



## Scholarship in Transition

**I**N 1990, THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION published the report *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, which offered a new paradigm for recognizing the full range of scholarly activity by college and university faculty. Since then, campuses across the country have been reexamining traditional ideas about scholarship against the new, more inclusive vision we proposed—one that goes beyond research or, as we prefer to call it, the scholarship of discovery, to encourage scholarship in teaching, integration, and application as well.

It has become clear, however, that an essential piece is missing. The effort to broaden the meaning of scholarship simply cannot succeed until the academy has clear standards for evaluating this wider range of scholarly work. After all, administrators and professors accord full academic value only to work they can confidently judge.

At The Carnegie Foundation, we are convinced that it is indeed possible to find standards that can be applied to each kind of scholarly work, that can organize the documentation of scholarly accomplishments, and that can also guide a trustworthy process of faculty evaluation. But before introducing these standards and exploring their uses, let us first consider what is at stake: the capacity of higher education to meet its responsibilities for teaching, research, and service to society.

Today's constructive and vigorous discussion about faculty roles comes at a critical time, finding America in the midst of a major transition that continues to challenge colleges and universities. The extraordinary growth of the post-World

War II era has ended, and what seems to matter most in this climate of constraint is doing more with less.

Meanwhile, an explosion in communications technology is changing the way information is managed and shared. Lifelong learning is increasingly important to the nation's knowledge-based economy. And college campuses, like the larger society, have grown more diverse and divided in terms of political, philosophical, and value perspectives. Policy makers, legislators, and the media increasingly view higher education not as an investment in the collective public good but as a private benefit to individuals. Thus, the goals and procedures of educational institutions and even the nature of knowledge itself have become objects of challenge and change. Assumptions that guided the academy for the last half-century no longer necessarily hold, underscoring a need to clarify campus missions and to relate the work of the faculty more directly to the realities of contemporary life.

These trends have implications for the meaning of scholarship and for the future of higher education itself. The larger issues go beyond questions of faculty promotion and tenure; they pertain to the kinds of scholarship that matter and how scholars carry out their work. In the late 1950s, shortly after Sputnik extended the Cold War to space, sociologist Robert Merton argued that America's capacity to respond to the Soviets depended on the nation's ability to encourage scientific development by recognizing excellence in research.<sup>1</sup> As colleges and universities today seek to bolster not only research but also teaching, integrative work, and the application of knowledge, the issue of faculty excellence that Merton raised must be addressed again so that a wider range of faculty talents may flourish.

## The Traditional Mission

The history of American colleges and universities is inextricably bound to the intellectual and cultural heritage of the nation itself. The commitment to teaching reflects a collegiate tradition brought to colonial America from England. The goal was to shape the character of young students in the hope of extending the Old World's view of civilization to the New World. Teaching was, historically, the central, even sacred, function of the faculty. In 1869, more than two hundred years after the founding of Harvard, its president, Charles Eliot, could still declare that "The prime business of American professors . . . must be regular and assiduous class teaching."<sup>2</sup>

During the nineteenth century, however, higher learning began to shift its mission so as not only to shape young lives but also to serve a burgeoning nation. The founding of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1824 demonstrated, according to historian Frederick Rudolph, that colleges could provide "railroad-

builders, bridge-builders, builders of all kinds. . . .”<sup>3</sup> After the Civil War, the Morrill Act established land-grant colleges to link higher learning to America’s rapid agricultural and technological growth. As recently as the beginning of the twentieth century, David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University, stated that the entire university movement in this country was “toward reality and practicality.”<sup>4</sup> Higher education’s mission of teaching was joined by a mission of service beyond the campus gate.

Another part of the mission emerged from the prestigious European tradition brought to these shores by American scholars who had pursued advanced studies in the great German universities. The Johns Hopkins University, founded in 1876, sought to emulate that tradition in its attention to doctoral studies and research, although most of the nation’s colleges continued to emphasize the teaching of undergraduates. The “work of investigation,” as it was called by William Rainey Harper, the founding president of the University of Chicago, added to the prevailing ideas of scholarship.<sup>5</sup> This approach to the discovery of knowledge spread ultimately from the biological and physical sciences to the humanities and to the incipient social sciences. By today’s standards, however, expenditures for research accounted for a relatively small portion of the budget.

Not until after the Second World War, in fact, did science successfully identify itself with the national interest and get funded accordingly. Research as a model for faculty work then began to spread exponentially and to colonize the academy as a whole, aided by the creation of the National Science Foundation in 1950. During that decade, growing numbers of Ph.D. recipients from a core of influential institutions committed themselves to research and fanned out to accept appointments in departments of colleges and universities across the country. No matter how remote the destinations of these novice academicians, they remained oriented to the academic centers where they had studied, which had the effect of lessening loyalties to the institutions where they taught. In this period, historian Clara Lovett observed, “faculty came to see themselves, and to be perceived by others, as mobile, independent specialists who were members of a national talent pool.”<sup>6</sup> It was at this time that colleges and universities of all kinds began giving their highest rewards to the small number of scholars on each campus whose research earned outside funding and prestige.

Thus began a subtle but pervasive transformation of faculty priorities in American higher education. Virtually all institutions maintained a formal commitment to undergraduate education, and teaching remained central to the culture of many liberal arts colleges. Still, institutions seeking a national reputation gained it primarily through the research accomplishments of their faculty, and young professors seeking status and mobility found it more rewarding—in a quite literal sense—to deliver papers at national meetings than to teach undergraduates. Promotion and tenure came more and more to depend on research and publication; salaries followed suit. Data from the 1987–88 National Survey

of Postsecondary Faculty indicated, according to James Fairweather, that teaching at all types of institutions was “at best a neutral influence and, at worst, a negative influence on faculty income.”<sup>7</sup> Fairweather’s study showed that “even schools traditionally structured for teaching—liberal arts and comprehensive institutions—now follow the research model.”<sup>8</sup>

The priorities of American higher education have been significantly realigned since World War II. The emphasis on graduate education and research has cast a long shadow over undergraduate education at many large universities. The prime focus at these institutions moved from student to professor, from the general to the specialized, and from loyalty to campus to fealty to profession. Colleges and universities followed what David Riesman called a “snake-like procession” as one institution after another, especially those aspiring to higher prestige, pursued the same path.<sup>9</sup> As the research model came to prevail, faculty members were too seldom recognized for their expertise in teaching or in applying knowledge in the service of society.

Ironically, the culture of the professoriate grew more restrictive and hierarchical at the very time that America’s higher education institutions became more open and inclusive in admitting undergraduates. The academy, in other words, began to undervalue teaching just as the changing profile of the student body made the need for good teaching both more important and more challenging. Professors downplayed matters of curriculum and pedagogy to respond to a reward system that stressed research and publication.

The academy also gave short shrift to the application of knowledge, despite the country’s increasing need for expert advice to cope with growing social, economic, technological, and environmental problems. Many colleges and universities have been loath to bestow academic rewards on faculty members who concentrate on applying knowledge instead of discovering it. Such resistance to an enlarged vision of faculty work limits the services that college and university faculty provide by means of outreach and extension activities.

We believe institutions of higher education that fail to recognize the need for good teaching and for engagement in society are falling out of step with the expectations of parents, students, politicians, and the larger public, as well as with their own stated goals. Indeed, we hope that the voices now questioning the reward system will soon rise to a crescendo to argue for a better way of setting expectations for faculty.

## Scholarship Reconsidered

Some of the best articulated questions in the academy today on faculty roles and rewards have been inspired by The Carnegie Foundation’s 1990 report, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, one of the first publications to propose that colleges and universities should make fundamental changes in order to tap the full range

of faculty talent. *Scholarship Reconsidered* proposed that America's colleges and universities need a fresher, more capacious vision of scholarship. We concluded in that report that institutions should broaden the scope of scholarship, and we set out a new paradigm that views scholarship as having four separate but overlapping dimensions: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching.

The first and most familiar element in this model—the scholarship of discovery—comes closest to what academics mean when they speak of research, although we intend that this type of scholarship also include the creative work of faculty in the literary, visual, and performing arts. The academy holds no tenet in higher regard than the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, a fierce determination to give free rein to fair and honest inquiry, wherever it may lead. At its best, the scholarship of discovery contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university. The process, the outcomes, and especially the passion of discovery enhance the meaning of the effort and of the institution itself.

Integration, the second of the four forms of scholarship, involves faculty members in overcoming the isolation and fragmentation of the disciplines. The scholarship of integration makes connections within and between the disciplines, altering the contexts in which people view knowledge and offsetting the inclination to split knowledge into ever more esoteric bits and pieces. Often, integrative scholarship educates nonspecialists by giving meaning to isolated facts and putting them in perspective. The scholarship of integration is serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research.

These first two kinds of scholarship—the discovery and integration of knowledge—reflect the investigative and synthesizing traditions of academic life. The third element, the scholarship of application, moves toward engagement as the scholar asks, “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?” Historically, higher learning has been viewed as being useful, “in the nation's service,” as Woodrow Wilson put it.<sup>10</sup> Yet this obligation to the larger society should go beyond Wilson's vision of educating future leaders. Colleges and universities also must respond to the issues of the day, following the model set in place more than a century ago by the land-grant colleges as they tried to meet the needs of the nation's farmers. Lessons learned in the application of knowledge can enrich teaching, and new intellectual understandings can arise from the very act of application, whether in medical diagnosis, exploration of an environmental problem, study of a design defect in architecture, or an attempt to apply the latest learning theories in public schools. Theory and practice interact in such ventures and improve each other.

Finally, we come to the scholarship of teaching. Scholarly teaching initiates students into the best values of the academy, enabling them to comprehend better and participate more fully in the larger culture. Teaching also entices future

scholars. Robert Oppenheimer, speaking at the two hundredth anniversary of Columbia University, said: “It is proper to the role of the scientist that he not merely find new truth . . . but that he teach, that he try to bring the most honest and intelligible account of new knowledge to all who will try to learn.”<sup>11</sup> Reciprocal benefits flow as well to the faculty members who enrich their teaching by building on what they learn in exchanges with students.

*Scholarship Reconsidered* argued that the academy needs to recognize and reward all four categories of scholarship. We remain persuaded of that proposition. The modern American university has built its distinction on the excellence of the scholarship of discovery. Institutions must remain unfaltering in that commitment. But research alone will not secure the future of higher education, nor of the country at large. Poised on the cusp of a new century, in a world that wrestles with a multitude of difficulties, the university must fulfill a more well-rounded mission. New generations of college-goers need scholarly teachers to help them prepare for a time when global interdependency is much more than a slogan. Knowledge, for all the glory and splendor of the act of pure discovery, remains incomplete without the insights of those who can show how best to integrate and apply it.

Thus, American higher education has to demonstrate the imagination and creativity to support and reward both scholars uniquely gifted in research and those who excel in other uses of knowledge. *Scholarship Reconsidered* suggested that colleges and universities help faculty build on their strengths and sustain their energies by affording them flexible career paths that avoid narrow definitions of scholarship.

A broader definition of scholarship should also enable institutions to define their goals more precisely. Although the full range of scholarship could flourish on a single campus, every college and university should find its own special niche. This may mean that an institution, while recognizing all types of scholarly work, may choose to stress teaching, or application, or integration, or research. Whatever the scholarly emphasis, the approach deserves dignity and respect, insofar as it is performed with distinction. Excellence must be the only yardstick.

## A National Conversation

In the years since its publication, *Scholarship Reconsidered* has joined and helped shape a lively debate about the work of faculty. Russell Edgerton, then president of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), noted that the report appeared just as the balance between teaching and research was emerging as the subject of a national debate.<sup>12</sup> By identifying the four scholarly functions, *Scholarship Reconsidered* helped refocus the discussion on how faculty roles and institutional missions support, rather than conflict with, each

other. The challenge to the academic community was and continues to be the need to expand the definition of legitimate faculty work in ways that put research in proper perspective without doing it harm.

A broader definition of scholarship sets the stage for giving greater legitimacy to activities in which faculty members already engage, even if their institutions do not yet accord their work the rewards it deserves. For example, faculty workloads have been measured in terms of classroom teaching hours for many years. In 1994, however, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) report *The Work of Faculty* directed “attention to total faculty workload rather than classroom hours.” As the authors noted, “The world changes: . . . We now approach the question of balance through definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service that emphasize the great variety of activities so embraced; we urge the integration of *all* the components of academic activity.”<sup>13</sup>

Many academicians want the term *scholarship* to have broader implications so that the expertise represented by faculty work other than research is appropriately rewarded. Even the disciplinary and professional societies find this idea intriguing. In an extraordinary venture, Robert Diamond of Syracuse University invited representatives of twenty associations to consider what a larger idea of scholarly activity in their fields might include. Historians; mathematicians; geographers; sociologists; chemists; architects; and faculty in a variety of the visual and performing arts, business, and journalism proposed frameworks to encompass the full range of professional work that scholars might do.<sup>14</sup>

Reports from these fields show how conceptions of scholarship have widened beyond matters limited to the published results of basic research. The mathematicians, for example, proposed to include research in core or applied areas, in mathematical techniques, and in teaching and learning; syntheses of existing scholarship such as surveys, book reviews, and lists of open problems; expositions that communicate mathematics to new audiences and to established audiences with improved clarity; the development of courses, curricula, or instructional materials for grades K–12 as well as college levels; and the development of software that provides tools for research and teaching in mathematics, as well as its application and communication.<sup>15</sup>

Historians, likewise, agreed that scholarship embraced more than published monographs and refereed articles that report on original research. Works of synthesis aimed at nonprofessionals could be scholarly, the historians suggested, and so could such applied activities as public history, including exhibits or tours in museums or other cultural institutions, consulting and providing expert testimony on public policy, participating in film and other media projects, historic preservation and cultural resource management, giving public lectures, and judging history-day competitions. Scholarly work might also include teaching and such associated activities as mentoring and advising, developing curricula and instructional materials, and collaborating with the schools.<sup>16</sup>

Conversations about expanded notions of scholarship continue apace in other venues as well. The themes of some national conferences reflect the larger debate about faculty roles: “The Engaged Campus”;<sup>17</sup> “Professors as Citizens: The Academic in Public Life”;<sup>18</sup> and, most notably, the series of annual meetings sponsored by the AAHE’s Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. Oversubscribed for its first meeting, this event grew from 564 participating individuals and teams in 1993 to 1,100 at the fifth meeting in 1997. As R. Eugene Rice, the director of the AAHE Forum, observed: “New issues related to the changing priorities, rewards, and responsibilities of the professoriate are drawn to our attention almost daily. Hundreds of campus projects designed to address these issues are now in place and examples of good practice are readily available.”<sup>19</sup>

To obtain a more comprehensive picture of campus activity, The Carnegie Foundation surveyed chief academic officers at all of the country’s four-year colleges and universities in the fall of 1994 and found that more than 80 percent of them either had recently reexamined their systems of faculty roles and rewards or planned to do so. More specifically, 21 percent of the provosts said that their institutions had completed reviews during the previous five years, 45 percent said reviews were still under way, and 17 percent expected to initiate reviews soon. Interestingly, the findings were comparable among the various institutional types (Table 1.1).

Our survey found a remarkably similar range of issues under consideration on most campuses. More than half of all institutions wanted to clarify their goals in order to strike a better balance between institutional mission and faculty rewards. At least three-quarters of all institutions hoped to find ways to improve the balance of time and effort faculty spend on various tasks. The most widely embraced goal was to redefine such traditional faculty roles as teaching, research, and service (Table 1.2).

About 80 percent of the provosts reported that the expanded definition of scholarship included the full range of activities in which faculty engage, and a similar number said that the definition of teaching included such activities as curriculum development, advising, and conducting instructional and classroom research. At least half were beginning to distinguish applied scholarship (professional service or outreach) from campus and community citizenship (Table 1.3).

As we argued in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, this is a critically important move. A sharp distinction must be drawn between citizenship activities and projects that relate to scholarship itself. To be sure, there are meritorious social and civic functions to be performed, and faculty should be appropriately recognized for such work. But all too frequently, service means not doing scholarship but doing good. To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity. Such service is serious, demanding work, requiring the rigor—and the accountability—traditionally associated with research activities.

Table 1.1. In the Past Five Years, Has Your College or University Reexamined Faculty Roles and Rewards?

	YES, THE REVIEW HAS BEEN COMPLETED	YES, THE REVIEW IS STILL UNDERWAY	NO, BUT WE PLAN TO INITIATE A REVIEW SOON	NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO INITIATE SUCH A REVIEW SOON
	21 %	45 %	17 %	18 %
All Institutions	25	48	11	16
Research	15	55	15	14
Doctorate-Granting	20	47	19	15
Comprehensive	22	39	17	22
Liberal Arts				

Source: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994.

**Table 1.2. Issues Identified as the Focus of Institutional Review**  
*(Percentage Responding "Yes")*

	ALL INSTITUTIONS	RESEARCH	DOCTORATE- GRANTING	COMPRE- HENSIVE	LIBERAL ARTS
Clarifying institutional mission	69%	76%	67%	70%	65%
Redefining faculty roles	86	87	96	91	78
Striking a balance between institutional mission and faculty rewards	66	86	80	65	58
Improving the balance of time and effort faculty spend on various tasks	78	76	88	79	76

*Source:* The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994.

Table 1.3. Changes in Institutional Definitions of Faculty Work  
(Percentage Responding "Yes")

	ALL INSTITUTIONS	RESEARCH	DOCTORATE- GRANTING	COMPRE- HENSIVE	LIBERAL ARTS
The definition of scholarship is being broadened. . .	78%	66%	79%	85%	74%
The definition of teaching is being broadened. . .	80	80	89	80	79
Applied scholarship is being clearly distinguished from citizenship	54	48	55	67	43
The role of faculty as campus citizens is being clarified	64	47	54	69	67

Source: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994.

Although officials at many institutions agree on the importance of enlarging the definition of scholarship, they do not as readily find consensus on matters regarding the reward structure. Campuses have a long way to go before they show that other forms of scholarship receive value equal to that accorded to traditional research. This does not mean efforts to change have been wholly unfruitful. Institutions are clearly enhancing rewards for teaching. More than two-thirds of the campuses in our 1994 survey reported that they provided travel funds for purposes of teaching improvement (79 percent), special awards for teaching excellence (78 percent), sabbaticals for teaching improvement (74 percent), and grants for course development (68 percent) (Table 1.4). Further, some 30 percent of institutions had developed policies to encourage faculty to shift their scholarly focus on occasion, for example concentrating extra time on research for a while and then on teaching. This is a notable beginning in the pursuit of a more balanced definition of scholarship.

## Assuring Quality

The move to broaden definitions of scholarship remains uncertain in its potential outcome. Even as the disciplinary associations propose more inclusive definitions of what might count as scholarly work, they insist that assurances of quality must accompany changes. The report of the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics states that “The results of scholarly activities must be public and must be amenable to evaluation.”<sup>20</sup>

The Association of American Geographers emphasized that “teaching competence should be verified by rigorous peer review” and that geography programs “develop coherent, systematic plans for evaluating and valuing outreach roles.”<sup>21</sup> The American Chemical Society concurred, adding, “The task force recognizes the fact that mechanisms for gauging scholarship outside of research are not generally or firmly in place. We encourage the creative development of new approaches to measure scholarship in chemistry across a broad spectrum of activities.”<sup>22</sup>

This concern about quality was already manifest in the efforts of many colleges and universities to give heightened importance to teaching. The Carnegie Foundation’s 1994 survey showed widespread experimentation with new evaluation techniques—especially in regard to teaching, where the need for more systematic sources and types of evidence has long been recognized. Across the United States, in fact, over two-thirds of college and university provosts reported that their institutions were developing new methods to evaluate teaching. They were looking in other directions as well. About one-third of the country’s colleges and universities reported attempts to fashion new methods for evaluating research, creative work, applied scholarship, and service to the college or profession (Table 1.5).

Table 1.4. New Practices in Place or Being Considered to Reward Good Teaching

	NOW IN PLACE	UNDER CONSIDERATION	NOT UNDER CONSIDERATION
Travel fund for teaching improvement	79%	11%	10%
Special awards for teaching excellence	78	12	10
Sabbaticals for teaching improvement	74	12	14
Grants for course development	68	16	15
Release time for course development	58	18	24
Merit increases for teaching excellence	50	25	25
Using distinguished teachers as mentors	37	39	22
A center for teaching improvement	28	33	37
Distinguished chairs for teaching excellence	23	23	53

Source: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994.

**Table 1.5. Areas in Which New Methods of Evaluating Faculty Have Been Developed**  
*(Percentage Responding "Yes")*

	ALL INSTITUTIONS	RESEARCH	DOCTORATE- GRANTING	COMPRE- HENSIVE	LIBERAL ARTS
Teaching	69%	77%	66%	66%	70%
Advising	38	28	39	38	41
Research	34	16	33	44	30
Creative work	36	24	31	38	38
Applied scholarship	38	39	47	43	32
Service to the college	42	22	33	46	46
Service to the profession	33	19	30	40	33

*Source:* The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, National Survey on the Reexamination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994.

This spate of attention to evaluation is overdue. Many of today's most familiar evaluation procedures were implemented in a hasty response to the very special circumstances of the 1970s. It was a period during which the academy's postwar expansion eased and tenure-track positions became scarce just as larger numbers of women and minorities sought to enter faculty ranks, putting pressure on the appointment process. The "old-boy network" that had long prevailed provided for professors to be appointed and promoted through far more personalized and less formal means than are used now. As recently as the 1960s, even many prestigious liberal arts colleges relied on recommendations from professors at particular graduate schools to identify new faculty candidates. "No outside evaluations were required or expected," wrote Robert McCaughey. "Such procedures and promotion policies provided the maximum assurance that the question 'Does he fit in?' could be answered positively before the college committed itself to a faculty member, and vice versa."<sup>23</sup>

The situation changed markedly at selective liberal arts colleges during the 1970s. Peter Seldin's surveys of practices in faculty evaluation at these institutions documented the shifts. He found that although classroom teaching remained the leading factor in overall evaluation of faculty, research, publication, activity in professional societies, and consultation rose in value. Meanwhile, length of service in rank, competing job offers, and personal attributes counted for less. Indeed, the use of so-called personal attributes, such as the candidate's politics, dress, or friends, declined as factors faster and more precipitously than any others. Seldin cited a dean at a college in Ohio who explained: "Through bitter courtroom experience we've learned that personal attributes won't stand up as the reason to deny a professor tenure. The judge insisted on hard data, but all we could offer were comments about personal attributes. We lost the case."<sup>24</sup>

It was not long before the entire evaluation process became more structured and systematic. By 1983, Seldin could conclude that in the liberal arts colleges "more data sources are being introduced, and the assessment procedures are more open. Although the department chairs and deans are still the predominant sources of information on teaching performance, their grip is loosening. Other data sources—classroom visits, course syllabi and examinations, and self-evaluation—are emerging in importance. Systematic student ratings have become so popular that today they closely trail dean evaluation in importance."<sup>25</sup> Seldin's 1993 survey found that the situation had stabilized to new norms: the changes that took place from 1973 to 1983 had become the status quo in liberal arts colleges.<sup>26</sup>

But shifts occurred in other sorts of institutions, too. Criteria for advancement became more formalized and more complex almost everywhere, earlier at universities and doctoral institutions and later at the comprehensive colleges and smaller institutions. As one overview of faculty evaluation put it, "A trend of the 1970s that has continued into the 1980s has been for colleges and universities to develop faculty evaluation programs that are more systematic and

comprehensive than those in the past.”<sup>27</sup> There can be no doubt that this change helped open up what was once a fairly closed system, making it easier for women and minority candidates to enter and advance in the professoriate and increasing opportunities for Ph.D.s from newer graduate programs and less prestigious schools.

It is equally clear, however, that the revised system contained flaws. In place of the old unwritten consensus about academic values, a tendency arose to avoid subjective judgments and to try to find ways to make quality seem more objective. The Carnegie Foundation’s 1992 International Survey of the Academic Profession found that 45 percent of American professors believed that at their institution “publications used for promotion decisions are just ‘counted,’ not qualitatively evaluated.”<sup>28</sup>

Such practices have invited abuse. Attempts at objectivity led to a system in which activities that were not so easily quantified—teaching, integrative work, and applied work—were avoided as a waste of valuable time. Friends and mentors advised young scholars to fashion their careers with their resumes in mind. We even found a how-to-succeed manual that recommended getting a book out early by looking “for something quick and sure, which may not be really important, but just good enough to get published.”<sup>29</sup> Senior scholars, too, sometimes publish simply to impress review committees at funding agencies and at their own colleges or universities. People have grown so eager to associate their names with as many scholarly papers as possible that in some scientific fields papers are signed by one hundred or more authors—everyone, in fact, who contributed in any manner to the research.<sup>30</sup>

When evaluation is obsessed with numbers, it shortchanges teaching and service as well as research. In teaching, this has led to undue emphasis on student course evaluations, which provide a wealth of statistical comparisons and measures. And it has contributed to the undervaluation of professional service because virtually no institution has yet figured out how to quantify such work. It is not surprising that public service and consultation ranked extremely low as factors used in evaluating the overall quality of faculty in liberal arts colleges<sup>31</sup> or that over 70 percent of American professors have said that “better ways to evaluate teaching performance” are needed at their institutions.<sup>32</sup>

Certainly, the move to broaden scholarship has called new attention to the imperative for better assessment—evidence and standards that allow colleagues to make reliable judgments about quality without overreliance on quantification. It is widely recognized that new means of evaluation are essential to foster first-rate research and creative work and to encourage and reward scholarly teaching and professional service. A task force on the reward system at the University of California, San Diego, for example, concluded that “to do proper justice to teaching and service contributions within the reward system, it is necessary to develop evaluation criteria and documentation methods to supplement those

now in use.”<sup>33</sup> Ball State University pointed out that a pluralistic approach to faculty scholarship requires “each faculty member . . . to communicate clearly his or her goals and accomplishments to those judging for tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases.”<sup>34</sup>

Our own experience attests both to the seriousness of the problem and to the necessity for change. *Scholarship Reconsidered* was well received on many campuses that were struggling to rethink faculty roles and rewards. The report was recommended reading for faculty and administrators involved in these conversations. But as useful as the book may have been for stimulating discussion about the nature of academic work, the fact remains that it had little to say about the practical issues facing campus committees charged with bringing about change. The ink was barely dry when we started to get calls and letters that said, in effect, “It’s one thing to give scholarship a larger meaning, but the real issue revolves around how to assess other forms of scholarship.”



During the last half century, the United States built what is unquestionably the most remarkable network of institutions of higher learning in the world. Now, though, this marvelous array of colleges and universities must adjust to new realities in an era of scarcity and rising expectations. The golden age of expansion for colleges and universities lingers as a memory. Richard Atkinson and Donald Tuzin have written that the time has come “to restore the structural balances through which the university attunes itself to a changing world.”<sup>35</sup>

The continued vitality of the nation’s colleges and universities in the approaching century depends on their ability to show more care for a wider range of missions. As a correlate, they must embrace a broader vision of scholarship to better align faculty roles with institutional goals. Otherwise, higher education ends up paying only lip service to faculty activities that it is not prepared to reward.

Realization of this vision demands new ways of evaluating scholarly work, so as to ensure its quality and fully legitimate its different forms. One distinguished professor at a prestigious liberal arts college told us, “As a faculty member who has been rigid about the role of ‘traditional research,’ I find my position much softened as long as the issue of scholarly rigor is being upheld.” This is, of course, our point.