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INTERPRETATIONS
The Oregon State University Model

The values of a university are clearly indicated by the criteria used to evaluate its faculty members.

A living position description that describes the scholarship expectations and assigned duties for each faculty member shall be the basis for evaluating their performance.

Faculty contributions to effective team efforts are valued as well as individual achievements.

Scholarship is creative work that is validated and communicated. Forms of scholarship include artistry and the discovery, application, and integrations of knowledge.

There are dozens of ways to communicate and validate scholarly achievements.

Peers validate accuracy and the degree to which a scholarly achievement is original, significant, and useful to others.

Scholarly achievements are made by knowledgeable people throughout society—not just at universities.
day1 THURSDAY, OCT. 1

WHY AND HOW ARE UNIVERSITIES CHANGING

9 am - 2 pm  Registration
Alumni Center, Lobby

Noon  Lunch and Opening Session
Alumni Center, Ballroom
• Workshop design and goals (overview)
• Finding value for yourself and your institution

1:20 pm  University Values and Faculty Evaluation — Examples of Change
LaSells Stewart Center
Austin Auditorium
• Imperatives for change (A video)
• The forces of change - Richard Sisson, Ohio State University
• Changing values at Oregon State University - A discussion
Roy Atten, Leslie Davis Burns, David Evans, Darcy Hingson,
Michael Orland, and Weber
• My own private microscope: A dance - Joseph Henschel
• Break, Networking, and Idea Fair

4:15 pm  Idea Fair and Progressive Buffet
Alumni Center, Ballroom
• A forum for exchanging ideas and making contacts
• Graze the four-course buffet while you visit with presenters, exhibitors,
and colleagues.
• Identify two ideas to discuss with your team this evening.

in Change
Alumni & LaSells Stewart Centers
(45 minute concurrent discussions)
• Broader views of scholarship.
  Alumni Center, Room 111A & B
  C. Glosick* (Carnegie),
  M. Henry (USM), G. Rice, (AAHE),
  Bud Weiser (OrSU).
• Faculty roles in shaping change.
  LaSells Stewart Center, Ag Products Room
  M. Orland* (OrSU), J. Byrne (OrSU),
  W. Vossman (Uld), W. Woodman,
  (IoSU).
• The ingredients for cultural change.
  Alumni Center, Room 115 A & B
  G. Evans* (OrSU), R. Perry (UMn),
  L. Houglum (OrSU),
  D. Damrosh (ColU).
• When and why change may run aground.
  LaSells Center, Ag Leaders Room
  L.D. Burns* (OrSU), G. Allen (UMn),
  L. Sandmann (MiSU),
  R. Sisson (OhSU).

8:00 pm  Work Sessions for University Teams
• Select a meeting space in the Alumni Center.
• Invite presenters to meet with your team if you wish.
• Adjourn at the teams' discretion.

day2 FRIDAY, OCT. 2

BUILDING THE CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

7:00 am  Continental Breakfast
Alumni Center, Ballroom
• University teams reconvene over breakfast to continue discussion
• Update and suggest additions to the agenda.

8:30 am  Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards
LaSells Stewart, Austin Auditorium
• Foundation for change (A video)
• The professor and scholar for the 21st century, David Damrosh,
  Columbia University
10:30 am

**Faculty evaluation and rewards at your university**

**Alumni Center, Ballroom**

- **Table Talk:** Each person at your table will speak briefly (2 minutes) on any one of the three questions below, followed by a general discussion around the table.
  - What useful ideas did you get from the presentations?
  - What approach might work well at your university?
  - What are the primary barriers at your university?
- Refine ideas during a Q & A period with a morning speaker and panelists.

12:30 pm

**Picnic Lunch on the Patio**

**Alumni Center Patio**

- **Musical Performance — Starr McMullen,** master fiddler, and friends with bass and guitar.

1:30 pm

**Walkabout Networking Session**

**Alumni Center, Ballroom**

- Visit various discussion sites of interest to you. They are organized by discipline and faculty assignments.
- Identify at least two ideas to discuss with your team this evening.
- Discussion sites:
  - **Applied Sciences** (engineering, agriculture, medicine, education, etc.)
  - **Basic Sciences** (physics, chemistry, biological sciences, etc.)
  - **Liberal Arts and Sciences** (arts, humanities, social sciences, etc.)
  - Cross-Discipline and International Programs
- G. Allen (UMn), S. Clark (OSU), C. Glassick (Carneige), G. Rice (AAHE), P. Riser (OrSU), L. Sandmann (MISU)
- Break and networking

3:15 pm

**Laying Foundations for Success**

**Alumni Center**

(45 minute concurrent discussions)

- Position description, Alumni Center, Room 115A & B
  - R. Arnold* (OrSU), T. Wilcox (OrSU), W. Woodman (UoA), W. Voxxman (UoA)
- Expectations of new assistant professors, Alumni Center, Room 111A & B
  - R. Perry* (UoA), R. Lynde (Montclair SU), S. McNall (Chico SU), E. Bird (UoA)
- Experiences with new guidelines — so what has really changed?
  - Alumni 114A & B
  - A. Hashimoto* (OrSU), M. Reardon (Portland SU), K. Schaffer (OrSU)

4:00 pm

**Sustaining Excellence Alumni Center**

(45 minute concurrent discussions)

- Validation and assessment — evaluating faculty scholarship and productivity
  - Alumni Center, Room 115A & B
  - L. D. Burns* (OrSU), B. Adorn (Syracuse U), J. Labov (NRC), L. Sandmann (MISU)
- Post-tenure review, Alumni Center, Room 111A & B
  - K. Krane* (OrSU), S. Clark (OSU), J. Byrne (OrSU), I. Lubchenco (OSU)
- Encouraging and evaluating faculty efforts on teams,
  - Alumni Center, Room 114A & B
  - S. Reed* (OrSU), G. Allen (UMn), L. Hougum (OrSU), A. Knox (UMn)

5:00 pm

**Social Hour, Dinner**

**Alumni Center, Ballroom**

- Performing artists who do scholarship — Angel of Light
  - a dance performance by Sven Toorvald and Aimee Ty

7:00 pm

**Creating Change at Your University**

**Alumni Center, Ballroom**

- **Table Talk:** Each person at your table will speak briefly (2 minutes) on any one of the three questions below, followed by a general discussion around the table.
  - What useful ideas did you get from the presentations?
  - What approach might work well at your university?
  - What are the primary barriers at your university?
- Refine ideas during a Q & A period with a morning speaker and panelists.

8:00 pm

**Work Sessions for University Teams**

- Select a meeting space in the Alumni Center or elsewhere.
- Invite presenters to meet with a team if you wish.
- Adjourn at the teams' discretion.
FINDING VALUE
for yourself and your university

Workshop

▶ goals
▶ design
▶ follow-up
▶ background materials
▶ acknowledgement
Scholarship Unbound
Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards

Goals for the Workshop

Universities are weighing choices for matching what is expected of faculty members with the several missions of a comprehensive university. The Scholarship Unbound national workshop is designed to help those who lead and set policy for universities to consider ways of reframing faculty evaluation and rewards. It is especially suited for teams of faculty representatives, administrators and members of external boards, but individual attendees will also find significant value. Plans will be developed for fostering and accelerating change in their university’s evaluation process and reward system. Conferees will have the opportunity to consult with faculty counterparts and peers from other universities and with noteworthy scholars who will provide advice and perspective.

Oregon State University is an appropriate host for this workshop as the first Carnegie I Research University to define scholarship broadly and to revise its tenure and promotion guidelines accordingly in 1995. A university’s view of scholarship is of central importance because scholarly contributions are a key requirement for the granting of tenure to any faculty member at any university. Workshop discussion leaders from six universities that have made significant changes will describe the nature of the process they used and the kinds of changes made at their institutions.

Value that People can find in the Workshop

- Learn from others that it is possible to change the reward system of a university.
- Make connections with others with similar interests for post workshop networking.
- Identify ideas and examples from other universities that may have value back home.
- Consult with resource people who are available at the workshop.
- Invite resource people at the workshop to visit during the coming year with no travel costs.
- Through the diversity of participation here, you will have an opportunity to see the issues and opportunities through the eyes and minds of people from disciplines different from your own, and from universities and colleges quite different from your own.

DIVERSITY IS CREATIVITY WAITING TO HAPPEN
CONCEPTS DRIVE CHANGE
Scholarship Unbound
Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards

DESIGN OF THE CONFERENCE

The conference has been designed around a number of vehicles for participants to create value for themselves throughout the conference. These include:

* **Idea Fair** (Thursday at 4:15 p.m.)
* **Concurrent Discussions** (Thursday at 7 p.m. and Friday at 3:15 and 4 p.m.)
* **Work Sessions for University Teams** (Thursday and Friday at 8 p.m.)
* **Table Talk** (Friday at 10:30 a.m. and 7 p.m.)
* **Walkabout Networking Session** (Friday at 1:30 p.m.)

**IDEA FAIR — How it works.**
The Idea Fair is designed as a forum for exchanging ideas and making contacts. The Alumni Center Ballroom will be set up with display tables around the walls and a buffet dinner set up in the middle. Participants will have the opportunity to visit with individuals at the display tables and colleagues while having dinner.

**CONCURRENT DISCUSSIONS — How they work.**
These are 45-minute discussions around broad topics. Each session has a convener and 3-4 discussion leaders. These are *not* meant to be traditional panel presentations, but a forum for discussion among participants. Flip charts will be available in each room. Overhead projectors are available, if needed. Here are some suggestions for making these sessions work smoothly:

- Convener (marked by an * in the program) -- start the session with a welcome and a description of how the session will go:
  * quick introductions
  * open floor to your comments, questions, sharing
  * last 10 minutes for closure around the value you (participants) received from the session.

  Ask 4 people to share what value they got out of the conversation and then to ask each discussion leader to share what they got. (the convener may want to put these main points on flip charts to be hung in the Ballroom).

**WORK SESSIONS FOR UNIVERSITY TEAMS**
Many universities are bringing teams of individuals. Time has been provided for the teams to get together and share what they have learned or applications to their home institution. Individuals who are not part of a university team will have the opportunity to join others in discussion. Presenters at the workshop are available to meet with university teams as a resource person.

**TABLE TALK**
Table Talk sessions are designed to allow individuals from different institutions to discuss what they have learned and to share experiences.

**WALKABOUT NETWORKING SESSION — How it works.**
The Alumni Center Ballroom will be set up with tables. Tables will have signs with 17 discussion topics. Participants will be encouraged to visit discussion sites of interest to them to meet other participants and share insights.
Scholarship Unbound: 
Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards

Follow-up Activities and Opportunities

In the coming year there will be a number of follow-up activities and opportunities designed for continued dialogue, networking, and information sharing. Examples include:

- Funds to fly one of the presenters/discussion leaders from this conference to your campus as a speaker/consultant.

- A Web conference site to provide a forum for continued discussion on issues that have emerged from the conference and to serve as a clearinghouse for information.

- On-going bridge conference calls for continued networking.

- Results of interviews and surveys of faculty, administrators, students, and constituency groups on the impact of Oregon State University’s promotion and tenure guidelines.

- Results of follow-up contacts with conference participants on changes at their institutions and strategies for change.

- Information on up-coming events.
SCHOLARSHIP DESCRIBED
Views of Scholarship Evolving at Universities

Tenure and promotion guidelines at most universities only define scholarship indirectly by using the words research and scholarship interchangeably, and by citing peer-reviewed research publications as the prime example for documenting scholarly achievement.

This often leads to a narrow interpretation of scholarship by faculty peers who consider scholarly achievement to simply be synonymous with research results published in a peer-refereed journal. Creative work in areas of professorial responsibility other than research is often not viewed as scholarly; peer validation by means other than anonymous review of a publication are not considered valid; and communication to interested audiences who are not peers, or by means other than refereed publications, are not viewed as being scholarly.

In campus cultures that are shaped by these values faculty members are advised to invest their creative energies and discretionary time in efforts that are valued and rewarded by peers and the institution such as applying for grants, conducting research and publishing results in their disciplinary specialty. In teaching, advising, outreach and some research recognition and rewards are ambiguous or lacking. This provides little incentive for faculty members to invest creative energy or effort.

Broader visions of scholarship that are developing at several universities recognize that creative peer-validated scholarly work may be carried out in any area of faculty responsibility or university mission -- not just in research. As a result the cultural values at those universities are changing in subtle but powerful ways that will alter how and where faculty members invest their creative energies. Such fundamental cultural changes reshape and determine the nature of institutions.

EVOLVING VIEWS OF SCHOLARSHIP INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- Scholarship is research. Research is scholarship (A prevailing view among faculty members at many universities, 1998).


- "Scholarship is intellectual work that results in new insights in the areas of discovery, integration or aesthetic creation, pedagogy, or application. Dissemination of the work through normally accepted academic venues, following an external peer review process, is evidence of the quality of the work." (Montclair State University, 1994).

- "Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Forms of scholarship include creative artistry and the discovery, development (application) and integration of knowledge." (Oregon State University, 1995).
• “Scholarship is an advanced form of learning. It involves the assimilation of experience into concepts and applying of concepts to experience—a transformative experience.” “Expressions (forms) of scholarship are the discovery, integration, application and interpretation (teaching) of knowledge.” “Scholarship implies superior intellectual, aesthetic or creative attainment.” (Portland State University, 1996).

• “The four types of scholarship include discovery, integration, application and teaching.” They are “mutually supportive, complementary and often overlapping.” (Kent State University, 1996).

• “Scholarship is creative, systematic rational inquiry into a topic and the honest forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. Scholarship includes research, creative activities, teaching and extension/professional practice. It results in a product that is shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product. In short, scholarship includes materials that are generally called intellectual property.” (Iowa State University, 1998).

• “Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is communicated and validated.” Forms of scholarship include “teaching and learning, artistic creativity, discovery and application/integration.” (University of Idaho, 1998).

The 1990 Carnegie Foundation report, Scholarship Reconsidered, authored by Ernest Boyer1 provided a starting point for these several examples of rethinking scholarship. The cultures and priorities of universities differ. It is appropriate that each university’s view of scholarship reflects its missions and vision of itself.

C. J. Weiser, September, 1998

---

# The Nature of Scholarship

Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Forms of scholarship include discovery, development, integration and artistry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Artistry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character of Scholarship</td>
<td>Generates, synthesizes, interprets and communicates new knowledge, methods, understandings, technologies, materials, uses, insights, beauty ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences for Scholarship</td>
<td>Peers, students, users, patrons, public ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Communicating Scholarship</td>
<td>Publications, presentations, exhibits, performances, patents, copyrights, distributions of materials or programs ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Validating Scholarship</td>
<td>Accuracy, replicability, originality, scope, significance, breadth, depth and duration of influence, impact or public benefit ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Documenting Scholarship</td>
<td>Present evidence that creative intellectual work was validated by peers; communicated to peers and broader audiences; recognized, accepted, cited, adopted or used by others; ... that it made a difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Bronwyn E. Adam**

A staff member of the Center for Support of Teaching and Learning at Syracuse University, Bron served as assistant director for the Institutional Priorities and Faculty Rewards project, a six-year initiative to facilitate changes in faculty reward structures on individual campuses by bringing faculty roles and rewards in line with institutional missions. The project included: the national study on the balance between research and undergraduate teaching — a survey of 260 colleges and universities — and the redefinition and assessment of scholarship, which helped 26 scholarly associations define the parameters for scholarly work in the disciplines. Project publications have included "Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward Systems for the Year 2000," "New Directions for Higher Education," "The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty," and "Documenting Diversity: The Professional Portfolio and Faculty Rewards." Bron consults and conducts workshops related to faculty roles and rewards and institutional change. She previously served as an instructor and coordinator for evaluation in the Syracuse University Writing Program, where she developed special interests in peer review and self-assessment practices for faculty and student evaluation. She practices yoga, cultivates herbs, and sent the first of two daughters off to college this fall. Phone (315) 443-5413; fax (315) 443-1524; e-mail beadam@cid.syr.edu.

**C. Eugene Allen**

Gene is a Distinguished Teaching Professor of Agriculture and executive director of International Studies and Programs at the University of Minnesota. As a faculty member for 17 years in two departments, he was involved in animal growth biology and food science teaching; outreach and research programs; and in student advising, faculty governance, international programs and a variety of professional leadership roles. From 1984–97, Dr. Allen served the University of Minnesota as a dean, vice president or provost. During this time he provided leadership to issues such as strategic planning, curriculum revision, expansion of student and faculty diversity, creation of numerous interdisciplinary programs and the closer linkage of research and education programs to societal issues. He helped establish 15 endowed chairs and expand scholarship funding. Dr. Allen reviewed and acted upon many promotion and tenure dossiers from faculty in a wide variety of disciplines that viewed scholarship very differently. He is currently involved in leadership development programs and activities that impact faculty. Gene is a serious golfer and an amusing grandfather. Phone (612) 624-3290; fax (612) 625-0286; e-mail <allen@mainbox.mail.umn.edu>.

**Roy Arnold**

Roy Arnold has served 31 years as a faculty member and administrator at two land-grant universities. He became the provost and executive vice president at Oregon State University in 1991 after serving as dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences for four years. Previously he served 14 years at the University of Nebraska as a faculty member and department head in Food Science and Technology, as dean and director of Agricultural Research and as vice chancellor of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources. At OSU Dr. Arnold played a central role as provost in fostering the promotion and tenure guidelines revisions that were adopted in 1995. Specifically, Roy chaired the extended education transition committee that restructured OSU's outreach efforts; he appointed the Faculty Senate committee that developed and recommended adoption of the new tenure and promotion guidelines; and, as provost, Dr. Arnold oversees the university-level promotion and tenure process that applies and interprets the guidelines. He has presented information about OSU's experience at several universities and professional meetings. During football season it is rumored that Roy sometimes wears red and white under his OSU black and orange outerwear. Phone (541) 737-2111; fax (541) 737-3033; e-mail Roy.Arnold@orst.edu.
LESLEI DAVIS BURNS

Leslie is director of Undergraduate Academic Programs and professor in the Department of Apparel, Interiors, Housing, and Merchandising at Oregon State University. Leslie served as a member of the Faculty Senate committee that revised OSU’s promotion and tenure guidelines and she chaired the Faculty Senate P and T Committee the first year the new guidelines were in effect. Leslie’s areas of scholarship include the use of technology to enhance the learning environment for students and student retention. As such, she has explored alternative means of peer validation and communication of her scholarly endeavors. In her role as director, Leslie is involved in university curriculum, student retention, undergraduate teaching and advising, first-year experience programs, community college relations, and education reform. Leslie has helped create forums on campus for discussion and action around relevant topics including assessment of advising responsibilities of faculty, community college articulation, and new student orientation. As associate coordinator of the workshop, Leslie will facilitate the follow-up activities of the workshop during the coming year. Leslie relaxes by tending her roses and reading mysteries. Phone (541) 737-0983; fax (541) 737-3033; e-mail <Leslie.Burns@orst.edu>.

JOHN V. BYRNE

President Emeritus at Oregon State University, John Byrne served through 1995 as OSU’s twelfth president. During his 11 years as president, Dr. Byrne created a climate at OSU that embraced change and made development of a broader vision of scholarship and adoption of new promotion and tenure guidelines possible. He officially adopted the new guidelines in 1995 in response to a unanimous recommendation by the Faculty Senate. John’s professional training is in geology, and he worked three years as a research geologist with an oil company. He spent 16 years in oceanography at OSU as faculty member, department chair, and dean; five years as dean and vice-president for Research and Graduate Studies at OSU; and several years as administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). As president of OSU, John guided the institution through a period of turbulence brought about by severe budget restrictions resulting from a ballot measure that limited property taxes. OSU continued to grow in programs, facilities and external funding, and Dr. Byrne was one of the first to introduce Total Quality Management techniques to higher education. In retirement, Professor Byrne continues to be active in higher education reform, serving as a senior advisor in Oregon and as executive director of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. In retirement John aspires to becoming a successful fly fisherman, virtuoso saxophonist and jazz harmonica player. Phone (541) 737-3542; fax (541) 737-4380; e-mail John.Byrne@orst.edu.

SHIRLEY MERRITT CLARK

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the Oregon University System since fall of 1990, Dr. Clark also holds the rank of professor in the College of Education at the University of Oregon. As vice chancellor, Clark and her staff provide leadership for academic planning and administration of a coordinated system of eight higher education institutions; student affairs and admissions; articulation with other educational sectors and agencies; international education; and distance education and interstate programs. Clark previously worked 22 years at the University of Minnesota as professor of education and sociology and chair of the Department of Educational Policy and Administration. Prior to that she was a faculty member at Ohio State and the University of Illinois. Clark’s teaching and research dealt with the sociology of education and foundations of education. In the past decade, she has written papers and articles on educational reform issues, professional development, gender issues, and a book on faculty vitality and institutional productivity. Professor Clark was president of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, serves on several editorial boards and is on the board of directors of The Bush Foundation. Shirley has recently embarked on a steep learning curve as a proud and indulgent new grandmother. Phone (541) 346-5791, fax (541) 346-5764; e-mail <Shirley_Clark@sch.ous.edu>.
DAVID DAMROSCH
David Damrosch is a professor of English and comparative literature at Columbia. Currently chair of his department, he previously spent a decade as director of Graduate Studies, first of Columbia’s interdepartmental program in comparative literature and then of the English graduate program. This work bred an interest in institutional constraints on collaborative and interdisciplinary work, an interest that led to his book “We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University” (Harvard, 1995). His own work has become increasingly collaborative; he is the general editor for the new “Longman Anthology of British Literature” (with 11 co-editors) and is now completing a methodological study, “Meetings of the Mind,” with three co-authors. Phone (212) 854-5215; fax (212) 854-5398; e-mail <dnd2@columbia.edu>.

THAYNE R. DUTSON
Thayne R. Dutson is dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences and director of the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station at Oregon State University. His disciplinary expertise is on the chemistry and ultrastructure of muscle from a food science perspective. The OSU college that Dr. Dutson leads has a statewide faculty and research programs in crop, livestock, wildlife, seafood and marine science at 12 locations in Oregon, extension programs in agricultural and natural resources in all Oregon counties, and teaching programs at OSU and Eastern Oregon University. Dr. Dutson directed the college’s research when new faculty evaluation policies were developed that viewed scholarship as broader than research. As dean, he guides implementation of OSU’s new promotion and tenure guidelines for a faculty that engages in all forms of scholarship and in collaborative and interdisciplinary team efforts. He commissioned one of the first computer-based research and education accountability systems in the nation — Oregon Invests! — which has become a model for similar systems being developed at more than two dozen universities across the country. Thayne relaxes by fixing fences on his ranch and skiing in the nearby Cascade Mountains. Phone (541) 737-2331; fax (541) 737-4574; e-mail Thayne.Dutson@orst.edu.

GWIL EVANS
Gwil is professor of agricultural communications at Oregon State University and is organizational and communications designer in the Office of the Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences. A faculty member at Oregon State since 1965, he has served as assistant and associate professor of journalism, director of Sea Grant communications, director of University Publications, director of the OSU Press, and director of communications for the OSU Extension Service and for the College of Agricultural Sciences. With Thayne Dutson, dean of Agricultural Sciences, Evans is the executive producer of the college’s nationally recognized research and education accountability database, Oregon Invests! For the past five years, Evans has directed the InterACTION! project, an institutional change initiative funded in part by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Work by the InterACTION! project and Oregon State’s adoption of new promotion and tenure guidelines have served complementary purposes. Phone (541) 737-0800; fax (541) 737-4574; e-mail evansg@bcc.orst.edu.
CHARLES E. GLASSICK

Charles E. Glassick, senior associate of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, previously served the foundation as interim president, vice chairman of the board of trustees, and earlier as Senior Fellow. The Carnegie Foundation as a policy center devoted to strengthening America’s schools and colleges. Professor Glassick assisted Ernest L. Boyer in the preparation of major Carnegie reports including “Campus Life: In Search of Community” and “Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.” He co-authored “Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate.” His disciplinary training is in chemistry, but his interests are broad. Dr. Glassick was president of the Robert W. Woodruff Arts Center in Atlanta, Georgia, from 1991 to 1995. This center includes four fine arts companies — The Alliance Theater, the Atlanta College of Art, Atlanta Symphony Orchestra, and the High Museum of Art. For 12 years Dr. Glassick served as the eleventh president of Gettysburg College. Dr. Glassick also is a senior associate of Jon McRae & Associates, where he serves as an executive search consultant specializing in non-profit institutions. Phone (770) 574-4062; fax (770) 574-4068; e-mail <CEGLASSICK@aol.com>.

ANDREW G. HASHIMOTO

Andy serves as associate provost for Academic Affairs at Oregon State University. He formerly chaired the Department of Bioresource Engineering. In his role as associate provost, Dr. Hashimoto coordinates the promotion and tenure process for the university. The Office of Academic Affairs annually distributes the Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Guidelines, and Dr. Hashimoto conducts P and T workshops for faculty members and departments and promotion and tenure committee chairs. Andy personally reviews all dossiers for the university, serves on the university promotion and tenure committee, and provides feedback to units on dossier preparation. Dr. Hashimoto also serves as the university’s academic personnel officer for faculty appointments, contract renewals, salary adjustments, and other related issues. He provides liaison with the ROTC units on campus and supervises the offices of admissions and orientation, registrar, summer session, and pre-college programs and undergraduate academic programs. Phone (541) 737-0732; fax (541) 737-3033; e-mail Andrew.Hashimoto@orst.edu.

MYRON HENRY

Myron Henry is provost and professor of mathematics at the University of Southern Mississippi. He was previously chief academic officer at Kent State University in Ohio and at Old Dominion University in Virginia. He directed Kent State’s participation in the American Council for Education national project on institutional transformation and leadership. Kent’s “change issue” for this project involved reconceptualizing faculty roles and rewards to reflect the institution’s definition of a teacher-scholar. Myron also directed Kent’s participation in the Michigan State University national project on realigning institutional mission and faculty work. For this MSU/Pew project, Kent’s focus was on unit-wide productivity in the context of a more encompassing view of scholarship. Myron is widely published in mathematics, and more recently has written on issues in higher education. Three of his publications, “Multidimensional Forms of Scholarship and the Collaborative Department” (co-authored, 1998), “Meeting the Challenges of Change at Kent State” (1996), and “Almost Metropolitan Universities: Challenges and Opportunities for Historically Residential Universities Located in Major Metropolitan Areas” (1994), feature themes of this workshop. Dr. Henry has given talks on multidimensional forms of scholarship and faculty roles and rewards in the United States, Europe, China, and Japan. Phone (601) 266-5002; fax (601) 266-6322; e-mail.
LYLA HOUGLUM
Lyla Houglum has served as the dean and director of the Oregon State University Extension Service since Jan. 1, 1995. Between 1990 and 1995 Dr. Houglum served as associate director for counties with the OSU Extension Service. She joined the OSU faculty in 1985 as an Extension 4-H youth development specialist, providing leadership for volunteer leader development and serving on the board of the Oregon Family Community Leadership program. As a member of the key committees, Lyla was personally involved in developing Oregon State University's new approach to extended education and outreach and in the revision of OSU's promotion and tenure guidelines. In her role as dean and director and as a member of the university's P and T committee, she is now involved in implementing fundamental changes in how faculty members at Oregon State University are evaluated, and by whom. Phone (541) 737-2713; fax (541) 737-4423; e-mail lyla.houglum@orst.edu.

ROBERT E. JONES
Robert is vice provost for faculty and academic personnel and professor of plant physiology in the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics at the University of Minnesota. His administrative duties include overseeing the university's promotion and tenure process, implementation of post-tenure reviews, faculty development, the recruitment and retention of faculty of color, and other faculty and academic personnel related issues and policies. He has previously served as an assistant vice president for Academic Affairs, a member of the senate consultative committee and of the faculty consultative committee, and as a consultant for the South African Education Program. He is participating in the workshop because he believes that higher education is continually changing and that how universities redefine and embrace what constitutes scholarship is pivotal in the effort to diversify and reframe the academy. Robert sings with the Grammy Award-winning choral ensemble “The Sounds of Blackness.” Phone (612) 625-0051; fax (612) 624-3814; e-mail jones012@tc.umn.edu.

ALAN B. KNOX
Alan has been a professor of continuing education at the University of Wisconsin, Madison since 1981. Previous faculty and administrative positions were at the University of Illinois, Teachers College Columbia University, University of Nebraska, and Syracuse University. While at Illinois he served as associate vice chancellor of Academic Affairs and director of Continuing Education and Public Service. He was a founding member and the second chairperson of the University of Wisconsin Teaching Academy. He recently completed a study of promotion and tenure decisions regarding assistant professors whose responsibilities included outreach-oriented teaching and research in their assignments in extension, continuing education, and public service. Phone (608) 263-2937; fax (608) 265-3135; e-mail <KNOX@mail.soemadison.wise.edu>.
KENNETH S. KRANE
A professor of physics at Oregon State University, Ken served from 1984-1998 as chair of the Physics Department and director of the Engineering Physics Program. His research in nuclear physics concerns the structure of highly unstable nuclei and the application of nuclear physics knowledge to problems in astrophysics. In 1996 Ken served as president of the OSU Faculty Senate and he currently is chair of the OSU Task Force on Post-Tenure Review. As chair of the American Physical Society's committee on education, he organized the participation of the national physics community in developing a report on the faculty reward and recognition system in physics. At OSU Ken organized a mentoring system for physics graduate students interested in college or university teaching careers, and he chairs and directs an annual national workshop for training new university physics faculty in teaching techniques. Professor Krane is the author of three widely used undergraduate physics textbooks. In his spare time, Ken plays guitar and prowls the beaches on the Oregon coast. Phone (541) 737-1692; fax (541) 737-1683; e-mail <kranek@physics.orst.edu>.

JAY B. LABOV
Jay is the director of the Division on Postsecondary Education at the National Research Council's (NRC) center for science, mathematics, and engineering education. He also serves as study director for the center's committee on undergraduate science education (CUSE). He supervised study on the feasibility and logistics of developing a digital national library for undergraduate science, mathematics, engineering, and technology (SME&T) education and will be responsible for an impending NRC study that will examine ways to recognize, evaluate, reward, and develop excellent teaching of undergraduate science, mathematics, and engineering. Previously, Dr. Labov was a member of the Department of Biology at Colby College (Maine) for 18 years. In that position he taught physiological and behavioral influences on mammalian reproduction, chaired the Division of Natural Sciences, and served as a member of the college's committee on promotion and tenure. This workshop is of timely interest because the NRC will become involved in evaluation and recognition of quality teaching based on student learning outcomes. Jay is a photographer and sings with the Choral Art Society of Washington. Phone (202) 334-1458; fax (202) 334-3159; e-mail <jlabov@nas.edu>.

JANE LUBCHENCO
Jane Lubchenco is the Wayne and Gladys Valley Professor of Marine Biology and a Distinguished Professor of Zoology at Oregon State University. Her interests and expertise span a wide range including science and the environment; public understanding of science; marine conservation biology; ecosystem services; ecological causes and consequences of global change; biodiversity; sustainable ecological systems; rocky intertidal shores; evolutionary community ecology; marine biology; plant-herbivore interactions; chemical ecology; biogeography; molluscs; echinoderms; and seaweeds. Professor Lubchenco's efforts are globally recognized and widely honored. She is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, serves on the U.S. National Science Board, and has just completed sequential terms as president and chair of the board of AAAS. Jane is engaged in dozens of efforts to communicate scientific knowledge to policy makers and the public. These range from local advisory panel involvement at the level of a city council to global level international scientist's statements, science briefings for the U.S. president and vice president and congressional testimony. OSU's top scientists such as Dr. Lubchenco endorsed and strongly supported the university's inclusive vision of scholarship that shaped the revision of promotion and tenure guidelines. Jane, her husband, and two children devote their private time to outdoor family activities. Phone (541) 737-5537; fax (541) 737-9501; e-mail <jlubchenko@ocean.oregonstate.edu>.
RICHARD A. LYNDE
Richard A. Lynde is the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs at Montclair State University in New Jersey. Since his arrival at Montclair in 1970 he also has served as a member of the chemistry faculty, chair of the Department of Chemistry, and dean of the School of Mathematical and Natural Sciences. The process in which faculty evaluation and rewards were reframed at Montclair State was initiated by remarks Dr. Lynde made in an address to the faculty in the fall of 1990. Since that time the university community has established a definition of scholarship that more closely reflects the mission of the institution and a faculty scholarship incentive program that encourages faculty participation in a broad range of scholarly and artistic activities. Additionally, the assessment process has been revised to accommodate Montclair State’s less traditional definition of scholarship, and the reward process has been made more flexible to accommodate the typical evolution of faculty interests during an extended career. The faculty at Montclair State is represented by a union, and Provost Lynde serves as consultant to the governor’s Office of Employee Relations on issues related to faculty contracts. Richard battles weeds and woodchucks in his garden, hikes, takes photos, and collects and repairs antique pendulum clocks. Phone (973) 655-4383; fax (973) 655-7647; e-mail lynde@saturn.montclair.edu.

SCOTT G. MCNALL
A professor of sociology, Scott has served as the provost of California State University, Chico since 1994. His research interests have revolved around the question of how and why mass democratic movements rise and fall. He has extended this interest to higher education and reframed the question to ask about the conditions under which the transformative efforts of universities succeed and fail. He was presented with a test case when he came to California because UC Chico had embarked on a major effort to institute a culture of teaching and learning on campus. A systematic plan was developed to create a strategic plan; implement a new merit-pay system; revise the general education curriculum; create a robust program to use technology to enhance faculty productivity and student learning; initiate a campus-wide effort to clarify the difference between teaching and learning; and revise the RTP (tenure and promotion) standards. He looks forward to sharing with other workshop members what worked, what did not, and why. Of particular concern will be the meshing of RTP standards with the university’s strategic planning efforts. When he is not working toward creating a new climate on campus, Scott refinishes antique furniture and goes hiking. Phone (530) 898-6101; fax (530) 898-4438; e-mail <smcnall@csuchico.edu>.

MICHAEL ORIARD
As then president of the Faculty Senate, Michael chaired the committee at Oregon State University that revised the promotion and tenure guidelines. He has been on the faculty at OSU since 1976 and is currently Distinguished Professor of American Literature and Culture in the English Department. Professor Oriard played a pivotal role in the process of developing the revised guidelines at OSU: first, in helping the committee sort through divergent views of scholarship; second, in articulating a concise definition developed by the committee to serve all faculties and missions of the university; and third, in conducting numerous forums, listening carefully to faculty members and incorporating their good ideas in refining the guidelines. In a series of four books, Michael has delineated the place of play and sport in both high literary culture and popular culture in America. His current research on the representation of sport in the 20th century’s popular media has particular significance for our understanding of race relations in America. Dr. Oriard received some of his advanced training in this field of study as an All American football player at the University of Notre Dame and as a professional player for the Kansas City Chiefs. Phone (541) 737-1638; fax (541) 737-3589; e-mail moriard@orst.edu.
RAYMOND P. PERRY
Ray is a professor of psychology and higher education at the University of Manitoba, the first university to be unionized in English-speaking Canada. Dr. Perry’s research focus is on teaching and learning in higher education, particularly on the dynamics of effective teaching, student motivation and achievement, and the evaluation of teaching. His research interests also include the adjustment of recently-appointed faculty members. He collaborates widely with peers in Canada, Germany, the United States and elsewhere. Dr. Perry’s most recent book is “Effective Teaching in Higher Education: Research and Practice” (1997). This workshop is of timely interest because the University of Manitoba is in the midst of an institution-wide renewal plan, initiated by the president, that is taking place jointly with labor negotiations surrounding an expired contract. Phone (204) 474-6945; fax (202) 474-7609; e-mail rperry@cc.umanitoba.ca.

MICHAEL F. REARDON
Dr. Reardon has served as provost of Portland State University since 1992. In 1996, PSU adopted a broad definition of scholarship and revised promotion and tenure guidelines that reflect its outreach mission as an urban university. Michael previously served as department chair, director of the honors program, associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and vice provost of Academic Affairs. Professor Reardon’s academic specialty is the history of European thought with specialization in French intellectual history. He has written on issues of science and religion in French culture, Catholic theology, and French conservatism, and he currently teaches courses on development of disciplinary knowledge and on the culture of the professions. He has a particular interest in curricular reform and has encouraged major changes in undergraduate education at Portland State and in national associations. Professor Reardon recently co-authored a chapter on curricular reform and cost containment for a revision of the Handbook on Undergraduate Education. He chairs the PSU project team sponsored by the ACE/Kellogg program on leadership and institutional transformation, and he leads a campus team that represents PSU in a collaborative effort with five other institutions that won a Pew Leadership Award in 1996. Phone (503) 725-5257; fax (503) 725-5262, e-mail reardonm@pdx.edu.

A. SCOTT REED
Scott is an associate dean of Extended Education and Extension Program leader in the College of Forestry at Oregon State University. He served on a university-wide team that helped transition the university’s outreach program to a new model that fully integrates off-campus Extension Service faculty into the academy. Dr. Reed worked with the College of Forestry to rewrite its promotion and tenure policies, and he takes a special interest in scholarship as it relates to the outreach education mission. Scott’s personal research interests include public policy options to improve decision making and collaboration and community dynamics affecting sustainability of the nation’s nonindustrial private forest land. Daily runs at dawn and biking excursions with the kids keep Scott lean and fit. Phone (541) 737-3700; fax (541) 737-3008; e-mail reeds@ccmail.orst.edu.
R. Eugene Rice

R. Eugene Rice is Scholar in Residence and director of the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards at the American Association of Higher Education in Washington, D.C. Before moving to AAHE, he was vice president and dean of the faculty at Antioch College, where he held a tenured appointment as professor of sociology and religion. Prior to that, Gene was senior fellow at the Carnegie Foundation engaged in the national study of the scholarly priorities of the American professoriate and collaborating with the late Ernest Boyer on the Carnegie Report “Scholarship Reconsidered.” His current work on the topic is available in AAHE’s New Pathways Working Paper Series in an essay entitled “Making a Place for the New American Scholar.” Professor Rice also provides leadership for the AAHE New Pathways project Academic Careers for the New Century: From Inquiry to Practice. For most of his career, Dr. Rice was a professor at the University of the Pacific, where he helped initiate the first of the experimental “cluster colleges” and chaired the Department of Sociology. His teaching and research focused on the sociology and ethics of the professions and the workplace. Gene serves on the provost’s advisory panel on teaching at Ohio State University and as a member of the review panel for the U.S. Professors of the Year program. Gene Rice has been recognized as an “idea leader” whose work has made a difference nationally. Tough on the tennis court, he is a student of the history, culture, and problems of Washington, D.C. Phone (202) 293-6440; fax (202) 293-0073; e-mail aaheffrr@aahe.org.

Paul Risser

Paul began his current position as president of Oregon State University approximately three years ago. OSU’s newly adopted tenure and promotion guidelines were one of the attractions to this assignment. Since arriving, Dr. Risser has sought to focus the university’s programs on the needs of its multiple constituencies, emphasizing quantitative information for making programmatic decisions. Paul views the state of Oregon as OSU’s campus, and the new “OSU Statewide” program providing educational access to all Oregon citizens reflects that vision. Paul also has encouraged changes in the funding model and governance at the state level. Prior to his arrival at OSU, he served as president of Miami University (Ohio), where he focused on using technology to enhance undergraduate education. He also served as provost at the University of New Mexico, where he led UNM 2000, the long-range planning process for the university. His research area is natural resource management, and he chairs the Ecosystem Panel of the National Research Council. Paul’s sense of humor and quick wit help keep everything in perspective. Phone (541) 737-2565; fax (541) 737-3033; e-mail <Paul.Risser@orst.edu>.

Lorilee R. Sandmann

Lorilee is director of University Outreach at Michigan State University (MSU) and associate professor in educational administration. Currently she also is president of the 6,000-member American Association for Adult and Continuing Education. Her responsibilities at MSU include leadership of university-wide outreach partnerships, particularly in urban settings. She develops models for successful partnerships with educational institutions and other organizations for establishing institutional change that promote the extension and application of knowledge and for reframing the criteria that are used to define and evaluate faculty scholarship. She chairs a MSU faculty committee that has explored the nature of scholarly activity in outreach, the standards of quality that apply to outreach, and institutional outcome indicators for outreach. She co-directs the national W.K. Kellogg Foundation-funded project on documenting the scholarship of professional service and outreach. Dr. Sandmann and her colleagues have conducted workshops on these topics for department chairs and at national meetings of organizations such as AAHE and NASULGC. Lorilee grew up in a ballroom and has been dancing ever since. Swing, anyone? Phone: (517) 355-4589; fax: (517) 355-4565; e-mail <sandmann@pilot.msu.edu>; web: <http://ext.msu.edu/dept/unit/outreach>.

Eugene Rice, American Association of Higher Education

Paul Risser, Oregon State University

Lorilee Sandmann, Michigan State University
KAY SCHAEFFER

Kay is dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Oregon State University and a psychologist who has taught a wide variety of graduate and undergraduate courses in clinical psychology. Her scholarly work reflects her interests in gender and health and in issues related to higher education. As dean, Kay has developed a clear mission for a college that is primarily responsible for a student-centered undergraduate experience in a Carnegie Research University. Dr. Schaffer has initiated new programs to enhance teaching, learning and scholarship, including a master teacher program, learning communities, a center for teaching and learning excellence, and a minority scholars program. She has encouraged liberal arts faculty to become leaders in university distance-learning initiatives. At national deans’ conferences, Kay has made presentations describing the changes in the Oregon State tenure and promotion guidelines and the benefits of these changes both for faculty and the entire university. She looks forward to this workshop as an opportunity to communicate with individuals and groups from other institutions about redefining scholarship and fostering change. Kay loves to hike in the OSU forests and along the Oregon coast. Phone (541) 737-4582; fax (541) 737-2434; e-mail <KSchaffer@orst.edu>.

RICHARD SISSON

Richard Sisson became senior adviser to the president in December 1997, and he holds the Distinguished Trustee Chair as a professor of political science at the Ohio State University. Dr. Sisson previously served as senior vice president and provost. Ohio State is a comprehensive student-centered research university, with nearly 55,000 students, 30,000 faculty and staff, and an annual budget of $1.6 billion. A land-grant university and the state’s flagship institution of higher education, Ohio State has 19 colleges and four regional campuses, a comprehensive academic medical center, a statewide agricultural research center based in Wooster, and is home to Ohio State University Extension. Dick’s first academic appointment was as an instructor and assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He then spent 25 years as a faculty member and administrator at the University of California, Los Angeles. At UCLA, he chaired the Department of Political Science, was acting dean of the Division of Social Sciences, served as vice chancellor for Faculty Relations, and was named senior vice chancellor for Academic Affairs in 1991. On returning to his alma mater in 1993, Dr. Sisson joined Ohio State’s senior leadership team during a comprehensive restructuring process designed to position Ohio State among the nation’s top public institutions of higher learning. As a scholar, Dr. Sisson has written extensively about the politics and economics of Asian cultures. His most recent books include “Politics and Culture in India,” “Congress and Indian Nationalism,” and “War and Secession: India, Pakistan and the Creation of Bangladesh.” Phone (614) 292-9658; fax (614) 292-1146; e-mail <Richard.Sisson@admin.ohio-state.edu>.

BILL VOXMAN

A professor of mathematics at the University of Idaho, Bill has taught at that university since 1970 and has published numerous articles in the areas of topology, combinatorics and fuzzy sets. He has co-authored five undergraduate and graduate texts in mathematics. A former eight-year member of the Moscow City Council, Voxman has most recently served two years as the chair of the University of Idaho Faculty Council, during which time substantial changes were made to the university’s promotion and tenure policies. He also served on the steering committee responsible for the development of the university’s newly adopted strategic plan. Voxman has studied and taught extensively in Europe and South America. He spent four years helping establish undergraduate and graduate mathematics programs in Chile and Ecuador. An avid clarinetist, Voxman has performed with a variety of chamber music ensembles and symphony orchestras. His black and white photographs are found in many galleries and private collections throughout the country. In an earlier life he taught tennis professionally; he continues to enjoy this game as well as fly-fishing, backpacking, and the outdoor life in general. Phone (208) 885-6719; fax (208) 885-5843; e-mail <wvoxman@uidaho.edu>.
CONRAD J. "Bud" Weiser

A retired plant physiology and horticulture researcher, teacher and administrator, Bud Weiser is Professor Emeritus and Dean Emeritus at Oregon State University. Dr. Weiser trained several dozen graduate students and postdocs and established the University of Minnesota's Laboratory for Plant Hardiness. He served 18 years as head of a statewide horticulture faculty with programs in undergraduate and graduate education, basic and applied research, extension, and international research and development. As dean, Bud initiated faculty discussions that led to college adoption of a broader view of scholarship, a "living" job description for evaluating faculty, and a commitment to recognize and reward faculty contributions to team efforts. Bud served on the Faculty Senate committee that refined these ideas to fit the whole university and provided a conceptual foundation for the university’s revised tenure and promotion guidelines adopted in 1995. He has visited other universities to describe OSU’s change and the process of change. Bud sculpts stone and trains bonsai trees when he is not coordinating this workshop.

Phone (541) 737-5824; fax (541) 737-4574; e-mail <weiserc@ccmail.orst.edu>.

ANTHONY WILCOX

Anthony Wilcox is associate professor and chair of the Department of Exercise and Sport Science at Oregon State University. He was a member of the OSU Extended Education Transition Team, which integrated Extension faculty and programs fully into academic departments and colleges, and provided the impetus for the revision of OSU’s promotion and tenure guidelines. Professor Wilcox is the immediate past-president of the OSU Faculty Senate. During his term as president the new promotion and tenure guidelines were being implemented. Tony also has served on the inter-institutional faculty senate of the Oregon University System. Tony lives his research by running early every morning with a wild bunch — come rain, shine, or dark of night.

Phone: (541) 737-2643; fax: (541) 737-2788; e-mail: <Anthony.Wilcox@orst.edu>

WILLIAM F. WOODMAN

Bill is a professor of sociology at Iowa State University. His research focuses primarily on the impacts of technology on society and on organizational effectiveness in large organizations including its ancient roots and modern manifestations. Most recently, Dr. Woodman completed a two-year stint as president of the ISU Faculty Senate during which a complete rewriting of the promotion and tenure guidelines and implementation of post-tenure review was undertaken and valued upon by the faculty of the university. He currently is conducting a study of faculty attitudes among both voting and non-voting members. An avid hot air balloonist, Bill finds that his fortunes are almost always ascending. On leave this semester, he can be reached by telephone at (515) 294-2228, fax (515) 294-2303, e-mail <wwwoodman@iastate.edu>.

"Bud" Weiser, Oregon State University

Tony Wilcox, Oregon State University

Bill Woodman, Iowa State University
JOSEPH HOUSEAL
Joseph Houseal has a distinguished international career as an impresario, producer and writer. His company, Parnassus Productions, designs a wide variety of paradigm shift art, curriculum materials, events and multi-art commodities. His career as a dancer and choreographer includes immersion in ancient Japanese forms. Joseph received his Ph.D. in Global Aesthetics from the University of London in 1997.

STARR McMULLEN
Starr is a professor of economics at Oregon State University who specializes in the field of transportation economics. She edits the professional journal “Research in Transportation Economics.” At the Scholarship Unbound workshop picnic Dr. McMullen will share another of her special interests with us — with the help of her fiddle and her friends Frank Moore on guitar and Jon Franke on bass. Starr has won many contests and consistently places among the top five to ten fiddlers at the National Oldtime Fiddle Contest. She teaches a fiddling course at the local community college.

SVEN TOORVALD
Sven Toorvald is a career professional dancer, having performed with the Houston Ballet and the renowned Hubbard Street Dance Company. Recently, he has partnered the legendary ballerina, Valentina Kozlova, in a series of command performances. Currently he writes and produces film in New York.

AIMEE TYE
Aimee is principal dancer with Tyego Dance Project and one of the finest ballerinas in Chicago, performing as well with Urban Jazz master Joel Hall and the Joel Hall dancers as the sole classical artist. Aimee has performed a number of revolutionary works to garner high critical praise, a feat she is capable of due to her strength as a creative artist as well as her arch-classical training at the Royal Winnipeg Ballet.
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Adam Bronwyn E.
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
Center of Support of Teaching & Learning
111 Waverly Avenue, Suite 220
Syracuse, NY 13244
Phone: (315) 443-5413
Fax: (315) 443-1524

Arnold Roy
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Affairs
624 Kerr Administration
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-2111
Fax: (541) 737-3033

Allen C. Eugene
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
201 Coffey Hall
St. Paul, MN 55108
Phone: (612) 624-3290
Fax: (612) 625-0286

Ascerno Mark
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
219 Hodson Hall
St. Paul, MN 55108
Phone: (612) 624-3278
Fax: (612) 625-5299

Allen Robert
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
University of Wyoming
Dept. of Management
Laramie, WY 82071
Phone: (307) 766-6332
Fax: (307) 766-3488

Atkinson Alfonza
TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY
F. D. Patterson Hall
College of Veterinary Medicine
Tuskegee, AL 36083
Phone: (334) 727-8174
Fax: (334) 727-8177

Alter Theodore R.
PENN STATE UNIVERSITY
Cooperative Extension & Outreach Adm. Office
217 Ag. Admin.
University Park, PA 16802
Phone: (814) 863-3438
Fax: (814) 863-7905

Autry David
PARNASSUS PRODUCTIONS
1096 Pratt Blvd #1-5
Chicago, IL 60626

Anderson Gregory
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Office of Vice Provost
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Storrs, CT 06269-0490
Phone: (860) 486-2919

Bales Kent
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
207 Lind Hall
207 Church Street
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 625-4889
Fax: (612) 624-8228

Anderson Steve
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
Dept. of English
Little Rock, AR 72204
Phone: (501) 569-8312
Fax: (501) 569-8312

Ballance Murray
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
Agricultural and Food Sciences
Department of Plant Sciences
Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2
CANADA
Phone: (204) 474-6086
Fax: (204) 474-7525
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Barrett Katherine
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
UBC Botany Dept.
3529-6270 University Blvd.
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4
CANADA
Phone: (604) 822-2340
Fax: (604) 822-6089

Bateman Chester
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
227 NW 17th Street
Corvallis, OR 97330
USA
Phone: (514) 737-4263
Chester.Bateman@orst.edu#

Battistella Ed
WAYNE STATE COLLEGE
Humanities Division
Wayne, NE 68787
Phone: (402) 375-7394
Fax: (402) 375-7204

Beneke Bill
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY
820 Chestnut Street
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0029
Phone: (573) 681-6191
Fax: (573) 681-5548

Berberet William J.
ASSOC. NEW AMERICAN COLLEGE
1408 Killdeer Drive
Naperville, IL 60565
Phone: (630) 717-9477
Fax: (312) 263-3424

Bertrand Jean
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Animal & Veterinary Sciences Department
117 Poole Center
Clemson, SC 29634
Phone: (864) 656-2325

Bird Elizabeth
UNIV OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
Consortium for Sustainable Ag Research & Edu
1450 Linden Dr Rm 146
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: (608) 265-6483
Fax: (608) 265-3020

Bland Carole
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
306 Bell Museum
10 Church Street
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 624-2072
Fax: (612) 624-2525

Bleyhl Julie
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
RR3 - Box 94
Madison, MN 56256
Phone: (320) 598-3825
Fax: (320) 598-7420

Block John H.
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
College of Pharmacy
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-5779
Fax: (541) 737-3999

Bloome Dr. Peter
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Extension Administration
101 Ballard Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-2713
Fax: (541) 737-4423

Boling James A.
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
University of Kentucky
201 Gillis Building
Lexington, KY 40506
Phone: (606) 257-5294
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Bowen Stephen H.
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIV
1400 Townsend Drive
Houghton, MI 49931-1295
Phone: (906) 487-2537
Fax: (906) 487-3568

Bumgradner Walt
UNIV OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Box 10075
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0075
Phone: (601) 266-4866
Fax: (601) 266-5790

Bowers Crowell
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIV
Box 7529, 202 Holladay Hall
Raleigh, NC 27695-7529
Phone: (919) 515-7528
Fax: (919) 515-1686
crowell_bowers@ncsu.edu

Burns Leslie
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Affairs
Kidder Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-0729
Fax: (541) 737-3033

Boyer Charles
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Dept of Horticulture
4017 ALS
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-5474
Fax: (541) 737-3479

Byrne John
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
President's Office
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-3542
Fax: (541) 737-4380

Braunworth Bill
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
College of Agricultural Sciences
138 Strand Agriculture Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-1317
Fax: (541) 737-3178

Campbell Gerald
UNIV OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
1450 Linden Drive
240 Agriculture Hall
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-3673
Fax: (608) 262-8852

Bruce Gigi
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of Academic Affairs
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-0732
Fax: (541) 737-3033

Carpenter James
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
Dept. of Animal Sciences
Henke 132
Honolulu, HI 96822
Phone: (808) 956-8393
Fax: (808) 956-4883

Bull Nancy H.
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Cooperative Extension System
1376 Storrs Road, U-134
Storrs, CT 06269-4134
Phone: (860) 486-1987

Celsi Richard
CAL STATE UNIV, Long Beach
Dept. of Marketing
1250 Bellflower Boulevard -BA 346
Long Beach, CA 90840
Phone: (562) 985-4765
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Charlton Sue Ellen
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
Provost Office
108 Administration Bldg.
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1001
Phone: (970) 491-4377
Fax: (970) 491-0215

Chisholm Ines
ASU WEST
College of Education
PO Box 37100
Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100
Phone: (602) 543-6374
Fax: (602) 543-6350

Christie Alice
ASU West
College of Education
PO Box 37100
Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100
Phone: (602) 543-6338
Fax: (602) 543-6350

Church Robert L.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
216 Adm. Building
East Lansing, MI 48824
Phone: (517) 353-8977
Fax: (517) 432-2069

Clark Shirley
OREGON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
111 Susan Campbell Hall
Eugene, OR 97403
Phone: (541) 346-5791
Fax: (541) 346-5764

Coakley Stella
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
2082 Cordley Hall
Department of Botany and Plant Pathology
Corvallis, OR 97331

Collins Claudia
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
Cooperative Extension
2345 Red Rock Street
Las Vegas, NV 89146
Phone: (702) 222-3130
Fax: (702) 222-3100

Collins Timothy H.
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIV
1400 Townsend Drive
Houghton, MI 49931-1295
Phone: (906) 487-2259
Fax: (906) 487-2583

Cox David E.
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
COA Academic Programs Office
PO Box 210036
Tucson, AZ 85721-0036
Phone: (520) 621-3612
Fax: (520) 621-8662

Crouch Ben N.
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
College of Liberal Arts
College Station, TX 77843-4223
Phone: (409) 845-2141
Fax: (409) 845-5164

Currie Raymond F.
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
Faculty of Arts
310 Fletcher Argue Bld.
Winnipeg, MB R3T 5V5
CANADA
Phone: (204) 474-9271
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Curry, Jack P.
OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
3201 Campus Drive
Klamath Falls, OR  97601
Phone: (541) 885-1327
Fax: (541) 885-1687

Damrosch David
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
English and Comparative Literature
602 Philosophy
New York, NY  10027
Phone: (212) 854-3215
Fax: (212) 854-5398

Davidson Dana
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
Miller Annex 4
Honolulu, HI 96822
Phone: (808) 956-7722
Fax: (808) 956-2239

DeShazer Jim
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
Dept of Biological & Ag Eng
Moscow, ID 83844
Phone: 208-885-8990
Fax: 208-885-6654

Dick Wayne
CAL STATE UNIV, Long Beach
Department of Computer Engineering & Science
1250 Bellflower Blvd. / ECS-541
Long Beach, CA 90840
Phone: (562) 985-1551
Fax: (562) 985-8004

Dinielli Gene L.
CAL STATE UNIV, Long Beach
Academic Senate
400 Golden Shore Suite 132
Long Beach, CA 90802
Phone: (562) 985-2613
Fax: (562) 985-2618

Dobney Fredrick J.
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIV
1400 Townsend Drive
Houghton, MI 49911-1295
Phone: (906) 487-2440
Fax: (906) 487-2935

Dodrill Steven
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Ext & Exp Station Communications
Kad 422
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-0803
Fax: (541) 737-0817

Donohoe Pat
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
Box 9571
Mississipi State, MS 39762
Phone: (601) 325-2180
Fax: (601) 325-1618

Dutson Thayne R.
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
College of Agricultural Sciences
136 Strand Agriculture Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-2331
Fax: (541) 737-4574

Ervin Elizabeth
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
512 Administration Bldg
Tuscon, AZ  85721
Phone: (520) 621-1139
Fax: (520) 621-9118
ervin@u.arizona.edu

Evans Gwil
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
InterACTION
126 StAg
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-0800
Fax: (541) 737-4574
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Fails Barb
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
121 Agriculture Hall
East Lansing, MI 48864
Phone: (517) 355-0282
Fax: (517) 355-6479

Gallagher Tom
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Western Rural Dev. Center
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-1573
Fax: (541) 737-1579

Ferguson Nancy
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Department of Agronomy
269 Poole Agricultural Center
Clemson, SC 29634
Phone: (864) 656-3510
Fax: (864) 656-3443

Gardner Gary
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Dept. of Horticulture
1970 Folwell Ave
St Paul, MN 55108
Phone: (612) 624-3606
Fax: (612) 624-4941

Fought Robert
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN
Music Department
230 Westbrook Music Bldg.
Lincoln, NE 68588
Phone: (402) 472-3751
Fax: (402) 472-4929

Geddes Doreen
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Speech and Communication Studies
407 Strode Tower
Clemson, SC 29634
Phone: (864) 656-3510
Fax: (864) 656-3443

Fox Carla
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Office of Vice Provost
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Storrs, CT 06269-0490
Phone: (860) 486-2919
Fax: (860) 486-4643

Geisler Margaret
UNIV OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
International Agricultural Programs
240 Agricultural Hall/1450 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706-1562
Phone: (608) 263-3488
Fax: (608) 262-2008

Francis Sally
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Apparel, Int, Housing, & Merch.
224 Milam
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-0987
Fax: (541) 737-0993

Gelinas Douglas
UNIVERSITY OF MAINE
5703 Alumni Hall
Orono, ME 04469-5703
Phone: (207) 581-1519
Fax: (207) 581-1633

Fritzell Erik K.
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Fisheries & Wildlife
104 Nash Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-2910
Fax: (541) 737-3500

Glassick Charles E.
CARNEGIE Foundation of the United States
640 Bluff Oak Court
Roswell, GA 30076
Phone: (770) 574-4062
Fax: (770) 574-4068
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Gomez Angelo
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Affirmative Action & Equal Opportunity
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-0715
Fax: (541) 737-0712

Gunther William D.
UNIV OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Box 5021
Hattiesburg, MS 39406
Phone: (601) 266-4659
Fax: (601) 266-5814

Hall John
DREXEL UNIVERSITY
Rush #416
Philadelphia, PA 19104
Phone: (215) 895-2488
Fax: (215) 895-2494

Halvorson Peter
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Office of Vice Provost
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Storrs, CT 06269-0490
Phone: (860) 486-2919
Fax: (860) 486-4643

Harding Anna
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Dept. of Public Health
256 Waldo Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-3825
Fax: (541) 737-4001

Harris B. L.
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
103 Jack K. Williams
Administration Bldg
College Station, TX 77843-7101
Phone: (409) 862-3932
Fax: (409) 845-9542

Hashimoto Andrew G.
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of Academic Affairs
628 Kerr Admin Bldg
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: 541-737-0732
Fax: 541-737-3033
andrew.hashimoto@orst.edu

Hayes Laurie
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
Provost Office
108 Administration Bldg.
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1001
Phone: (970) 491-4377
Fax: (970) 491-0215

Helms Doris
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Provost's Office
206 Sikes Hall
Clemson, SC 29634
Phone: (864) 656-7359
Fax: (864) 656-1515

Henry Myron S.
UNIV OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Office of the Provost
Box 5002
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5002
Phone: (601) 266-5002
Fax: (601) 266-6322

Hetrick Barbara
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
Biology Department
Cedar Falls, IA 50613
Phone: (319) 273-2458
Fax: (319) 273-7125
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Hilliard Stephen
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN
English Department
303 Andrews Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0333
Phone: (402) 472-8815
Fax: (402) 472-9771

Hogle Jerrold E.
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Faculty Center
PO Box 210473
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473
Phone: (520) 621-1342
Fax: (520) 621-8844

Holly Mary Louise
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
225 Moulton Hall
Kent, OH 44242
Phone: (330) 672-2992

Hornum Barbara
DREXEL UNIVERSITY
3141 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
Phone: (215) 895-1892
Fax: (215) 895-1656

Hougum Lyla
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Administration Extension Services
Ballard Extension 100
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-2713
Fax: (541) 737-4423

Houseal Joseph
PA RNASSUS PRODUCTIONS
1096 Pratt Blvd #1-5
Chicago, IL 60626
Phone: (212) 366-0494

Howell Emory
UNIV OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
USM Box 5043
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5043
Phone: (601) 266-4375
Fax: (601) 266-6075

Hoyt Ann
UNIV OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
345 A Human Ecology Bldg.
1300 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-7390
Fax: (608) 262-5335

Hu C. Y.
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Animal Science
Witham 308
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-1915
Fax: (541) 737-4174

Iwaoka Wayne
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
CTAHR
3050 Maile Way, Gilmore 211
Honolulu, HI 96822
Phone: (808) 956-6997
Fax: (808) 956-3706

Jacobson Evelyn
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN
Academic Affairs
208 Admin. Bldg.
Lincoln, NE 68588-0426
Phone: (402) 472-3751
Fax: (402) 472-4929
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Jamieson Jim
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
Faculty of Science
251 Machray Hall
Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2
CANADA
Phone: (204) 474-9348
Fax: (204) 474-7618

Jansen Sylvia
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
Faculty Association
29 Dysart Road
Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2
CANADA
Phone: (204) 474-8282
Fax: (204) 474-7548

Johnson Duane
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
4-H Youth Development
105 Ballard Extension Hall
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-1311

Jones Robert J.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
232 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 625-0051
Fax: (612) 624-3814

Kelly John W.
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
130 Lehotsky Hall
Clemson, SC 29634-5201
Phone: (864) 656-3015
Fax: (864) 656-3608

Kennedy Pat
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN
CBA 317
Lincoln, NE 68588-0492
Phone: (402) 472-3800
Fax: (402) 472-3837

Koch Timothy
UNIV OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Box 5081
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5081
Phone: (601) 261-1306
Fax: (601) 261-1308

Knowles C. Ernest
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIV
Box 7529, 202 Holladay Hall
Raleigh, NC 27695-7529
Phone: (919) 515-7528
Fax: (919) 515-1686
ernest_knowles@ncsu.edu

Knox Alan
UNIV OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
School of Education
1025 W. Johnson Street
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: (608) 263-2937
Fax: (608) 263-3135

Kidd Bob
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
5050 Yesness Lane
University of Wyoming
Casper, WY 82604
Phone: (307) 235-1325
Fax: (307) 235-6474

Kiernan Kevin
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Department of English
Lexington, KY 40506-0027
Phone: (606) 266-3353

Knight James
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
COA Agricultural Education
Tucson, AZ 85721
Phone: (520) 621-7111
Fax: (520) 621-8662

Lehotsky Hall
130 Lehotsky Hall
Clemson, SC 29634-5201
Phone: (864) 656-3015
Fax: (864) 656-3608

Lincoln, NE 68588-0492
Phone: (402) 472-3800
Fax: (402) 472-3837

Lincoln, NE 68588-0492
Phone: (402) 472-3800
Fax: (402) 472-3837
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Koch Laura
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
160 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 624-1085
Fax: (612) 624-6057

Kolbo Jerome
UNIV OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Box 10075
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0075
Phone: (601) 266-4866
Fax: (601) 266-5790

Krone Ken
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Physics Department
Weniger 301
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-4569
Fax: (541) 737-1683

Kubena Karen
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
College Station, TX 77843-2402
Phone: (409) 845-3712
Fax: (409) 845-6083
k-kubena@tamu.edu

Kudisch Jeffrey
UNIV OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Department of Psychology
Box 5025
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5025
Phone: (601) 266-4609
Fax: (601) 266-5580

Kugrens Paul
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
Provost Office
108 Administration Bldg.
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1001

Kuhi Leonard
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
356 Physics
116 Church Street
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 624-7053
Fax: (612) 626-2029

Kustka Linda
WISCONSIN COOPERATIVE EXT
Room 328 Lowell Hall
610 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53703
Phone: (608) 262-9605
Fax: (608) 262-6407
kustka@admin.uwex.edu

Labov Jay B.
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
HA 450
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20418
Phone: (202) 334-1458
Fax: (202) 334-3159

Lamb Greg
WISCONSIN COOPERATIVE EXT
Courthouse
PO Box 670
Sturgeon Bay, WI 54235
Phone: (920) 746-2260
Fax: (920) 746-2531
gregory.lamb@ces.uwex.edu

Lassila Deborah L.
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIV
1400 Townsend Drive
Houghton, MI 49911-1295
Phone: (906) 487-2440
Fax: (906) 487-2935
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Maronek Dale
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
360 Cg Hall
Stillwater, OK 74078
Phone: (405)-744-5415
Fax: (405)-744-9709

Massey Joe
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA EXTENS
209 Kaufert Lab
2004 Folwell Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
Phone: (612) 624-7459
Fax: (612) 625-6286

McDowell George R.
VIRGINIA TECH.
Department of Agricultural & Applied Economics
Blacksburg, VA 24073-0401
Phone: (540) 231-6848
Fax: (540) 231-7417
mcdowell@vt.edu

McKittrick Tom
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Architecture
College Station, TX 77843-3137
Phone: (409) 845-7858
Fax: (409) 862-1571

McLean Vi
ASU WEST
Academic Affairs
PO Box 37100
Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100
Phone: (602) 543-4514
Fax: (602) 543-7012

McNall Scott
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Affairs
Chico, CA 95929-0110
Phone: (530) 898-6101

Miller Wally
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
1000 Valley Rd
Reno, NV 89512
Phone: (702) 784-4072
Fax: (702) 784-4583

Miller April D
UNIV OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Box 5115
Hattiesburg, MS 39406
Phone: (601) 266-5237
Fax: (601) 266-4978

Moore Roy
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Colle of Communications & Information Studies
Lexington, KY 40506-0042
Phone: (606) 257-7805
Fax: (606) 257-7818

Morse John
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Entomology Department
310 Long Hall
Clemson, SC 29634
Phone: (864) 656-5049
Fax: (864) 656-5065

Nabet Bahram
DREXEL UNIVERSITY
Commonwealth #318
Philadelphia, PA 19104
Phone: (215) 895-6761
Fax: (215) 895-1695

Nebeke T. Evan
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
103 Clay Lyle Building
Mississippi State, MS 39762
Phone: (601) 325-2085
Fax: (601) 325-8837
SCHOLARSHIP UNBOUND
Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards
October 1 – 3, 1998  Oregon State University

Nelson A. Gene
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Dept of Agricultural Economics
College Station, TX 77843-2124
Phone: (409) 845-2116
Fax: (409) 862-1563
nelson@tamu.edu

Oriard Michael
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
English Department
232 Moreland
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-1638
Fax: (541) 737-3589

Parliament Claudia
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
218 Classroom Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55108
Phone: (612) 625-5733
Fax: (612) 625-6245

Pate Joy
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
1680 Madison Avenue
Wooster, OH 44691
Phone: (330) 263-3700
Fax: (330) 263-3688

Perry Raymond P.
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
Center for Higher Education Research & Devel.
Winnipeg, Ma R3T 2N2
CANADA
Phone: (202) 474-6945
Fax: (202) 474-7609

Peters Scott
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA EXTENS
146 Class. Office Bldg.
1994 Buford Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
Phone: (612) 624-3013
Fax: (612) 625-1955

Pletcher Peggy
UI BOISE CENTER
800 Park Blvd, Suite 200
Boise, ID 83712
Phone: (208) 885-8990
Fax: (208) 885-6654

Newman Michael
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
Box 9660
Mississippi State, MS 39762
Phone: (601) 325-3462
Fax: (601) 325-8407

Nielsen-Gammon John
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Meteorology
College Station, TX 77843-3150
Phone: (409) 862-2248
Fax: (409) 862-4466

Oldham Philip
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Chemistry
Box 9573
Mississippi State, MS 39762
Phone: (601) 325-3584
Fax: (601) 325-1618

O'Connor Carl
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
432 North Lake Street Room 601
Cooperative Extension
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: (608) 263-2775
Fax: (608) 265-4545
carl.oconnor@ces.uwex.edu

Orf Jim
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
411 Borlang Hall
St. Paul, MN 55108
Phone: (612) 625-0263
Fax: (612) 625-3056
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Pratt Dick
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
ESR, PO Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751
Phone: (503) 725-8038
Fax: (503) 725-3888
prattja@pdx.edu

Prunty Lyle
NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
Soil Science Dept.
Warner Hall 147
Fargo, ND 58105
Phone: (701) 231-8580
Fax: (701) 231-7861

Rahneha Sha
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
1328 Dover Road
Wooster, OH 44691
Phone: (330) 264-3911
Fax: (330) 262-7634

Reardon Michael
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of Academic Affairs
PO Box 751
Portland, OR 97207
Phone: (503) 725-5257
Fax: (503) 725-5262

Reed Scott
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
College of Forestry
Peavy Hall 121
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-3700
Fax: (541) 737-3008

Reid David S.
UNIV OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
CA & ES Dean’s Office
DAVIS, CA 95616
Phone: (530) 752-0110

Rice Eugene
AMERICAN ASSOC OF HIGHER ED
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
Phone: (202) 293-6440
Fax: (202) 293-0073

Risser Paul
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
President’s Office
Kerr Administration 646
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-2565
Fax: (541) 737-3033

Roberts Lani
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Philosophy Department
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-5654
Fax: (541) 737-2571

Robson Robert
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Affairs
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-5171
Fax: (541) 737-0517

Roper Larry
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Student Affairs
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-3626
Fax: (541) 737-3033

Rose Robin
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Forest Science Dept.
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-6580
Fax: (541) 737-5814
SCHOLARSHIP UNBOUND
Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards
October 1 – 3, 1998  Oregon State University

Rowe Randy
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Plant Pathology
Selby Hall, 1680 Madison Avenue
Wooster, OH 44691
Phone: (330) 263-3839
Fax: (330) 263-3841

Rutledge Jim
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Extension 4-H Youth
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-1737
Fax: (541) 737-1332

Saint-Germain Michelle
CAL STATE UNIV, LONG BEACH
1250 Bellflower Boulevard
Graduate Center for Public Policy
Long Beach, CA 90840
Phone: (562) 985-8883
Fax: (562) 985-4672

Sandberg Howard
USDA
Agriculture South, Room 3433
1400 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20250-2251
Phone: (202) 720-2211
Fax: (202) 720-2030

Sandmann Lorilee
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
University Outreach
13 Kellogg Center
East Lansing, MI 48824-1022
Phone: (517) 355-4589
Fax: (517) 355-4565

Schaffer Kay
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
College of Liberal Arts
Social Sciences 207
Corvallis, OR 97331

Schofer Peter
UNIV OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
660 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-7940
Fax: (608) 265-3892

Scott Shirley
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
121 The Valley Library
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-7269
Fax: (541) 737-1328

Seely Bruce E.
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIV
1400 Townsend Drive
Houghton, MI 49911-1295
Phone: (906) 487-2549
Fax: (906) 487-2468

Shelburne Victor B.
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Forest Resources Department
212 Lehotsky Hall
Clemson, SC 29634
Phone: (864) 656-4855
Fax: (864) 656-3304

Shelton Diana
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
Box 3334
Coe Library
Laramie, WY 82071
Phone: (307) 766-6216
Fax: (307) 766-3062

Siegel Don
ASU WEST
School of Management
PO Box 37100
Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100
Phone: (602) 543-6217
Fax: (602) 543-6222

Michelle Seely
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY Extension
99 Youth
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-1737
Fax: (541) 737-1328
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Sigman-Grant Madeleine
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
Cooperative Extension
2345 Red Rock Street
Las Vegas, NV 89146
Phone: (702) 222-3130
Fax: (702) 222-3100

Singha Suman
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Office of Academic Programs
U-90 1376 Storrs Rd.
Storrs, CT 06269-0490
Phone: (860) 486-2919
Fax: (860) 486-4643

Sisson Richard
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of Academic Affairs
203 Bricker
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: (614) 292-9658
Fax: (614) 292-1146

Skipper Horace
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Department of Agronomy
203 Poole Agricultural Center
Clemson, SC 29634
Phone: (864) 656-3525
Fax: (864) 656-3443

Small Leslie
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
Academic & Student Affairs
88 Lipman Drive
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8525
Phone: (732) 932-9000
Fax: (732) 932-8880

Smey Joseph W
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
SAH 358 Mansfield Rd U-101
Storrs, CT 06269-0490

Stadulis Robert E.
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Box 5190, School of ELS
Kent, OH 44242
Phone: (330) 672-2857
Fax: (330) 672-4106
rstaduli@kentvm.kent.edu

Stanek Kay
WISCONSIN COOPERATIVE EXT
Room 108 County Administration
Juneau, WI 53039
Phone: (920) 386-3790
Fax: (920) 386-3928
kay.stanek@ces.uwex.edu

Stobart Robert
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
Box 3354
University Station
Laramie, WY 82071
Phone: (307) 766-5212
Fax: (307) 766-3379

Stolle Carlton
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Department of Accounting
College of Business Administration
College Station, TX 77843-4353
Phone: (409) 845-0338
Fax: (409) 845-0028

Strauss Steve
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Forest Science
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-6578
Fax: (541) 737-1393

Stuckey Richard
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
4420 West Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50014-3447
Phone: (515) 292-2125
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Thorburn Tom L.
W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION
One Mich. Ave. East
Battle Creek, MI 49017
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The Value System of a University—Rethinking Scholarship

Conrad J. Weiser

Revised promotion and tenure criteria that evolved from extensive faculty deliberations were adopted this year by a major Land Grant university. Scholarship was defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Discovery, development, integration, and artistry were identified as forms of scholarship. Evaluation of a faculty member’s performance will be based upon a position description of assigned duties, appropriate scholarship, service and the relative proportion of effort devoted to each. Changes in promotion and tenure criteria at universities are rare. The process and outcomes described here may be relevant to other institutions.

Many universities are re-examining their values as public confidence in and support for higher education has waned. A university’s values are most clearly described by its promotion and tenure policies, and by the criteria it uses to evaluate faculty members’ performance. In American universities all professors are expected to engage in scholarship, and each is also expected to perform other job responsibilities assigned to his or her position. These assigned responsibilities typically include specific teaching, research, advising, extension, or administrative assignments.

The balance of emphasis between scholarship and other assigned duties varies from one faculty position to another—ranging from faculty whose primary responsibility is to engage in scholarship, to faculty with extensive assigned duties who devote a limited but significant effort to scholarly achievement.

All faculty members are also encouraged to provide service relevant to their assignment and of value to their institution or profession, but tenure and promotion decisions are typically based on evidence of significant scholarly contributions and effective performance of assigned duties—not on outstanding service. Scholarship and performance of assigned duties are valued highly at most universities, and faculty members are denied tenure if accomplishment is inadequate in either area. Excellence, not adequacy, is the performance goal for university faculties.

Professor and Dean Emeritus, College of Agricultural Sciences. Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA.
Oregon State University is a research-oriented Land Grant university, designated as a Research University I by the Carnegie Foundation. The University has three primary missions and its faculty members have three fundamental responsibilities as shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Missions</th>
<th>Faculty Member Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>assigned duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>(Specific duties and the balance of effort among these three areas of responsibility are described for each faculty position.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Education (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. The relationship between University missions and faculty responsibilities.

Effective organizations have developed systems for evaluating and rewarding employee performance as it relates to the missions of the organization. In universities, evaluating a faculty member's scholarly contributions and assessing how well he or she has performed the specific duties assigned to the position seems appropriate and straightforward. Unfortunately it is often neither simple nor straightforward, in part because:

- Scholarship is undefined and poorly understood at many universities. Scholarship is often oversimplistically equated with research.

- A faculty member's performance is sometimes evaluated by peers without reference to the position description—as if all faculty positions were identical.

- Emphasis on individual achievement in faculty performance is sometimes interpreted by peer evaluators to imply that faculty contributions to team efforts are not valuable and important—as if it were not possible to value both individual achievement and collaborative effort.

- It is easier to document and evaluate form and activities, rather than substance or consequences, in describing and assessing faculty contributions.

Discussions are underway at many American universities seeking ways to improve evaluations of faculty and promotion and tenure processes. These discussions are prompted, in part, by the limitations mentioned above, but also by growing public dissatisfaction and distrust of universities' values, which are perceived to be:

- unduly focused on research and research funding, to the detriment of undergraduate education;
inward looking and directed predominantly at specialized peer audiences; and

* overspecialized, discipline focused, and not particularly relevant or responsive to societal problems which tend to be complex.

**Scholarship Reconsidered**

Ernest L. Boyer's 1990 book *Scholarship Reconsidered—Priorities of the Professoriate* (2) stimulated much of the discussion of scholarship currently taking place within universities and scholarly and scientific societies. In his book, and in frequent public talks, Dr. Boyer makes an eloquent case for the importance of valuing teaching more highly in assessing faculty performance. He poses the question "Is it possible to define the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates?" He answers the question by proposing "that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of *discovery*; the scholarship of *integration*; the scholarship of *application*; and the scholarship of *teaching*.'

At Oregon State University, Boyer's book *Scholarship Reconsidered* provided the impetus for discussion by faculty (3) in the College of Agricultural Sciences whose primary assignments included teaching, research, extension, and international programs. The group's objectives were to develop a collective understanding of what scholarship implies, and to describe the nature of scholarship at a university in concise terms that would be understood by faculty in all disciplines, and by nonacademics as well.

In the course of a year this faculty group defined scholarship simply: scholarship creates something new that is validated and communicated. They described five forms of scholarship which were similar to the four proposed by Boyer, except that *creative artistry* was added as a fifth form of scholarship, and *learning* was added to describe the scholarship of *teaching and learning*. Fig. 2 illustrates the type of format that was used to describe scholarship in a matrix that fits on one sheet of paper. This definition and these concepts were subsequently improved upon, as described later.
Forms of Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the scholarship</th>
<th>Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Artistic Creativity</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With learners, develops and communicates new understanding and insights; develops and refines new teaching content and methods; fosters lifelong learning behavior.</td>
<td>Generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Interprets the human spirit, creates and communicates new insights and beauty; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Synthesizes and communicates new or different understandings of knowledge or technology and its relevance; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Develops and communicates new technologies, materials or uses; fosters inquiry and invention; develops and refines new methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary audiences for scholarship</th>
<th>Learners: Educator peers.</th>
<th>Peers: Supporters of research; Educators; Students; Publics.</th>
<th>Various public: Patrons; Students</th>
<th>Users: Educators; Students; Patrons; Students</th>
<th>Users: Customers; Educators; Peers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials and methods: Class; Curricula; Publications and presentations to educator peers and broader publics.</td>
<td>Peer-reviewed publications and presentations; Presentations.</td>
<td>Shows, performances and distribution of products; Reviews, news reports; Copyrights; Peer presentations and publications.</td>
<td>Presentations, publications, demonstrations, and patents.</td>
<td>Demonstrations and presentations to audiences: Patents; Publications for users; Periodicals and reports; Peer presentations and publications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Primary criteria for validating scholarship | Originality and significance of new contributions to teaching; depth, duration and usefulness of what is learned; lifelong benefits to learners and adoption by peers. | Originality, scope, and significance of new knowledge; applicability and benefits to society. | Beauty, originality, impact, and duration of public value; scope and persistence of influence and public appreciation. | Usefulness and originality of new or different understandings, applications, and insights. | Breadth, value, and persistence of use and impact. |

| How scholarship is documented | Teaching portfolio: summaries of primary contributions, impacts on students and learning; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, significance and impact in advancing knowledge, new methods, public benefits; communication and validation by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, public interest, and impact: communication to publics, peer recognition and adoption; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, scope of adoption and application, impact and benefit; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, scope of adoption and application, impact and benefit; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. |

*Fig. 2.* Forms of scholarship matrix. Prior to University-wide deliberations, five iterations of discussion and review were focused on completing the cells in this matrix to characterize various forms of scholarship. Fig. 3 illustrates the subsequent evolution of the matrix into a simpler definition and description of scholarship that emphasizes similarities among various forms of scholarship.

**Faculty Discussion**

The definition and description of scholarship provided the basis for widespread faculty discussion at Oregon State University beginning in the College of Agricultural Sciences. These discussions resulted in five cycles of review and revision of the Forms of Scholarship matrix (Fig. 2). The matrix format provided a useful initial focus for discussion of the several forms of scholarship. As discussions progressed, however, the taxonomy tended to focus discussion on differences among forms of scholarship rather than on unifying characteristics of all types of scholarship. Over a two-year period the faculty discussions in the College evolved into:

- adoption of revised promotion and tenure guidelines for the College based upon the definition and description of scholarship;
• addition of a category labeled *results of team effort* into the format for documentation of faculty achievements; and

• encouragement of departments to identify peer counselors to advise and assist new faculty members in early career development.

During this period of discussion and revision the deans of all other colleges also participated in describing and defining scholarship, and in recommending University-wide consideration.

Faculty understanding and acceptance of this concept of scholarship were remarkably widespread and enthusiastic. Faculty members and college deans who considered the matter were very comfortable with the simple definition of scholarship proposed, and with the idea that discovery, application, integration, and creative artistry are fundamental forms of scholarship. A point that troubled a substantial number of faculty was inclusion of teaching as a form of scholarship. Faculty members who expressed the greatest reservations about describing teaching as a form of scholarship included many effective teachers in agriculture, faculty members in education departments, and faculty members in departments such as English and Chemistry that have substantial undergraduate teaching responsibilities. Subsequent university-wide adoption of an improved definition and description of scholarship resolved these reservations by considering teaching, research, and extended education as vital university missions and activities—not forms of scholarship.

Some faculty members were concerned that defining scholarship and identifying discovery, development, integration, and artistry as forms of scholarship somehow lowered standards and diminished the value placed on research by the University. Most faculty members, including distinguished researchers, understood that standards of performance were likely being raised rather than lowered, and that research would continue to be highly valued by the University. In a similar vein, one person expressed concern during a Faculty Senate discussion that recognition of faculty contributions to collaborative team efforts somehow diminished the importance and value placed by the University on individual achievements. These examples of *zero-sum game* thinking were relatively rare.

The scholarship definition and promotion and tenure policies adopted by the College of Agricultural Sciences were subsequently considered by an Extended Education Transition Committee that was appointed and chaired by the Provost (4). The committee's assignment was to advise the President on implementation of a major new initiative that reaffirmed extended education as the University's *third mission* (5). This initiative required each college and department to develop an *extended education* plan for delivering educational programs beyond the campus. In addition, extension faculty (agents and specialists) are now tenured in colleges and departments rather than in Cooperative Extension, as was previously the case.

The Extended Education Transition Committee reviewed, refined, and endorsed the College of Agricultural Sciences' promotion and tenure policies which were viewed as supportive of the University's extended education mission, and of the tenuring of extension faculty members in academic college and department. The Committee recommended University-wide
Faculty Senate Deliberation

A diverse campus-wide Faculty Senate Committee (6) devoted a year to intensive, almost weekly meetings to developing revisions in the promotion and tenure guidelines. The revised guidelines were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate as a whole in May 1995, and officially adopted by the University President (7) in June 1995. The revised guidelines drew from concepts developed initially by the College of Agricultural Sciences and the Extended Education Transition Committee, but the Faculty Senate Committee improved on several points including a definition of scholarship that does not propose teaching as a form of scholarship.

Specifically, Oregon State University’s new promotion and tenure guidelines define scholarship more broadly (8), value team efforts, and require that position descriptions provide the basis for evaluating faculty performance. The new guidelines (9) have eliminated need for separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines previously used in library and information services, extension, international development, veterinary medicine, and several other specialized areas. The new guidelines also help alleviate concerns of extension faculty who wondered whether their work and creative scholarly achievements would be understood and valued by teaching and research colleagues in campus departments.

Key elements of the newly adopted Oregon State University promotion and tenure guidelines, as interpreted and modified here, include the following:

- Defines scholarship as: *Creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated.*

- Describes four forms of scholarship:
  * Discovery of new knowledge;
  * Development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses;
  * Integration of knowledge leading to new understanding; and
  * Artistry that creates new insights and interpretations.

- Recognizes teaching, research, and extended education as vital university missions and faculty activities—*that are not scholarship in themselves*—but which can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated intellectual work (scholarship) in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry).

- Recognizes that peer validation and communication can occur in a variety of ways including, *but not limited to*, peer-refereed publications. Emphasizes documenting whether, not how, peer validation and communication has occurred. Emphasizes "communication in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself."

- Identifies *performance of assigned duties* and *scholarly achievement* as the two primary
• Requires that a position description will provide the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance. The position description will describe assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort among assigned duties, scholarship, and service. States that, "The responsibilities of individual faculty vary and will be specified in position descriptions developed at the time of initial appointment and revised periodically as necessary. Faculty with assignments in research, extension, international development, information services, student services, diagnostic and analytical services, and administration will be evaluated by the standards appropriate to the field."

• Recognizes that some faculty positions are devoted primarily to conducting scholarly work with few additional assigned responsibilities, and that other faculty positions have extensive assigned duties (in areas such as teaching, advising, extension, or administration), and a small but significant expectation of scholarly achievement.

• Affirms that scholarly achievement is expected of all professorial rank faculty members, regardless of other assigned duties (including administrators such as the university president, provost, deans, and department heads). Administrators' scholarship could be in a subject-matter discipline, or in creative intellectual work developing better management methods (validated by peers and communicated) in their area of administrative responsibility.

• Recognizes that teachers and extension educators could focus their scholarship in a subject-matter discipline or in developing improved education materials, methods, or programs.

• Recognizes that disciplinary peers around the world are the primary audience for most types of research scholarship, but that the primary audiences for some types of scholarship may be more localized or regionalized in the case of teaching, extension, and field research that is locally adapted. The promotion and tenure guideline language was changed to reflect this reality—from "professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship" to "professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession."

• States that the University values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report specifically their contributions to the results of significant team efforts in documenting their accomplishments.

• Recommends that documentation of achievements focus (whenever possible) on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, on describing what has changed or improved as a result of a faculty member's efforts.
Summary.

The definition of scholarship developed and adopted by Oregon State University (OSU) differs from that proposed by Ernest Boyer. Specifically, Boyer described characteristics of scholarship, but did not define scholarship *per se*. He proposed "four separate but overlapping functions" of the professoriate as: "the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching." In proposing these four functions as forms of scholarship Boyer in effect classified virtually all important faculty activities as scholarship.

In contrast the OSU guidelines consider that a university, and its faculty, performs essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. Scholarship is considered to be creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated including: *discovery* of new knowledge; *development* of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses; *integration* of knowledge leading to new understandings; and *artistry* that creates new insights and understandings. Fig. 3 illustrates the nature of scholarship as described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Nature of Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Forms of scholarship include discovery, development, integration and artistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character of scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences for scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of communicating scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for validating scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of documenting scholarship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. The nature of scholarship.
This description of scholarship does not assume that most activities engaged in or originated by faculty are scholarship in and of themselves. It recognizes, in fact, that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not only by university faculty. It emphasizes the importance of validation to ensure validity, and of communication to broader audiences to ensure that results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others. Nonacademics who have reviewed the new OSU guidelines readily understand and value this concept of scholarship.

The OSU and Boyer approaches are similar in that both achieve the aim of broadening the view of scholarship beyond research, and both articulate, advocate, and provide a mechanism for recognition of scholarship in areas such as teaching, learning, and education. Boyer does this by proposing that teaching is scholarship. The OSU model does so by recognizing that scholarship in teaching can occur in the areas of discovery, development, integration, or artistry—whenever creative intellectual work in teaching is validated by peers and communicated.

The process at OSU that led to adoption of new promotion and tenure guidelines, and the new concepts about scholarship and faculty performance that crystallized out of those faculty deliberations may prove useful to others who are dealing with these issues.
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Finally, Bruno Moser has written an excellent essay on the subject of retirement, a difficult transition for many faculty, especially regarding nonfinancial concerns. He has dealt with a number of issues ranging from retirement planning, alternatives, incentives, and the impact that retirements can have on a department. Faculty approaching this milestone still have much to offer, and, although their roles and contributions may change, they must remain productive department members.

This colloquium focuses on the issues and concerns faculty have during their professional career. These challenges and concerns change during the span of an individual's academic tenure. The presenters have provided information that can assist individuals and departments to remain productive and accomplish their goals.
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**Faculty Scholarship and Productivity Expectations — An Administrator's Perspective**

C.J. Weiser

Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331

The value system of a university is most clearly described by its promotion and tenure policies, and by the criteria it uses to evaluate faculty members' performance. In American universities, all professors are expected to engage in scholarship, and each professor is also expected to perform other job responsibilities assigned to his or her position. These assigned responsibilities typically include specific teaching, research, extension, advising, or administrative assignments.

The balance of emphasis between scholarship and other assigned duties varies from one faculty position to another-ranging from faculty with few assignments beyond engaging in scholarship, to faculty with extensive responsibilities for other assigned duties who devote a small but significant effort to scholarly achievement.

All faculty members are also encouraged to perform service relevant to their assignment and of value to their institution or profession, but tenure and promotion decisions are typically based on evidence of significant scholarly contributions and effective performance of assigned duties—not on outstanding service. Scholarship and performance of assigned duties are both valued highly at most universities, and faculty members are denied tenure if performance is inadequate in either area. Excellence, not adequacy, is the performance goal for university faculties.

Evaluating a faculty member's scholarly contributions and assessing how well he or she has performed the specific duties assigned to the position seems appropriate and fairly straightforward. Unfortunately, it is often neither simple nor straightforward, in part because:

- Scholarship is undefined and poorly understood at most universities. Scholarship is often oversimplified thinking to be synonymous with research.

- A faculty member's performance is sometimes evaluated by peers without reference to the position description—as if all faculty positions were the same.

- Emphasis on individual achievement in faculty performance is interpreted by some peer evaluators to imply that faculty contributions to team efforts are not valuable and important—as if it were not possible to value both individual achievement and collaborative effort.

- It is easier to document and evaluate form and activities, rather than substance or consequences, in describing and assessing faculty contributions.

There are discussions underway at many American universities of ways to improve faculty evaluations and the processes of promotion and tenure. These discussions are prompted in part by the limitations mentioned above, but also by growing public dissatisfaction with the values, which are perceived to be:

- primarily focused on research and research funding, rather than on undergraduate education;

- introspective, with communications of faculty accomplishment directed predominantly at specialized peer audiences; and

- overspecialized, discipline focused, and not particularly relevant or responsive to real problems, which tend to be complex.

Publication of Scholarship Reconsidered — Priorities of the Professoriate (Boyer, 1990) stimulated much of the discussion of scholarship currently taking place within universities and professional societies. In this book, and in frequent public talks, Dr. Boyer makes eloquent case for the importance of valuing teaching more highly in assessing faculty performance. He poses the question "Is it possible to define the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates?" and answers by proposing "that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching."

At Oregon State University (OSU), Dr. Boyer's book Scholarship Reconsidered provided the starting point for discussion by a group composed of faculty members in the College of Agricultural Science whose primary assignments were in diverse areas, including teaching, research, extension, and international programs. The group's objectives were to develop a collective understanding of what scholarship is, and to describe the nature of scholarship across the university in concise terms that would be understood by faculty in all disciplines and by nonacademics as well.

In the course of a year, this faculty group defined scholarship simply: scholarship creates something new that is validated and communicated. They described five forms of scholarship that were similar to the four proposed by Boyer, except that creative arts were added as a fifth form of scholarship, and learning was added to propose the scholarship of teaching and learning. This definition and these concepts were subsequently improved, as described later.

This simple definition and description of scholarship provided it basis for widespread faculty discussion, especially within the College of Agricultural Sciences at OSU. These discussions resulted in the following iterations of review and revision, and evolved over a 2-year period into:

- adoption of revised promotion and tenure guidelines for the College, based on the definition and description of scholarship;

- incorporation of a position description for each faculty member;
The College of Agricultural Sciences was subsequently studied, refined, and endorsed by an Extended Education Transition Committee that was appointed and chaired by the Provost to advise the President on implementation of a major new initiative that established extended education as the university's third mission. This initiative required each college and department to develop an extended education plan for delivering educational programs beyond the campus. Extension faculty (agents and specialists) are now assigned to, evaluated by, and tenured in colleges and departments—rather than in Cooperative Extension, as was the case previously.

The Provost appointed a Faculty Senate Committee to consider recommendations and propose revisions in the OSU promotion and tenure guidelines.

This highly diverse cross-disciplinary faculty senate committee devoted a year to intensive weekly deliberations to revise promotion and tenure guidelines. The new guidelines were presented to and approved by the Faculty Senate in May 1995, and subsequently adopted in June by the university president. The new guidelines drew substantially from concepts developed initially by the College of Agricultural Sciences and the Extended Education Transition Committee, but the Faculty Senate Committee improved on several points, including the definition of scholarship, as described below.

OSU’s new promotion and tenure guidelines define scholarship more broadly, value team efforts, and use position descriptions as a basis for evaluating faculty performance. The guidelines have eliminated any need for several separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines previously used to assess faculty performance in library and information services, extension, international development, veterinary medicine, and several other specialized areas. The new guidelines are helping to alleviate the concerns of extension agent faculty members who wondered how well their work would be understood and valued by teaching and research colleagues in campus departments.

Key elements of the newly adopted OSU promotion and tenure guidelines include:

- Four forms of scholarship are described: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, materials, and uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understanding; and artistry that creates new insights and interpretations.
- Recognizes that teaching, research, and extension are vital university activities—that are not scholarship in themselves—but that can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated scholarship in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry).
- Recognizes that peer validation and communication can occur in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, peer refereed publications. Emphasizes documenting whether, not how, peer validation and communication has occurred. Emphasizes “communication in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the discipline itself.”
- Identifies performance of assigned duties and scholarly achievement as the two primary areas for evaluating faculty performance. Service is considered to be a less important area of performance evaluation.
- Requires that a position description identifying assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort in these two areas provide the basis for evaluating a faculty member’s performance. States that “the responsibilities of individual faculty vary and will be specified in position descriptions developed at the time of initial appointment and revised periodically as necessary. Faculty with assignments in research, extension, international development, information services, student services, diagnostic and analytical services, and administration will be evaluated by the standards appropriate to the field.”
- Recognizes that some faculty positions are devoted primarily to conducting scholarly work, with few additional assigned responsibilities, and that other faculty positions have extensive assigned duties (in areas such as teaching, advising, extension, or administration) and a small but significant expectation of scholarly achievement.
- Affirms that scholarly achievement is expected of all professorial rank faculty members, regardless of their assigned duties (including administrators such as the university president, provost, deans, and department heads). Administrators’ scholarship can be in a subject matter discipline, or in creative intellectual work developing better management methods (that are validated by peers and communicated) in their area of administrative responsibility.
- Recognizes that teachers and extension educators also have the option of focusing their scholarship either in a subject matter discipline or in developing, providing for peer validation, and communicating improved education materials, methods, and programs.
- Recognizes that international disciplinary peers are the primary audience for most types of research scholarship, but that the primary audiences may be regionalized or localized for some of the scholarship in teaching, extension, and field research that is locally adapted. The promotion and tenure guideline language was changed to reflect this reality from “professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship” to “professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate’s wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession.”
- States that the University values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report specifically the results of their team efforts in documenting their contributions.
- Recommends that documentation of achievements focus (whenever possible) on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, documentation should describe what has changed or improved as a result of a faculty member’s efforts.

+ encouragement of departments to assign two peer counselors to new faculty members to assist them in their early career development.
described characteristics of scholarship throughout his book (1990), but he did not define scholarship. He proposed “four separate but overlapping functions” of the professoriate as: “the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching.” In proposing these four functions as forms of scholarship Dr. Boyer in effect classified most, if not all, important faculty activities as scholarship.

In contrast, the OSU guidelines consider that a university and its faculty perform essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. Scholarship is considered to be creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated, and several forms are described including: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, materials, and uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and artistry that creates new insights and understandings.

This description of scholarship does not assume that most faculty activities are scholarship. It recognizes, in fact, that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not only by university faculty members. It emphasizes the importance of validation by peers to help ensure validity, and of communication to broader audiences to ensure that the results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others. Nonacademics who have reviewed the new OSU guidelines understand and value this concept of scholarship.

Specifically, the OSU guidelines consider teaching, research, and extension to be important university (and faculty) activities—but do not view these activities as scholarship. The OSU and Boyer approaches are similar in that both achieve the aim of broadening the view of scholarship beyond research, and both articulate, advocate, and provide a mechanism for recognition of scholarship in areas such as teaching, learning, and education. Dr. Boyer does this by proposing that teaching is scholarship. The OSU model does so by recognizing that scholarship in teaching can occur in the areas of discovery, development, integration, or artistry—whenever creative intellectual work in teaching is validated by peers and communicated.

The process at OSU that led to adoption of new promotion and tenure guidelines, and the new concepts and ideas about scholarship and performance that were distilled out of those faculty deliberations may prove useful to others who are interested in these issues.
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Junior Faculty: Their Needs and Professional Development

L. Dee Fink

*Instructional Development Program, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019*

Institutions of higher education, like all large-scale organizations, must deal with the task of regularly incorporating new personnel into their systems of operation. Many of these newcomers originate from preparatory programs which, in the case of higher education, are graduate schools; others are experienced personnel who transfer from other institutions. Both groups face the challenge of having to learn quickly how to fit into new roles and how to adapt to the peculiarities of a particular institution.

This process, which takes place every year and continues well beyond the first year, raises a number of questions that have begun to be addressed by research and by new institutional practices. This paper will address four of these questions:

1) Why is it important for academic administrators to attend to the professional development of junior faculty?
2) What is happening now to new faculty members as they enter new institutions?
3) What are the reasons for these problems?
4) What is being done and can be done to better assist the professional development of new faculty?

In discussing these questions, I will summarize some of the major research and institutional practices of the last two decades.

**IMPORTANCE OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF JUNIOR FACULTY**

The prospect of hiring a new faculty member into a department is exciting: it provides an opportunity to bring new ideas and workers into the unit, but it also incurs a major cost for the department. This cost includes the direct cost of advertising the position and transporting candidates for interviews, and the much larger indirect cost of tying up major amounts of faculty time for defining the position, preparing the advertisement, keeping track of applications, reviewing the applications, creating a short list, hosting and listening to candidates, deciding who to make an offer to, etc. When these two sets of costs are added together, the real total cost of hiring a new faculty member probably runs into tens of thousands of dollars. Limiting the frequency of such costs by reducing unnecessary turnover of unhappy new faculty members is the first reason academic administrators should concern themselves with the welfare and professional development of new faculty members.

The second reason has a more long-term basis. If a new faculty member stays at an institution for his or her whole career, the institution will eventually spend well over $1 million in salaries and benefits. Some faculty members will make a big return on this investment in terms of high quality teaching and scholarship; others will stagnate after a few years. The difference between faculty members at these two ends of the spectrum stems primarily from their attitude towards and success in working on their own professional development. To ensure that faculty members stay productive over time, it is necessary to start professional development activities early.

The third reason has to do with changing times. It is very easy for academic administrators to think in terms of their own experiences as a new faculty member when working with today’s new faculty. The problem with this response is that many of the junior faculty coming into academic today are quite different from those of yesteryear. A significantly larger percentage are women, ethnic minorities, or immigrants. Therefore, administrators need to learn about the felt needs of today’s junior faculty.

**CURRENT PATTERNS AND PROBLEMS**

Researchers have been studying the situation of new faculty members during the last two decades. I have been concerned with what happens specifically during the first year of being a faculty member (Fink, 1984); others have studied what happens during the next 4 to 5 years after that (Boice, 1992a; Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992). I will summarize some of the major points of these studies.

The study of beginning college teachers was one I conducted. The research involved a comprehensive study of the training, socialization, and professional development of new faculty members in a large, well-known public university. A key finding of this research was that new faculty members have a wide range of needs and that those needs are highly dependent on the context in which they are placed.
Scholarship Unbound for the 21st Century

To provide a conceptual base for reviewing and revising tenure and promotion guidelines a faculty senate task force at Oregon State University undertook the challenge of defining and articulating the core characteristics of scholarship that apply across academic disciplines and university missions. The result was: *Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated—including creative artistry and the discovery, integration and development of knowledge.*

Scholarly achievement and excellence in performing other assigned responsibilities are the primary categories for evaluating faculty performance, but OSU’s new promotion and tenure guidelines describe other aspects of faculty performance that the University values. These include collaborative effort, international perspective and service. Revised tenure and promotion guidelines reflecting these values, and basing faculty evaluation on a position description, were adopted by the University in 1995 with unanimous Faculty Senate support. Numerous universities are considering such changes, but few have progressed this far. Oregon State University will host a national workshop October 1-3, 1998, to provide a forum for exchanging ideas on the nature of scholarship and the reframing of faculty evaluation and rewards that is taking place in American universities.

OSU’s new guidelines eliminated the need for separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines which were previously used to describe scholarship in programs such as extension, international development, veterinary medicine and library and information services where scholarship sometimes does not fit the traditional research model of results published in peer reviewed journals.

In short, Oregon State University’s new promotion and tenure guidelines:

- Reaffirm that scholarship is required of all professorial faculty, and articulate a definition of scholarship that applies across the arts and sciences.

- Require that an annually updated position description serves as the basis for evaluating a faculty member’s performance. The position description explicitly describes assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort among assigned duties, scholarship, and service for each faculty position.

- Identify performance of assigned duties and scholarly achievement as the two primary areas of faculty evaluation.

- Recognize service performed by faculty members which is not part of their assigned duties as a secondary area of performance evaluation. Assigned duties such as administration, extension, outreach and student advising are not viewed as service when they are assigned to a faculty member. By the same token such activities are considered service when they are performed by a faculty member whose assigned duties lie in another area, such as research or teaching.

- Recognize teaching, research, and outreach as vital university missions and faculty activities that are not scholarship in themselves but which can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated intellectual work (scholarship) in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry). This is a significant departure from Ernest Boyer’s view of teaching per se as scholarship.

- Recognize that peer validation and communication are separate processes that can occur in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, peer-refereed publications. When peer validation and communication are accomplished in non-traditional ways it is the faculty members responsibility to clearly describe and document how peer validation and communication were accomplished.
• Recognize that teachers and extension educators can do scholarly work in developing improved education materials, methods, or programs or in conducting research in their subject-matter discipline.

• Recognize that the audiences for scholarship in research are disciplinary peers worldwide, but that audiences for scholarship in teaching, extension and site-specific field research are often more localized. The promotion and tenure guidelines language was changed to reflect this reality—from "professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship" to "professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession."

• Emphasize that the University values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report contributions to significant team efforts in documenting their accomplishments.

• Recommend that documentation of achievements focus whenever possible on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, on describing what changed or improved as a result of a faculty member's efforts.

The OSU Promotion and Tenure guidelines acknowledge that the faculty of a university performs essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. The guidelines explicitly describe scholarship as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated including: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and artistry that creates new insights and understandings. This view acknowledges that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not just at universities. It emphasizes the importance of ensuring validity, and of communicating to broader audiences to ensure that results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others, and articulates the fundamental nature of scholarly achievement that applies across all disciplines.

Citizen advisors value OSU's new guidelines which they feel will recognize and reward faculty efforts that benefit students and citizens in Oregon. Several universities are finding that the Oregon State University definition of scholarship provides a useful starting point for their institution's deliberations about faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure and post-tenure review. University faculties, and the broader public, seem ready to improve faculty evaluation and reward processes.

Additional information, shown below, can be obtained from: Office of Academic Affairs, Oregon State University, 628 Kerr Administration Building, Corvallis, OR 97331, (541)737-0732 or gigi.bruce@orst.edu.

- Oregon State University, 1995 Revised Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and Dossier Preparation Instructions. http://www.orst.edu (Full-Text Search of OSU, "promotion and tenure")
- Draft paper, 1995 "The Value System of a University—Rethinking Scholarship" by C. J. Weiser describing in more detail the process at OSU and the changes that resulted.

July 1998

C. J. Weiser, Dean Emeritus
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
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Broader Visions of Scholarship

—A Comparison of Carnegie Foundation and Oregon State University models

The Nature of Scholarship

Carnegie: Four activities of the professoriate—teaching and the discovery, integration and application of knowledge are described as the categories of scholarship.

OSU: Scholarship is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Four forms of scholarship are described: creative artistry and the discovery, integration and development (application) of knowledge.

Both models view the discovery, integration and application of knowledge as three forms of scholarship. Additionally, the Carnegie model includes teaching while the OSU model includes creative artistry as a fourth form of scholarship.

Implications

Carnegie: Scholarship is determined and described as the things that professors do, hence good teaching is considered to be scholarship. Literary, visual and performing arts are considered to fall under the scholarship of discovery.

OSU: Professors do important work that is not scholarship. Creative teaching or research, for example, does not become scholarship unless and until it is validated by peers and communicated beyond the classroom or file drawer. Creative artistry is viewed as a distinct form of scholarship that interprets the human spirit and creates new insights and beauty. Scholarship can be done by creative knowledgeable people throughout society—not just at universities.

Assessing Scholarship

Carnegie: Scholarly achievements can be assessed (validated) by determining that "phases of an intellectual process" occurred during their development. The six sequential phases of an intellectual process are identified as: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

OSU: Peers validate scholarly achievements in terms of accuracy and the extent to which achievements are original, significant and potentially useful to others.
Assessment of scholarship in the Carnegie model focuses on using a scholarly process to achieve scholarly results. In contrast, the OSU model focuses on peer validation in terms of accuracy, originality, significance and usefulness of scholarly results rather than on the inputs or process used to achieve a scholarly result.

**Similarities and Differences**

Both models place high value on scholarly achievements that result from research, but both envision scholarship as being broader than research results published in peer refereed journals. Both models extend the concept of scholarship to include various types of intellectual work and achievement.

The Carnegie Foundation model basically describes scholarship in terms of the teaching and research activities that faculty members routinely engage in. The OSU model views scholarship as creative work that is peer validated and communicated to others—suggesting that scholarship can occur in all areas of professorial work, and outside of academia.

The Carnegie and OSU models were developed to achieve similar objectives. They travel parallel conceptual pathways in articulating comprehensive visions of scholarship that can provide a basis for recognizing, evaluating and rewarding faculty creativity across university disciplines and missions. These models and others yet evolving will hopefully accelerate progress towards making the missions of universities congruent with the criteria and processes used to evaluate and reward the faculty that carry out those missions.

C. J. Weiser
May 1998
A faculty senate task force at Oregon State University (OSU) undertook the challenge of defining and articulating the core characteristics of scholarship that apply across academic disciplines and university missions to provide a conceptual base for reviewing and revising tenure and promotion guidelines. The result was: Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated—including creative artistry and the discovery, integration, and development of knowledge.

Scholarly achievement and excellence in performing assigned responsibilities are the primary categories for evaluating faculty performance, but OSU's new promotion and tenure (P&T) guidelines describe other aspects of faculty performance that the University values. These include collaborative effort, international perspective and service. Revised tenure and promotion guidelines reflecting these values, and basing faculty evaluation on a position description, were adopted by the university in 1995 with unanimous Faculty Senate support.

Some may be familiar with the model put forth by the Carnegie Foundation (1990) that asserts that scholarly achievements are assessed by determining whether "phases of an intellectual process" were followed. The phases are clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective preparation, and reflective critique. In contrast, the OSU model uses criteria that focus more on outputs to validate scholarship. Specifically, the criteria are used in assessing the extent to which a scholarly achievement is original, significant, and useful to others.

The Carnegie and OSU models both envision scholarship as broader than results of research published in a peer refereed journal. Both models place high value on scholarly achievements that result from research. Both models extend the concept of scholarship beyond research to include the other types of creative intellectual work and achievement. The Carnegie Foundation model basically describes scholarship in terms of the teaching and research activities that faculty members normally engage in. The OSU model views scholarship fundamentally as creative work that is peer validated and communicated to
others. This view suggests that scholarship can occur in all areas of professorial work as well as outside of academia.

OSU's new guidelines eliminated the need for separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines previously used to describe scholarship in programs such as Extension, international development, veterinary medicine, and library and information services where scholarship sometimes does not fit the traditional research model of results published in peer reviewed journals.

In short, Oregon State University's new (P&T) guidelines:

* Reaffirm that scholarship is required of all professorial faculty, and articulate a definition of scholarship that applies across the arts and sciences.

* Require that an annually updated position description serves as the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance. The position description explicitly describes assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort among assigned duties, scholarship, and service for each faculty position.

* Identify performance of assigned duties and scholarly achievement as the two primary areas of faculty evaluation.

* Recognize service performed by faculty members that is not part of their assigned duties as a secondary area of performance evaluation. Assigned duties such as administration, Extension, outreach, and student advising are not viewed as service when they are duties assigned to a faculty member. By the same token such activities are considered service when they are performed by a faculty member whose assigned duties lie in another area, such as research or teaching.

* Recognize teaching, research, and outreach as vital university missions and faculty activities that are not scholarship in themselves but which can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated intellectual work (scholarship) in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry). This is a significant departure from Ernest Boyer's (1990) view of teaching per se as scholarship.

* Recognize that peer validation and communication are separate processes that can occur in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, peer-refereed publications. When peer validation and communication are accomplished in non-traditional ways it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly describe and document how peer validation and communication were accomplished.

* Recognize that creative work of teachers and extension educators in developing education materials, methods, or programs or in conducting research in their subject-matter discipline will become scholarship if the work is validated by peers and communicated.
* Recognize that the audiences for scholarship in research are disciplinary peers worldwide, but that audiences for scholarship in teaching, Extension, and site-specific field research are often more localized. The P&T guidelines language was changed to reflect this reality—from "professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship" to "professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession."

* Emphasize that the university values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report contributions to significant team efforts in documenting their accomplishments.

* Recommend that documentation of achievements focus whenever possible on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, on describing what changed or improved as a result of a faculty member's efforts.

The OSU P&T guidelines acknowledge that the faculty of a university performs essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. The guidelines explicitly describe scholarship as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated including: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and artistry that creates new insights and understandings. This view acknowledges that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not just at universities. It emphasizes the importance of ensuring validity, and of communicating to broader audiences to ensure that results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others. In addition, it articulates the fundamental nature of scholarly achievement that applies across all disciplines.

OSU has just completed a third year of using the new University P&T guidelines. How the OSU model has affected the Oregon Extension Service was recently outlined by Lyla Houglum, dean and director of the Extension Service. She makes the following observations about changes that have occurred over the past three years:

* All Extension faculty in Oregon (county and campus-based) carry an appointment in an academic college or department. Oregon county agents and specialists have long held professorial rank with full privileges and tenure in Extension. Since 1995 the tenure home of all Extension faculty has become an academic department or college through which they are considered for promotion and tenure along with their on-campus teaching and research colleagues.

* Department and college P&T committees now have broader representation that includes Extension faculty (both county and campus based faculty). Committees have worked hard to appropriately evaluate and value Extension faculty accomplishments. In addition, the dean and director of the Extension Service serves on the University P&T committee.
* Research faculty are accepting Extension faculty as peers within departments and colleges and are evaluating them, and being evaluated by them, through the department committee P&T process. This represents a huge change from the first year of implementation when several researchers balked at evaluating or being evaluated by Extension faculty.

* Academic deans have worked hard to gain the necessary knowledge to evaluate, support, and defend their Extension faculty through the college and university P&T processes.

* There is much more clarity among faculty, department heads, deans, and the university P&T committee about how scholarship is defined. The university committee commonly refers back to the definition when evaluating faculty accomplishments; for example, Was there creative intellectual work? Was the work validated by peers? Was it communicated?

* The quality of all faculty position descriptions has improved significantly. The position description is used as the foundation for annual performance appraisals and for P&T dossier evaluation.

* OSU faculty without Extension appointments are including outreach activities and accomplishments in their dossiers.

Citizen advisors value OSU's new guidelines because they feel the guidelines recognize and reward faculty efforts benefiting students and citizens in Oregon. Several universities are finding that OSU's definition of scholarship provides a useful starting point for their institution's deliberations about faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review. Iowa State University and the University of Idaho have recently adopted broader views of scholarship and revised promotion and tenure criteria to reflect that view. University faculties and the broader public seem ready to improve faculty evaluation and reward processes.

OSU will host a national forum on this subject on campus October 1-3, 1998, entitled "Scholarship Unbound: Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards. Registration forms for this W. K. Kellogg supported workshop, co-sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, may be obtained by writing to Scholarship Unbound Workshop, Oregon State University, 202 Peavy Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331-5707; fax (541) 737-4966; phone (541) 737-2329; or e-mail: duncamp@ccmail.orst.edu.

Other information may be found on the Internet, including OSU's revised tenure and promotion guidelines at http://www.adec.edu/clemson/papers/houglum.html and a draft paper called "The Value System of a University-Rethinking Scholarship", at http://www.adec.edu/clemson/papers/weiser.html

Relevant questions and answers from the authors' participation in a satellite teleconference titled "Position Description: A Key to Scholarship," program #2, October 2,
1997, in a program series titled "21st Century Land Grant University" sponsored by Clemson University can also be accessed at http://www.adec.edu/clemson/questions/program2.html
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SCHOLARSHIP DESCRIBED
Views of Scholarship Evolving at Universities

Tenure and promotion guidelines at most universities only define scholarship indirectly by using the words research and scholarship interchangeably, and by citing peer-reviewed research publications as the prime example for documenting scholarly achievement.

This often leads to a narrow interpretation of scholarship by faculty peers who consider scholarly achievement to simply be synonymous with research results published in a peer-refereed journal. Creative work in areas of professorial responsibility other than research is often not viewed as scholarly; peer validation by means other than anonymous review of a publication are not considered valid; and communication to interested audiences who are not peers, or by means other than refereed publications, are not viewed as being scholarly.

In campus cultures that are shaped by these values faculty members are advised to invest their creative energies and discretionary time in efforts that are valued and rewarded by peers and the institution such as applying for grants, conducting research and publishing results in their disciplinary specialty. In teaching, advising, outreach and some applied research recognition and rewards are ambiguous or lacking. This provides little incentive for faculty members to invest creative energy or effort.

Broader visions of scholarship that are developing at several universities recognize that creative peer-validated scholarly work may be carried out in any area of faculty responsibility or university mission--not just in research. As a result the cultural values at those universities are changing in subtle but powerful ways that will alter how and where faculty members invest their creative energies. Such fundamental cultural changes reshape and determine the nature of institutions.

EVOLVING VIEWS OF SCHOLARSHIP INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- Scholarship is research. Research is scholarship (A prevailing view among faculty members at many universities, 1998).


- “Scholarship is intellectual work that results in new insights in the areas of discovery, integration or aesthetic creation, pedagogy, or application. Dissemination of the work through normally accepted academic venues, following an external peer review process, is evidence of the quality of the work.” (Montclair State University, 1994).

- “Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Forms of scholarship include creative artistry and the discovery, development (application) and integration of knowledge.” (Oregon State University, 1995).
• “Scholarship is an advanced form of learning. It involves the assimilation of experience into concepts and applying of concepts to experience—a transformative experience.” “Expressions (forms) of scholarship are the discovery, integration, application and interpretation (teaching) of knowledge.” “Scholarship implies superior intellectual, aesthetic or creative attainment.” (Portland State University, 1996).

• “The four types of scholarship include discovery, integration, application and teaching.” They are “mutually supportive, complementary and often overlapping.” (Kent State University, 1996).

• “Scholarship is creative, systematic rational inquiry into a topic and the honest forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. Scholarship includes research, creative activities, teaching and extension/professional practice. It results in a product that is shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product. In short, scholarship includes materials that are generally called intellectual property.” (Iowa State University, 1998).

• “Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is communicated and validated.” Forms of scholarship include “teaching and learning, artistic creativity, discovery and application/integration.” (University of Idaho, 1998).

The 1990 Carnegie Foundation report, Scholarship Reconsidered, authored by Ernest Boyer provided a starting point for these several examples of rethinking scholarship. The cultures and priorities of universities differ. It is appropriate that each university’s view of scholarship reflects its missions and vision of itself.

C. J. Weiser, September, 1998

---

9 June, 1999

Thomas L. Thorburn, Program Director  
W. K. Kellogg Foundation  
One Michigan Avenue East  
Battle Creek, MI 49017-1611

Dear Dr. Thorburn:

Attached is our final report to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation on the grant that supported the Scholarship Unbound Workshop (Grant Ref. No. P0061975). Thank you for supporting this important workshop. The grant was instrumental in making the workshop a truly national event of high quality that attracted broad participation and fine presenters.

As the report describes, the workshop continues to generate interest and to stimulate cultural change processes at U.S. and Canadian universities in a variety of ways and settings.

As shown in the budget report we are requesting a one-year, no-cost time extension of the project (until May 15, 2000). This extension would permit us to use unexpended funds ($14,214) to complete postworkshop activities. These include continuation of postings on the Scholarship Unbound Web Conference Site; completion and analysis of the survey in September 1999, one year after the workshop; and support for travel and emeritus professor salary (as needed) to present invited talks at about six other universities or national professional meetings during the coming year. Last year invited presentations were made at four universities by three OSU professors, and two presentations are scheduled for summer and fall 1999.

We are pleased with the considerable and continuing impacts that the workshop is having and greatly appreciate the Foundation's support.

Sincerely,

Roy G. Arnold  
Provost  
And Executive Vice President
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PROJECT SUMMARY

The W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant provided support for the "Scholarship Unbound" national workshop that was hosted by Oregon State University on October 1-3, 1998. The overarching goal of the workshop was to encourage and accelerate changes in the culture of comprehensive universities—specifically by making institutional value systems congruent and complementary with the university's missions in education, science, and outreach.

The workshop focused on changes in the criteria that universities use to evaluate and reward faculty. These criteria provide the clearest picture of what a university really values, and markedly influence how faculty members spend their creative energies and effort.

To accomplish its goal the workshop drew upon 36 distinguished presenters from 19 institutions (Appendix 1) who engaged 230 workshop participants (Appendix 2) in interactive program sessions (Appendix 3) designed to prepare them to be agents for change at their institutions. Workshop sessions identified common sources of resistance to change; illustrated successful examples of cultural changes taking place at six universities; provided models and resource materials (Appendix 4) to support a "diffusions of innovation" approach; and helped individual participants and teams from 16 universities enlarge their network of professional peers.

The participants came from 58 universities and education organizations in the U.S. and Canada. They included elected faculty senate representatives who were sent by their institutions and administrators who are personally involved in faculty evaluation and promotion and tenure processes, including department chairs, deans, and provosts.

Continuing postworkshop activities (Appendix 5) included development of an interactive Web conference site for conveying information and providing a communication forum for interested persons (Appendix 6). Oregon State University faculty members are being interviewed to assess the scope and nature of cultural change that is taking place ( Appendix 7). An analysis of the results of those interviews will be made available by posting on the Scholarship Unbound Web conference site. We continue to respond to requests for the workshop videos and for examples of OSU faculty position descriptions and peer validation and communication avenues other than peer reviewed publications (Appendix 10), and continue to make presentations of invited talks and confer at other universities and at national professional meetings.

In September 1999, the 230 participants in the Scholarship Unbound workshop will be surveyed "one year later" to identify activities and progress on their campuses regarding faculty rewards systems. An e-mail survey format will be utilized for this survey. Participants will be asked to comment on what has happened on their campuses during the past year and how participation in the Scholarship Unbound workshop might have affected change on their campus. Responses will be content analyzed according to emergent categorical themes.
As a part of this report a no-cost time extension is being requested to support completion of these postworkshop activities.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOAL

The philosophy and approach of the workshop are illustrated in the description of the several ways that participants could find value as presented in Appendix 3. In short the program provided choices that allowed attendees to design their participation in a way most relevant for themselves and their institution.

There was a consistent message to participants that it was their responsibility to "find value." A journal was provided with encouragement to write down their ideas and key take-home messages. Art was an integral component of the program to illustrate and reinforce a broader vision of scholarship. These include original artwork to create the workshop logo, poster art, and moveable banners displayed during the workshop, musical entertainment at meals, dance performances, and discussion with artists that reinforced a broader vision of scholarship.

There were no speakers during meals and only one plenary speaker a day to encourage and allow proactive networking, discussion, and thinking. Two 10-minute videos, produced cooperatively by communication experts at several land grant universities were used to quickly set the context and stimulate thinking at the beginning of the first and second day's programs.

Concurrent discussion sessions provided choices, and panelists were instructed to talk no more than two minutes (making one primary point) so that time would be available for discussions that were driven by participant questions and interests. Other workshop features were an Idea Fair incorporating a progressive dinner, a walkabout networking session with disciplinary peers, table talk discussions involving 6 to 7 persons, and scheduled times for institutional teams to meet and work. This was a different sort of a workshop. It required considerable intellectual involvement of participants.

A survey of participants was conducted at the end of the workshop (Appendix 8) and summarized (Appendix 9). In the end of meeting rush 39 respondents (17 percent response) offered 88 comments on elements of the workshop program they felt were particularly effective, 33 comments on ineffective elements, and 57 comments on what they viewed highlights of the workshop.

At the top of the list of highlights were:

- The opportunity for networking and interaction (19 comments);
- The format and climate of the workshop (12 comments); and
- The artistic components of the workshop (11 comments).

Panels and program plenary sessions were also each cited seven times as highlights.
Ironically the workshop interaction and networking activities (walkabout, Idea Fair and table talk) were collectively cited 18 times as the least effective elements of the program. Likewise the workshop format and climate was cited six times as the least effective element of the program. Plenary sessions were described as ineffective six times.

The most effective sessions were judged to be the plenary sessions (18 citations); opportunities for networking and interaction (16 citations); panel discussions (15 citations); and concurrent sessions (11 citations). The artistic component and overall meeting format were each cited nine times as highly effective.

The survey responses are challenging to interpret because they often appear to be contradictory. Clearly opinions did differ. Some people felt that a certain element of the program was least effective while others felt that the same element was among the most effective. Attendees were a heterogeneous group. Thankfully, responses were predominantly positive.

As previously noted the workshop was designed to stimulate thinking and provide a variety of learning opportunities while placing the responsibility for "finding value for yourself and your university" squarely on the shoulders of individual participants. We were not prescriptive or directive about how (or whether) conferees chose to participate in the concurrent sessions, the Idea Fair, table talk, walkabout sessions, getting to know other conferees, etc. This freedom of choice and responsibility was clearly the most appealing aspect of the workshop to many survey respondents—and the least appealing to others.

In retrospect we might have been able to increase the comfort level of those craving more specific directions—without risking becoming just another workshop at which participants could follow directions and passively absorb good information with minimal effort. That approach can be effective for conveying facts, but it is not a good way to stimulate thinking. Some participants wanted to be presented with factual information on what to do and how to do it. Instead we presented examples of cultural change now occurring at several universities to illustrate the concepts that are driving change, the process(es) of change, and the types of change being implemented. These were not described as examples of values that all universities should adopt. Each university needs to shape and identify its own values and missions.

Contacts from participants in the months following the workshop indicate that the articles about the Oregon State University experience (Appendix 4) have been useful in initiating discussions at other institutions. These have been distributed at invited presentations on other campuses and reprinted to meet continuing requests. Participants have also indicated that the Presenter Photo Directory (Appendix 1) and the Participant List Appendix 2) have helped with networking, organizing programs, and contacting speakers. Ninety-five copies of the two videos produced for the workshop have been distributed, and purchase requests are continuing.

In response to requests we have assembled examples of Oregon State University faculty position descriptions and of peer validation and communications of scholarship by means
other refereed journal publication. These examples were distributed at our presentations at Rutgers University and Oklahoma State University (Appendix 10).

Workshop organizers have accepted invitations to speak and confer at four universities and at two upcoming national professional meetings. These include three two-day programs organized by workshop participants at Rutgers University, Oklahoma State University, and Texas A&M University. A one-day workshop of 20 public and private Texas universities hosted at Baylor University was also a direct outcome of the Scholarship Unbound workshop. Drs. Leslie Davis-Burns, Michael Oriard, and C. J. "Bud" Weiser served as invited speakers and conferees in these programs that typically involved a general presentation for all faculty and meetings with provosts, deans, department chairs, and key faculty senate committees.
The W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant provided support for their airfares while host universities covered other travel expenses.

Also as an outcome of the workshop Dr. Weiser has been invited to speak at annual meetings of the American Society for Horticultural Sciences, July 1999 in Minneapolis and of the Deans of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, November 1999 in Seattle, WA. About 1500 horticulturists from around the world attend the ASHS meeting and about 600 deans attend the CCAS annual meeting. The grant extension (requested) would support such continuing activities.

Other workshop outcomes include an open letter from Provost Scott McNall to his faculty at Chico State University on the nature of scholarship in teaching—written by Dr. McNall immediately following his participation as a presenter at the workshop. The postworkshop survey of participants which will be conducted in September 1999 should provide an interesting snapshot of workshop impacts one year after the event. Cultural change takes time.

Outcomes of the workshop that are already apparent confirm that its goals were realistic. Stirrings of cultural change beginning at dozens of universities are often being led by persons who attended the workshop, supported directly and indirectly by the ideas, concepts, and resources from the workshop, and sustained by networking among workshop participants.

There were few surprises or modifications in plans. We decided to use confidential interviews rather than surveys (as initially visualized) to assess the perceptions of faculty on the impacts of revised promotion and tenure guidelines at OSU. The interview process provided a rich body of information and identified ten emergent themes (Appendix 7). Light use of the "discussion forum" capabilities of the Web conference site has been somewhat surprising.

**FUTURE PLANS**

Workshop project postworkshop activities that were described in Appendix 5 have essentially been completed except for conducting the retrospective postconference survey in September 1999. We will continue the Scholarship Unbound Web conference site (Appendix 6) until September 1999, and possibly beyond if use is substantial. We will continue indefinitely to respond to requests for videos, articles, examples of position descriptions, and other resource
material, and will continue to accept invitations to speak and confer at other universities and at national professional meetings. The grant time extension that is being requested would support the cost of analyzing the postconference survey in September and travel of invited speakers to other universities and national meetings. The funds available could support about six such trips—four beyond the scheduled ASHS and CCAS presentations scheduled for July and November 1999.

The workshop is self-sustaining in the sense that it has established connections among motivated people, and that it has helped crystallize powerful ideas that people are using, both to build the conceptual foundations for change and to design the processes for making changes at their universities. These self-perpetuating contributions will accelerate the evolution of U.S. and Canadian universities.

A second workshop in a year or two hosted by another university that is in the process of cultural change could be especially timely and effective. Iowa State University would be a good candidate to serve as organizer and host institution in view of its thorough and successful two-year effort at defining scholarship and revising promotion and tenure guidelines that involved a vote of the entire faculty. Dr. William Woodman would be an appropriate contact person initially. He expressed interest at the workshop in the possibility of Iowa State hosting a follow-up workshop and visited briefly with Tom Thorburn. Dr. Woodman led the change effort at ISU while serving two consecutive terms as faculty senate president. His phone, fax and e-mail are: 515-294-2228; 515-294-2303; <wwoodman@iastate.edu>.

DISSEMINATION

Workshop resource materials, survey findings, and other relevant information are regularly disseminated via the Web conference site, and in response to requests. We do not plan to disseminate information about this project by means other than participating as invited speakers/conferees and via on-going communications on the Web conference site. If there is a second follow-up workshop on this subject in a year or two we would be pleased to provide assistance and information to the workshop organizers.

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S OPINION

The fact that six universities represented at the workshop were substantially changing their value systems was an especially valuable feature of the workshop. Comparing the processes that led to change at these six universities was revealing and interesting. For example:

- Processes at all six universities involved faculty input in a sustained and significant way. In most cases the process was led and carried out by faculty members, although administrators often started the process.
- The change processes were iterative, took considerable time, and involved lots of thought and discussion. Typically, most took at least one full year.
• Administrators who were involved characteristically provided encouragement, but were not prescriptive regarding outcome. They were generally trusted by their faculties.

• At all six universities a clear definition of scholarship, broader than the previous view, was adopted. In all cases this broader vision of scholarship provided the conceptual foundation for changes that were subsequently made in faculty evaluation and the tenure and promotion process.

Several universities that have tried, but failed thus far, to make these types of cultural change started by discussing faculty rewards and attempting to develop new evaluation criteria and promotion and tenure guidelines—without first agreeing about the nature of scholarship. That backward approach seems doomed to failure.

At the six universities where change is occurring large majorities of faculty and administrators endorsed and accepted the revised evaluation criteria and guidelines for promotion and tenure. Half of the six universities have unionized faculties. The broader views of scholarship which were adopted were remarkably similar at five of the six universities. The use of a position description as the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance is a new practice at universities. Four of the six universities adopted a policy of using a faculty member's job description as the basis for evaluating their performance—at times of annual reviews and promotion and tenure consideration and for posttenure review.

It is becoming apparent that the formidable resistance people wholeheartedly believe exists to viewing scholarship more broadly is imaginary, not real. This assertion is based on Dr. Weiser's experiences in presentations during the past five years, at the workshop, to national science audiences (AAAS, etc.), and to faculties at 18 universities. In all of these settings, within 30 minutes of discussion, 85 to 100 percent of the individuals in every group sampled have indicated acceptance and enthusiasm for a broader concept of scholarship—and for changing faculty evaluation and university values accordingly. The challenge is to get faculty members to think about the nature of scholarship. Once faculty members and administrators engage in this thinking there seems to be little resistance to adopting a broader value system for evaluating faculty in ways that are congruent with the missions of comprehensive and engaged universities.

We thank the Foundation for its support, we request a grant extension to complete postworkshop activities, and encourage you to consider support of a second workshop in about two years to further catalyze and accelerate the change process at universities. Specifically, we encourage contact with Iowa State University (via William Woodman) to assess their possible interest in organizing and hosting such an event.
PARTICIPANTS

▶ Alphabetical List
▶ List by Organization
day 1  THURSDAY, OCT. 1
WHY AND HOW ARE
UNIVERSITIES CHANGING
9 am - 2 pm  Registration
Alumni Center, Lobby
Noon  Lunch and Opening Session
Alumni Center, Ballroom
- Workshop designs and goals
  for session
- Finding value for yourself and your
  institution
1:30 pm  University Values and Faculty
  Evaluation -- Examples of
  Change
LaSells Stewart Center
Austin Auditorium
- Implications for change (A video)
- The forces of change - Richard
  Eissen, Ohio State University
- Change at Oregon State
  University: A discussion
  Tracy Arnold, Leslie Davis-Butts,
  Carol Evans, Lyla Horgan,
  Michael Grant, Paul Weiser
- My own private microscope
  - A dance - Joseph Bonsall
  - Break, Networking, and Idea Fair
  set up
4:15 pm  Idea Fair and
  Progressive Buffet
Alumni Center, Ballroom
- A forum for exchanging ideas and
  making contacts
- Enjoy the four-course buffet while
  you visit with presenters, exhibits
  and colleagues
- Identify two ideas to discuss with
  your team this evening

day 2  FRIDAY, OCT. 2
BUILDING THE CONCEPTUAL
FOUNDATIONS
7:00 am  Continental Breakfast
Alumni Center, Ballroom
- University teams receive over
  breakfast to continue discussion
- Update and suggest additions to
  the agenda
Reframing Faculty
Evaluation and Rewards
LaSells Stewart, Austin Auditorium
- Foundation for change (A video)
  with professor and scholar for the
- The 10th century, David Damrosch,
  Columbia University
FINDING VALUE
for yourself and your university

Workshop

- goals
- design
- follow-up
- background materials
- acknowledgement
THE OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE
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Scholarship Unbound: Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards

Follow-up Activities and Opportunities

In the coming year there will be a number of follow-up activities and opportunities designed for continued dialogue, networking, and information sharing. Examples include:

- **Funds to fly one of the presenters/discussion leaders from this conference to your campus as a speaker/consultant.**

- **A Web conference site to provide a forum for continued discussion on issues that have emerged from the conference and to serve as a clearinghouse for information.**

- **On-going bridge conference calls for continued networking.**

- **Results of interviews and surveys of faculty, administrators, students, and constituency groups on the impact of Oregon State University’s promotion and tenure guidelines.**

- **Results of follow-up contacts with conference participants on changes at their institutions and strategies for change.**

- **Information on up-coming events.**
Need Help? Click here for a quick and easy tutorial.

Exit  New Messages  Search  Options  Logout/in

Active threads from last 90 days:

Position Descriptions
Position Descriptions  03/24/99 (1)

Next Steps and Miscellaneous Topics
test  03/09/99 (1)

Subscribe to Thread

Conference Organizer
Leslie Burns, Ph.D.
Leslie.Burns@orst.edu
Voice: (541) 737-0983

Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331
APPENDIX 7

Research: The Impact of the 1995 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Revised Definition of “Scholarship” on the OSU Campus

The impact of the broader definition of “scholarship” and other components of the OSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines adopted in 1995 on faculty and students was explored through in-depth interviews with sixteen OSU faculty members and administrators. Individuals asked to be interviewed were selected because they were knowledgeable about or involved in the promotion and tenure process on campus, their own scholarship or the scholarship of others in their unit was acknowledged in the broader definition of scholarship, and/or they had recently gone through the promotion and/or tenure process at OSU. Through hour-long interviews using a series of questions (see below), these 16 “key informants” provided valuable insight to the impact of the guidelines and the definition of scholarship at OSU. Interviews were taped recorded for reference in identifying emergent themes from the interviews.

Interview Questions:

1. To what extent are the faculty members in your unit knowledgeable about the P&T guidelines that were adopted in 1995? The broader vision of scholarship?

2. What has changed in your unit (if anything) as a result of OSU’s adoption in 1995 of a broader vision of scholarship and new P&T guidelines?

3. Do you think the new guidelines have changed (raised or lowered) standards of faculty performance in your unit?

4. How will the new guidelines affect the experiences/activities (if at all) of:
   • a new freshman student in your unit
   • a new assistant professor in your unit
   • a senior associate professor in your unit

5. Do you have an updated position description? Do others in your unit have updated position descriptions? Are position descriptions shared?

6. Letters from individuals external to the university are very important part of the dossier. Has your discipline accepted a broader vision of scholarship?

Emergent Themes:

Definition allows for the acknowledgement of diversity of intellect and skills among faculty. The broader definition of scholarship was heralded by some as acknowledging the range of intellect and skills of faculty within the university. Several, whose positions were not within academic units, commented that their scholarly work is now more aligned with their responsibilities rather than something that is separate and removed from what they do on an everyday basis.
Standards within units have stayed the same or increased.
It appeared that standards of excellence within units either stayed the same or increased. For units whose scholarly work centers on research, standards of excellence have not changed because of the new guidelines or broader definition of scholarship. For some units, whose faculty engage in scholarly work beyond research, standards of excellence have actually increased. This is because the scholarly work is better aligned with faculty responsibilities and expertise.

Position descriptions can provide clear expectations for faculty.
Units vary in terms of the time and energy devoted to creating and maintaining updated position descriptions for faculty. For units whose faculty have position descriptions, there was a general sense of the advantage of articulating faculty expectations. This was viewed as particularly important for tenure track faculty. Individuals interviewed had many questions about appropriate format and development of position descriptions reflecting a need for additional information and guidance in these areas.

Faculty now may have greater freedom to pursue scholarly endeavors related to teaching, technology transfer, outreach, and applied problem solving.
Some faculty interviewed noted that the broader definition of scholarship allowed them the freedom to pursue scholarly endeavors beyond research, knowing that these activities would "count". In the sciences, the increased availability of funding for curriculum development, technology transfer, and outreach further compelled some faculty to pursue these endeavors. It also appeared that tenured faculty viewed greater freedom than faculty in tenure track positions.

Impact of the guidelines has not been uniform across campus.
It appeared that units who have been affected most by the 1995 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and broader definition of scholarship are those whose faculty engage in scholarly work that had been marginalized by earlier guidelines. Before 1995, these units had developed and implemented supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines. Now those supplemental guidelines are no longer needed. For many units on campus, scholarly work and promotion and tenure standards and expectations have not changed since the adoption of the 1995 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. These units are typically those whose faculty engage in traditional scholarly work for the specific disciplines.

Standards and expectations within disciplines sometimes may override university standards or expectations.
Letters from reviewers external to OSU are an important part of the promotion and tenure dossier. Letters are sought from experts in a discipline who are asked to comment on the quality and impact of a candidate’s scholarly work. As such, unwritten standards and expectations within the disciplines are often used as criteria in evaluating candidates’ work. These may or may not be congruent with OSU’s definition of scholarship or our criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

Accreditation standards sometimes may override university standards or expectations.
For academic programs on campus that are accredited by professional agencies or associations, the standards and expectations of faculty outlined in accreditation reviews may or may not be congruent with university standards and expectations.
Lack of standardization of documentation of scholarship outside the traditional peer-reviewed journal article is problematic. Faculty that were interviewed, who engage in scholarly work where peer validation and communication is not achieved through a traditional peer-reviewed journal article, commented on the need for greater standardization for documenting how peer validation occurs and how the work is communicated beyond the university.

Need was identified for on-going campus conversations regarding scholarship and the promotion and tenure process. It was apparent that not all faculty are aware of OSU’s broader definition of scholarship and how that broader definition might affect them. The faculty who appeared to be most aware were those who had gone through the promotion and/or tenure process since 1995 or who were currently in tenure track positions. Concerns were raised about the awareness of the broader definition of scholarship of members of college promotion and tenure committees, many of whom were promoted and/or tenured prior to 1995. Those interviewed noted that additional information and workshops were needed on topics such as creating position descriptions, interpreting the broader definition of scholarship, and documenting scholarly work.
Scholarship Unbound
Conference Evaluation

Please take a few minutes to provide us with feedback on the format of the conference. Thanks!

1. What sessions were particularly effective for you in finding value in the conference and why? (Use the back of the sheet for additional comments.)

2. Were there sessions you did not find particularly effective in your finding value in the conference? If so, which sessions were they and why were they ineffective? (Use the back of the sheet for additional comments.)

3. For you, what was the highlight of the conference? Why?

4. Any suggestions for future workshops/conferences on institutional change, faculty rewards, and related topics?

5. How did you find out about Scholarship Unbound? (Check all that apply).
   
   ____ flyer  ____ Chronicle ad
   ____ colleagues  ____ e-mail information
   ____ other (please specify ________________________)

Please return evaluation form to the conference registration table or send to Leslie Burns, 341 Snell Hall, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331.

Thank you!
Thirty-nine participants, 38 comments on what was particularly effective, 
33 on what was ineffective, 
57 on the highlights. 

Comments summarized in six categories shown below, noting the 
order of frequency each was mentioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Most Effective</th>
<th>Less Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Session</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scholarship Unbound
Conference Evaluation

Please take a few minutes to provide us with feedback on the format of the conference. Thanks!

1. What sessions were particularly effective for you in finding value in the conference and why? (Use the back of the sheet for additional comments.)

- Panel discussion Day 1 and Day 2- for setting the stage and defining the work we were to do; break out sessions- for individualization of information
- Open discussion sessions.
- The ones on "Validation and Assessment" and "Experience with New Guidelines." There was a great deal of specificity about practical activities and lingering problems.
- The presentation by David Damrash and the follow-up panel discussion- it brought out some of the real pit-falls of opening up the definition of scholarship and dealing with it
- Group session, Active component, Plenary sessions
- Art Sessions; Video Thursday Panel; John Byrne
- The opening session—video, plenary speech, panel—because it gave a fact to the written accounts of Scholarship Unbound and set the pace for subsequent dialog. The 8:15 am Saturday session because many practical concerns were aired/discussion in light of the ideas presented throughout the conference
- John Byrne and all others were very thought provoking
- David's talk the 2nd day; The Art- dance; the Networking- idea Fair
- "Imperatives for Change"- hope to use this at my home institution; The use of performing arts to broaden perspective on scholarship was somewhat effective for me, but their lecture components "went by me" because of the vast differences in vocabulary; Networking opportunities.
- The Walkabout Networking session provided an opportunity for a very directed and lively exchange of ideas on a practical level.
- Walkabout Networking Session; Dance
- Session on expectations for new assistant professors- excellent interchange of ideas that were relevant to my institution. In general, the small group panel discussion sessions worked very well. The panels were good at getting discussions started, but not dominating and using most of the time with presentations. I think the tone of "conversations" was set very well with the first day's panel in the large opening sessions, and that model seems to have carried over well into the other groups. I particularly liked the way in which introduction started in the form of conversations, rather than with some of the more "gimmicky" means that are often used in conferences (e.g.-giving small groups a task to reach a consensus on, etc.).
- Position description; post-tenure; final 8:30 session
- Videos set the stage and put issues in focus effectively; Concurrent sessions helped focus on specific issues (although it was hard to decide which one to attend).
- Experiences with new guidelines; validation and assessment
- None were "particularly effective"
- Reframing faculty evaluation and rewards. Put into focus how to revalue contributions of faculty that are not usually considered scholarship.
- University Values and Faculty Evaluation- this was important because changes and equivalent recognition are included in the broader scholarship definition. Also, change process should be inclusive, open and appropriately paced.
- The 'keynote' speeches by Sisson and particularly Damrosch's were excellent. The conference itself; a forum to discuss was quite helpful.
2. "Broader views of scholarship" - I think it could have been the opening session, a general session. The effectiveness was primarily in the gestate of the conference, rather than in a particular session.

- The performances Thurs. afternoon
- Joseph and others for the opening of door for new thoughts. I came here for specifics and I am leaving with a broader view of scholarship.
- See Q & A Re: Artistic Scholarship; Enjoyed concurrent session and was able to gain unique information and get more specifics vs. Other sessions which, as one presented acknowledged, were loosely structure and less detailed.
- Univ. values and Faculty Eval.- Examples of change Distance Ed., Extension Outreach
- Walkabout networking session - direct interaction with faculty from other institutions with similar problems; position description
- Opening session; David Damrosch- good night forum, Mon.- Landont (sp.?) perspective; Good opportunity to talk with colleagues from my own university
- Table talk on how we could affect change at home institutions
- Idea fair; Work sessions for Univ. teams; Table talk; Walkabout Networking Session
- Breakout sessions day 2; Opportunity for discussion and exchange of ideas
- Two areas were not informative; The first was the Wed. afternoon session with Sisson, the panel and Joseph. The second was discussing with colleagues at "Table talk" the problems as opportunities at our own institutions.
- Session on expectations of new assist. Professors. Really highlighted perspective problems with "unbinding" scholarship
- Opportunities to interact with colleagues from other universities who share same challenges this was a wonderful chance to learn and recruit support.
- Reframing faculty Eval. And Rewards- David Damrosch
- All were good - interaction times were very worth while
- I most enjoyed the small breakout sessions.
- Concurrent discussion- specific topics; good interaction and Q&A possible
- The idea fair was god and the panels also. I found some good ideas in all events but didn't leave with an overall game plan
- The General Session panels; Concurrent discussions; Open and flexible agenda; The art component
- All about equal- except table talk- could have had longer sessions. Wasn't really crazy about Idea Fair.
- Changing Values at Oregon State- Picked up some points that were useful in thinking about situations. Also, Prof. And Scholar for 21st century- Damrosch.

2. Were there sessions you did not find particularly effective in your finding value in the conference? If so, which sessions were they and why were they ineffective? (Use the back of the sheet for additional comments.)

- The "table talk" Day 2- needed a bit more direction- although we sat as a team and discussed information sitting at mixed tables were really desired- we didn't know that; The Walkabout sessions- I would have liked a signal or cue to move. The groups got bogged down and I felt uncomfortable just "leaving" the group discussion. There were other groups I had wanted to get to.
- The "walk around" sessions (Fri. afternoon)- room was too noisy and it was difficult to hear and get involved- they might be done in individual rooms- also in some of the small meeting groups certain individuals dominated discussion.
- Idea fair did not work for me; Walkabout okay, but too long
Possibly the discussions under #1 might have been more effective if some way of mixing us worked. We didn’t have to sit with colleagues from our own schools, but we did. Maybe put different colored stickers on name tags to mix us, etc.

I did not take full advantage of table talk or the Idea Fair.

The talk before the dancing; too much, however, delightful to begin with. The art could have been spoken largely for itself and been better (if briefly) integrated into the theme.

Videos had an overtone of propaganda.

None

There were no real dogs. All had much to offer depending on the attendee’s needs or questions.

The discussion by discipline- felt forced

“Forces of Change”- topic development was not in a very logical sequence and was delivered too fast for comprehension and contemplation.

The Idea Fair. I suspect that there might have been a more efficient way to share this information.

Table talk sessions

Idea Fair- maybe this would have worked better (for me) if there had been a bit more structured way to interact with the people at each place. Linking of some topics with overall conference them not always clear.

General- some of the sessions seemed too focused on the presenters, their bios, their ramblings- keep focus on issues!

Joseph Houseal spoke too much. His and the other dancer’s presentations would have been better without the lengthy monologues.

Beginning the journey- it became a session for either blowing one’s own horn or just whining.

Some of the general discussion sessions were too unorganized and I sometimes had trouble getting into an appropriate group.

Laying foundations for success- this was useful but not as informed as others because much of what was discussed had already been discussed in earlier “talk” sessions.

Table-talk sessions were not focused so they were not effective but they were necessary to the whole conference.

I think more concrete examples of successes or problems would have been helpful.

There really were none.

“Walkabout networking” was not particularly effective. Didn’t work in getting the specific areas.

Day 2- Walkabout Networking Session (too long- could have made better use of this time.)

The position description- very little info provided and not very engaging discussion

Had difficulty learning “details” of OSU experience. Needed grass root faculty members at meeting to interact with participants!

The “artistic” program- Joseph Houseal may have a career as a standup comic, but I would prefer to see local talent. He is overpaid and too pretentious for words and not very good. We really do not need to see anorexic ballerinas and men with overly developed muscles- There is nothing new or creative or “outside the box” about this- very disappointing- we don’t need East Coast types to bring “culture” to the “hinterlords” to “enlighten” us… too pretentious for words- a total waste of time.

Large plenary sessions

No sessions were totally useless but as in all workshops of this nature, diminishing returns sets in after the first day. You could have done away with the networking on Friday and possibly finished on Friday p.m. (after dinner).

Walkabout Networking session- could not identify any useful ideas, conversations dominated by 1 or 2 individuals.

I found value in each session attended. During Laying Foundation and Sustaining Excellence my value was not really scholarship but the work related topics so they were probably the weakest.

None
3. For you, what was the highlight of the conference? Why?

- Getting to know the other members of my team and discussing related items concerning our University.
- The chance to compare what other colleges are doing in these areas during the table-discussion sessions. There were good such interchange times. That's where practical advice can really be found.
- None, but there were some low spots. The final session displayed a remorsefully shallow analysis of exponential growth. If that many academics really believed what was said, we are in real trouble, but he was entertaining anyway.
- Networking & Teamwork opportunities. The food and format were excellent!! The environment
- The Saturday Panel discussion and question & answer period: issues and ideas were presented that made sense to me- I came as a "non-believer" and by Sat. was still not convinced. The Saturday morning presenters brought more clarity to me.
- Speech and panel on Friday morning
- Oregon in October; Collegial Conversations; opportunity to contribute
- John Byrne's talk and the first OSU panel.
- The opportunities for open and frank dialog among presenters and attendees; among senior administrators, dept. chairs, faculty, associations representatives.
- The opportunity to interact (multiple institution perspectives).
- The Ballet- something very memorable to take away to remember the reason for the conference.
- The opportunity to discuss with team members where we should go – intensive over three days, without distractions. Identified need for faculty administration agreement on a definition for "scholarship" and a need for position description.
- 1) Gene Rice's comments- I'm taking a number of "sound bites" back home with me. 2) the open format of the meeting that allowed for continuous and intense sharing of ideas with my colleagues. 3) David Damrosch's vision.
- The dance presentations. Allowed me to interpret and process information in a new way.
- The unusual structure of the workshop that made it a real participating workshop in a meaningful way - and the inclusion of the artistic events helped reinforce the idea that this was a different conference. Addendum: what I wrote on the front was written Friday night. Now, on Saturday I must add the lasting image that Joseph provided of moving from "The Thinker" to Blake with the refrain of Scholarship Unbound.
- Joseph- was able to distill meaning out of words, provide "images" for future use. Also Byrne final session on day 3.
- Opportunity to meet, hear from and discuss with people involved in this important issue.
- Walkabout network session- had opportunity to share and learn from other faculty governance leaders.
- A few good discussions with colleagues from other institutions. Helped me put what we are doing in perspective.
Gave me hope that faculty rewards can actually be restructured to recognize contributions of faculty. Also, the "walkabout" sessions were great- made a lot of new friends.

The conference, the gathering itself. That the issues had reached a level of description and maturity- a critical mass that allowed such a gathering.

The idea of hearing teams from Universities was very effective. At least I think it was. The proof awaits the impact once the four of us return to our campus.

The contact and interaction with committed people.

Joseph

No particular session, rather being able to benchmark "Best Practices" (lessons learned, prescriptions for success, barriers); particularly enjoyed Day 2 video.

Becoming better aquainted with what OSU has done to broaden perspectives of scholarship sharing with others.

David Damrosch- very interesting perspectives on scholarship; Michael Oriard- a true faculty perspective on why this works.

Chance to talk to people from other institutions dealing with problems and issues similar to ours.

Chance to talk at length to my colleagues without the rush of the campus structure.

That's a tough question. I totally loved the interaction of heart and mind- that is the mix of the arts; interactive dance, music, with the opportunities to explore all of the dimensions of what it means to be a scholar in this exciting time of change. I'm so happy this is my profession in life!

Collegiality of conferences and presenters to share position and negative changes and effects. The first day set the tone well and was a highlight.

Interacting with diverse faculty and administrators from my institutions- it's not easy to do this at home.

Status of Post-tenure review at other institutions since we are starting PTR at our institution.

Meeting many people from other institutions for future networking.

Fellow from Columbia

The Revelation of how broad "scholarship" can be defined even possibly in my own somewhat interactive scientific field/profession. Obviously, the performances by Joseph et al were a concrete embodiment of scholarship and helped me to see the possibilities for defining scholarship in my own field.

Personal one on one conversations; Also, very much enjoyed musical presentations.

The timing was excellent: topics flowed, much was accomplished without it seeming like work. Chances to share within and outside our Univ. team were excellent.

Friday Dance performance brought together ideas from several directions.

The integration of art.

Damrosch

There were several. Overall, it was the feeling of pride in OSU.

The space to think, feel, and discuss issues of very important worth to me as a faculty/chair and to the project of intellectual endeavor in general.

Joseph!

4. Any suggestions for future workshops/conference? Why?

Continue artistic content, implementation of scholarship redefined

Loss of tenure track position at universities, non-tenure research extension, reward systems after tenure, lack of professional development opportunities at universities vs. Industry

Two days (not three) is sufficient for a workshop/conference

Weakest talk: Ohio State---I am glad I came. I learned no new solutions. I think my university (U.W. Madison) is/has dealt with the problems. But things are in focus. OSU is doing a great job, but I wish the conference had been less a show-case of OSU and more panelists from other success stories.
• None, but I think perhaps there should be more concrete examples of scholarship and its range in different fields. You did this well with Joseph?, but it is always interesting to see the possibilities in more scientific fields which would spark ideas for scholarship in others
• Need to have some visuals with presentations for those of us who are visual learners. All the oral and no visuals are very difficult to handle all day long. Especially for keynote speakers, would like slides or overheads with key bullet points. Saw a couple of flip charts in main auditorium with this type of information on it- i.e. definition of LEAPS-- However, did not know where this came from or where discussed. I would have found this (use of flip charts) very helpful in short breakout sessions also. Often could not learn and would have really benefited from a bullet list visual.
• Seems the focus should not be on measurement but how to_____ scholarship, we may not be able to change each institution – but we could still have a large impact upon individuals.
• I would have liked it if the material presented at the idea fair was available through the conference.
• A follow-up conference on several discussions of actual chase studies and changes at multiple institutions. I could use more examples to work from, though OSU has done great things.
• Invite an AAUP speaker. Include material on how “to maintain” the integrity of the university for achieving its primary mission (“the methodical discovery and the teaching of truths about serious and important things” - Edward Sloots, The Academic Ethic) while accommodating structured change.
• Shorter days perhaps and a field trip, perhaps sessions devoted to views of particular stakeholders and constituencies.
• Keeps things open for maximum interaction between faculty, administrators and stakeholders.
• Interesting, intensive format, like Chinese water torture, intended to wear down all defenses and provide impetus for real breakthroughs. This was the most energizing and inspiring workshop/conference I have attended in 30+ years. It was marvelous. (Peter Bloome)
• In about 2-3 years, follow-up on those institutions who have institutional change. Be very specific---“case study” approach! Too much Oregon St.; could have included the others more (especially Sat. am)
• Less talk talk! Long sessions to let the discussion develop. Opening session- discuss cut short when there were some additional questions to be addressed.
• One other suggestion for the conference- I would have benefited from speaking to others in my specific discipline! That was not quite achieved at the walkabout.
• Dealing with resistance.
• No
• Get us into the community/area
• Keep it going!
• Accountability through the measure of learning outcomes is going to have a great impact on how the scholarship of teaching is perceived and carried out. There needs to be conversation across institutional lines about this.
• The opportunity for progress reports from across the country. Success stories!!
• More faculty present- some students and involved community members. Cases studies- both successes and restraints
• Bring back John Byrne
• Not everyone was in an institutional team. How about making arrangements to “team up” the independents.
• Send out more specific agendas in advance.
• Actual case studies on implementation issues would be good- not on “implementing post-tenure,” but rather on “achieving faculty buy-in for post-tenure,” etc. Arizona (U of A) has excellent stories on this.
• Follow-up in 1-2 years about what has changed, successes, failures, and what remains to be done. Also, hearing from pre-tenured faculty at schools with these reforms in place.
I felt that I wanted more information on the process of changes rather than the final products of the process of change. Provide concrete case studies that address the "how to" and "what we struggled with."

A little more structure needed.

Make conference a full three days but end each session after dinner so that "burn-out" is no a factor. i.e.- Thursday, Fri, Sat, 8:30 am - 7pm.

A little more discussion of the "rewards" side of the equation would be helpful. Should all forms of scholarship be rewarded by promotion to full professor? By equal salary increases? Following Michael Oriard's comment, I think future teams should include (or be advised to include) faculty members as well as academic administrators. Our team included an academic faculty member, a head of department, two deans and a contract administrator from the Faculty Association (the Union) who deals with grievances. This was a useful mix. I may be wrong, but I think we could have had more "ordinary" academics at the meeting. Overall, a very useful conference, very worthwhile. Very hospitable! Thank you. (Raymond Curris, Dean of Arts, U. of Manitoba)

Keep the art, the diversity! Include more faculty and faculty organizations such as AAUP!

Post-tenure review, awards, point in description.

More focus on Process Issues (Implementation, Evaluation, eg.- Mentoring Processes vs. Content). Would have liked to have seen more hard data re: effectiveness of current efforts-primarily lots of "quantitative" evidence- at times hard to distinguish "advocacy vs. good science'.; Great use of "Artistic Scholarship" to reinforce/support learning points/concepts.; Wonderful meals/refreshments/conference accommodations.

Need better interaction on implementation, more sharing of other Univ. as to where we are in this issue. Need to continue the debate and discussions.

Focus on scholarship and how definition changes over time.

Liked format and chance for interaction. Just start day a bit later, end a bit earlier. Have at least one workshop on working with/training department heads who are pivotal to success.

This might seem counter productive because often bigger is supposed to be better, but I felt that rather small, personal nature of the conference was a huge advantage. Perhaps try to retain that. Also, maybe more rounds of small sessions would be helpful- repeat each to give us all a chance to experience one more set of the topics offered.

Because the conference was nothing other than a series of informal discussions, I stayed only for the first day/evening and did not return. What was sorely needed was a systematic review of where the USA and OSU are and how they got there. It was assumed, instead, that all the participants knew all this. What was also needed were some serious, self-critical assessments of pitfalls to the new "all is scholarship" paradigm. Most important to me is how high standards of excellence can be measured and maintained when nearly all activities, validated by all sorts of peers, now constitute "scholarship." I was seeking some serious analysis and got only chit-chat instead. As the new head of a departmental P&T committee seeking to learn, I was profoundly disappointed with this conference. (Steve Strauss, forest science)

5. How did you find out about Scholarship Unbound? (Check all that apply).

13 Flyer
26 Colleagues
0 Chronicle add
3 e-mail information
16 other (please specify)
Other:
- Administrator at University
- College administration informed me
- Dr. Weiser visited our campus
- Dr. Weiser
- My professor asked me to attend
- Dean
- University notification
- Dr. Weiser at UNL
- Peter Bloome
- Dean of my college
- Experiment station director
- Web site
- Contacted by Bud to be a discussant
- A conference
- College dean and Provost
- Ray Perry, one of the presenters at the conference told me about it and I convinced 3 others to come, for a team of five.
EXAMPLES

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

□ POSITION DESCRIPTIONS of faculty in different ranks describing the assigned duties, scholarly work, and service for each position.

The percentage of total effort devoted to performing assigned duties, doing scholarly work, and service vary considerably and are shown for each position.

Scholarly achievement is required in all tenure track faculty positions, but not for non-tenure track instructors and research assistant or associate positions.

□ SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT EXAMPLES in applied research and education that involve scholarship in integrating or applying knowledge.

In these examples peer validation and communication generally takes place in ways other than publication of results in a peer reviewed scientific journal article.
DEPARTMENT OF FOREST PRODUCTS

POSITION DESCRIPTION

Departmental Mission

The Department of Forest Products is an academic unit of the College of Forestry at Oregon State University, the Land-Grant University of Oregon and part of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. The Department fulfills the education, research and outreach missions of the College of Forestry with a focus on the science and technology of forest products, wood and wood-based materials.

The Department mission is to educate students to be responsible professionals, conduct distinctive problem-solving and fundamental research, and to disseminate objective research-based information which will:

- extend renewable forest resources to meet society's growing demand for forest products, and
- maximize the economic benefits of forest products for the citizens of Oregon and the world.

Nature of Position

This is a tenure track, 12-month academic professorial faculty appointment with the general faculty responsibilities as described in the OSU Faculty Handbook and the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The incumbent contributes to the research, education and outreach missions of the department but has a principal assignment to the research mission (approximately 75%) with secondary emphasis on resident instruction and advising (approximately 25%).

The incumbent is expected to conduct research on wood anatomy and wood quality that is relevant to the use of forest resources. She also serves as a key research bridge between the utilization focus of the Department of Forest Products and the emphasis on tree and forest growth found in the Departments of Forest Science and Forest Resources. The incumbent is expected to conceive research projects within the mission of the Department and to seek extramural funding to conduct them. She is expected to recruit qualified graduate students, oversee their work, guide them to successful graduation and to actively promote their professional development. The output from the incumbent's scholarly and creative activity is to be validated by peers and effectively communicated to appropriate audiences through various means. This includes, but is not limited to, peer reviewed journals, books, conference presentations, publications for practitioners, short course presentations and similar outlets.

The incumbent is expected to be broadly familiar with the field of wood anatomy, tree growth and physiology, silviculture and the salient industrial processing technologies, product characteristics, product applications and external factors which will impact her research program. The incumbent shall also be broadly aware of the state-of-the-art in appropriate research tools, methods and equipment and is expected to keep abreast of broad new developments within industry, society and the scientific community.
The incumbent conducts research at the Forest Research Laboratory, industrial sites or other appropriate locations. In collaboration with the Department Head, she is expected to develop and maintain quality research facilities at the FRL, subject to funding and institutional limitations.

The position incumbent is responsible for formal scheduled classroom instruction at the direction of the Department Head or on his/her initiative with the consent of the Department Head. Course responsibility will be assigned annually, but her principal teaching assignment will be undergraduate and graduate courses in wood anatomy. Informal instruction and interaction with undergraduate and graduate students as well as formal mentoring and training of graduate students are expected. As appropriate, the incumbent contributes to fulfilling the Departmental extended education mission and will seek opportunities to use continuing education and similar vehicles to educate and serve constituents. She serves as a wood identification consultant to faculty and others in accordance with departmental policy.

The incumbent is expected to devote time to service as a faculty member and citizen of the University, College, and Department. Participation and leadership in professional and scientific societies are expected. She is expected to interact with colleagues and constituents on local, national and international level.

**Expected Performance**

To achieve tenure and/or promotion the incumbent's performance will be evaluated using the criteria found in the OSU Faculty Handbook, the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and the College of Forestry Administrative Memorandum No. 4. An annual review of performance by the Department Head and interim review by departmental faculty and the Dean will supplement these criteria and this position description.

The incumbent is expected to responsibly manage all budgets and other allocated resources and to supervise any employees that may be assigned in addition to graduate students. The incumbent's activities are expected to directly contribute to the University, College and Departmental missions.

Assistant Professor

Department Head

December 1994,
Editorial Revisions. November 1997
Position Description for Dr.

Dr. is a tenured Associate Professor in the Department of Agricultural Chemistry with a 12 month appointment supported through the Center for Gene Research and Biotechnology at Oregon State University. Dr. Dreher is an Affiliate of the Department of Microbiology and of the Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, and is a member of the Molecular and Cellular Biology Program and the Genetics Program, both of which are interdepartmental graduate programs, and of the Bioreources Research Program, an undergraduate Major program. The primary responsibilities are to maintain a competitive research program in molecular biology that is primarily funded by external grants, and to participate in teaching subjects related to molecular biology.

Specific duties are:

* **Scholarship and Research (75%)**: maintenance of an active, externally funded research program of national and international visibility; timely publication of research results in respected, peer-reviewed journals; presentation of results at national and international scientific conferences and meetings; maintenance of a research environment for the training of graduate students and post-doctoral associates.

* **Teaching and Advising (15%)**: participation in teaching graduate and undergraduate students subjects related to molecular biology, especially participation in comprehensive core courses of the Molecular and Cellular Biology and the Genetics Graduate Programs that cover microbial and eukaryotic molecular genetics (translation and post-translational gene expression); training and advising of M.S. or Ph.D. students and undergraduate students seeking research experience.

* **Professional Activities (10%)**: participation in administrative and advisory committees at the university level, and professional activities related to molecular biology research at the national/international level (e.g., reviewing of grant proposals and journal manuscripts); current commitment to serve on the Editorial Boards of *Virology* and *Journal of Virology*.
DEPARTMENT OF EXERCISE & SPORT SCIENCE

POSITION DESCRIPTION

Faculty member:
Rank: Associate Professor
Hire date:

As a member of the faculty of the Department of Exercise and Sport Science in the College of Health and Human Performance, Dr. is expected to meet or exceed acceptable levels of productivity in performing instructional and service duties associated with his appointment, and to establish an independent research program that is relevant to his position.

Dr.'s responsibilities include:

Teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in movement studies in disability and related specialties, as assigned by the Department Chair, and counseling students as appropriate in their scholastic, academic, research and professional development.

Conducting and directing research, seeking extramural funding, and mentoring graduate students. Research shall be published in peer-reviewed journals recognized as relevant to exercise and sport science. Other forms of scholarship and creative activity must also be validated by peers and communicated in appropriate ways (e.g., books, articles, presentations, performances, exhibitions) to publics beyond the University or to the discipline itself.

Coordinating the Movement Studies in Disability program, which includes, but is not limited to, the following responsibilities: directing the various community based programs for individuals with disabilities including the OSU Special Physical and Motor Fitness Clinic, OSU Multiple Sclerosis Program, and affiliated support for local schools in adapted physical education; seeking external funding to partially support graduate students and programs in this related area; serving as resource for school districts in Oregon on adapted physical education; recruiting and orienting graduate students in this area of study.

Providing service to the Department, College and University in the form of committee work and participation in faculty meetings and appropriate Department, College and University events. Providing service to the profession, through attendance and presentations at meetings, manuscript reviewing, activity — including leadership activities — in professional and scientific organizations, etc.

Over time, it is reasonable to expect an evolution of specific duties within the categories described above. As such, other specific duties, as assigned and agreed, will amend this position description.
December 4, 1996

To:

From:

Subject: Position Description

Appointment:
- Associate professor (September 1988)
- Tenure (September 1983)
- 9-month appointment @ 1.0 FTE in the College of Science

Job description:
To teach graduate and undergraduate courses, to conduct independent and/or collaborative research, and to perform service to the university, the department, and your discipline. In addition to these general duties, you and Professor Ramsey have the primary responsibility for curriculum development in the ST 4/511-3 service course sequence.

Approximate division of responsibilities:
- Teaching*  55%
- Research  40%
- Service  5%

* Service on graduate committees and your curriculum development work are both counted toward this teaching responsibility.
POSITION DESCRIPTION

NAME: 

RANK: Faculty Research Assistant

The Coastal Oregon Productivity Enhancement (COPE) program is a 12 year research program examining forestry and wildlife issues in the Oregon Coast Range. The goal of the program is to provide resource managers and the public with information on the management of resources in the Oregon Coast Range. COPE has two components; fundamental and adaptive. Fundamental COPE scientists conduct basic research studies. Adaptive COPE applies and adapts existing research to conditions in the Oregon Coast Range. Adaptive COPE also provides and facilitates information transfer by providing continuing education opportunities. The program is funded by federal, state, local agencies, timber industry, and local and state organizations.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1) Responsible for data collection, analysis, statistical summary and study maintenance of four silviculture studies. Responsible for data analysis and statistical summary for one additional study. Maintain databases and documentation for each study that will be submitted to the Forest Science Database during late 1997 and 1998 after analysis is completed. Present findings in oral and written forms.

A) Establishment and Growth of Conifers Under Existing Riparian Vegetation. Study began in 1990. Responsibilities include a) supervise data collection for the third, fifth, and seventh years; b) revise and correct previously collected data sets by other Research Assistants and update study documentation; c) reduce, analyze, and summarize data collected; d) present results in oral and written form at meetings, workshops, field tours, and the COPE Report; and e) write manuscript, as primary author, following seventh year data analysis in 1997.

B) Release of Suppressed and Intermediate Conifers in Alder-Dominated Riparian Zones of the Oregon Coast Range. Study began in 1990/1991. Responsibilities include a) supervise data collection for the third, fifth, and seventh years; b) revise and correct previously collected data sets by other Research Assistants and update study documentation; c) reduce, analyze, and summarize data collected; d) present results in oral and written form at meetings, workshops, field tours, and the COPE Report; and e) write manuscript, as co-author, following seventh year data analysis in 1998.

C) Application of Commercial Thinning to Increase Structural Diversity in Young Douglas-fir stands. Study began in 1992/1993. Responsibilities include a) supervise data collection and study maintenance for overstory growth and yield and the hardwood and conifer species trials for pre-treatment, first, second, and fourth post-treatment years; b) reduce, analyze, and summarize data collected; c) present results in oral and written
POSITION DESCRIPTION
1997-98

Director of
Professor
1.0 FTE 12-month

TEACHING, ADVISING, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES

55% Director Responsibilities:
Senior administrator in the Office of Academic Affairs with primary responsibility for improving undergraduate academic programs. Responsibilities include: review all curriculum proposals; provide leadership to improve student retention; provide leadership to improve undergraduate instruction; provide leadership to improve undergraduate advising; oversee the baccalaureate core; conduct surveys related to current undergraduate students and alumni; community college liaison; accreditation liaison; catalog liaison; chair, Academic Learning Services; oversee the university's First Year Experience Program; oversee educational reform efforts; review student appeals; coordinate Undergraduate Academic Program reviews.

Ex-officio member of the following Faculty Senate committees:
Curriculum Council
Baccalaureate Core Committee
Advancement of Teaching Committee
Task Force on Student Assessment of Teaching

Member of the following committees:
Undergraduate Education Council
Retention Work Group of the UBC, Chair
Academic Advising Council
LBCC/OSU Partnership Team, Co-Chair (planning LBCC/OSU joint admissions program)
CONNECT Planning Team
First Year Residential Experience Planning Team
Weatherford Hall "Dream Team"
Academic Affairs Council
Provost's Council
Interinstitutional Assessment Council
OSSHE/Community College Task Force

25% Teaching Responsibilities in
Teach the following courses during 1997-98:
SIGNATURES

__________________________  Date

Head

__________________________  Date

Associate Provost

__________________________  Date
IV. POSITION DESCRIPTION – Nine Month, 100 % Teaching

A. Teaching and Advising ..............................................................................................80%

This position is located at Eastern Oregon University in La Grande, Oregon. The clientele include Crop and Soil Science majors and minors, other OSU College of Agriculture students in the cooperative Agriculture Program, and occasional Eastern Oregon University students. The expectations of this position include advising and teaching approximately one-half of the Crop and Soil Science courses, so that students may complete baccalaureate degree requirements within four years. Criteria for successful accomplishment will be: 1) program growth; 2) student learning; and 3) student satisfaction both during and after the educational process.

B. Service ..................................................................................................................10%

Ten percent of this position will consist of services to the University and beyond. It will include active participation in committees and professional organizations that further agricultural higher education. Service to the community includes development of programs and educational opportunities enhancing cooperation among residents with diverse expectations for natural resource use.

C. Scholarship .............................................................................................................10%

Ten percent of this position will consist of scholarly activity associated with teaching and service responsibilities. Scholarship will include development, implementation and validation of new technologies for delivery of natural resource education beyond the Eastern Oregon University campus. Scholarship will include development, implementation, and validation of tools for the general public to use (educational programs, demonstration projects, etc.) in making policy decisions involving natural resource issues.

This position description has been in effect since 1991.
Oregon State University Extension Service

POSITION DESCRIPTION

Faculty Member:  
Position Title:  
Counties:  

FTE Allocation: 100%  
Extension

FTE Program Area:  
40% Agriculture  
35% Sea Grant  
25% Forestry

PROGRAM MISSION

The mission of the Extension Agriculture Program is to deliver research-based, objective informal education to help Oregonians solve problems, develop leadership, and manage resources wisely.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF POSITION

This position as a Watershed Management Extension Agent is a tenure-track, 12 month academic professorial faculty appointment in the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Forestry and Sea Grant and Oregon State University Extension Service (OSUES), with assignment to Coos and Curry Counties, Oregon. The incumbent contributes to the missions of OSUES, with principal responsibility for needs assessment, Extension program development, delivery, and evaluation. The incumbent is an Assistant Professor in an appropriate academic department.

Design, develop, maintain and/or carry out Extension programs to insure that all people have equal employment opportunities and equal program participation opportunities regardless of their race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, marital status, disability, and disabled veteran or Vietnam-era veteran status.

PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES

This position carries the general and specific responsibilities of a faculty member described in the OSU Faculty Handbook and the promotion and tenure guidelines of the appropriate academic College. These include an extension education program, demonstrable scholarly activity and service contributions, and active professorial development.

Primary objectives of the program are to provide private and public multiple resource managers with the knowledge they need to assist in improving water quality, water conservation, salmonid fish populations, and ecosystem health through watershed management while maintaining or improving their interrelated interests.
DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Teaching, Advising, and Other Assignments 75%

1. Provide leadership for design, delivery, and evaluation of Extension educational programs for private and public natural resource managers. Encourage and explain/demonstrate the application of research based knowledge for improving coastal watersheds that will benefit salmonid populations and habitat, water quality, water conservation, and ecosystem health.

2. The Extension program will require coordination, cooperation, and networking with landowners and other private citizens, relevant agencies, organizations, i.e., watershed councils and Soil and Water Conservation Districts through educational programs that address natural resource issues, and watershed management strategies on public and private land.

3. Assist in the formation, maintenance, and improvement of voluntary, community-based decision making, through educational programming. Assist citizens in developing action plans, watershed assessments, and watershed enhancement projects.

Interpersonal Skills

1. Help solve problems and improve communication within the office.

2. Make significant contributions as a “team player” with other faculty, clientele and volunteers.

3. Provide leadership in multidisciplinary or multi-agency projects across program areas.

Professional Development

1. Increase professional competency and seek professional experiences to insure accurate and pertinent program offerings, effective teaching and delivery methods, and professional and personal growth.

Scholarly Activity 15%

1. Engage in scholarly activity through applied research and/or innovations in teaching. Share results (methods, discoveries, and applications) with peers so they can be validated.

2. National publications, as appropriate, and/or professional meetings at county, regional, statewide and/or national levels are some of the forums for peer communication, evaluation, and validation.
Service 5%

1. Maintain active membership and participation in appropriate professional organizations.

2. Participate in staff meetings including those of the Extension Agriculture, Sea Grant and Forestry programs, in this priority order. Maintain professional relationships with Extension faculty and office staff.

3. Serve on University, College, Department and/or Extension committees as appropriate.

Organizational Accountability 5%

1. Utilize appropriate and effective methods of communication to promote programs and market Extension.

2. Keep records and provide necessary reports to Extension Administration and the three program areas, including plans of work, narrative reports, statistical reports and reports of accomplishments.

EXPECTED PERFORMANCE

To achieve tenure and promotion, the incumbent's performance will be evaluated using the criteria found in the OSU Faculty Handbook, University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and the guidelines of the appropriate academic college and department. An annual performance appraisal will be performed by OSUES and will supplement these criteria and this position description.

Extension Agent, Watershed Management

Date

Staff Chair

Date

Academic Unit Department Head

Date
Integration of Knowledge and Information

EXAMPLE: Integrated Fruit Production (IFP)

Situation:
Historically, sweet cherry growers relied on conventional spray programs with non-selective pesticides coupled with calendar-based timing. Conventional spray programs were often disruptive to beneficial insects and the environment and control measures were sometimes missed or over-applied. Lack of proper irrigation scheduling was also common as most growers lacked an understanding of soil water holding capacities and tree needs.

Action:
After studying several successful IFP programs in Europe, I obtained 11 grower-funded grants to conduct foundational studies in support of an IFP program for cherries. The information required to develop a soft control program for obliquebanded leafroller (OBLR) and cherry fruit fly (CFF) was wanting. In addition, growers lacked the understanding to properly control western tentiform leafminer (WTLM).

Research determined larval and adult thresholds and best monitoring techniques for OBLR. The effect of conventional spray programs on beneficial insects and secondary pest populations such as WTLM and two-spotted and McDaniel mites was also determined. From this information, an effective, but soft, control program was developed for cherries. Integrating this information into a viable IFP program was aided by the establishment of two IFP demonstration plots. Working with cooperators throughout the Mid-Columbia region, a weather station network was established, assisting growers in program implementation.

This effort was communicated through 58 presentations to introduce and train growers. Five presentations were made at professional meetings before peers and 31 publications and numerous articles, six of which were peer-reviewed, trained growers and informed peers on various aspects of the IFP program. In addition, an International Cherry Fruit Fly (CFF) Conference was held, with published proceedings, to encourage scientific interest in much-needed CFF work.

Impact:
This program has significantly impacted Mid-Columbia cherry growers. In 1998, 70% of Wasco County cherry acreage was enrolled in the program. Packing houses hired scouts to monitor pest levels, and regularly-monitored acreage increased by 50% from 1993 to 1998. The first irrigation in the spring has been delayed by more than one month in the last two years and fertilizer rates cut in half compared to 10 years ago.
Integration of Knowledge and Information

EXAMPLE: Extended Educational Program: Production of Hardy Kiwifruit

Situation:
Many growers have expressed interest in alternative crops that could be produced economically in Oregon. In 1990, hardy kiwifruit was identified as a possible crop which could potentially fill this niche, but there was no information on suitable varieties nor on production practices—commercial acreage in 1990 was estimated at less than 5 acres (grown mainly as a novelty).

Program:
In 1990, I established a kiwifruit variety trial at the North Willamette Research and Extension Center when there was relatively little commercial interest in the hardy kiwifruit.

Using information gained from this trial and an integration of knowledge from other areas and different kiwifruit species, I authored a kiwifruit publication in November 1995. This sold over 1,300 copies in two years.

In December 1995, I co-organized and presented information at the first kiwifruit production workshop—40 growers attended. I presented information on varietal decisions and pruning/training. I conducted an industry acreage and production system survey in 1997. In February 1998, a second workshop was organized, with 65 growers attending. Results from an undergraduate student research project on fruit maturation (I advised this student) was presented, along with more information on planting establishment and pruning/training.

Impact:
The commercial acreage of hardy kiwifruit in Oregon has increased from approximately 5 acres in 1990 to over 65 acres in 1997. The value of this new industry will be $1.3 to $2 million (mature production at present prices and acreage). A processing industry was established in 1997, thus increasing the economic impact (value added) of this commodity.

Validation of Scholarship:
The Extension Service publication I authored, Growing Kiwifruit, is being used in extended educational programs in Wisconsin and has sold internationally (Italy, New Zealand, Canada, and Poland).

It is the first publication of its kind on hardy kiwifruit.

At the request of extended educational personnel in Washington State, Growing Kiwifruit was republished as a PNW publication without editing (PNW 507, 1998).
Application of Knowledge and Information

EXAMPLE: Extended Educational Delivery: Blueberry Pruning Video

**Situation:**
The blueberry industry was expressing frustration with the amount of time required to train pruning crews annually. There is no "formula" for pruning blueberries, thus the time commitment for training was quite high.

**Solution:**
We decided that a video would be a good approach to solving this problem. However, there was no blueberry pruning video available in other production areas that could be used.

(Professor, Oregon Blueberry Growers' Association), and I wrote the text for the video and (videographer, Agricultural Communications, OSU) and I produced the video in 1990.

**Impact:**
In one year, Pruning Highbush Blueberries—a grower's guide (VTP 002; 21:50) sold 212 copies (60 to other states and 21 internationally).

This video is now used by over 75% of the blueberry industry in Oregon to train pruning crews.

**Validation of Scholarship:**
This was the first video of its kind produced in North America.

**Sunset Magazine** recommended this video as "offering expert help", "...shows you all you need to know about pruning...", and "this video is beautifully made and has the earmarks of a real-world experience" (Sunset Magazine, Feb. 1991:120).

In 1995, we gave the British Columbia (B.C.) blueberry industry permission to translate this video into Punjabi (the language of their primary labor force). This translated version is used by B.C. blueberry growers for training and was aired on public television in B.C. in 1995 (Provincial Blueberry Specialist, B.C.).
Application of Knowledge and Information

EXAMPLE: Green Peas

Situation:
The Blue Mountain area of eastern Oregon and Washington has produced green peas for processing for over 50 years. Thirty-five to forty thousand acres of peas are grown in rotation with winter wheat, contributing to the local economy and reducing soil erosion and weed populations. Because of highly variable growing conditions and the build-up of soilborne diseases, pea yields have remained fairly stable. Loss of herbicides has made weed control more difficult.

Action:
Interdisciplinary research and Extension programs, in cooperation with the green pea industry, have been developed to address these problems. Since 1982, I have tested an average of 50 green pea varieties each year for acceptable quality and adaptability to the region. These trials are one of three in the U.S. and include entries from seven seed companies.

USDA plant pathologist, Prosser, Washington and I collaborate on the screening and rating of new varieties for disease resistance and test seed treatments for disease reduction/control.

In 1991, acting as project director, along with Professor Emeritus, Oregon State University as the principal investigator, we tested six herbicides on 48 pea varieties. The project was funded under a CAAR grant. The plots were evaluated for weed control and variety tolerance. Similar studies were conducted on 44 varieties in 1992. In cooperation with green pea herbicides have been evaluated.

Validation of Scholarship:
Currently, 16,000 acres (50%) of peas in the region are tested varieties. Average yields have increased by 15% and annually return growers over $720,000. More disease-tolerant varieties have been identified and are being planted. New seed treatments have been relatively ineffective and are not widely used, thus saving growers money. Herbicide research resulted in the use of Pursuit on over 90% of the green pea acreage. Pursuit provides excellent control of nightshade, a contaminant in processed peas. Two non-registered herbicides were dropped from further testing because of poor weed control and/or unacceptable crop injury on some varieties.
PERIOD ENDING May 31, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Expenditures of WKKF Funds (rounded to the nearest dollar)</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Differences Between I &amp; II</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Previously Approved per dated</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Proposed if Different from IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Ltr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 37,385</td>
<td>$36,813</td>
<td>$572</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>$12,665</td>
<td>$28,335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42,296</td>
<td>$41,869</td>
<td>$427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$40,950</td>
<td>($15,120)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$146,511</td>
<td>$14,214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A written explanation should be given for deviations actual and/or proposed expenditures from originally approved budget items.

I certify that this Financial Report Form is prepared on:

Less Cash Balance Remaining (III above) (See Instructions Item VI)

Proposed WKKF Payment (See Instructions Item VII)

X a Cash Basis (Check the basis that applies an Accrual Basis See Instructions Item VIII)

Resulting balance to be correct. I further certify that this organization continues to be classified as an organization described in Section 509(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Specter, Vice President for Finance & Administration

Hashimoto, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs

Chief Financial Officer Name and Title (please type) Instructs Item IX

Director Name and Title (please type) Instructs Item IX

His Form with Original Signatures to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (Photocopies or Faxes Are NOT Acceptable)
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PROPOSAL

Oregon State University and its Faculty Senate propose to host a national forum on the changing value system(s) of American universities in the form of a workshop entitled Scholarship Unbound, Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards to be held on the OSU campus in Corvallis, Oregon on October 1-3, 1998. The workshop announcement and draft agenda (Appendices 1 and 2) describe the event.

This grant request to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation consists of three parts. 1) a request for support of preworkshop studies, including surveys and development of education materials to be used during the workshop. 2) a request for support of the workshop, and 3) a request for support of postworkshop activities including a follow-up survey of participants to evaluate the impacts of the workshop and support for travel of workshop organizers to universities that request their advice and assistance in implementing cultural change during the year following the workshop.

The total request to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for the three phases is:

$146,511 including $27,976 for preworkshop, $102,535 for workshop, and $16,000 for postworkshop components. The postworkshop request could be considered at a later date.

- The budget for preworkshop studies ($27,976) would support data collection via surveys of five sample population such as newly hired assistant professors, department chairs, etc.

These data will be analyzed and compiled for the workshop participants along with anecdotal examples of changes that have occurred. Those examples will be collected via personal interviews. These data and examples will provide the basis for several scheduled discussion sessions during the workshop.
The request for workshop support ($102,535) includes funds to publicize and conduct the workshop, as described herein, for up to 280 participants (250 paying the $200 registration fee and 30 invited discussion leaders and speakers whose fees are waived).

The budget for post workshop follow-through ($16,000) would provide for a survey of participants in six to nine months following the workshop to determine the nature and extent of institutional actions stimulated by the workshop. In addition, this budget would support travel for resource persons from Oregon State University to visit other universities that request their advice and assistance in initating and implementing change processes during the year following the workshop. All key organizers of the workshop at OSU are willing and available to make such site visits and presentations at other universities.

WORKSHOP RATIONALE

American universities need to evolve rapidly at the risk of becoming marginalized—both in terms of public support and in their effectiveness in meeting the educational needs of individuals and of society as a whole.

The value system or culture of a university is analogous to an organization’s genetic code in that intrinsic values determine the nature and character of the organization. The intrinsic values (culture) of a university must change in order for significant and sustainable organizational evolution to occur.

The criteria used by a university to evaluate and reward its faculty provide the clearest view of the institution’s value system. The criteria used to assess faculty member’s eligibility for tenure and promotion are key indicators because they determine how faculty spend their time and energy.
A read-out of the genetic code of American universities, and of the professional societies to which their faculties belong, would identify individual achievements, generating research grants and publishing research results in peer journals as dominant characteristics that are highly valued. Recessive traits in the value system include faculty contributions to collaborative efforts, faculty efforts that are not research and that do not directly generate revenues, and faculty communications to audiences that are not peers, by means other than peer reviewed publications.

These universities values have evolved over time. It has been said that the dominant role of research in American universities today was largely a product of the Cold War. The Cold War is over. While research should continue to be an important university activity, the challenge for universities is to also place high value on creative intellectual work by teachers and faculty engaged across the full range of university missions.

Current university values encourage and reward faculty who work well independently in conducting research. Research however is just one of the three fundamental missions (education, research and outreach) of a comprehensive university. There is comparatively less incentive, beyond personal motivation, for faculty members to work in teams to address complex issues, or to focus their creative energies and scholarly effort in areas of responsibility other than research.

The reality that university values are incongruent with their missions is a serious and potentially fatal flaw. This workshop will address these issues in a constructive way designed to foster change that is appropriate to each participating university. (One size does not fit all). Appendix
3 is a letter of invitation to a potential workshop discussion leader. It describes the interactive style of programs the workshop will provide.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Universities, their faculties, and the public recognize the incongruencies between a university's missions and how the faculty that carry out those missions are evaluated and rewarded. Changing the basic culture of a university to synchronize faculty evaluation and rewards with university missions would establish a more adaptable, relevant, and effective institution. There are no easy shortcuts to accomplish this, but there are a growing number of examples that illustrate how such fundamental changes can be accomplished. One such example is the experience of host-institution Oregon State University which adopted a broader vision of scholarship and new tenure and promotion guidelines to reflect the values of the institution and its diverse faculties. Appendices 4 and 5 describe these changes and compare the Oregon State University and Carnegie Foundation models. The Carnegie model of scholarship has been extensively considered but rarely adopted because most faculties, disciplines and universities view it as a significant lowering of standards. The workshop will invite speakers and discussion leaders from institutions that are making changes, and will feature examples of change processes that are useful models.

Specifically, the workshop is designed to accelerate the rate of cultural change that is beginning to occur slowly and sporadically around the country by providing a national forum and drawing upon the collective experience and expertise of the participants in:
- identifying real and perceived sources of resistance to changing values (Know thy enemy);

- sharing examples of how resistance has been overcome;

- identifying commonalities in efforts that have succeeded and in those that have failed;

- identifying the kinds of change and change processes that may have application at similar institutions.

Common sources of resistance (based on discussions with faculty groups and administrators at numerous universities) include:

- A complacency that everything is fine, and that nothing needs to change. (This is increasingly rare).

- The assumption by university administrators that faculty will oppose any change. (An estimated 80 percent of faculty members typically endorse fundamental changes within 10 minutes of discussion.)

- Faculty members' assumption that university administrators will oppose any change. (An estimated 90 percent of deans and vice presidents typically endorse fundamental changes within 10 minutes of discussion.)
- The temptation of both faculty and administrators to shortcut the process by trying to make substantive and sustainable changes in faculty evaluation criteria without first building a solid conceptual foundation and consensus about the underlying values. (It does not work.)

The workshop will address these sources of resistance in drawing upon successful examples and in identifying models that provide a basis for a “diffusion of innovation” approach to embolden participants to initiate needed change in values that are right for their university. The workshop will show that values can and are changing, provide participants with an understanding of how to proceed and help them establish a broad network of professional friends who will be available and interested in providing assistance, encouragement and support. A follow-up study will survey participants during the year following the workshop to determine whether and how it has influenced change.
# WORKSHOP BUDGET

OVERALL BUDGET including preworkshop (A), workshop (B), and postworkshop (C) budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Note</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>WKKP</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclassified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>25,643 (.25)</td>
<td>10,258 (.10)</td>
<td>35,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assoc. Coord.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Office Spec 1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,064</td>
<td>8,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>5,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified @ 44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>3,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Grant Personnel Tot</th>
<th>22,886</th>
<th>60,271</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speaker Travel (25 @ $1,400)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Speaker registr. fee waiver (30 @ $200)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional Services</th>
<th>Grant Travel total = $41,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Workspan Inc. (Paul Axtell)</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parnasses Productions (Joseph Houseal)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Conference management</td>
<td>19,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Survey Research Center</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Grant Services Tot = $42,296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Facilities/Audio Visual</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>6,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>47,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Grant Services Tot = $42,296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75,830</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Income (250 @ $200)</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount requested of the W.K. Net</td>
<td>$25,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. Preworkshop Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>WKKF</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclassified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>10,257 (.10)</td>
<td>5,129.00</td>
<td>15,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Assoc. Coord.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Office Spec 1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,064</td>
<td>8,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified @ 44%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>20,476</td>
<td>17,249</td>
<td>37,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Services and Supplies | | | |
|-----------------------| | | |
| Operating | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Survey Research Center | 7,500 | 0 | 7,500 |
| **S & S Subtotal** | 7,500 | 1,000 | 8,500 |

| **TOTALS** | 27,976 | 18,249 | 46,225 |

Amount Requested of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, $27,976
### B. Workshop Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>WKKP</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclassified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>15,386</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>20,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,909</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>22,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker/Moderator Travel Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(travel, lodging, etc., 15 @ $1,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker/Moderator fee waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspan Inc. (Paul Axtell)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnasses Productions (Joseph Houseal)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Production (S. Dodrill)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference management @ 23%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,896 (15%)</td>
<td>10,611 (8%)</td>
<td>30,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker and Services Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>59,796</td>
<td>14,611</td>
<td>74,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event Expenses</strong> (Other S &amp; S)—Based 265 participants, 250 paid &amp; 15 speakers and discussion leaders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Audio Visual</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>7,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event S &amp; S Subtotals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,830</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>77,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>152,535</td>
<td>22,048</td>
<td>174,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Income ($200 for 250)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount Requested of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, $102,535**
C. Postworkshop Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Services</th>
<th>WKKP</th>
<th>OSU (faculty time)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Research Center</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 trips at $1,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16,000</th>
<th></th>
<th>16,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amount Requested of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, $16,000
JUL 8 1999

Dr. Roy G. Arnold
Provost and Executive Vice President
624 Kerr Administration Building
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-2153

Re: P0061975 (Please refer to this number when writing to the Kellogg Foundation about this project.)

Dear Dr. Arnold:

In response to your letter of June 9, 1999, I am pleased to approve a one-year, no-cost time extension for your project to host a national forum on the changing value system(s) of American universities. This additional time will allow you to expend the remaining $14,214 in project funds to support postconference survey analysis and travel for invited speakers to other universities and national meetings.

The end of the commitment period is now May 31, 2000, shortly after which final reports are due. Approximately two months prior to that date, we will send you a letter of reminder as well as a financial report form for your use when submitting your final reports.

We reviewed the statement of expenditures for the period ending May 31, 1999, and approve it. We note that the expenditure in the Workshops Support line item was higher than the approved budget. The necessity of the overexpenditure is accepted. However, in keeping with our letter of commitment, we ask that in the future you obtain written approval from the Foundation before expending beyond the approved budget items.

As requested in the financial report form dated June 8, 1999, the approved budget for the extension period (June 1, 1999, through May 31, 2000) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>5,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops Support</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,214</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This time extension in no way increases the Foundation's total commitment to this project, and all conditions contained in our June 18, 1998, letter of commitment continue to apply for the life of this grant.
I am pleased to be able to approve this additional time to allow you to complete project activities in an orderly fashion. Best wishes for continued success.

Sincerely,

Thomas L. Thorburn
Program Director
Food Systems and
Rural Development Programs

/cc: Andrew G. Hashimoto
BUDGET NOTES

1. Conrad J. Weiser, dean emeritus, coordinator of the three phases of workshop activities. Pay period July 1, 1997 to December 31, 1997. Actual work period January 1, 1997 to December 31, 1999 when postworkshop activity is complete. The grant would reimburse the College of Agricultural Sciences for it’s previous expenditures for this item that were made in anticipation of this request.

2. Leslie D. Burns, director of undergraduate academic programs, will serve as associate coordinator of the three phases of the workshop activities. She has lead responsibilities for pre and post workshop survey design, interviews, interpretation and reporting of results. The .12 FTE requested herein would buy out Dr. Burns teaching of a 4 credit course during spring term, permitting her to devote time to surveys and interviews while faculty on 9 month appointments are on campus. Pay period April 1 to July 1, 1998 at .36 FTE or .12 for a 9 month appointment, (so department can pay the replacement teacher). Actual work period July 1, 1997 to December 31, 1999 (when the follow-up survey of participants is completed).

3. Judy Modrell, office specialist in the College of Agricultural Sciences, will do the extensive scheduling, travel arrangements, word processing, mailings, etc., for the workshop. She will perform these tasks for the period covering all three phases of the project. Her effort, estimated as .35 FTE for one year will be paid by the College of Agricultural Sciences. Her efforts will be concentrated and only charged to the project when her involvement is substantial. Routine activities will not be charged to the project.

4. OPE rates are about 10, 30 and 44% respectively for Weiser, Burns and Modrell.

5. This would cover the travel costs for 3 workshop speakers and 12 discussion leaders from around the country (15 at $1,400 in the workshop budget), and for travel for 10 site visits at other universities by Oregon State University resource persons to advise and present invited talks in the postworkshop follow-up phase of this proposal (10 at $1,400 in postworkshop budget).

6. The registration fee of $200 will be waived for invited speakers and discussion leaders from other institutions (15) and from Oregon State University (15).

7. Workshop Inc (Paul Axtell) fee and travel to participate as a presenter-trainer of discussion leaders and discussants, and to serve as an advisor to the planning committee during the workshop. Dr. Axtell is already providing valuable advice on workshop design in the course of his monthly visits to campus—without cost to this budget.

8. Parnassus Productions (Joseph Houseal) will design and present two artistic performances (see agenda) that interpret and illustrate the central theme(s) of the workshop. This fits especially well with OSU’s vision of scholarship which includes creative artistry as a form of scholarship along with the discovery, application and integration of knowledge.

9. Steve Dodrill, Department of Extension and Agricultural Communications, will collaborate with his counterparts at other land grant universities in videotaping forceful-quotations from a spectrum of people speaking to the external and internal forces that are driving change in the value systems of universities. Steve will edit and assemble two short (6 to 8 minute) hard hitting videos that will be used to remind workshop participants why we are here, for presentation at the beginning of the Thursday and Friday workshop sessions. (see agenda). The department will contribute most ($4,000) of the faculty time that will be required to
produce these tapes. The $1,500 will partially reimburse the department for supplies and services.

10. Workshop management is provided by the OSU College of Forestry Conference Office. This is an experienced, effective and self supporting team the manages over 50 conferences and workshop a year. Their normal management fee is 23% of the direct costs. They agreed to lower the fee to 15% for this workshop. The difference (8%) is shown as a College of Forestry contribution to this event.

11. Includes rent for Alumni Center and LaSelles Stewart Center space and for video and sound equipment, etc.

12. Includes folders, handouts, P & T guidelines, nametags, etc.

13. Includes mailing of pre-registration and registration materials, etc.

14. Includes two lunches, two dinners, two continental breakfasts, coffee breaks, etc.

15. Includes mailings, signage, poster session idea fair with social, etc.

Some of these costs will be to reimburse previous expenditures and we would appreciate the flexibility to retain unspent funds for program related efforts after the initial follow-up.
APPENDICES

1- Workshop announcement
2- Workshop draft agenda
3- Example of discussion leader invitation letter
4- Broader Vision of Scholarship
5- Scholarship Unbound for the 21st Century
Scholarship Unbound
Reframing faculty evaluation & rewards

October 1 - 3, 1998
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

This national workshop is designed to assist universities that are engaged in changing faculty evaluation and rewards, including changes in:

- the definition of scholarship
- faculty expectations in a contemporary university
- tenure and promotion criteria
- the concept of tenure and the tenure process
- post-tenure review

It will focus on redefining scholarship and changing tenure and promotional criteria in universities that are engaged in research and education on and beyond the campus.

The program will draw upon Oregon State University's three years of experience with revised promotion and tenure guidelines, which are based on the concept that (1) scholarship is creative intellectual work — validated by peers and communicated, and (2) scholarship encompasses creative artistry and the discovery, development, and integration of knowledge.

Who Should Attend
Interested individuals or university teams including key faculty representatives, administrators, and members of external boards. Universities are encouraged to send a team of participants that will have met to consider questions posed prior to the workshop. The workshop will accommodate the first 200 registrants.

Outcome
At the workshop, plans will be developed by individuals or teams for fostering and accelerating cultural change in their own university's evaluation process and reward system. Conferences will have the opportunity to consult with OSU faculty counterparts, with peers from other universities that are implementing changes, and with noteworthy scholars who will provide advice and their perspectives. Evening poster sessions at various nontimes will provide additional opportunities for conferencing ideas.
Scholarship Unbound
Reframing faculty evaluation & rewards

At this national workshop, hosted by Oregon State University and its Faculty Senate, you will:

- Develop a plan for fostering change in your university's evaluation process and reward system.
- Compare experiences with your counterparts from other universities.
- Learn about the OSU experience.
- Exchange ideas with noteworthy scholars from other institutions.

Oregon State University
October 1 - 3, 1998

Target Audience:
Administrators
Key Faculty Members
Representatives of External Boards

Fill Out This Workshop Interest Form and Return It

Name __________________________
Mailing address ___________________
E-mail address ____________________

To receive further information and registration forms for the workshop, mail this interest form to:
Office of Academic Affairs
Oregon State University
624 Kerr Administration Building
Corvallis, OR 97331
Phone: (541) 737-0732 Fax: (541) 737-3033 E-mail: gigi.brace@orst.edu

Please briefly describe the status of deliberation or action on these issues at your university.
AGENDA

Scholarship Unbound—Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1. WHY AND HOW ARE UNIVERSITIES CHANGING

- Registration: 9:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Noon Lunch and Opening Session

- Workshop design and goals (briefing)
- Finding value for yourself and your institution

Afternoon Plenary Sessions:

UNIVERSITY VALUES AND FACULTY EVALUATION: EXAMPLES OF CHANGE

- Imperatives for change (brief video)
- The Forces of Change (30-minute presentation)
- The Oregon State University Experience: A discussion
- Artistic interlude
- Break, Networking, and Idea Fair set up

4:15 Idea Fair and Progressive Buffet

CULTURAL CHANGES IN PROCESS

7:00 p.m. Concurrent Discussion Sessions

FINDING COMMONALITIES IN CHANGE

(discussions of 45 minutes led by a convener with two or three other contributors)

- Broader Views of Scholarship
- Faculty Roles in Shaping Change
- Key Ingredients for Cultural Change
- Learning from Unsuccessful Efforts
8:00 Work Sessions for University Teams

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2.

BUILDING A CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION

7:00 a.m. Continental Breakfast

- University teams reconvene over breakfast to continue discussion

8:30 Morning Plenary Session

- Update and suggested additions to the agenda
- Foundation for change (brief video)
- The Professor and Scholar for the 21st Century (60 minute presentation)
- Discussion
- Break and networking

10:00 REFRAMING FACULTY EVALUATION AND REWARDS—A DISCUSSION

Table Talk

FACULTY EVALUATION AND REWARDS AT YOUR UNIVERSITY

- What useful ideas did you get from the presentations?
- What approach might work well at your university?
- What are the primary barriers at your university?

12:30 p.m. Picnic Lunch on the Patio

1:30 Afternoon Walkabout Interaction Sessions—

IDENTIFYING BARRIERS AND BUILDING CONSENSUS

1. Visit the various discussion sites of interest to you that are organized by type of discipline and faculty assignment.
2. Identify at least two ideas to discuss with your team this evening.
Discipline Discussion Sites

- Applied Sciences (engineering, medicine, agriculture, forestry, etc.)
- Basic Sciences (physics, chemistry, biological sciences, etc.)
- Liberal Arts and Sciences (arts, humanities, social sciences, etc.)

Cross-Discipline Programs
- Nationally Accredited Professional Programs
- TBA, based on feedback during workshop.

Faculty Assignment Discussion Sites

- Advising, Undergraduate
- Teaching, Undergraduate
- Research and Graduate Advising
- Distance Education, Extension, Outreach
- International Programs
- Librarians
- Clinicians
- Communicators
- Administrators
- TBA, based on feedback during the workshop.

Break-and-Networking

3:15 Concurrent Discussion Groups

LAYING FOUNDATIONS FOR SUCCESS

Five concurrent sessions:
- The Position Description - OSU Style
- Expectations of New Assistant Professors
- Departmental Experiences with New Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
- So What Has Really Changed at OSU?
- TBA - based on feedback during the workshop
4:00  Concurrent Discussion Groups

SUSTAINING EXCELLENCE
Five Concurrent sessions:
- Validation and Assessment—Evaluating faculty scholarship and productivity
- Post-tenure review—professional development opportunity or public flogging
- Peer mentoring potentials and pitfalls
- Encouraging and evaluating faculty efforts on teams
- TBA—based on feedback during the workshop

Social Hour, Dinner
- Performing Artists Who do Scholarship

7:00 p.m.  Table Talk
- What useful ideas did you get from the presentations?
- What approach might work well at your university?
- What are the primary barriers at your university?

8:00  Team Work Sessions

SATURDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 3.

GENERATING MOMENTUM

7:00 a.m.  Continental Breakfast

8:15  Closing Plenary Session

BEGINNING THE JOURNEY
- Update
- Reflections and Words of Advice—A discussion
- Views from Beyond the Academy—A discussion
- Break and networking

10:30  The American University for the 21st Century (30 minute presentation)
Open forum—Participants' Views and insights
What ideas are particularly powerful and useful for you and your institution?
March 19, 1998

Dear :

I am writing to invite you to serve as a discussion leader at a national workshop, "Scholarship Unbound—Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards." The enclosed announcement describes this event that will be hosted on campus by Oregon State University and its Faculty Senate with support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The workshop program will begin at noon Thursday, October 1, and adjourn at noon on Saturday, October 3. Mark your calendar now.

The workshop is designed to accommodate 280 conferees from public and private universities engaged in education and research on and beyond their campuses. The program will emphasize interaction and networking among participants, and learning from other universities via poster sessions and idea fairs. There will be no traditional panel discussions and few formal speeches. Discussion groups and feedback sessions will be created during the course of the workshop based on participant interest.

We are inviting about a dozen experts from around the country to serve as discussion leaders and resource persons at the workshop. Beyond participating in sessions of interest they will be asked to convene and co-lead discussion sessions; advise university teams at their evening meetings; or to serve as discussants in feedback sessions where their ideas, impressions and advice would be shared with all conferees.

A cadre of internal OSU experts, like yourself, is being invited to play similar discussion-leader roles, including co-leading of discussion groups with external counterparts. This assignment will require no advance preparation on your part.

The workshop is designed to provide a national forum for exchange of ideas among participants from universities that are at various stages of rethinking scholarship and reframing faculty evaluation and rewards in ways that support their missions and meet public expectations. A preliminary agenda and articles about Oregon State University's experience are enclosed for information. Shaded sections of the agenda denote workshop sessions that will be open to all OSU faculty and the broader public.
We hope that you will be available and interested in serving as a discussion leader. Early indications are that there is strong interest in the workshop throughout the country. Give me a call 541/737-5824 or 541/753-5851; or e-mail to weiserc@ccmail.orst.edu to respond or ask questions.

Best regards,

C. J. Weiser  
Workshop Coordinator  
Dean Emeritus

Enclosures
Broader Visions of Scholarship

—A Comparison of Carnegie Foundation and Oregon State University models

The Nature of Scholarship

Carnegie: Four activities of the professoriate—teaching and the discovery, integration and application of knowledge are described as the categories of scholarship.

OSU: Scholarship is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated. Four forms of scholarship are described: creative artistry and the discovery, integration and development (application) of knowledge.

Both models consider the discovery, integration and application or development of knowledge to be three forms of scholarship. Additionally, the Carnegie model includes teaching while the OSU model includes creative artistry as a fourth form of scholarship.

Implications

Carnegie: Scholarship is determined and described as the things that professors do, hence good teaching is scholarship. Literary, visual and performing arts are considered to fall under the scholarship of discovery.

OSU: Scholarship can be done by creative knowledgeable people throughout society—not just at universities. Professors do important work that is not scholarship. Creative teaching or research, for example, does not become scholarship unless and until it is validated by peers and communicated beyond the classroom or file drawer. Creative artistry is a distinct form of scholarship that interprets the human spirit and creates new insights and beauty.

Assessing Scholarship

Carnegie: Scholarly achievements can be assessed (validated) by determining that "phases of an intellectual process" occurred during their development. The six sequential phases of an intellectual process are identified as: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

OSU: Peers validate scholarly achievements by assessing their trueness or accuracy and the extent to which achievements are original, significant and potentially useful to others.
Assessment of scholarship in the Carnegie model focuses on using a scholarly process to achieve scholarly results. In contrast, the OSU model focuses on peer validation in terms of its trueness, originality, significance and usefulness rather than on the process that was used to achieve the results.

Similarities and Differences

Both models envision scholarship as being broader than results of research published in peer refereed journals. Both place high value on scholarly achievements that result from research. Both models extend the concept of scholarship beyond research to include the other types of intellectual work and achievement.

The Carnegie Foundation model basically describes scholarship in terms of the teaching and research activities that faculty members normally engage in, while the OSU model views scholarship fundamentally as creative work that is peer validated and communicated to others. This view suggests that scholarship can occur in all areas of professorial work, as well as outside of academia.

The Carnegie and OSU models were developed to achieve similar objectives. They travel parallel conceptual pathways in articulating comprehensive visions of scholarship that can provide a basis for recognizing, evaluating and rewarding faculty creativity across all university disciplines and missions. These models and others yet evolving will hopefully accelerate progress towards making the missions of universities more congruent with the criteria and processes used to evaluate and reward the faculty that carry out those missions.

C. J. Weiser
November, 1997
Scholarship Unbound for the 21st Century

To provide a conceptual base for reviewing and revising tenure and promotion guidelines a faculty senate task force at Oregon State University undertook the challenge of defining and articulating the core characteristics of scholarship that apply across academic disciplines and university missions. The result was: Scholarship is creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated—including creative artistry and the discovery, integration and development of knowledge.

Scholarly achievement and excellence in performing other assigned responsibilities are the primary categories for evaluating faculty performance, but OSU's new promotion and tenure guidelines describe other aspects of faculty performance that the University values. These include collaborative effort, international perspective and service. Revised tenure and promotion guidelines reflecting these values, and basing faculty performance evaluation on a position description, were adopted by the University in 1995 with unanimous Faculty Senate support. Numerous universities are considering such changes, but few have progressed this far. Oregon State University will host a national workshop October 1-3, 1998, to provide a forum for exchanging ideas on the nature of scholarship and the reframing of faculty evaluation and rewards in American universities.

OSU's new guidelines eliminated the need for separate supplemental promotion and tenure guidelines which were previously used to describe scholarship in programs such as extension, international development, veterinary medicine and library and information services where scholarship sometimes does not fit the traditional research model of results published in peer reviewed journals.

In short, Oregon State University's new promotion and tenure guidelines:

- Reaffirm that scholarship is required of all professorial faculty, and articulate a definition of scholarship that applies across the arts and sciences.

- Require that an annually updated position description serves as the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance. The position description explicitly describes assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort among assigned duties, scholarship, and service for each faculty position.

Identify performance of assigned duties and scholarly achievement as the two primary areas for evaluating faculty performance. Recognize that service performed by faculty members which is not part of their duties is a secondary area of performance evaluation. Assigned duties such as administration, extension, outreach and student advising are not considered to be service when they are assigned to a faculty member. By the same token these activities are considered to be service when they are performed by a faculty member whose assigned duties lie in some other area, such as research or teaching.

- Recognize teaching, research, and outreach as vital university missions and faculty activities—that are not scholarship in themselves— but which can each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated intellectual work (scholarship) in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry). This is a significant departure from Ernest Boyer's view of teaching per se as scholarship.

- Recognize that peer validation and communication are separate processes that can occur in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, peer-referred publications. When peer validation and communication are accomplished in non-traditional ways it is important for a faculty member to clearly describe and document how they were accomplished. The guidelines emphasize "communication in appropriate ways so as to have impact on or significance for publics beyond the University, or for the
• Recognize that teachers and extension educators can do scholarly work in the form of research in their subject-matter discipline or by developing improved education materials, methods, or programs.

• Recognize that the audiences for scholarship in research are usually disciplinary peers worldwide, but that audiences for scholarship in teaching, extension and site-specific field research are often more localized. The promotion and tenure guidelines language was changed to reflect this reality—from "professors must achieve a national or international reputation for their scholarship" to "professors must achieve distinction in scholarship as evident in the candidate's wide recognition and significant contributions to the field or profession."

• Emphasize that the University values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report their contributions to significant team efforts in documenting their accomplishments.

• Recommend that documentation of achievements focus whenever possible on what was accomplished rather than how it was accomplished; on substance rather than form; on accomplishments rather than activities. In short, on describing what changed or improved as a result of a faculty member’s efforts.

The OSU Promotion and Tenure guidelines acknowledge that the faculty of a university performs essential and valuable activities that are not scholarship. The guidelines explicitly describe scholarship as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated including: discovery of new knowledge; development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses; integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and artistry that creates new insights and understandings. This view acknowledges that scholarship can be carried out by knowledgeable creative people throughout society—not just at universities. It emphasizes the importance of ensuring validity, and of communicating to broader audiences to ensure that results of scholarship will be accessible and useful to others, and articulates the fundamental nature of scholarly achievement that applies across all disciplines.

Citizen advisors value OSU’s new guidelines which they feel will recognize and reward excellence in faculty efforts that will benefit students and citizens in Oregon. Several universities are finding that the Oregon State University definition of scholarship provides a useful conceptual basis for their institution’s deliberations about faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure and post-tenure review. University faculties, and the broader public, seem ready to change faculty evaluation and reward processes.

Additional information, shown below, can be obtained from: Office of Academic Affairs, Oregon State University, 628 Kerr Administration Building, Corvallis, OR 97331, (541)737-0732 or gigi.bruce@orst.edu


☐ Draft paper, 1995 "The Value System of a University—Rethinking Scholarship" by C. J. Weiser describing in more detail the process at OSU and the changes that resulted.

C. J. Weiser
November 1997
Universities nationwide are considering changes in faculty evaluation and rewards. They are weighing choices for matching what is expected of faculty members with the several missions of a comprehensive university.

**Scholarship Unbound** is a national workshop designed to help those who lead and set policy for universities to consider ways of reframing faculty evaluation and rewards. The workshop is designed to be of particular value to three- to six-member institutional teams. About 250 participants are expected to attend this event, which begins at noon Thursday, October 1, and adjourns by noon on Saturday, October 3.

Supported and sponsored by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Scholarship Unbound is hosted by Oregon State University and its Faculty Senate. Co-sponsors include the American Association of Higher Education, and others.

**The workshop** is designed to be highly participative and will focus on helping you and your institutional team find value from its many components:
- Three keynote speakers of national stature.
- Thirty-five discussion sessions led by distinguished experts.
- An Idea Fair for sharing materials and ideas through discussion, posters, and displays.
- Table Talk sessions in which small groups reflect on specific topics.
- University team meetings where you may develop plans with colleagues while the day’s ideas are fresh in mind.

**The program** will draw on the experiences of several universities that have defined scholarship broadly in revising their promotion and tenure guidelines and processes. Among them are Oregon State University (with three years of experience with new guidelines) and Iowa State University (where a 1998 faculty referendum approved guidelines developed by its Faculty Senate).
Scholarship Unbound

Reframing faculty evaluation and rewards

Who Should Attend
The workshop is especially suited for teams of faculty representatives, administrators and members of external boards, but individual attendees will also find significant value. To help team members gain the most from their experiences, workshop planners will send registrants a set of questions intended for discussion before the team leaves home.

Outcome
At the workshop, plans will be developed by individuals or teams for fostering and accelerating change in their university's evaluation process and reward system. Conferees will have the opportunity to consult with faculty counterparts and peers from universities that are implementing changes, and with noteworthy scholars who will provide advice and perspective.

Agenda Main Topics

Thursday Afternoon (October 1)
- The Forces Driving Change in University Values
- Examples of Cultural Changes at Universities
- Idea Fair:
  Displays
  Discussion
  Posters
- Concurrent Discussion Sessions
- Work Session for University Teams

Friday (October 2)
- Building the Conceptual Foundation for Change
- The Professor and Scholar for the 21st Century
- Reframing Faculty Evaluation and Rewards
- Identifying Barriers and Building Consensus

Saturday Morning (October 3)
- Generating Momentum for Progress
- Reflections from Distinguished Experts
- The View from Beyond the Academy
- The American University for the 21st Century
- Open Forum

For More Information
For registration information, contact Oregon State University at (541) 737-2329. E-mail: duncanp@ccmail.orst.edu
Location
The workshop will be held on the Oregon State University campus. Eugene and Portland airports are 45 miles and 95 miles from Corvallis respectively. Registered participants will receive information in their confirmation packet on motels, meeting locations, and rental cars and alternative airport transportation. Information about Corvallis and vicinity is available at www.visitcorvallis.com. Those who spend an extra day or two will find plenty to enjoy at the nearby Pacific Coast, visiting Willamette Valley wineries or in the snow-capped Cascade Mountains.

Registration
You may enroll for the workshop by mail, telephone (541-737-2329), e-mail (duncanp@ccmail.orst.edu), Fax (541-737-4966), or via the World Wide Web at http://www.cof.orst.edu/cof/extended/conferenc/scholar. The registration fee can be paid by either check or credit card. The first 250 registrations will be accepted.

Idea Fair
Participants will be invited to discuss and display what their university is doing with regard to faculty evaluation via posters, materials, handouts or dialog. Details will be provided in the registration confirmation packet.

Fee
The early registration fee will be $200 until Monday, September 14. After that date, the fee is $260. This pays for the workshop program, handouts, refreshment breaks, two lunches, and two dinners.

Cancellations
If you cancel your reservation at least seven working days prior to the start of the workshop you will receive a full refund. Thereafter, a late-cancellation charge will be made. Substitutions of participants are acceptable.

Target Audience:
- Administrators
- Key Faculty Members
- Representatives of External Boards

Scholarship Unbound: Reframing Faculty Evaluation & Rewards

Registration Form
October 1 – 3, 1998

Fee: $200 by Sept. 14
$260 Thereafter

Name ____________________________
Mailing address ____________________________
City __________________ State __________ Zip __________
Telephone __________________ Fax __________________

Workshop Fee: $200 Payment: ☐ Check enclosed. Please make check payable (in US dollars) to OSU.
Charge to: ☐ Visa ☐ Mastercard Account number ____________________________
Expiration date __________ Name as it appears on card ____________________________

Mail to Scholarship Unbound Workshop, Oregon State University, 202 Peavy Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331-5707. Fax (541) 737-4966; Phone (541) 737-2329; e-mail: duncanp@ccmail.orst.edu
Scholarship Unbound
Reframing faculty evaluation & rewards
Scholarship...
...creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and communicated.
Forms of scholarship include:

- Discovery of new knowledge;
- Development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses;
- Integration of knowledge leading to new understandings; and
- Artistry that creates new insights and interpretations.
Recognizes teaching, research, and extended education as vital university missions and faculty activities--that are not scholarship in themselves--
- Each involve creative, communicated, peer-validated intellectual work (scholarship) in any of its several forms (discovery, development, integration, artistry).
Requires that a position description provide the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance.
- The position description will describe assigned duties, relevant areas of scholarship, and the relative balance of effort among assigned duties, scholarship, and service.
Emphasizes that the University values and encourages collaborative work, and asks faculty members to report specifically their contributions to the results of significant team efforts in documenting their accomplishments.
Recognizes that peer validation and communication can occur in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, peer refereed publications.
Recognizes that teachers and extension educators could focus their scholarship in a subject-matter discipline or in developing improved education materials, methods, or programs.
Scholarship Litmus Test

Was there:
- Creative Intellectual work?
- Peer Validation?
- Communication?
Policy:

Oregon State University has a responsibility to describe the expectations it has of each faculty member. Performance and scholarship expectations will be described in all announcements and descriptions of tenure track faculty positions.

The University has two fundamental expectations of each faculty member:

- that they will meet or exceed acceptable levels of productivity in performing their job; and
- that they will perform scholarship that is relevant to their position.

Content:

The position announcement and position description shall include performance and scholarship expectations related to the University’s three missions in teaching, research, and extended education.

The major duties and responsibilities of a position, and the scholarship expectations specific to that position will be described. Oregon State University recognizes scholarship in teaching and learning, discovery, artistic creativity, integration, and application. The scholarly expectations for a position will be described in terms of the:

- type(s) of scholarship that are relevant
- primary audiences for the scholarship
- primary means of communicating the scholarship
- primary criteria of validating the scholarship
- primary means of documenting the scholarship.

Process:

The position announcement and position description, prepared at the time a faculty position is proposed will include a description of performance and scholarship expectations appropriate to that position.

When PROF reviews (periodic review of faculty) are conducted the position description will be used as a basis for evaluating a faculty member’s progress and performance. The position description will be reviewed at this time and modified if there are changes. The initial position description shall be approved (signature lines) by the lead supervisor, and the tenure and funding unit supervisor(s) (if different). Modified position descriptions shall additionally require the signature of the faculty member. The lead supervisor is responsible for drafting the initial position description, and for proposing subsequent modifications.
Promoting early career development of tenure-track faculty

Policy statement
Oregon State University supports the professional development of its faculty and staff. To assist tenure-track faculty members in the period before tenure is granted, the lead supervisor is encouraged to enlist counsel and mentoring from selected tenured faculty whose knowledge and experience is relevant to the primary job responsibility, scholarship, and job performance of a newly hired or appointed faculty member. These selected faculty serve as peer counselors.

Objectives
For the new faculty member, this relationship is intended to promote greater career satisfaction, assure focus on important aspects of career development and success in job performance, assist in networking with other professionals, and enhance an understanding of the missions of the University. For a peer counselor, selection affirms recognition of professional leadership in a role that provides valuable service to the University. Participation as a peer counselor offers opportunities to review and upgrade knowledge, renew professional interests, and gain satisfaction from participating in the professional growth of a fellow faculty member.

Process
Within the first 60 days after a tenure-track faculty member is appointed, the faculty member's lead supervisor is encouraged to enlist at least two peer counselors who are willing to work with the newly appointed person. Those appointments continue until the supervisor, the peer counselor(s), or the faculty member choose to discontinue them. It is the University's intent that faculty members have the benefit of peer counselors at least until indefinite tenure is granted.

Responsibilities

Lead supervisor

- Enlists two or more tenured faculty (from within or outside the tenure unit of the new faculty member) who are willing to serve as peer counselors. These individuals should be considered by their peers as expert in areas closely related to the new faculty member's primary job responsibility and scholarship.
- Provides peer counselors with a position description which includes scholarship and performance expectations.
Policy: Promoting early career development of tenure-track faculty

Oregon State University

- Consults at least annually with the peer counselors regarding the faculty member's progress.
- Considers changes in peer counseling assignments when the faculty member, the lead supervisor, or the peer counselors believe it is appropriate.

Peer counselors

- Advise the faculty member in achieving job performance and scholarship expectations as described in the position description including at least one session annually with the faculty member.
- Acquaint themselves with the quality and character of the faculty member's professional performance in areas of principal responsibility. This may require observing the faculty member's performance in classroom, laboratory, field, and other professional settings.
- Keep the lead supervisor informed of the counsel being provided to the new faculty member and of the faculty member's progress.

Individual faculty member

- Regularly informs lead supervisor and peer counselors of professional plans, programs, and objectives.
- Invites peer counselors to critique plans and performance.
- Seeks advice and guidance from lead supervisor and peer counselors.

March 1994

Peer counselors (OSU version)
Policy
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Reporting results of team effort

The complexity of issues that scientists and educators at a Land Grant university deal with in their teaching, research, extended education, and international assignments often extend beyond the expertise of an individual. The university values effective collaboration, recognizes that it often requires extra effort, and wishes to encourage and reward faculty members who contribute effectively to team efforts.

When appropriate, please add a Results of Team Efforts category to whatever professional vitae format you use for documenting your accomplishments. In this category briefly state significant team accomplishments (not activities), identify your collaborators, and describe your role in the team effort. Report accomplishments (not activities in progress) that resulted from team efforts only where your contributions were significant.

March 1994
Forms of Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the Scholarship</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Artistic Creativity</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With learners, develops and communicates new understanding and insights; develops and refines new teaching content and methods; fosters lifelong learning behavior.</td>
<td>Generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Interprets the human spirit, creates and communicates new insights and beauty; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Synthesizes and communicates new or different understandings of knowledge or technology and its relevance; develops and refines methods.</td>
<td>Develops and communicates new technologies, materials or uses; fosters inquiry and invention; develops and refines new methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary audiences scholarship

| Learners: Educators; peers. | Peers: Supporters of research; Educators; Students; Patrons; Students; Publics. | Various publics: Educators; Students; Peers. | Users: Educators; Students; Peers. | Users: Customers; Educators; Peers. |

Primary means of communicating scholarship

| Teaching materials and methods; Classes; Curricula; Publications and presentations to educators; peers and broader publics. | Peer-reviewed publications and presentations; Patents; Public reports and presentations. | Shows, performances and distribution of products, reviews, news reports; copyrights; peer presentations and journals, publications. | Presentations, publications, demonstrations, and patents. | Demonstrations and presentations to audiences; Patents; Publications for users; Periodicals and reports; Peer-presentations and publications. |

Primary criteria validating scholarship

| Originality and significance of new contributions to learning; depth, duration and usefulness of what is learned; lifelong benefits to learners and adoption by peers. | Originality, scope, and significance of new knowledge; applicability and benefits to society. | Beauty, originality, impact, and duration of public value; scope and persistence of influence and public appreciation. | Usefulness and originality of new or different understandings, applications, and insights. | Breadth, value, and persistence of use and impact. |

New scholarship documented

| Teaching portfolio: summaries of primary new contributions, impacts on students and learning; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, significance and impact in advancing knowledge, new methods, public benefits; communication and validation by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, public interest, and impact; communication to users, scope of adoption and application, impact and benefits; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, significance and scope of use and benefits; commercial and societal value; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. | Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users, significance and scope of use and benefits; commercial and societal value; acceptance and adoption by peers; evidence of leadership and team contributions. |
Documenting scholarship: some examples

Teaching and Learning

Describe your original and most significant scholarly contributions to teaching and learning.

Document impacts of your contributions on student learners, in terms of gains such as enhanced student understanding, retention, behavioral change, and subsequent performance.

Document your communication of scholarly contributions to educators and summarize evidence of peer acceptance, recognition, or citation of your contributions.

Analyze student, and peer (or public) evaluations of your courses, materials, curricula, and teaching or advising methods.

Summarize evidence of your leadership and contributions to successful efforts, as a scholar.

Discovery

Describe your original and most significant discoveries and scholarly contributions.

Document the impacts of your contributions in terms of outputs such as advancement of scientific discovery and understanding within and beyond your area of inquiry, and public benefits attributable to your scholarship.

Document your communication of scholarly contributions to peers, and summarize evidence of peer validation, acceptance, or use of your contribution.

Summarize evidence of your leadership, and contributions to successful efforts, as a scholar.

Artistic creativity

Describe your original and most significant creative accomplishments.

Document the impacts of your creative contributions in terms of results, as public, patron, and student acceptance, attendance, and interest in your work.

Document your communication of scholarly contributions to artists and art peers, and summarize evidence of their recognition, acceptance, and use of your contributions.

Describe the size and scope of the audience for your creative scholarship, and summarize evidence of peer, patron, and commercial support of your scholarship.

Summarize evidence of your leadership and contributions to successful team efforts, as a scholar.

Integration

Describe your original and most significant accomplishments in creating new and different understandings and uses of information.

Document the adoption and applications of your integrative contributions by others.

Document your communication of scholarly achievement to public and peer audiences, and summarize evidence of their recognition, acceptance, and use of your scholarship.

Summarize evidence of your leadership, or contributions to successful team efforts, as a scholar integrator.

Application

Describe the original and most significant applications resulting from your scholarship of application.

Document the impacts of your creative development of new materials, technologies, or uses in terms of results such as scope of use, markets, and benefits of your contribution.

Document your communication of contributions to users, publics, and peers, and summarize evidence of their recognition and use of your contributions.

Summarize evidence of your leadership, and contributions to successful team efforts, as a scholar.