service, or the scholarship of application of knowledge. It is frankly ironic that we have in the past 100 years brought in the academy schools of medicine, law, business, education, physical education, nursing, and the like—all of

them assuming that knowledge should be applied--and yet we give no credit to those colleges for the essential work that they are called upon to do. So that when you get tenured into medical school, it is not to heal patients, but to do another research project. So when you get tenured into the school of education, it is not to go out and work with children in the schools, but to write another research project.

So the application of knowledge was diminished, and yet not to apply knowledge is to define scholarship as irrelevant in the social context. Then it occurred to us that this situation is still not sufficient. Discovery, integration, and application are not enough. What is needed, finally, is the scholarship of sharing knowledge, or transmission in order to keep the flame of scholarship alive. If there is any reality about scholarship, it is that it is a communal act. It takes on life only when it is shared. The test of scholarship is whether you can make sense of what you are doing with someone else. Incidentally, we never give tenure for research, we always give tenure for research *and* publication. This is an interesting point because publication is a teaching act.

So in the very structure of the narrow paradigm we have inserted teaching, but we have not called it that. Research *and* publication, that is, teaching through the printed page. So, we really did box ourselves in after World War II. At the very time we broadened the mission, we narrowed the paradigm of scholarship and diminished the reward system. In addition, we paid a deep price for the catch-22 signals that were sent to our colleagues, to our students, and to the public. I am convinced that if we wish to revitalize the academy we must somehow broaden the reward system by broadening the definition of what it means to be a scholar and really affirming the great traditions that brought us to where we are.

Now, I must confess that I did not expect *Scholarship Reconsidered* to become one of Carnegie's most widely discussed reports. It has been especially gratifying to me that, in the last few years, campuses have been reexamining their faculty reward systems. Just 2 months ago we surveyed every college and university in the United States and asked them whether they were reviewing and renewing and revising their reward system. The last time I checked—just a few days ago—60% of all colleges that responded have said that in the past 5 years they have, in fact, been revising and renewing their system of faculty rewards. I say this only to make a point and not to be self-congratulatory, but 60% of these campuses said that *Scholarship Reconsidered* was significantly involved in influencing them under the system that they made.

One thoughtful critic of the current climate, a colleague on my Board, observed as follows: Campuses are not simply giving more weight to teaching, they are redefining the roles faculty perform and are coming to what, he called, a more inclusive definition of what both teaching and research entail. And I might add parenthetically, that from my reading of the tea leaves, service is being rediscovered, too. It is just on the edges, but increasingly I am called to talk on campuses about how service can also be defined as a definition of scholarship and how it can be more adequately rewarded and seen as simply a committee meeting or working with the local YWCA.

This brings me, finally, to the essence of my remarks this morning (in case you have been wondering where this all will lead). Soon after *Scholarship Reconsidered* was published, something strange—even mildly irritating—began to happen. The ink was hardly dry on our report, when we started to get lots of calls and

letters that said, in effect, "It is one thing to give scholarship a larger meaning, but the real issue is how can scholarship be assessed?" and "Can we develop agreed upon procedures and standards by which these fancy new rediscoveries you are proposing can be used operationally?" Or, as I said back in my office, what are we going to do about it Monday morning? Many said they liked the new typology of *Scholarship Reconsidered*, but they also said it wouldn't go very far without some agreed upon standards and procedures by which faculty performance could be measured.

And, I must tell you, at first I was annoyed by this irreverence—frankly it sounded (humorously) to me like, "What have you done for us lately?" We are all theory; figure it out for yourself! Then, after a bit of sulking—which means calling another committee meeting—I concluded that the callers were absolutely right. We began at the Carnegie Foundation about 2 years ago to reflect on the possibility of a companion volume to be called, not surprisingly, *Scholarship Assessed*. It is a work in progress. My aim is to have it published within the calendar year of 1995.

I would like to reflect this morning, in our remaining moments, on four issues that were considered that do go beyond *Scholarship Reconsidered* and try to relate practically the theory of that document to some hard-hitting questions that every faculty committee inevitably must confront. Here are, tentatively, four conclusions, or at least momentarily held observations. We are concluding that evaluating scholarship requires first a consideration of the personal and professional qualities of the professor. Now I know this is very touchy ground. And yet, as we surveyed the literature, I was struck that some of the most compelling references to scholarship focus not on what scholars do, but on what scholars *are*: the quality of their life and mind, as delicate—and even as dangerous—as that concept might be considered.

Scholarship was mentioned as early as 4,500 years ago in Sumerian tablets. The translation of these tablets was said to be made by a professor of Assyriology at Berkeley. We learned from these translations, according to the professor at Berkeley, that young students who aspired to be scribes—that is, learning how to put knowledge down on clay tablets—were considered scholars. I was told that is probably the most appropriate translation. So if you think that scholarship was rediscovered by your faculty, I simply cite you 4,500 years of history.

According to those transcriptions, the early scribes were considered scholars. Incidentally, in preparing to become young scholars, students were given these silvery admonitions: You must sit still for scholarship; you must concentrate day and night. And then they ended with this observation: you must be humble. Now there is a personal quality and one that strikes me as appropriate for aspiring scholars. At least until you pass your final orals—or maybe until you secure tenure—you must be humble! But is humility merely a facade until you get there? Or does it remain an inherent personal characteristic throughout life? Are in fact scholars, by definition, humble people who always remain sure there is more to know?

Scholarship is also mentioned in a collection of sayings attributed to Confucius more than 2,500 years ago. Confucius sternly warned at that time, "The scholar who cherishes love of comfort is not fit to be deemed a scholar." So watch the degree to which you argue for merit increases! Personal qualities which strike me as a legitimate reason to deny tenure even now. Incidentally, last fall a distinguished

Chinese scholar was in residence at the Carnegie Foundation, and we asked Professor Chang how he would define the qualities of a scholar. He immediately replied, "Good character." Would that show up in your tenure committee as a first criterion, as the basis for granting status to your colleagues?

In modern times, some of the most insightful observations about scholarship were made by Columbia professor C. Wright Mills. In his essay, "Intellectual Craftsmanship," Mills writes, "Scholarship is a choice of how to live as well as a choice of a career." This is pretty sticky stuff. A scholar, Mills declares, constructs a character that has, at its core, the qualities of a good workman. We are still talking not about the checkpoints by which an article can be made, but the qualities by which a life might be lived. I especially liked the way Wayne Booth from the University of Chicago, one of my academic favorites, described the scholar. In Booth's essay, "The Scholar in Society," he writes, that at the very heart of a scholar's professional life are essential attributes that he calls "habits of rationality." These include such virtues as courage, persistence, consideration, humility, and of course, honesty. I would submit to you that one of the quickest ways for any colleague in the Academy to define disgrace is for the charge of plagiarism, or lack of integrity, to be leveled. We still acknowledge that no matter how much performance you do, there is something about integrity and honesty. If I were to choose just three of the characteristics that I think mark a person and that do not mark a performer, I would say knowledgeability, integrity, and, perhaps, persistence. One might also add creativity to the list as well.

You can define your own list, but what I am suggesting is that the evaluation of scholarship relates, in the first instance, not to a catalogue of accomplishments, but to a quality of character—to the habits of rationality that so intrigued Wayne Booth. I recognize that these may be the most difficult to measure, but still I am convinced they are the most essential.

Several years ago I was thinking about the great teachers that I had. They included a literature professor, a high school history teacher, and my own first-grade teacher—I talked about her a thousand times. But as I was reflecting on what these superior teachers had in common—I'm even inclined to say what these superior scholars had in common—I concluded they were great not only because of what they did or how they taught, but especially because of who they were. Let the record show, I'm not talking about examining the private lives of professors. I worry a lot about prejudice, about not allowing idiosyncrasies, and about gender discrimination and race discrimination. Those have no place in the world of scholarship. But I am suggesting that in defining scholarship we must consider first those human characteristics that give dignity and integrity to professional importance. Simply stated, scholarship is, as C. Wright Mills put it, a choice of how to live.

This leads me to issue number two. First, we were worrying about the qualities of the person. Second, we are asking what are the criteria that you actually use by which faculty performance might be assessed. It is absolutely obvious that in evaluating scholarship you must not only look at the person. We must have clearly defined standards by which his or her work can be measured, not just in research, but in teaching and in service, too. But is it possible, and could we agree upon criteria that would be the benchmarks of performance and excellence in all of these various measures of scholarship itself?

Let me say parenthetically that when we asked some of the publishers of journals and the like the standards they use for research publications, we got a blur of answers. There are no criteria agreed upon regarding research, even within the Academy. What is agreed upon is a process. Below the surface you will discover that, even in evaluating research, the emperor has few clothes. There is more of a sense of, "Well, my peers say it is all right," rather than, "these are criteria that we have agreed upon." And indeed, year after year, in our surveys of faculty, we discovered about 40% of them say that, on their campus, research publications are just counted, not professionally evaluated.

So we are not all that successful at having standards for performance, even in research. And certainly it is true that we have hardly any standards when it comes to teaching, and none for service. In searching for the answers to questions concerning what standards should be used, we decided to look at current practice. We pulled together in our Princeton office a whole file cabinet full of faculty handbooks and teacher evaluation forms. We then asked the editors of 31 scholarly journals and the directors of 58 scholarly presses to tell us the criteria they used in judging the merits of scholarship. At first we saw no pattern in this pile of paper. When it came to assessing scholarship in all of its forms, it seemed that every campus, every discipline, every form of scholarship, and, to some degree, every publishing house and every journal was marching to a different drummer. No agreed upon standards could be found.

Then, as we began to study the comments more closely, we began to see a pattern. We discovered that six standards of excellence were mentioned time and time again in faculty handbooks, in teacher evaluation forms, in university press guidelines, and the like. It occurred to me that these standards might in fact provide a common framework against which all forms of scholarship might be measured.

I can discuss each one of these at length, but let me summarize them for you in just ~~three~~ **A FEW** sentences. The six standards that might be used to evaluate scholarship in all of its forms could be stated this way. (And this we drew inferentially from all of this and our current practices in this country.) First, did the scholar have clearly stated goals? Second, did the scholar follow well-defined and appropriate procedures? Third, did the scholar have adequate resources and use them in effective ways? Fourth, did the scholar communicate effectively to others, since scholarship in whatever form is a communal act? Fifth, did the scholarly effort lead to significant results? And sixth, did the scholar engage in reflective self-critique? Did she or he learn from the experience?

Let me pause on that sixth and final point. It seems very clear that we are able to advance scholarship only to the extent that those who engage in the act, whether it is research, teaching, or service, culminate their effort in self-reflection: to look back, define strengths and weaknesses, and then move forward to a higher level of performance, having learned from their own activity itself.

When I imagine after all of this, putting it all together, I can imagine a grid in which the four forms of scholarship—discovery, integration, application, and teaching—are placed horizontally across the top; running vertically down the sides are the six standards by which all forms of scholarship might be measured: clear goals, appropriate procedures, adequate resources, effective communication, significant results, and careful and thoughtful self-critique.

This brings me, then, to issue number three. In addition to pursuing the qualities of a scholar and defining the standards of evaluation to be used, the next question we considered in our development of *Scholarship Assessed* is, Whom do you have do the evaluation? Whom do you give the evidence? In the Carnegie Report we concluded that there are only four sources to be used, and they are obvious people. First of all you gather evidence from the scholar herself or himself--the self-evaluation. It seems that in a printed article in research, that is all that it is. A journal article is self-evaluation in which the professor describes "what I have done, what I have found, and here it is." We don't give self-evaluation nearly as much when it comes to teaching and service, and I am convinced that the first step is to ask the professor to define the goals, explain the procedures, and demonstrate the self-critique. So self-evaluation is source of evidence number one.

The second source of evidence is peer evaluation. You not only have the professor report her progress or his progress, you have peers observing from the side and making judgments, too. Now we use this comfortably when it comes to research, but we are much more skittish when it comes to teaching. I don't know of anybody especially engaged in evaluating service in a peer review. The problem is that we do not like our colleagues "snooping around" too much. It is all right to snoop around in a printed article, but not snoop around in a classroom. We developed an attitude in our campus that academic freedom means closed doors instead of open minds. I wish that academic freedom could mean open classrooms, too, where everyone could come in and where it would be comfortable to evaluate a college class just like a kindergarten classroom. In fact the older I get the more convinced I am that if we give as much status to first-grade teachers as we give to full professors, the act alone would renew education. And if we give as much openness in the college class as we give in the elementary school, that too would bring in some fresh air and dry out the musty attitudes.

But we somehow think that college is a closed system instead of an open mind. I'd like to see peer review become a common practice, but I have to warn that it can only happen in a climate of mentoring. If you bring in a peer review as a crash course when I am up for tenure and somebody shows up, you are going to have anger and stomach cramps and a bad case of Maalox. What we need to do is create a climate on campus in which younger scholars, from the very day they arrive, are being helped along by mentors who guide them, who mentor them, and observe them so that when tenure and promotion time come review has been a part of the culture, not simply a dangerous invasion. So when I talk of peer review I'm talking of a culture of academic caring.

Third, in addition to self-evaluation and peer evaluation, certainly when it comes to teaching we need student evaluation. Incidentally, I guess I have taught for 40 years, ~~damaging~~ generation after generation. I remember it was some 40 years ago in my first college class, I was asked to have the students evaluate me. During my time teaching at Princeton, every semester in every class at Princeton every professor is evaluated and the results are sent directly to the Dean. So I have had some experience with evaluation, and I have to admit that there have been some students that have failed to discover the erudition and insights of my effort. By and large, though, I have to confess they got it right. Occasionally I was angered by the critique, but when I was more sober I knew they had gotten it. There were areas in which performance was not sufficient.

Weeding out the occasional wrong thinkers, overall the pattern of student opinion mattered very much. The only caution I make is that the only way for student evaluation to really be authentic is for students to be oriented carefully about the process itself. To drop a questionnaire on them at the end of the course, say "Fill this out," giving them no time, no respect, or no thoughtful discussion as to why they should do it, is going to result in garbage in, garbage out. They will take it as casually as we present it. But let us imagine that every freshman coming in would have as part of the orientation a half-day discussion on faculty evaluation. This is what we do in this place; this is why it is important; these are the criteria that we use; this is as important to the professor as the professor's evaluation of you will be for you; and this is an ethical act in which you are engaged. Let us discuss this questionnaire, maybe help shape it. Then, when they are asked to do it, it is in a context of credibility, and they are prepared for it. So student evaluation, just like faculty evaluation, needs to be conducted in a context of credibility and respect.

Incidentally, you can also survey former students. I have had faculty say time and time again, "Wait a minute: Students don't appreciate me now, but 10 years from now they are really going to discover my brilliance and my contribution." Well, let us test that claim. I think it was at Dades College several years ago where they told me that they never give tenure without first surveying students who graduated 6 years before. They send letters to them and say, "We are going to make decisions about this professor. Would you now 7 years later reflect on the meaning of those classes?" Students will often very conscientiously reply. So when I say student evaluation, I mean former students, too.

Finally, the other source of evaluation [is] clients, or field colleagues if you like. After all, when it comes to service, there are people in the field who have experienced your professional relationship. Moving into the field and asking colleagues—professionals in the classes in the schools, in medical centers, or in social welfare units—or professionals related to your own disciplines, what can you ask them to do to help evaluate the performance of the scholar?

Let me conclude this by saying at this point that while I see four sources of evidence, I would like to see the four sources working against the same six criteria that I have mentioned so we do not have a hodgepodge of evaluations. Let us have the standards clear and explicit, and then let us ask four different sources to comment. Then we can see patterns. The professor has no clear goals, and students and faculty and peers and clients say they don't have clear goals, and on down the list. So you start to identify strengths and weaknesses in the role of the scholar, drawing in evidence from different sources. Currently, the student evaluation form has nothing to do with the research, and on and on. So if we can get the criteria straightened out, then we have a grid of commonality by which those who provide the evidence can give us a common pattern.

One final point in our report: In addition to the matter of the character of the professor and the standards to be used and the source of evidence, the final issue to be debated is what type of evidence should be drawn together. Now I know everybody in this room has heard, with almost tear-jerking repetition, of the portfolio approach. I've thought a lot about the portfolio, and the more I think about it, it is only a place to put things! I wish I could be more enthusiastic. I was visiting a school in San Antonio, a wonderful school—Jackson Keller. I found that they

have 600 students, and I found in every classroom 30 pizza boxes! And I said, "What are those?" And they said, "Well, that is where we put all the student work." So I have a new proposal for evaluation called the "Pizza Box Approach" to faculty evaluation. If you don't have a portfolio, try a pizza box.

I don't mean to be too irreverent, but bear in mind that the portfolio gives you a moment of observation, that maybe you need something more than a published article. Also, you need a place to put it. Let's call it a portfolio. The question is, What do you put in that portfolio? I do support the idea of trying to get diversity to the evidence just as you give diversity to the sources who provide the evidence. You can think of your own list, certainly published articles. But that is only the beginning: Why not course syllabi? How about personal descriptions? Maybe written testimony from others, taped interviews, videos of classroom teaching, musical scores, recordings, or paintings? Getting to be a pretty big portfolio!

The point is that we should have evidence as diverse as the performance and even what John Gardner calls the multiple dimensions of intelligence itself. I've been intrigued for years by Howard Gardner's book *Frames of Mind*, in which he reminds us we not only have verbal intelligence, we have intuitive intelligence and spatial intelligence and physical intelligence and aesthetic intelligence and social intelligence; and yet when we come to assessment we focus in on the verbal and forget the full-breadth intelligence that makes us truly human! What if we had sources of evidence that were as broad as the dimensions of our own intelligences? That would show physical behavior and aesthetic behavior and spatial behavior and social behavior and intuitive behavior and then of course verbal behavior, which means playing around with words.

SAME PERSON?

In summary, the documentation of scholarship should be as rich and as varied as scholarship itself. Let me underscore the point that documentation should be a moving picture, not a snapshot, and that the evidence should be gathered over time.

Well, here is the word that you have been waiting for; here is my conclusion! I suggest that the scope of scholarship should be broadened to include the discovery of knowledge, the integration of knowledge, the application of knowledge, the sharing of knowledge, and that all forms of scholarship should be rewarded. But for this to be accomplished we should define with clarity the criteria by which the work of scholarship in all its forms will be assessed. I have suggested as a possibility, six standards: clear goals, well-defined plans, effective use of resources, good communications, significant results, and thoughtful critique. However, let me caution you at the end that none of this will work if the process is not trusted. We can develop all the right formulas, we can have all the right standards, and forget that the lives of people are at stake. What they really need to have is confidence in the decisions because they have confidence in the people, not in the checklist. It is what the Quakers would call the waiting brethren.

I have two brothers, one of whom is here today, a distinguished colleague. My other brother is at another university. I called him one day and asked him about faculty reward process on his campus—a large land grant university—and he gave me the insight when he said, "I don't know the process, but I know the people." Well that, in the end, is what it is all about. Universities are people places. They should not be process places alone.

Now we can clarify the process, but we have to believe in the integrity of the people. So although we talk about the procedures, let us find ways to maintain a

climate of trust in the carrying out of a clarified arrangement. This leads me to a question I am often asked—whether the faculty reward system will ever change. And my response is that this is really the wrong question. The simple truth is that nothing is ever static, conditions are always changing. This is the one truism of life itself. So the real question is not will it change—of course it will! I just reminded you that for 300 years we had a different pattern. The last 30 years defined the current paradigm. Don't tell me that now we are fixed on a model that will never shift; it is always in transition. The only two questions that matter are, In which direction is it changing? and, How long will it take?

I may be a bit optimistic because it is Palm Springs, but I do believe that, from what I have seen, there is no question that the paradigm of faculty rewards is moving toward greater recognition of teaching. I could document that for several hours because we have the evidence in our office. I also have this sense in my bones that service is going to reemerge with greater vitality than we have seen in the last 100 years simply because the university must be engaged if it hopes to survive. The social imperative questions have become so urgent that the university can not ignore them. I must say that I am worried that right now the university is viewed as a private benefit, not a public good. Unless we reengage the university as a publicly engaged institution I think our future is at stake.

So I have no question that the two dimensions of our own tradition recently neglected—teaching and service—will reemerge as priorities within the academy itself. Now, as for the speed of change, how long do we have to wait? I can only ~~say~~ **NOTE** you that if a decade ago you would have told me that in my lifetime the Berlin Wall would collapse, the Soviet Union would no longer exist, Arafat and Begin would sign a peace accord on the lawn of the White House, and Nelson Mandela would be president of South Africa, I would have said, "You're crazy!" And yet, we of the Academy persist in the belief that, "Oh, it will never change," while these cataclysmic, earth shaking, unbelievably transforming events have occurred within a decade. Why are we so timid? It is not so difficult for me to imagine that in the next decade or two the priorities of the professoriate will be reordered. I'll make it 30 years, and therefore I won't have to defend my claims.

But the larger point I would like to make is that none of this has been chiseled in stone. We sit back and pretend that change is going to happen outside us. The truth is that it will happen within us. We are the transformers of our own academy, and if there is to be change or not change, it is in this group and not in the stars. I happen to believe that this is an exhilarating time for higher education. For the first time in 40 years faculty are discussing seriously their own mission in faculty roles and rewards. I have a feeling that we are beginning to find a common language about a central function, one that will revitalize research, integrate the disciplines, and give dignity to teaching. I truly hope the Academy becomes more responsive and more serviceable to the global problems that threaten our very survival on this planet.

(LAUGHTER)