Reconsidering the Paradigm of Scholarship
A Broader View: Boyer and Glassick’s Models

Q: Is it possible to define the work of faculty in ways that reflect more realistically the full range of academic and civic mandates?

A: The work of a scholar means stepping back from one’s investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one’s knowledge effectively.

DEFINING SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship of Discovery

Makes “a commitment to the advancement of knowledge, freedom of inquiry, and investigation”
- Contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge, but also to outcomes, process, and passion for the effort.
  - Asks the question, “What is to be known, what is yet to be found?”

Scholarship of Teaching

Does the scholar state the basic purpose of his or her work clearly?
- Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?
- Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

Scholarship of Integration

Makes “connections across disciplines, placing specialties in a larger context, or illuminating data in a revealing way”
- When serious disciplined work seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research.
  - Asks the question, “What do the findings mean?”

Scholarship of Application

“Applies the outcomes of discovery and integration and moves knowledge towards engagement”
- Asks the questions:
  - “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?”
  - “How can it be helpful to individuals as well as institutions?”

Scholarship of Engagement

Connects “the rich resources of academic institutions to pressing social, civic, and ethical problems present in communities”
- Community Engaged Scholarship represents faculty work in communities through:
  - teaching
  - research
  - community responsiveness
  - service
  - clinical and population-based care

Glassick’s Criteria – Assessing the Quality of Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear Goals</th>
<th>Adequate Preparation</th>
<th>Appropriate Methods</th>
<th>Significant Results</th>
<th>Effective Presentation</th>
<th>Reflective Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Does the scholar state the basic purpose of his or her work clearly?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar achieve the goals?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar’s work add consequently to the field?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating the work to its intended audiences?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar’s work open additional areas for further exploration?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?</td>
<td>- Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References: