1000 0002 0014

dee 7/6

CHAPTER 5

~~EVALUATION~~ ~~Rese~~ Review & Recognition

No challenge to the thesis of this report is greater than that of evaluation. If we cannot show that the various dimensions of scholarship can be appropriately assessed it will be difficult if not impossible to establish new practice. Indeed we are persuaded that if academic work, regardless of its thrust, cannot be documented, and judged objectively by others, it does not merit reward. The task of broadening and making more legitimate the procedures by which faculty are assessed will not be easy, but the effort must be made since more creative approaches to evaluation would, we believe, encourage faculty to feel good about the work of their profession. We have noted repeatedly in this report, the three legs of the professional stool on which the American professoriate sits are firmly in place: research, teaching, and service, but the top priority—and often the only priority that matters—is research, or more precisely publication. And while talking to colleagues about the current situation we often heard that research is so dominant, not because it is the only consequential faculty function, but because it can be ''assessed.'' It is time that published articles be counted, even read, but the truth is that evaluating the quality of journal articles is difficult, indeed.

Further, it is inappropriate, we believe, to limit the definition of scholarship to those functions that are considered ''easiest'' to measure. The challenge facing American higher education is to, evaluate all forms of scholarship in ways that have the same legitimacy as we now assign to basic research and publishing. William D. Schaefer, professor of English at the University of California, Los Angeles and, former Executive Vice Chancellor at that institution, put the challenge this way: ''I do not have the answer. I think, however, that if in its reward system colleges and universities would attempt to take a serious look at the *totality* of the individual—not merely one's publication but the quality of one's teaching and of one's

mind—recognizing that they also serve those who do not always or often have something worth saying in print, one might be on firmer ground.''

The process by which faculty are assessed should lend dignity and meaning to the scholarly life and provide a basis for the authentic recognition of a variety of functions. The reward system of higher learning should stimulate creativity rather than suppress it. Further, an enlarged view of assessment could provide an integrating thread within the academy, drawing the several strands of scholarship together into a coherent whole. Above all, its our conviction that the reward system should encourage faculty members to build on their interests and capabilities and also give them the sense that they are contributing to the special mission of the institution in which they serve.

We conclude that the scholarship of integration, application, and teaching can, in fact, be measured. We also are persuaded that the evaluation of the professoriate urgently needs to be expanded in ways that bring more integrity to the process of faculty selection, tenure, and promotion. Only as this occurs will the potential of professors—as well as the nation's higher learning institutions—be fully realized. But before discussing specific ways by which this might be accomplished, there are several issues that relate to evaluation, generally, that be carefully considered.

First, the standards used to hold faculty member's accountable for their work must reflect the standards of the guild as well as the mission of the institution. As we have stressed repeatedly in this report, many of the conflicts about tenure and promotion we encountered occurred because the college and university wasn't clear about its own emphasis; or, worse because it gave lip service to one priority—teaching, for example, and then held faculty accountable for another, most frequently research and publication. Frankly, it's grossly unfair to aggressively recruit students, assign faculty a heavy teaching load and then develop standards of

faculty assessment where teaching is neglected. We are convinced that faculty assessment will be clarified as colleges become clear and consistent about just what it is they are trying to accomplish.

Another point. The most important standard to which all scholars should be held accountable is integrity. The false manipulation of lab data or plagiarism or some other form of fraud not only discredits profoundly the researcher but destroys the foundation on which fair and effective evaluation must be built. In recent years, there have been disturbing examples occasionally of the misuse of data and more subtle, but equally disturbing is the way senior researchers use junior colleagues or graduate assistants without giving them full credit for their work. The task of evaluation begins, therefore, with the individual's commitment to openness and honesty in the process. While the educational institution can demand integrity, only the individual scholar can guarantee it.

While, in this report we emphasize and defend four categories of scholarship, we also would insist that all faculty, especially all who are on tenure-track, should have demonstrated their capacity to conduct original research. Indeed, this is what the dissertation is all about. That experience, with its discipline and excitement, should be remembered and respected and allowed to influence the later form of scholarship.

First, every scholarly project should have goals and procedures worked out in advance, not retrospectively reported.

Second, every project should be well documented, usually in writing—although films, computer software, and other forms of evidence may be used.

Third, in every project, the scholar should critique his or her own result. Critical self-evaluations, written and oral, are expected.

Fourth, every scholarly project should be peer reviewed—which may require not just reading papers, but field visits and classroom visits, too.

What we are proposing in short is that the evaluation process be broadened and become more individualized as well. If faculty are going to build on their strengths *and* contribute to institutional, evaluation criteria must be negotiated and tailored to fit individual capabilities as well as institutional needs. But, the mandates summarized above can, we believe, be usefully applied to every dimension of scholarship discussed in this report.

Thus far we talked about general assessment considerations appropriate for all professors, but how does evaluation relate, more precisely, to the four dimensions for scholarship discussed in this report? Let's consider, first, the scholarship of discovery. It's here that assessment patterns are most familiar. Faculty members are expected to select a research topic, gather evidence in the library or laboratory, summarize, writing the findings, and publish the result to demonstrate the *advancement of knowledge*. Disciplinary journals select the leading specialists in the field to review submissions and only the best appear in print. This is the ideal—not always attained—but it remains a process in which most academics have confidence. If journal articles are good, books published by university presses where a similar review process is utilized are even more highly valued. But here a word of warning: While published articles is the way the scholarship of discovery is assessed, there is disturbing data suggesting that such articles are not carefully critiqued. At least that is the opinion of many academics. When we surveyed college faculty several years ago, a sizeable minority reported that at their institution publications were, in fact, "just counted." (Table x)

Although we stress the importance of written documentation, we do not want a procedure that discriminates against faculty in the arts. This is, perhaps, the most difficult dimension of

discovery. Problems of documentation not with study, it is our conviction that artistic endeavors such as music recitals and performances, juried exhibitions of art work, and involvement in the creative aspects of theatrical and dance productions deserve recognition. We suggest that these products cannot only be critiqued by peers but we also suggest the onlist might also be asked to prepare a description of the activity and a record of peer or juried assessment should be possible and readily provided.

This brings us to the scholarship of integration. Multidisciplinary work is becoming increasingly important as the old categories of knowledge are beginning to break down and new interdisciplinary studies are beginning to emerge. Further, there is a growing need for the synthesis of knowledge, and information is being organized in ways that reveal illuminating insights. Further, we were particularly annoyed to discover that today's professor understood the significance of their work. In our faculty survey we asked faculty to respond to this statement: ''Multidisciplinary work is soft and should not be considered scholarship.'' Only 8 percent agreed, 17 percent were neutral, while a striking 75 percent disagreed. The pattern, with only slight variation, was true for both male and female professors, young and old, in various disciplines and at all types of higher learning institutions.

TABLE __

MULTIDISCIPLINARY WORK IS SOFT AND
SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED SCHOLARSHIP

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE WITH RESERVATIONS	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE WITH RESERVATIONS	STRONGLY DISAGREE
All respondents	2%	5%	17%	26%	49%
Four Year	2%	5%	12%	27%	54%
Two Year	2%	7%	27%	24%	39%
Research	2%	5%	9%	27%	57%
Doctorate	2%	4%	14%	25%	56%
Comprehensive	3%	5%	14%	27%	51%
Liberal Arts	2%	6%	16%	28%	49%
Two Year	2%	7%	27%	24%	39%
Male	2%	7%	17%	28%	46%
Female	2%	2%	18%	22%	56%
Less Than 40	2%	4%	14%	27%	54%
40 Years or More	2%	6%	18%	26%	48%
Biological Sciences	2%	7%	17%	22%	53%
Business	2%	3%	28%	31%	37%
Education	2%	5%	18%	22%	53%
Engineering	2%	7%	19%	33%	39%
Fine Arts	4%	4%	22%	23%	47%
Health Sciences	1%	8%	11%	33%	48%
Humanities	2%	6%	13%	25%	53%
Physical Sciences	1%	7%	18%	32%	42%
Social Sciences	2%	6%	11%	21%	60%
Other	3%	5%	20%	27%	45%

First, scholars engaged in integrative work can be evaluated by their publications. There remains today the widespread assumption that if faculty are publishing in specialized journals they are not engaged in scholarship. We need to be straightforward about this. There are different kinds of journals and other forms of writing that are also scholarly and deserve recognition. A number of the more recently established professional journals came into being

precisely for the purpose of synthesizing knowledge and building bridges between the disciplines, not extending the specialization. (GET EXAMPLES)

But, we do not want to limit writing that is acceptable as scholarship to articles published only in academic journals. Writing for a broader, non-specialist audience is desperately needed and can be appropriate scholarly. Consider, for example, textbooks. Despite the heavy—we think, inordinate—reliance on the textbook, those persons most capable of writing richly textured comprehensive texts often are discouraged from doing so. According to the prevailing view, ''real'' scholars do not write textbooks. The writing of textbooks is regarded as a commercial endeavor that is said to indicate the scholar's lack of professional commitment.

In her article on ''The Academy's Contribution to the Impoverishment of American Texts,'' Harriet Tyson-Bernstein finds that ''. . . the academy's disdain for those who write textbooks is enormous. That disdain is expressed not only in the mutterings of colleagues, but also by powerful institutional disincentives.'' Still, if the integration of knowledge is going to be both more highly valued and encouraged among faculty, the writing and publishing of textbooks that synthesize, interpret, and relate materials in an intellectually challenging way will need to be recognized. We suggest that textbooks be sent—for peer review—to a scholar who has himself or herself authored a well regarded textbook.

''We value publication by our faculty members, but the kinds of publications we value are different,'' said Martin Schatz, dean of the Crummer Graduate School of Business at Rollins College in Florida. Unlike most institutions, the Crummer School considers faculty members worthy of tenure for writing textbooks or articles on teaching business. The 15 faculty members have produced 38 textbooks among them.

''Schools need to be more succinct in defining their mission,'' Dean Schatz said. ''For a large research university with doctoral programs, traditional research may be appropriate. But for a school like ours or the many others where the main work is at the undergraduate or master's level, the application of knowledge should be valued more than the development of knowledge.''

Finally, there is the matter of so called popular writing, having articles printed in well regarded literacy magazines, for example. Opportunities to publish this kind of scholarly work are growing. And, because integrative scholarship is more readily accessible to the non-specialist, faculty can publish their scholarship in more popular literature, reaching—not inconsequentially—a much larger audience. The integration of knowledge can be documented and assessed in much the same manner as is specialized disciplinary work. Openness to a broader range of publications is required and peer review, by colleagues who are broadly educated and capable of synthesis themselves, will be necessary.

Yet another measure of the scholarship of integration might be active participation in curricular innovations—a freshman integrative core program, perspective courses in the sophomore and junior years that give an added dimension—moral and ethical, perhaps—to the student's program of study, and senior year cross-disciplinary seminars or other capstone experiences. All of these activities would be areas or locations for faculty evaluation. Is the faculty member teaching outside as well as within his or her department? And, is there evidence of commitment to innovative approaches to the goal of integration in the undergraduate curriculum? Positive responses to these questions will contribute to favorable evaluation. And we could imagine asking a faculty who has been working on an interdisciplinary course to describe, in writing, the connections he or she is seeking and then invite colleagues from the disciplines involved to evaluate the work.

The application of knowledge, our third form of scholarship, has been so frequently discounted as mere service and separated from that which is rewarded as scholarship that its serious assessment is particularly difficult to consider. There has been an inclination for service to include everything from corporate consultation to summary on the school board. Review committees have been understanding reluctant to disguise scholarship in such vague and precise

ways. Still, the application of knowledge is increasingly important and can, we believe, be carefully critiqued. Consider, for example, that the results of applied research are frequently published in academic journals and subjected to the same kind of peer review as is basic research. Again, there is little difficulty here.

Applied research *not* submitted for publication can also be thoroughly documented, including a report on the methodology used and outcomes achieved. Faculty involved consultation or field work are going to have to be especially careful in documenting their work. Written evaluations by clients or other recipients of professional services need to be systematically collected and submitted for evaluation. Letters of assessment from practitioners in the field would contribute constructively to the process.

Applied scholarship can seldom be contained within disciplinary boundaries. For example, policy analysis or environmental studies are by their very nature interdisciplinary in character. In fairness, problem-centered scholarly activity requires that the evaluation process include scholars whose interests go after a single department or division. Also, because this work takes place beyond the campus—in the ''real world'' as we like to say. The evaluation process will be enriched, we believe, by using external representatives. Such practitioners drawn into the evaluation process from the outside will ask questions and provide perspectives that are valuable and not otherwise unavailable. Their participation would not only enhance the academy's appreciation of what can be learned from practice, but would encourage its recognition.

We wish to say a special word about the application of knowledge as it relates to working with the schools. Some of the disciplines are establishing alliances between college and university professors and teachers in the high schools that focus on the teaching of discipline-based subject matter. These efforts in such fields as modern languages, mathematics, and history have met with enormous success. Scholarly work is being produced on the analogies that are drawn, the metaphors generated, and the experiments developed that best represent the content

of the discipline. Faculty are being encouraged to generate case studies of effective teaching in their subject matter area. This form of scholarship can certainly be documented and assessed, and it should be rewarded.

Finally, the evaluation of the scholarship of teaching is crucial, too. Effective teaching requires more than performance skills and communication techniques. Still, teaching is highly prized within the academy and this commitment should, we believe, be reflected in the evaluation system. But again, how should we proceed? During the preparation of this report, we found that almost all colleges and universities say teaching is important but then make little or no effort to judge, with care the performance of faculty members and use the evidence as significant in deciding who should receive tenure and be promoted from one rank to another. What we found interesting, however, is the high priority faculty themselves assign to teaching. More than 60 percent of the faculty we surveyed agreed that ''teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty.'' It is worth noting, however, the gender difference. Women faculty members were more in agreement with the student than were men. Older faculty supported teaching more than their younger counterparts. And not surprising, faculty at liberal arts, community colleges gave higher priority to teaching then did those at the research and doctorate institutions.

TABLE __

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD BE THE
PRIMARY CRITERION FOR PROMOTION OF FACULTY

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE WITH RESERVATIONS	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE WITH RESERVATIONS	STRONGLY DISAGREE
All Respondents	32%	30%	7%	18%	13%
Male	29%	29%	8%	19%	15%
Female	39%	35%	6%	14%	7%
Less Than 40	28%	25%	9%	24%	15%
40 Years or More	33%	31%	7%	17%	12%
Biological Sciences	21%	30%	7%	21%	22%
Business	37%	30%	5%	16%	12%
Education	41%	29%	8%	14%	9%
Engineering	28%	18%	9%	23%	22%
Fine Arts	37%	36%	9%	12%	5%
Health Sciences	36%	35%	6%	14%	9%
Humanities	27%	36%	6%	20%	13%
Physical Sciences	23%	28%	7%	21%	20%
Social Sciences	25%	25%	9%	24%	17%
Other	46%	31%	5%	12%	6%
Four Year	20%	27%	9%	25%	19%
Two Year	56%	36%	3%	3%	1%
Research	6%	15%	9%	36%	34%
Doctorate	14%	27%	11%	30%	18%
Comprehensive	31%	37%	8%	17%	8%
Liberal Arts	38%	38%	6%	12%	6%
Two Year	56%	36%	3%	3%	1%

The documentation of good teaching requires evidence from three sources: self-assessment, assessment of faculty colleagues, and the students. As for self assessment, it is appropriate, we believe, that each faculty member submit a self-evaluation, one that includes a statement of class goals and procedures. Such a report also would include course outlines, justification of teaching materials used, and a copy of tests. One of the best ways to document this basis requirement is to provide instructional materials to faculty colleagues for analysis and

critique: the syllabus, the textbook, readings and reference lists, class assignments, student manuals, computer programs. Examinations and quizzes are particularly revealing. An external examiner—an off-campus expert—might add objectively to the process.

Classroom visitations by peers are being used more frequently, but need to be more than one-shot affairs. A collaborative teaching environment, where faculty are constantly moving in and out of one another's classrooms and sharing in a variety of approaches to teaching, makes direct observation of the how and what of teaching more authentic. Classroom visitations by professional peers are being used more frequently, but, as pointed out, they need to be more than one-shot affairs. A collaborative teaching environment, where faculty are constantly moving in and out of one another's classrooms and sharing in a variety of approaches to teaching, makes direct observation of the how and what of teaching more authentic.

We know the limits of peer evaluation—faculty as poor judges of teaching, kid-glove treatment, uneven criteria mixed with personal judgments, etc. Nevertheless, peer review can be useful, can be handled in a fair and disciplinary way, and should be a part of the information deemed relevant to evaluation. Institutions interested in this aspect of evaluation need to provide regular opportunities for faculty to interact in contexts where teaching process and the intellectual substance of a field come together. Team teaching, capstone seminars, even disciplinary clubs—e.g., the economics club or the French club-allow faculty to intellectually engage the subject matter of their fields in the presence of both colleagues and students.

At Evergreen State, where collaborative teaching is taken most seriously, faculty have ample opportunity not only to see their colleagues teach, but to probe the depth of their knowledge, challenge their assumptions, witness how they function in an interdisciplinary environment, and query students about what they are learning. The special kind of scholarship required to sustain quality teaching is constantly being assessed by peers and can be reliably documented. At another West Coast university, the Philosophy Department sponsors a forum which meets once a week and reviews a recently published book in this field—a book of

significance. Department members take turns relating the substances of the book to their own specialization and courses they teach in the undergraduate program, and a vigorous discussion ensues. The faculty members' ability to interpret and synthesize—the synoptic capacity we speak of—becomes most evident.

Finally, students also have an important role to play. At Princeton University a faculty evaluation program was introduced in 1969. Today, all students fill out an evaluation form for all faculty in all courses. This form includes an "open-ended" question in which students are free to make additional comments. Student evaluations at Princeton are used for tenure review, and also provide feedback to each teacher (*College: The Undergraduate Experience in America,* p. 156).

Perhaps the best critique of teaching is for the teacher and students occasionally to step back and evaluate while the course is still in progress. As professors pause to talk openly about what is going on, students will be encouraged to react, and through such openness teaching and learning will improve. In one class we visited, the professor began with a discussion of the last class meeting, which he felt "had not gone very well." Students were asked to give their opinions about the session. A healthy exchange followed. The goals and procedures of the class were candidly discussed (*College: The Undergraduate Experience in America,* p. 156).

At the Western College program of interdisciplinary studies, Miami University of Ohio, faculty were frustrated with standard student evaluation forms because they provided little opportunity for interpretation of what students wished to communicate about their experiences with faculty. Consequently, a new course evaluation form was developed which offers a series of essay and short-answer questions to supplement numerical data, which is also collected. This expanded procedure is proving useful for future course planning. At William Jewell College, studies of student evaluations of faculty show that "semester after semester the overall mean figures for the college on student evaluations will fall between 4 and 5 on a five-point scale in spite of the fact that there will be consistently be four or five [class] sections in which the scores

will fall as low as 2.3 or 1.8. There is evidence, in other words, that students discriminate fairly between good and bad teaching.''

Skidmore College has been successful in a procedure to regularly contact alumni—especially in tenure review cases—to gain retrospective former student assessments. Each academic year, *departmental or divisional peer evaluators (selected by departmental faculty) should make evaluations of the scholarly performance of each untenured but tenure-track faculty member*. Departmental chairs should also visit classes of untenured faculty.

Having considered the criterion to be used in evaluating the various forms of scholarship, we should like to comment briefly on fixing the process. According to current practice evaluation focuses, with special urgency, on young, non-tenured members of the professoriate. Once tenured, often the heat is off. We are convinced that faculty evaluation should continue throughout the professional career, and while standard used may shift, all professors should, we believe, be regularly assessed. Perhaps at the beginning of each academic year every faculty member could be asked to submit a self-evaluation of his or her scholarship for the past year, and, a statement of professional goals-including goals of scholarship—for the new year. This procedure is now well-established at many colleges and universities, including Eckerd College and Northeast Missouri State University.

A successful recent candidate for tenure at Syracuse University was a faculty member in the Writing Program who had designed the curriculum for a course, taught the curriculum, taught other teachers how to use the curriculum, presented a discussion of the curriculum at a conference and wrote a journal article examining the theoretical principles of the curriculum.

Candidates for tenure and promotion in the Writing Program are evaluated on two dimensions of performance and achievement that cut across the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. The guidelines speak of ''significant intellectual work'' and say that it includes the following:

a) creating new knowledge or understanding

b) clarifying, critically examining, weighing, and revising the knowledge claims, beliefs or understandings of others

c) connecting knowledge to other knowledge

d) preserving, restoring, and reinterpreting knowledge

e) arguing knowledge claims in order to invite criticism and revision

f) making specialized knowledge publicly accessible and usable, especially to young learners

g) helping new generations to become active knowers themselves, preparing them for lifelong learning and discovery

h) applying knowledge in significant or innovative ways

i) applying ethetic, ethical, political, or spiritual values to make judgments about knowledge and its use

j) creating insight and communicating forms of experience through artistic works or performance

"We use the term 'intellectual work' to cover the horizon," said Louise Wetherbee Phelps, director of the Writing Program and professor of writing and English. "A university is about knowledge and about the different things that can be done with knowledge."

The Writing Program is the first unit at Syracuse to respond to an exhortation by the university's administration to make the institution a model for a balanced integration of teaching and research. Dr. Ronald R. Cavanaugh, vice president for undergraduate studies, has been urging all units within the university to reconsider the guidelines that affect hiring, evaluation, salary, promotion, and tenure.

"It is my contention that a new game of 'balanced integration' is going to be placed front and center in the public's eye and that if we announce that we intend to make up its challenge and then are able to deliver some early results, we can both discharge our institutional

responsibility and achieve the national recognition we seek in the same action,'' Mr. Cavanagh said this year in a seminar for the university's administrators.

We have another priority to propose. There is strong evidence that the scholarly interest of a professor may shift from time to time. We could imagine, for example, that a faculty member would be greatly captive by a research topic and would like to devote most of his or her time to specialized investigation. It is possible that later on some integrative questions would emerge, and, still later, there may be special interest in the scholarship of application or of teaching.

It is our conviction that these shifting interests should not only be permitted but encouraged and rewarded. Specifically, we strongly recommend that colleges and universities have *Scholarship Contracts* for all faculty, an arrangement in which the faculty member would be able to define in writing his or her professional goals for a three- to four-year period. The professor would be permitted and encouraged to shift from time to time from one scholarly activity to another. Staying with our discussion of scholarship for many years without a break would, in fact, be considered the exception.

Every contract, regardless of the dimension of scholarship involved, would be expected to meet four general principles that apply to every project, studies that can be used as framework for faculty in all fields and in all fair dimensions of scholarly endeavor.

The approach to scholarship we are advocating requires an evaluation process that is flexible, capable of being individualized, and that can vary across institutional sectors of higher education. In our search for a process that might accommodate this variety of needs, as mentioned earlier, we kept returning to occupations outside the academy—architects, photographers, and artists. These professionals have portfolios in which they display their best work, making accessible, for all to see, the strengths—and the weaknesses—of their professional efforts. The recent work of the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning supports this approach. Robert A. Blackburn and his colleagues

reviewed the literature on effective performance appraisal systems and concluded that the individualized portfolio can promote continuous faculty growth and development while also meeting the organizational needs of the department and the institution: "... the portfolio process involves close interaction between individual faculty members and their peers and chairs; it increases understanding and respect for one another's work and can reduce gender and racial bias."

Finally, the way data about faculty are gathered and organized also needs to be considered. We are impressed by the *faculty portfolios* idea, an agreement understanding the individualization of evaluation allows each person to document his/her strengths and interests. Through this evaluation process individual faculty are freed to concentrate on those activities to which they are most committed. In the portfolio process a faculty member would choose which one-or more—of the four forms of scholarship would be emphasized in his or her work over a given period of time. This decision would take into consideration not only the faculty member's scholarly interests and strengths, but the needs of the department and distinctive mission of the institution, as well. Goals would be collaboratively established and ways of documenting their accomplishment would be agreed upon. Also discussed would be the kind of support needed to achieve the stated objectives. The documentation of this process and related achievements would be the responsibility of the faculty member. (ADD SKIDMORE EXAMPLE HERE).

17A B C D

When all is said and done, effective evaluation of the New American Scholar will occur only when the spirit of mutual trust and good will prevail in the relationship between that individual and the college or university. We have presented several areas for evaluation, and even more specific procedures, but unless they are used fairly and appropriately, unless both individual and institution accept these forms of evaluation as likely to be beneficial to personal growth and institutional mission, these arrangements will fail. We believe they can benefit faculty, encouraging them to be scholars, and thus benefit the institutions with which they are affiliated. Only that outcome will justify evaluation.

#7 17 A

At Skidmore College in New York State, a planning group of faculty, students, trustees and administrators was appointed to examine the institution's future. It's report, issued in December 1989, among other matters, called for a reemphasis on teaching and a review of faculty promotion and tenture guidelines to ensure that they underscore this mission. These imperatives were presented in the context of bolstering the college's Liberal Studies curriculum, the centerpiece of the curriculum for all students. The report stated:

"We need to provide a clearer statement of the expectations of faculty at Skidmore College, one that pays due regard to the primacy of teaching among the several criteria at which we look and that takes into a-count a faculty member's participation in Liberal Studies, in collaborative students/faculty research, in supervision of senior thesis and projects, and in general involvement--extracurricular as well as curricular--with students.

B

Alverno College has developed a system of assessing and rewarding faculty members that is consistent with its education mission, which is built on an ability-based curriculum that stresses student outcomes. What this means in the assessment of faculty is that Alverno is far more interested in what they do to contribute to the development and teaching of the curriculum than in counting their publications.

The promotion criteria look at the extent to which faculty members do the following:

1) Develop their expertise in the theory, teaching and assessing of a particular ability, at all levels of its development.
2) Deepen their own academic experience through interaction with educators across disciplines.
3) Contribute significantly to curriculum design, development, implementation and evaluation within the context of a particular competence.
4) Function as a resource for their colleagues in instructional and assessment techniques.

"At Alverno," says the Alverno Educator's Handbook, "becoming an expert in a discipline necessarily means becoming an expert in teaching that discipline."

Thomas R. Lord said: "For some, the term scholarship only implies research leading to publication. Faculty work falling outside the definition is seen as academic dabbling. This type of sterotypical thinking excludes not only much of the scholarly activity in the community college, but in most of the baccalaureate and smaller institutions as well. Scholarship, instead, should be seen in a much broader context."

"Most of the time scholarship is still equated with research and publication on our campus," said Bruce Henderson and William Kane, members of the faculty at Western Carolina University. "We have been surprised at the degree of resistance to the broader notion of scholarship. And we are at a comprehensive, not a research university." Henderson is a professor of psychology and Kane is an associate professor of management and marketing. (Chronicle, p. B3, 5/2/90)