

PACIFIC JOURNAL



VOL. 1, NO. 1
2006

Preface

D. Merrill Ewert

The *Fresno Pacific Idea* has framed intellectual inquiry at this university since its inception as a four-year institution. The *Idea* calls the university to be Christian in its world view, collaborative in its practice, and transformative in its orientation.

This means, first of all, that students must be challenged to think Christianly about the world—about the nature of knowledge, the process of scholarship, and the meaning of truth. Christian scholarship must be grounded in an understanding of God as creator of the universe, affirming the authority of Scripture over matters of faith and life, and acknowledging the unity of body and spirit, mind and matter. It will call people to a life of discipleship, holiness, witness, and service as well as learning and knowing. It will integrate faith and learning, as Arthur Holmes so eloquently argues in his classic book, *The Idea of a Christian College*. Students will sharpen their skills of observation as they look at the world around them, developing the ability to think critically under the careful supervision of their faculty mentors.

Since Plato and Aristotle, we have understood that learning happens best through dialogue, challenge, and debate. John Dewey taught us that reflective thinking is the key to human development. More recently, the constructivists have clearly demonstrated that much of our knowledge is socially constructed. Without community, knowledge becomes idiosyncratic; ideas are untested and people become narrow-minded and dogmatic. That provides the argument for collaborative scholarship and peer review. In his highly acclaimed book, *The Role of the American University: The Creation of the Future*, Cornell University President Emeritus Frank Rhodes calls the loss of community within the academy, catastrophic. This loss, Rhodes says:

“...undermines the very foundation on which the universities were established; the conviction that the pursuit of knowledge is best undertaken by scholars, living and working, not in isolation, but in the yeasty and challenging atmosphere of community.”

Fresno Pacific’s commitment to community also calls us to marshal our intellectual resources and disciplinary skills in ways that not only examine the problems and issues facing our society, but put our scholarship to work on behalf of humankind. This is more than an academic opportunity; it is a moral imperative for the Christian university.

The *Fresno Pacific Idea* also calls us to be prophetic, speaking out in conscience—speaking to and critiquing contemporary culture and practice. We invite our community and church to use the tools of our academic disciplines to help find answers to some of the most vexing and difficult issues facing our society. Fresno Pacific University can help by building a culture of scholarship in the Church.

The Church and society itself are plagued by growing anti-intellectualism. Wheaton College historian Mark Noll, in his thoughtful book, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, diagnoses the problem. Evangelical Christians, he suggests, have oversimplified issues, substituting inspiration and zeal for analysis and reflection. The scandal of the Evangelical mind, he argues, is that there *is* no evangelical mind. Noll calls for Christians to build a culture of scholarship that engages faculty members and their students in the search for truth.

We need a culture of inquiry that is dissatisfied; that is motivated not by the fear of failure but by the joy of discovery. As Christian scholars, we can contribute to the development of our disciplines while also helping the Church and society answer the tough questions. We have the enormous privilege of working in higher education. Anthony Diekema, former president of Calvin College, in his book, *Academic Freedom: Christian Scholarship*, declared: “Life in the academy was originally intended to be a . . . noble covenant, a mutually beneficial partnership with society . . .”

This monograph series contributes to that partnership by engaging Fresno Pacific University faculty in sharing their scholarship about issues that matter to the Church and society.

What is Scholarship?

Rod Janzen, editor

Introduction

Fifteen years ago, Ernest Boyer wrote the influential book *Scholarship Reconsidered*.¹ In it he suggested that we broaden the way in which “scholarship” is defined, in order to recognize not only those who do original research (what Boyer called “the scholarship of discovery”) but also faculty members who are involved in three other scholarly arenas -- what Boyer referred to as the scholarship of integration, application and teaching.² Boyer decried the minimal amount of knowledge about the teaching and learning process and saw the need to expand the domain of investigation. (A related study, *Scholarship Assessed*, was issued in 1997.³)

Boyer’s own experience in higher education was wide ranging—from teaching at a small Brethren in Christ institution (Upland College) in southern California, to U.C. Santa Barbara and Princeton. Boyer also served as Chancellor of the State University of New York and as the United States Commissioner of Education.

Following Boyer’s publication, the American Association for Higher Education requested responses from various discipline-based professional organizations (such as the Joint Policy Board for Mathematics and the American Historical Association). These statements were published in two volumes, in 1995 and 2000, respectively.⁴ The groups were not in complete agreement on how to break down the different scholarship categories. But they did show consensus on six general “scholarship” features: In their view, anything worthy of this designation had to:

- require a high level of discipline-related expertise
- break new ground, be innovative
- be capable of replication or elaboration
- show the possibility of being documented
- go through a peer-review process
- have significance or impact.⁵

Simultaneously, here at Fresno Pacific, then-Academic Vice-President Howard Loewen and other administrators and faculty members were also thinking and talking about different notions of scholarship. In 1995, Loewen sent faculty members a copy of a treatise he enthusiastically entitled, “A Manifesto for Educational Research at Fresno Pacific College.”⁶ Loewen’s communiqué noted, among other things, that “the need for research underlines the provisional nature of knowledge.”⁷ He recommended that scholarly activities at Fresno Pacific College (later “University”) be tied to the institution’s *Idea*⁸ statement.

The graduate school faculty retreat at Casa Pacifica that same year incorporated the research definition agenda. In addition, during the 1995-96 and 1996-97 school years undergraduate/graduate faculty seminars focused attention on this issue. After this, formal university-wide conversations about research and scholarship went into a cruising mode, although the Graduate School continued to provide significant funding for faculty attendance at professional conferences, while Undergraduate Dean Stephen Varvis was successful in substantially increasing financial support for college faculty to do the same.

There is no question that Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* has had major influence on higher education. While some lament the movement away from pure research, most welcome the new insights and wider view of the demanding intellectual work of faculty members. Among comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges, renditions of the four categories of scholarship are well ensconced within faculty handbooks. Only research universities have been slow to consider these new definitions.

In the past two years Christian educators have also been introduced to a number of important books that discuss the relationship between scholarship and different faith traditions. Two of these are Douglas Henry and Bob Agee's *Faithful Learning and the Christian Scholarly Vocation* and Douglas and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen's *Scholarship & Christian Faith: Enlarging the Conversation*.⁹ This is another significant area for discussion.

But this monograph focuses on scholarship interpretations through four essays, each of which discusses one of the Boyer scholarship definitions, and gives specific attention to what these interpretations might mean for the work of faculty members. In this regard I begin with a reflection on the scholarship of discovery with David Alan Thompson providing a brief response from the perspective of a science professor. This piece is followed by articles by Patricia Anderson (the scholarship of application), Michael Kunz (the scholarship of integration) and Stephen Varvis (the scholarship of teaching).

The Scholarship of Discovery

Rod Janzen

Definitions

First a comment about definitional diversity: The way in which Boyer uses the word “discovery” is not the way that academics in the field of education employ the term. Following Jerome Bruner, discovery—in the education literature—is a learning approach that emphasizes active student learning as the optimal way to inspire conceptual development and the ability to solve problems.¹⁰ Discovery in this context is to a considerable extent controlled by teachers, who decide which questions are asked, which methods are followed and often where the problem-solving investigations end up—so that students “discover” whatever it is that teachers want them to discover.

An alternative learning approach referred to as “inquiry” is more generative—and more akin to what Boyer calls discovery—although it does not necessarily focus on original research and is more relevant in some academic disciplines than in others. Inquiry emerges from the motivations and curiosity of students as well as teachers—following John Dewey’s notion of “reflective inquiry”¹¹ and Paulo Freire’s “problem-posing”¹²—and may lead toward the construction of new understandings.

Using these definitions, one might refer to original research as the “scholarship of inquiry.” Nonetheless, for the purpose of discussing scholarship in general using Boyer’s “discovery” definition has become widely accepted.

Original Research

Boyer defines discovery scholarship as original research. It is “a commitment to knowledge for its own sake,” to “freedom of inquiry” and “an investigation to wherever it may lead.”¹³ According to the American Historical Association, this kind of scholarship leads to the “uncovering and exchange of new information,”¹⁴ causing the shape of previous interpretations to be re-assessed and introducing participants to ideas for continuing research in different areas. Discovery is any activity that generates new knowledge in the context of any subject field.

The research process itself is an exciting and meaningful endeavor for those involved. Something new is being sought after, found in some incarnation and thought about. The discovery operation is also consequential for whoever participates in the information-sharing and discussion phase of this venture. Thus it contributes, as Boyer puts it, to “the intellectual climate of a college...”¹⁵

The scholarship of discovery demands collective appraisal by peers at different junctures in the process; perhaps while the research is being done—and perhaps because the project is a team effort. But in any case a critical peer review transaction typically precedes and follows publication or presentation of research findings, whether the latter appear in the form of a book, a journal article or perhaps a museum exhibit or government policy paper. Discovery assumes research that is shared with others in a public setting at some point, in some context.

Original research is the kind of scholarship that is often deemed most important at this country’s most prestigious universities (at times to the detriment of other scholarship forms). But the scholarship of discovery has not been given much support at Fresno Pacific. For example, after I published a book on the Synanon community with The Johns Hopkins University Press in the summer of 2001¹⁶—and

even after it was reviewed in such places as the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the *Journal of American History*, the *L.A. Times*, the *Nation* and *Utopian Societies*—there were no book-signings or public conversations that might have included our own faculty as well as local scholars, former Synanon members, drug rehabilitation experts, American history enthusiasts and the like. Personally, I continued, until three years ago, to be congratulated primarily for teaching, mentoring and performing administrative responsibilities. These are the things that we do well here at Fresno Pacific; that students and constituents talk most glowingly about. And these are the very important functions for which faculty members are most recognized.

The Scholarship of Discovery and History

With regard to the subject field of history specifically, original research typically involves an analysis of both primary and secondary source materials. The two are then appraised transformatively or “integratively” (using Boyer’s second scholarship definition).

To write the Synanon book I used a number of original sources, including encounter group (“game”) transcripts, Synanon school assignments, legal depositions, autobiographical accounts, comic books, taped music (including a great song called “Brainwashed,” that includes the lyrics, “I used to make my living by robbing stores... Now I’m brainwashed”: a creative response to concerns brought forward by anti-cult activists).¹⁷ I also interviewed about 150 former members (including one of the men in who placed the infamous rattlesnake in the mailbox, as well as attorney Paul Morantz, who opened up that mailbox only to have a rattlesnake—with its rattles removed—lunge out at him).

It was also necessary, however, to place the Synanon story in the context of California history and society in the 1950s, 60s, 70s and 80s. It was important to do a considerable amount of background reading in the drug rehabilitation literature. Research in history is usually a mix of the two scholarship types, discovery and integration. And discovery research is often tied to teaching as well. Personally it has even taken me into Boyer’s application category (in 1988, for example, I was chosen as a delegate to the Iowa Democratic Party county, district and state conventions, an unanticipated development precipitated by a case study—a collaborative Foxfire-like¹⁸ discovery effort undertaken with students in an American History class).

Historians do like to think that their approach to research is significantly different from that observed by many scientists since there is no demand in history that verifiable hypotheses be constructed with any power to predict. Historians do not assume behavioral consistency when dealing with people. Instead they rely on a more subjective, what Jean Elshtain has described as “impressionistic,”¹⁹ analysis of causal relationships, since history writing necessitates reflection on difficult-to-evaluate values, biases and emotional preferences.

There is also a divergence in methods of inquiry between history and science. The fundamental distinction (according to American historian John Lewis Gaddis) is between a reductionist and an ecological view of reality.²⁰ Historical events have many antecedents. People do things for a variety of reasons, not always selecting the most obvious or rational pathways; thus the difficulty of predicting the future. Look what happened, for example, between 1989 and 1991 in Eastern Europe. And recall Cambodian Prince Norodom Sihanouk’s on-again, off-again flirtation with different forms of Marxism, including the genocidal Pol Pot regime, in the 1970s.

Historians, as Gaddis notes, reject “the doctrine of immaculate causation which seems to be implied in the idea that one can identify, without reference to all that has preceded it, such a thing as an independent variable” when studying the

past.²¹ Historical research is more qualitative, which places a significant ethical burden on the scholar, for as Michael Patton notes: “the validity and reliability of qualitative data depend to a great extent on the methodological skill, sensitivity and integrity of the researcher.”²²

Still history and science do have things in common: both rely extensively on the recognition of patterns—on the realization that some things are “like” other things. In the case of the Synanon project, the breaking-of-the-will activities that heroin addicts were forced to undergo at Synanon centers were ultimately replicated for non-addict (“square”) members when they were forced to perform jobs they did not want to do or did not know how to do. Jazz musician Ken Elias was told that the community needed a plumber; to quit playing the keyboard and start learning how to fix toilets.

Gaddis has also recently suggested that getting inside other people’s minds (very important in historical research) requires that your own mind is “open to their impressions—their hopes and fears, their beliefs and dreams, their sense of right and wrong, their perception of the world,” not just your own, or society’s.²³ In other words, you have to portray the reality you’ve experienced vicariously—as if being sent back in a time machine—and then you jump back into the present, in order to regain a sense of distance, of autonomy, before you begin to analyze what appears to have happened. What in the Synanon story, for example, caused leader Chuck Dederich, a confirmed alcoholic, to introduce the consumption of alcohol (prohibited previously) in 1978? I assume that recognition of the historical context is what led Merrill Ewert as well to publish an article (five years ago) tangentially supporting affirmative action, basing his argument on Paulo Freire’s reminder that we need to take into consideration that “historical conditions...reinforce feelings of inferiority, destroy self-confidence and produce myths to justify oppressive social structures.”²⁴

There is no single objective standard in history. It is constantly being re-assessed due to the addition of previously overlooked perspectives. We have only in recent times decided that women’s contributions, the impact of disease, the viewpoints of our own Native peoples—to name a few examples—are meaningful variables.

The Scholarship of Discovery at Fresno Pacific University

Note one example of a class discovery-like assignment that, although it does not meet Boyer’s criteria, involves large numbers of students in proto-scholarly activity. Students in the 20th Century America course are asked to do an interview project involving people who have been directly involved in a major movement in recent American history (e.g. Vietnam War veterans, former hippies, white migrants from the Midwest, Japanese-Americans interned during the 1940s, etc.). I too have simultaneously engaged in these discovery-comparable projects, such as one that involved Japanese-Americans whose farms were taken care of by neighbors while they were sent off to the desert.

This assignment caused one student (in a 1998 class) to discover the unique case of a Japanese child who was hidden away (from 1942-1944) by a white family in southern California. Many Japanese-Americans told me that Henry Martens (in Reedley), was the only car dealer who would sell vehicles to them when they returned to the area in late 1944. Martens did this under cover of night and he was heavily criticized for doing it. (A public sign in nearby Orosi read “Don’t Sell to Japs.”)

Another story: Relocation camp veteran Frank Abe said that he and his friend Virgil Goossen were walking home from school one day when they were

approached by a family friend of the Goossen's. He offered a ride home in his truck but then said pointedly, "Not you, Jap" when Frank started getting in alongside Virgil.²⁵ These stories, placed in proper historical context, have meaning beyond the time period within which they are situated and they create new knowledge.

One of the most important benefits of discovery scholarship is the impact that it has on teaching, in terms of encouraging general intellectual and practical honesty (for example, not asking students to do more than we are willing to do ourselves). It is also motivational (for both students and faculty), keeping one passionate and up-to-date about one's subject field. Research helps clarify conceptual foundations and pedagogical approaches and it forces greater attention to detail, to the logical construction of arguments. It demands proper attention to up-to-date sources due to the process of peer review and it promotes the professional exchange of ideas and practices (at times an important corrective). The sharing of research findings also establishes important relationships with the community-at-large.

Research and the *Fresno Pacific Idea*

The scholarship of discovery fits the *Fresno Pacific Idea*, the school's ethos definition, in a number of ways. (The *Idea* statement itself is found in the Appendix.) The Christian angle in much research is central. It is hard to think about history, for example, without thinking in moral terms. Questions of foundational meaning are basic, as George Marsden notes in his book *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*.²⁶ Similar issues are discussed by a number of writers in a recent book edited by Andrea Sterk (*Religion, Scholarship and Higher Education*).²⁷ Christian academics have a particular responsibility to look at nonviolent alternatives in different social situations,²⁸ always maintaining a sense of deep humility while doing so. Note the following cautionary excerpt from the Di Brandt poem, "Non-resistance or love, Mennonite-style":

"turn the other cheek when your brother
hits you & your best friend tells fibs
about you & the teacher punishes you
unfairly if someone steals your shirt
give him your coat to boot this will
heap coals of fire on his head & let him
know how greatly superior you are
while he & his cronies dicker & bargain
their way to hell you can hold your
head up that is down humbly knowing
you're bound for the better place....."²⁹

Christian perspectives determined to some extent what was included in the Synanon book. Most of one chapter evaluated the way in which this drug rehabilitation commune re-defined itself as a religion in 1974 (and was given letters of support from such luminaries as the theologians Gordon Kaufman and Richard Quebedeaux).³⁰ Perhaps even more important was the opportunity to reflect on a basically secular communal group from the perspective of previous research on Christian communities. Christian values impacted reflection as well on Synanon's decision in 1975 to ask all males over the age of 21 to have vasectomies.

Research, as noted above, involves a community of learners. As the *Idea* statement puts it: "... learning takes place through dialogue and discourse between people who have different experiences and perspectives...."³¹ Collaborative projects in particular fit this emphasis, both those that involve more than one faculty member

and those that involve students as research colleagues or assistants. One thinks here of anthropology professor Katrina Poetker's collaborative work with Bryant Leman, Alan Thompson's supervision of research conducted by Pulkit Sawroop, Merrill Ewert's idea for community-based projects and education professors Denise Rea and Sandra Mercuri's collaborative book project (in process). Research can also lead to prophetic commentary and action, as elucidated by the Japanese-American interview project, which brought forth strong personal indictments of past beliefs, policies and practices.

The “Scholarship of Discovery” at Fresno Pacific: a Possible Definition

How therefore should we define discovery scholarship at Fresno Pacific University? Consider the following:

“In most subject matter areas, discovery scholarship is original research that is published in peer-reviewed academic journals, bulletins, monographs or books. In the fine arts, discovery scholarship incorporates newly-created and publicly exhibited and/or performed works that undergo a peer-review process.”

This definition includes a mix of peer-reviewed publications, art exhibits, music compositions, etc., all of which bring forth new knowledge, new interpretations and new understandings in particular subject matter areas. Some of these projects might be undertaken by individual faculty members, working essentially on their own, while others might involve other FPU faculty, or perhaps represent a combined effort that includes colleagues from other institutions.

We might also encourage our students, particularly at the graduate level, to be involved in even more collaborative research projects with professors (as assistants), as well as to consider the possibility of publishing their own particularly strong papers or theses, as recently happened when Doug Noll, a graduate of the conflict and peacemaking management program, published his master's degree thesis as *Peacemaking at the Intersection of Law and Human Relations*.³² Beyond this, I believe that we should recognize those who are involved in a variety of in-class proto-discovery projects even though these research endeavors do not usually go through an external, outside-of-class review process.

When the various professional organizations were asked by the American Association of Higher Education to define the “scholarship of discovery,” they did not reach full agreement. There were too many differences in terms of subject matter specific work modes. The American Academy of Religion went on record opposed to the very notion of broadening the scholarship definitional categories: “We are not sanguine that redefining the word scholarship to cover teaching or other professional activities now not normally considered as such, is particularly useful or appropriate. Indeed it could well appear disingenuous, seemingly to stretch the categories like this in an attempt to gain what might otherwise be a worthy end”³³ (i.e. to recognize the importance of teaching and community involvement).

Most teachers at Fresno Pacific, who do not engage in the scholarship of discovery, likely do engage in significant personal research simply by the way in which they prepare for classes. Some of this research is, I suspect, not a lot different from what others have done in published studies and articles. Perhaps much of the latter is also of the same, if not higher, quality. This stuff is just not being reviewed by peers in the field. And it is hard for members of the academic community to be aware of what is happening when the sharing of such “research” does not leave the classroom.

Response from David Alan Thompson

As with historical research, scientific research poses an unanswered question (for example, a testable hypothesis regarding a natural phenomenon) with the goal of generating new and original knowledge. Most scientists lean toward the reductionist approach Janzen refers to. Here, issues of falsifiability and reproducibility—not as obviously applicable in historical research—are paramount.

However, while the scientific investigator may use existing data to accumulate a body of evidence germane to the question posed, the investigator may also generate the data via experimentation or observation. A further contrast lies in an intense focus on the use of logic and reason to move from the evidence to a conclusion regarding the hypothesis. As with historical research, the quality of the evidence, and of the logic used in reaching a conclusion, is generally subject to peer review prior to publication. Although there are concerns with respect to the quality of peer review in some disciplines, scientific research is notable not only for the occasional ethical lapse but also for intellectual moorings, such as falsifiable hypotheses, which convey a self-correcting character to the field.

Loewen's description of the "provisional nature of knowledge" is especially relevant. Scientific research enlivens academia not only through the generation of new knowledge, but also from the overturning of old paradigms (witness the conflict between Newtonian and quantum mechanical views of the physical world). Boyer points out that this process "contributes not only to a stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university."³⁴ Furthermore, most scientific research is of a collaborative nature, resonating well with the *Fresno Pacific Idea*.

One may envision how other aspects of scientific research fall within the framework of the *Idea* as well. Paradigms of Christian thought can influence the choice of research subjects, for example. While the results from such a study may contribute to prophetic commentary, the outcome of scientific research conducted without an intentional choice of subject can also inform dialogue in the academic community. For example, quantum theory has made a substantial contribution to the discussion regarding the materialistic/mechanistic view of human beings.³⁵ Or, to take another example from physics, consider the current theoretical prediction that over 90 percent of the universe consists of "dark matter" (mass and energy) that "we can't see and don't really understand."³⁶ Certainly such observations have great potential to contribute to dialogue, resonating with a biblical perspective (for example, I Corinthians 2:16; Romans 11: 33-34 and Isaiah 55:9) as they remind us of our finite, limited natures.

Scientific research does present a contrast to much of the research in other disciplines since it generally uses people with varying degrees of technical expertise as well as sophisticated equipment and infrastructure. Because of these resource demands, much scientific research is a collaborative effort funded largely through extramural support.³⁷ While the costs of scientific endeavors such as space exploration are obviously prohibitive in a university, even "big biology" projects such as the human genome sequencing effort can consume millions of dollars per annum. Although this amount is larger than the research budget of the typical science research laboratory, even an average health sciences laboratory budget is hundreds of thousands of dollars per annum.³⁸

It is important, therefore, to examine the larger resource/reward structure in which research activities take place: the measures the university takes to facilitate research as well as the reward structure the university provides. With respect to resources, it may be worth evaluating whether faculty have sufficient resources to

conduct research. If material and monetary resources are available, do faculty have sufficient time to conduct research and compete for extramural grant funding? The implications of teaching load reductions for junior faculty and of positions such as the Fresno Pacific “Distinguished Scholar” position might be considered.

Research and teaching both consume time. This reality may be reflected in the lighter teaching loads at four-year doctoral institutions, larger classes and greater use of graduate students and lecturers. It has been estimated that the average full professor in a four-year doctoral institution spends 5.9 hours per week in instruction in the undergraduate classroom, while thirteen hours per week were spent by the average professor in a non-doctoral institution without a tenure system. Furthermore, it has been estimated that 57 percent of full-time faculty provided undergraduate credit instruction at four-year doctoral institutions, while 86 percent of full-time faculty did the same at four-year non-doctoral institutions.³⁹

A second aspect worth examining is the reward structure provided by the university. The “publish or perish” mentality has dominated the research university in recent decades: “...few professors ever receive tenure in a major university unless they are strongly motivated to work hard at their research.”⁴⁰ J.P. Hafler and F. H. Lovejoy indicate the culture at Harvard Medical School (HMS) has shifted from promotion based solely on publication (original scholarship) to promotion based on a “a broad array of educational contributions.”⁴¹ While their conclusion is debatable, HMS faculty now prepare portfolios that include not only original research, but a “broad array of educational contributions” such as teaching and committee service. Without incentives, a tenured professor may spend much of his/her time gardening.

Notes

¹ Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered* (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

² Ernest Boyer, 15-25.

³ Charles Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, Gene Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).

⁴ Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam, eds., *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional and Creative Work of Faculty* (Washington D.C., The American Association for Higher Education, 1995), and Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam, eds., *Disciplines Speak: More Statements on Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional and Creative Work of Faculty* (Washington, D.C., The American Association for Higher Education, 2000).

⁵ Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam, eds. (1995), 14.

⁶ Howard Loewen, “A Manifesto for Educational Research at Fresno Pacific College” (unpublished manuscript, 1995).

⁷ Howard Loewen, 1.

⁸ Fresno Pacific University, eds., *The Fresno Pacific IDEA* (Fresno, CA: Fresno Pacific University, 1995).

⁹ Douglas V. Henry and Bob R. Agee, eds., *Faithful Learning and the Christian Scholarly Vocation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003). Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen, eds., *Scholarship & Christian Faith: Enlarging the Conversation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

¹⁰ Jerome Bruner, *On Knowing* (Cambridge: Belknap, 1963).

¹¹ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Free Press, 1916). Bruner’s and Dewey’s discovery and inquiry positions are reviewed in Rod Janzen, “The Social Studies Conceptual Dilemma: Six Contemporary Approaches,” *The Social Studies* (May/June, 1995), 136.

¹² Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 1989), 67, 68.

¹³ Ernest Boyer, 17.

- ¹⁴ Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam, eds. (1995), 29.
- ¹⁵ Ernest Boyer, 17.
- ¹⁶ Rod Janzen, *The Rise and Fall of Synanon: A California Utopia* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).
- ¹⁷ "Sounds of Synanon Live in Concert at the Stew Temple," audiotope (April 27, 1979, Ken Elias Synanon Collection).
- ¹⁸ The Foxfire approach is outlined in Elliot Wigginton, *Sometimes a Shining Moment: The Foxfire Experience* (Garden City, Anchor, 1986).
- ¹⁹ Jean Bethke Elshtain, "Does, or Should, Teaching Reflect the Religious Perspective of the Teacher?" in Andrea Sterk, ed., *Religion, Scholarship & Higher Education: Perspectives, Models, and Future Prospects* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), 195.
- ²⁰ John Lewis Gaddis, *The Landscape of History: How Historians Map the Past* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). 54.
- ²¹ John Lewis Gaddis, 55.
- ²² Michael Quinn Patton, *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (Newbury Park: Sage, 1990).
- ²³ John Lewis Gaddis, 124.
- ²⁴ D. Merrill Ewert, "Proverbs, parables and metaphors: applying Freire's concept of codification to Africa" *Wajibu: A Journal of Social & Religious Concern* 13 (1998). 2.
- ²⁵ Details of the latter two stories were confirmed by Stan Martens (son of the late Henry Martens) and by Virgil Goossen.
- ²⁶ George Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).
- ²⁷ Andrea Sterk, ed.
- ²⁸ See, for example, James C. Juhnke and Carol M. Hunter, *The Missing Peace: The Search for Nonviolent Alternatives in United States History* (Kitchener: Pandora Press, 2001).
- ²⁹ Di Brandt, *Agnes in the Sky* (Winnipeg: Turnstone Press, 1990), 38.
- ³⁰ Rod Janzen, *The Rise and Fall of Synanon*, 168.
- ³¹ "The Fresno Pacific University Idea," Fresno Pacific University Catalog (2003-2004).
- ³² Doug Noll, *Peacemaking at the Intersection of Law and Human Relations* (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 2003).
- ³³ Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam, eds. (1995), 17, 18.
- ³⁴ Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 17.
- ³⁵ S. M. Barr, "Retelling the story of science," *First Things* 131 (2003), 16-25.
- ³⁶ L. Rowan and R. Coontz, "Welcome to the dark side: delighted to see you," *Science* 300 (2003), 1893.
- ³⁷ J. Cohen, "Scientists who fund themselves," *Science* 279 (1998), 178-181. Most scientific research is supported in part by private foundations, industry grants, and federal funding agencies although some research is done in full or partial independence of these sources.
- ³⁸ <http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/awards/award.htm> (July 9, 2003). The average NIH R01 grant in 2002 was approximately \$326,000.
- ³⁹ X. Chen and L.J. Zimble, *Teaching undergraduates in U.S. postsecondary Institutions* (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of education, National Center for Education Statistics (1998).
- ⁴⁰ Derek Bok, *The Commercialization of Higher Education* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 22.
- ⁴¹ J.P. Hafler and F.H. Lovejoy, "Scholarly Activities Recorded in the Portfolios of Teacher-Clinician Faculty," *Academic Medicine* 75 (2000). 649-652.

The Scholarship of Application

Patricia Anderson

Ernest Boyer describes application scholarship as a move toward understanding and knowledge of the real world. He asks how knowledge can “be responsibly applied to consequential problems” and how “social problems themselves define the agenda for scholarly investigation.”¹ Boyer notes that application scholarship earned early legitimacy through the formation of land-grant institutions established by federal law in 1862. The intent was for these schools to carry on research that helped people in their daily lives. But Boyer decried modern professional schools, whose purpose might include the application of theory to practice, but whose graduates were often ill prepared academically.

Boyer’s new definitions created a challenge for many who thought them too loose or sufficiently ambiguous, but he added some useful definitional boundaries. In particular, he clearly indicated that scholarship of application was not community service that might occur while serving on a board of directors, or in completing an accreditation document with others. Rather, scholarship of application is “serious, demanding work, requiring rigor—and accountability—traditionally associated with research activities.”²

Clearly, the seeds of confusion lie in the discussion of scholarship as service as a type of scholarship of application. Service is often identified as participating in community activities; either on campus in governance activities or off campus in a myriad of social endeavors. Boyer specifically points out the difference between “doing good,” as in good citizenship and the scholarship of application. He identifies the role of application scholarship as first requiring *that knowledge be discovered and then applied*. He indicates that new knowledge can flow out of every instance where it is being applied. He states:

Such a view of scholarly service—one that applies and contributes to human knowledge—is particularly needed in a world in which huge, almost intractable problems call for the skills and insights only the academy can provide.³

Boyer adds, “While social and civic projects are important, they should not be considered a part of the scholarship of application. What *should* be included are activities that relate directly to the intellectual work of the professor and carried out through consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation and the like.”⁴

What seems more critical in this definition of application scholarship is that there may be two different types of scholarship being described: 1) using one’s expertise to consult, write a grant, respond to accreditation, etc. and 2) testing or evaluating theory in practice, in a “real world” situation. The former provides onerous questions as to how to document an individual faculty member’s contribution to the project (particularly when several faculty members contribute to a report) and its relationship to the expertise of the faculty member. When one is consulting or contributing as an expert, Boyer calls for written descriptions of each faculty member’s contribution, something that is then subject to peer review, which might even include outside experts, in order to assess the significance of the contribution. In some ways this requires a more demanding analysis and reflection.

I would argue that defining scholarship as giving advice to community groups or collecting materials already developed by colleagues in an accreditation report may be considered valid, but whether results can be evaluated for their impact on societal problems is a long stretch. Such a definition hampers the development of

clear criteria for application scholarship in the many disciplines where it might be used. The latter definition of actually testing theory in practical settings requires assumptions to be tested, a research design, data collection (formative or summative and qualitative or quantitative) and written results prepared for peer review. Moving from theory to practice simply offers clearer opportunities to design and carry out ‘experiments’ based on theory.

Expanding definitions

Following Boyer’s death, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching asked three colleagues to prepare *Scholarship Assessed*⁵ from Boyer’s early writing, notes and lectures on this topic. In this document one sees the expansion of the scholarship of application to include yet a newer definition of application: the scholarship of engagement, which Boyer coined in a speech that was published after his death.⁶ The examples are similar—applying the skills and knowledge of the faculty to the problems and issues of the community. What is added are ways to evaluate such application or engagement. Questions that might be answered by the faculty member who engages in this approach to scholarship are the following: Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the discipline? Does the scholar’s work open additional areas for further exploration?⁷

Eugene Rice of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) indicates that Donald Schon has done much to enlarge this definition in his article in *Change* magazine.⁸ Schon, author of the *Reflective Practitioner*, describes the high ground of basic research where problems are “relatively unimportant to individuals and society at large” and the swamp where problems are messy and confusing, and where methods cannot be (as) rigorous.⁹ He calls this the dilemma of rigor or relevance, which he relates to the epistemology of the research university and that of professional schools. Scholarship of application falls into this messy yet relevant domain.

Schon describes application scholarship as not less important than that done by the more rigorous basic scholars, but that which must consist of the application of science or systematic knowledge to the problems of practice. He argues that we should not think of higher or lower schools of knowledge; rather, that application scholarship provides not only for putting knowledge into practice, but its very generation. Thus, it is not merely carrying out theory to practice, but testing its fidelity. He calls this action research. He says:

If community outreach is to be seen as a form of scholarship, then it is the practice of reaching out and providing service to a community that must be seen as raising important issues whose investigation may lead to generalizations of prospective relevance and actionability...The scholarship of application means the generation of knowledge for, and from action.

A recent ASHE ERIC Higher Education Report, *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer’s Four Domains*, published in 2002, provides greater clarity or perhaps greater confusion on application scholarship, depending on where a faculty member wants to focus her efforts. The authors of this report argue that service to the community, as long as it emanates from one’s scholarly discipline, should be considered scholarship.¹⁰ They list such examples as serving on community boards, on a university program review committee or preparing a seminar for local community members. Only in the appendix do the authors distinguish the above examples as scholarly activities rather than scholarship, per se. Compared to scholarly activities, “scholarship takes the form of unpublished scholarly outcomes and publications. Unpublished scholarly outcomes fully meet the definition of

scholarship if they appear in publicly observable form. By being publicly observable, unpublished scholarly outcomes meet the three criteria for scholarship delineated by Shulman and Hutchings: they must be public, subject to critical review and in a form that allows use and exchange by other members of the scholarly community.¹¹

Clearly the nuances of definitions and activities described by application scholarship are still formative. Whether serving on a university committee is a scholarly activity or scholarship confuses and perhaps enlarges such service beyond its merit.

Choosing to use the scholarship of application will require careful attention to the role of the faculty member in a community setting. Is she viewed as the expert and the community members as unequal participants? With ‘messy’ questions, will faculty members commit to the staying power (several years possibly) to plan and carry out program interventions and their evaluations? Is there a difference in terms of scholarship whether the faculty member provides consultation or engages in a lengthy study, which is presented or published in peer-reviewed venues? How will the academy judge the consultation? Is that consultation service rather than scholarship?

From the original definition to those versions finding their way into faculty handbooks, the scholarship of application has both a centered definition that receives little debate and multiple peripheral definitions that call for greater justification to link the activity to scholarship. The centered approach would require planning programs based on theory; evaluating professional programs whether a theory is posed or not, conducting meta-analyses of multiple program types, testing theories from multiple disciplines in a community setting and using knowledge to solve consequential problems. This is clearly scholarship that can be written about and presented.

Peripheral activities such as serving on a search committee, faculty executive or handbook committee, where questions of individual contribution, intensity of effort, expertise and even outcomes are more difficult to measure, or not perceived by most as scholarship, must engender greater specificity and justification if they are included as scholarship. It is critical that as we expand arenas for scholarly activity that we not fall into the trap where the public is presented with “inconsequential and trifling” activities at best or “the greatest intellectual fraud” at worst.¹²

Relationship of the *Fresno Pacific Idea* to Scholarship of Application

Fresno Pacific University faculty members carry on their work out of a deep value system described in the *Fresno Pacific Idea*. Three themes of the *Idea* are Christian influence, community and consequential outreach (prophetic). These themes might be connected through a statistical technique called path analysis. Christian influence leads to community, which in turn leads to disciplinary investment in our community. The *Idea* states in part:

...to be prophetic is to serve the church and society by engaging in dialogue with and critique of contemporary culture and practice. The university encourages informed reflection on personal, institutional and societal values which contribute to developing a vision for wholeness, justice and reconciliation. It offers leadership to the church and the world by enabling persons to extend perceptive, creative and skillful responses to current issues...

The problems of our society, in Fresno and beyond, call us to commit to using the best of our disciplines to consider solutions. Guided by our preparation in our disciplines and encouraged through the challenges in society, faculty should be on the forefront of analyzing, reflecting, offering solutions and evaluating solutions. These activities are application scholarship that flows naturally out of the prophetic theme of the *Idea*.

Examples

Following is a personal statement on application research as well as comments from four Fresno Pacific University faculty members.

1. *Testing Theory in Practice*: My article in the *Journal of Continuing Higher Education* entitled "Application of Curriculum Learning Outcomes from an Adult Baccalaureate Degree Program," tested theoretical research findings indicating that adults define success in learning as the ability to apply classroom learning to other settings, such as jobs. One conclusion suggested by this research with 185 Management and Organizational Development (MOD) alumni leaders from Fresno Pacific is that alumni working in leadership positions have been strongly proactive in taking leadership learning and applying this learning in their workplace. The findings of the research with these 185 Fresno Pacific MOD alumni leaders therefore suggest support for the literature. To summarize, adults are very intentional in what they seek to learn, and are very proactive at trying to put the learning gained to use in other life settings they consider important to them, such as the workplace. (Breck Harris, business faculty)
2. *Theory to Practice and Practice Revisions*: Several iterations of theory to practice, to research and practice, can be cited from a project I was involved with some years ago. During this period I was a consultant and researcher for a juvenile court in Washington State where the court was involved in a national demonstration project. As a consultant I was free to work with court officers and design new programs aimed at reducing delinquency. An early program in offering volunteers as mentors to juveniles referred to the court served as a springboard for another program: Family Crisis Intervention. This program was planned and implemented on various family intervention theories used in mental health. It was intended to extend that work to juvenile status offenders who are acting out sufficiently to be arrested or brought to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. Both the mental health setting and the juvenile setting were viewed as symptoms of family dysfunction. Critical to the intervention theory was that families are more open to change and growth during the period of crisis. The intervention approach was also based on one used in Texas for families in mental health crises, not criminal justice crises. The Texas program called on professional mental health therapists to be assigned to each member of the family. Multiple mental health members were each assigned to a family member in an intensive two-to-three day period. The purpose was to identify and explore problem issues in full families and to rotate among various smaller-than-family settings down to individuals. In all of these settings, the assigned therapist stayed with his/her assigned family member. The results were profoundly positive and lasting.¹³

If the program worked with professionals in a mental health setting, could trained volunteers work with families in crisis over a shorter period of time? A number of research questions surrounded the approach and outcomes. In short, volunteers were trained and even with more seriously delinquent juveniles and their families, the recidivism rates for those in a 6-8 hour intervention was significantly lower than that of similar offenders not provided the intervention. A report of the project design and findings was written with the collaboration of members of the juvenile court, a national research firm, volunteers and consultants. The U.S. Government Printing Office published the report, *Family Intervention*, for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (Patricia Anderson, provost)

3. *Implications from Practice:* From 1993-2004, I directed the Small Business Institute (SBI) program, or capstone class, for senior-year business students. This class assists students in their transition from the classroom to the workplace through a process that takes the theories learned in their undergraduate experience and applies them to actual business situations in the local community. Businesses are approached through the Central Valley Small Business Administration, the Central California Chamber of Commerce or through personal references. Working with the business owner or management team, the student teams design practical, realistic and affordable solutions to specific problems or challenges faced by their client business. Students work in teams of three to four. They are required to understand the client business or industry and to use the actual financial statements in developing solutions. Each team works confidentially and independently with their client through scheduled meetings during the semester. Regular classroom sessions are held to discuss similar problems or situations encountered in the projects and to review basic business concepts that all businesses face. Examples of some of the benefits to the clients include innovative concepts for marketing strategies, assistance with accounting systems, advice on the use of technology, diversification or expansion ideas. Students benefit through gaining a systemic view of the working of an actual business through hands-on organizational development work. At the end of the semester, students present their results to their clients in an oral report and provide their client a written and bound report with full details of their study. This project has been submitted to a professional peer-reviewed organization. (Consuelo Meux, former business faculty.)
4. *Disciplinary Expertise to Practice:* From 1992 to 1995, I served as a training consultant and counselor for the YWCA-Marjoree Mason Center in Fresno. In addition to keeping my counseling skills active and relevant to the courses I taught in Fresno Pacific's social work department, particularly "Foundations of Social Work Practice" and "Working with Groups." These community activities also gave me the opportunity to apply current theories of intervention to real-life situations and evaluate their usefulness. I also taught these counseling theories and skills to the staff of the center through various professional development training sessions that I conducted for them. In turn, my work at the center lead me to conduct a research project investigating the manner in which organizational structure impacts shelter workers'

ability to function effectively in their jobs. The research results were presented at the 2001 Pacific Sociological Association's annual meeting in San Francisco and a journal article is under review by the social work journal, *Affilia*. (Stacy Hammons, sociology faculty.)

5. *Theory Testing*: An important, but secondary, dimension of my doctoral study, "Negotiating Cultural Identities: Conflict Transformation in Labrador" (Syracuse University, 2002) raised key methodological questions concerning the relationship between the conflict intermediary role of mediator as carried out in the context of conducting applied research. I concluded that these roles are both compatible and complimentary and suggest that the praxis reflected in their unique combination provides a useful model for both ethnographic research and practice within the emerging field of conflict resolution. Following Burdick's (1998) approach to social movements' political analysis of culture, I suggest that a careful, measured ethnographic voice can be an added presence to a disputing party's analysis of conflict. Furthermore, I argue, following Hudson and Taylor-Henley's¹⁴ experience of conducting research among First Nations, that different aspects and forms of research are not best seen in their parts but essentially as a unified set of concepts and approaches. As the relatively new field of conflict resolution produces emerging scholar-practitioners—what some have called "pracademics"—this method and methodology will serve as a model for combining research and practice. (Larry Dunn, conflict management and peacemaking faculty)

Implications for Fresno Pacific University

Assuming that added diversity of scholarship is helpful, I pose the following definition for scholarship of application:

The scholarship of application includes all forms of scholarly inquiry that use current theory or knowledge gained from practice in new situations where knowledge is not complete. It generally takes the form of studying professional practice or programs using established research design protocols developed to solve real-world problems. It is intended to solve consequential problems.

Evidence would include published materials, both refereed and not, articles, monographs, books, music and exhibitions in the faculty member's field. Invited participation in programs or presentations at professional meetings, local community organizations and the like would serve as evidence. Obtaining grants requiring expertise in one's field would also qualify.

Service to the University

To avoid confusion and not reduce the value of service, service should be identified separately (as in teaching, scholarship and service) as a worthy endeavor of faculty members (as it has for at least the last 75 years in higher education).

University service activities would include those engaged on campus or off campus that arise from the faculty member's special field of knowledge. On-campus activities make significant contributions to the mission, *FPU Idea*, curricular,

educational and governance goals of the university. Off-campus service would include participation and leadership in professional or disciplinary organizations, accreditation teams, providing expertise to governmental agencies or court or law, serving on local boards of directors and participation in leadership of the church and her affiliate organizations.

Notes

- ¹ Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered* (New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990), 21.
- ² Boyer, 22.
- ³ Boyer, 23.
- ⁴ Boyer, 36.
- ⁵ Charles Glassick, Mary T. Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff. *Scholarship Assessed*. (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1997).
- ⁶ Ernest Boyer. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Outreach* (1996), 1, 11-20.
- ⁷ Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 29.
- ⁸ Donald A. Schon. "The New Scholarship Requires A New Epistemology." *Change*, Nov/Dec. 1995, vol 27. no 6.
- ⁹ Donald A. Schon, *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books, 1995).
- ¹⁰ John Braxton, William Luckey, and Patirica Helland, "Institutionalizing A Broader View of Scholarship Through Boyer's Four Domains," *ASHE ERIC Higher Education Report* (2002), 32.
- ¹¹ John M. Braxton, William Luckey, and Patricia Helland, 141.
- ¹² Martin Anderson, *Impostors in the Temple* (California: Hoover Institution Press, 1996).
- ¹³ Robert MacGregor et. al., *Multiple Impact Therapy with Families* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).
- ¹⁴ Burdick, John, "Uniting Theory and Practice in the Ethnography of Social Movements: Notes Toward a Hopeful Realism," *Dialectical Anthropology* 20 (1995), 361-385. Hudson, Peter and Sharon Taylor-Henley. 2001. "Beyond the Rhetoric: Implementing a Culturally Appropriate Research Project in First Nation Communities." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 25(2): 93-105.

The Scholarship of Integration

Michael Kunz

Those of us who, by grateful choice, teach at smaller Christian institutions of higher education do so with one clear understanding: our facility for conducting cutting-edge research is compromised. From the perspective of many of our peers who chose more traditional academic pathways, ours was a choice of, if not professional suicide, at least professional compromise. In our minds though, it is an avenue to pursue other tasks we value. Here we may teach a wide range of topics, we may interact closely with our students and our fellow faculty, we have opportunity to help shape the character of our program and our institution and here we may bring all that we are to our work—intellectual, personal and spiritual.

It therefore strikes a raw nerve when our professional worth is measured by a standard our teaching load inhibits, our institution can poorly support and toward which our passions and perhaps our gifts may not incline us. By the measure of peer-reviewed journal articles publishing original research, I am admittedly an academic failure. And I am not alone. Yet I have the confidence to believe that I and those like me are of more academic value than the traditional vita presents. It was with this conundrum in mind that Ernest Boyer called for an expanded understanding of the meaning of scholarship.¹

Boyer argued that original research into a particular discipline is only one of several types of scholarly activity. He considered the breadth of endeavors faculty actually engage in, and the range of objectives called for by the missions of various types of institutions of higher education. What resulted was a four-fold classification of scholarship: discovery, integration, application and teaching. In Boyer's view, a truer measure of evaluating the contribution of faculty requires that scholarship be redefined to match the range of institutional missions, faculty gifts and actual faculty practice.

Boyer's challenge to reconsider the nature of scholarship generated a wealth of responses from academia. We also have been called to reflect upon the nature of our scholarship at Fresno Pacific University. How do we define scholarship? How should our scholarship be evaluated? Are there particular forms of scholarship for which, by mission or organization or gifting, we are better prepared to undertake?

Characterizing the Scholarship of Integration

In Boyer's four-fold classification of scholarship, the second domain is that of integration. Boyer considered work at the boundaries of different disciplines to be integrative, especially as such work allows a larger context for understanding knowledge. Integrative scholarship is practiced when the academician places her own research, or the research of others, into larger intellectual patterns. Included in this domain is work that interprets knowledge to those outside the academic discipline. In simplified fashion, he considered the scholarship of discovery to address the question of, "What is to be known, what is yet to be found?" In contrast, the scholarship of integration addresses the question of, "What do the findings mean?"²

Glassick, Huber & Maeroff elaborated upon the aims and character of this type of scholarship:

Integration...involves faculty members in overcoming the isolation and fragmentation of the disciplines. The scholarship of integration makes connections within and between the disciplines, altering the contexts in which people view knowledge and offsetting the inclination to split knowledge into ever more esoteric

bits and pieces. Often, integrative scholarship educates non-specialists by giving meaning to isolated facts and putting them in perspective. The scholarship of integration is serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research.³

In the quest of a simple, four-fold typology of scholarship, Boyer, Glassick and others appear to link two somewhat different endeavors into a single category. The first is inter-disciplinary research, which can be as arcane and technical as any disciplinary subject. The distinction between this type of activity and the scholarship of discovery is not marked, since many interdisciplinary fields congeal over time into accepted disciplines. The second is interpretive work, which makes more complex and technical knowledge understandable to non-specialists. The two may have a common goal; Boyer suggests that such endeavors “can lead the scholar from information to knowledge and, even, perhaps, to wisdom.”⁴ The two can also be drawn together in works that interpret interdisciplinary discovery for general audiences. For our purposes, I will follow Boyer and consider both interdisciplinary and interpretive endeavors to fit within the domain of integration.

Delimiting and Assessing Integrative Scholarship

In expanding the notion of scholarship beyond that of the disciplinary, peer-reviewed journal article, Boyer and others provide examples and lists⁵ of the types of work that might be considered integrative scholarship. The range of potential activities is quite broad. Interdisciplinary articles, literature reviews, chapters and books written for academic audiences are included under the domain of integration. Since many of these will be peer-reviewed, there should be little controversy in considering them works of scholarship. Disciplinary literature and book reviews are also included here, presumably because they interpret a disciplinary field to its practitioners.

More controversial in many academic settings is the inclusion of popular writing as legitimate works of scholarship. This includes a wide range of written work, such as books, articles, textbooks and reviews. The venues for such writing include local newspapers, national magazines or university publications. The commonality among this diversity is that it interprets disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspectives to a wider audience.

Boyer and Glassick et al. also include activities associated with the development of curriculum under the heading of integration, perhaps because it performs the task of placing the discipline in context. Related to this category are activities such as the design of new courses and the development of curricula and instructional materials. The development of other media of communication such as software, videos and television programs has also been listed within the scholarship of integration.⁶

Moving beyond published works, integrative scholarship might include the development of cross-disciplinary seminars,⁷ lectures given to local audiences or talks given on radio or television.⁸ Even involvement in judging competitions and expert testimony have been proposed to fall within the purview of integrative scholarship.⁹

Given this plethora of suggested activities, how should the boundaries of legitimate integrative scholarship be drawn? One common benchmark for any scholarly work is that it must be public, and it must be capable of evaluation by some form of peer review.¹⁰ Others add the additional requirement that scholarly work be in a form capable of being used by other academics.¹¹ Glassick et al. maintain that all works of scholarship must meet six demonstrable, qualitative standards: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation

and reflective critique.¹² More specific to integrative scholarship, criteria for evaluation might include the advancement of public discourse, presentation of creative insights and clarification of issues and relationships.¹³

Once the criteria for scholarship are met, there is the second issue of the domain to which any particular work belongs. Academic interdisciplinary work could legitimately be considered the scholarship of discovery. Activities associated with curriculum design and instruction might fit more comfortably within the scholarship of teaching.

Documentation of such a wide range of activities for peer review would certainly present challenges to the scholar and to those responsible for review. A portfolio of scholarly work would be necessary, and might require a variety of forms of documentation, such as papers, reports, websites, software and videos.¹⁴ Reflective essays might introduce each scholarly work.¹⁵ Finding appropriate evaluators of the work might also be time-consuming and challenging. Boyer suggests that popular writing be evaluated by others who practice that form of scholarship,¹⁶ yet the disciplinary content would still require evaluation by disciplinary peers. Glassick et al. suggest that each particular project might require the evaluation of different specialists, clients, collaborators and beneficiaries of the scholarship.¹⁷ Given the potentially great amount of time and effort required to document and adequately review this form of scholarship, it is easy to understand why a tally of peer-reviewed journal articles is the standard form of assessing scholarship in most academic settings. Such a diversity of possible approaches to assessment provides the potential for considerable disagreement regarding the quality of work. Glassick et al. quote a senior professor with experience in promotion and tenure committee work: "In the end, faculty must believe that they will be treated fairly. It's far more important to have a climate of trust than well-defined standards, as important as they may be."¹⁸

Scholarship of Integration and the *FPU Idea*

The *Fresno Pacific Idea* statement occupies a central place in the mission of our university. If the scholarship of integration can be justified as an activity important to our work here, it should not only be compatible with the *Idea*, but flow from it organically. It is not difficult to find such connections to the scholarship of integration, for the language of integration is not new to Fresno Pacific. Boyer's suggestion that integrative scholarship leads from information to knowledge to wisdom correlates to the affirmation found in the *Idea* that "wisdom grows out of the commitment to the Christian faith and to the integrative perspective of the liberal arts." Indeed, each of the major sections of the *Idea* can be related to the themes that arise out of the scholarship of integration.

The *Idea* promotes FPU as a community of learners. This provides both a philosophical and a pragmatic rationale for inter-disciplinary scholarship. The *Idea* section on community contends that wisdom arises from "dialogue and discourse between people who have different experiences and perspectives..." Interdisciplinary dialogue and discourse is understood to promote wisdom. From the pragmatic point of view, most intellectual dialogue between faculty in a small institution will be interdisciplinary, almost by necessity. Departments of two or three faculty per discipline offer little scope for extensive discussion, but schools organized around different student populations encourage interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and learning, and thus provides a stimulus to interdisciplinary thinking.

The *Idea* also sketches a vision of the university as a prophetic voice, speaking of "an integrative, Christian ethic and perspective" capable of critiquing current culture and issues. Embedded in the concept of the prophetic is the notion that the prophet speaks with an enhanced perspective informed by an encounter with God.

This suggests that faculty make use of both the disciplinary and theological perspectives to address contemporary issues.

It is easy to view such scholarly critique of culture flowing from the Christian university outward toward secular society. This is not, however, the only possible outcome of prophetic critique. Prophets spoke to those outside of the community of faith, but more frequently prophesied to those within the community. From an Anabaptist perspective, much of American religious culture is a syncretism of Christian and non-Christian values and beliefs. Insights from academic disciplines can also provide a prophetic voice capable of critiquing contemporary religious culture.

Talk of integrating faith and learning is common in Christian higher education, and is part of our own *FPU Idea* statement. A third characterization of Fresno Pacific University in the *Idea* is that of a Christian university in which the liberal arts provide a context for the “integration of faith, learning, and action...” Such integration may take different forms in the different academic disciplines; the connections between faith and a particular discipline may seem quite evident, while such connections may be less apparent with other academic disciplines.

It seems that the language of integration and the goal of wisdom that may come through integrative study provides a cogent rationale for pursuing the scholarship of integration at Fresno Pacific. And while teaching has traditionally been the primary task of faculty, the integrative task of interpreting disciplines to broader audiences shares much in common with the act of classroom instruction, which interprets a discipline to a particular student audience.

Cautionary Notes on the Scholarship of Integration

While the connection between the *FPU Idea* and integration is apparent, there are two reasons to approach this form of scholarship with caution. First, there is a significant leap required to move from interdisciplinary instruction and discussion to public, inter-disciplinary scholarship. Interdisciplinary forays require most faculty to venture outside the bounds of their academic training. Some of our faculty have received the benefit of broad, interdisciplinary graduate programs, but most academics are trained within a much narrower disciplinary focus. Teaching at a small university such as our own requires most faculty members to become knowledgeable over a wide range of topics within a broader discipline. Keeping abreast of diverse sub-disciplines requires tremendous effort not required of faculty at larger institutions, where the teaching assignments are more focused. To extend the scope of competence to interdisciplinary topics requires even greater effort, and if the foray into the field involves public, scholarly work, the level of understanding must be even greater than that required to instruct competently.

All faculty are familiar with the errors, misunderstandings and ignorance sometimes displayed by academics who venture outside their discipline. But lest the fear of repeating such mistakes prevents us from expanding the scope of our interests, I do believe that collegial interaction at FPU provides us with a better foundation for inter-disciplinary exploration than can be found at most institutions.

A second caution relates to the particular goal of scholarly integration. The term “integration” in the field of science and religion has a specific meaning. Many practitioners embrace this approach, but there are legitimate reasons for a critical evaluation of this enterprise.

Over the past forty years, one of the most influential writers on the relationship between science and religion has been Ian Barbour. He categorized four diverse models by which science and religion may interact.¹⁹ They are commonly perceived in the public mind to be in “conflict”; witness the cultural phenomenon of

debates regarding creation and evolution. But in academic practice, the desire to avoid such unpleasantness leads toward an “isolation” of science and religion. There are definite advantages to such an approach. A discipline can be explored in more depth this way, facilitating the disciplinary model of scholarship. Barbour gives “integration” as a third mode of interaction. By this he means a systematic joining of the two into a seamless whole. The fourth model is that of “dialog,” in which the disciplines maintain their separate identity, but speak to some common issue and inform each other in ways that enrich both fields.

The search for a specifically Christian or theistic form of science can be viewed as an attempt to integrate science and religion. The endeavor to integrate two such diverse fields is perhaps a noble one, but historic and contemporary examples of such integration expose the pitfalls of such approaches. When particular scientific theories or paradigms are integrated into Christian theology, then any challenge to these scientific ideas also becomes a challenge to religious belief. Examples of the resulting conflict can be seen in the stories of Galileo and the 17th century Catholic Church, Darwin’s challenge to the 19th century British apologetics of natural theology and the contemporary fusion of biblical literalism and creation science.

This phenomenon is not restricted to science and religion. For example, much of conservative American Christianity integrates capitalist economics with the Gospel, while Third World liberation theologies at times uncritically embraced Marxism. If the methods and purposes of two disciplines share little in common, a forced marriage may do more damage than good. If such overarching, interdisciplinary integration is attempted, its conclusions should be held loosely and tentatively.

An alternative approach is that of interdisciplinary dialog. It does not allow disciplines to develop in a vacuum, ignorant of the advances made in other fields, yet it recognizes with humility that we may not be wise enough to discern all of the connections between two disparate fields. An example of such dialog can be seen in the quest to understand the nature of humanity, which is both a theological and a scientific undertaking.

A complete, systematic integration that claims to understand what it means to be human may be beyond our capabilities. A theology of human nature is a religious endeavor, with religious concepts such as sin, the flesh, free will, the fall and redemption. I cannot imagine that these concepts could be developed in a manner that engages the contemporary world without information provided by modern understandings of genetics, psychology and other disciplines. Conversely, there are socio-biological models of human behavior that suffer from the lack of engagement with the reality of religious experience, and its transforming power in the lives of many.

Such interdisciplinary dialog may indeed bring about the transformation from information to wisdom that Boyer claims for this domain, and it supports the *FPU Idea*’s affirmation that a Christian, liberal arts community provides an environment that leads to wisdom.

Conclusion

The purpose of this article is to clarify the nature of the scholarship of integration, and to discern its relationship to our work here at Fresno Pacific. In conclusion, it may be useful to summarize some of the important issues, and to formulate a definition that can serve as a starting point for discussion.

1. The scholarship of integration emphasizes meaning and understanding, in contrast to the emphasis on new knowledge characteristic of the scholarship of discovery.
2. Two somewhat distinct categories are considered scholarship of integration: interdisciplinary work and interpreting disciplinary knowledge to wider audiences.
3. Assessing this type of scholarship may be challenging and time-consuming.
4. The *FPU Idea* statement lends support to the goals of integrative scholarship.
5. Competent interdisciplinary scholarship is a challenging undertaking.
6. Seamless integration of disparate disciplines has its pitfalls, but interdisciplinary dialog is essential to many important issues.

If our own understanding of the scholarship of integration requires a definition that integrates the unique characteristics of Fresno Pacific University's mission, then I offer the following as a proposal:

The scholarship of integration promotes a greater understanding of academic disciplines through interdisciplinary dialog and through communication in non-academic settings. It supports the *FPU Idea* by promoting wisdom that comes through broadened perspectives, and serves both the church and society. It involves public work amenable to peer evaluation.

Notes

- 1 Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (New Jersey, 1990).
- 2 Boyer, 18-21.
- 3 Glassick, Charles, Mary T. Huber, & Gene I. Maeroff. *Scholarship Assessed*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997), 9.
- 4 Boyer, 20.
- 5 For example, Braxton, John M., William Luckey, & Patricia Helland. *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship Through Boyer's Four Domains*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002), 143-145.
- 6 Boyer, 36. Glassick et al., 11.
- 7 Boyer, 36.
- 8 Braxton et al., 143-144.
- 9 Glassick et al., 11.
- 10 Glassick et al., 16.
- 11 Schulman, L.S., & P. Hutchings. *About the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: The Pew scholars national fellowship program*. (Menlo Park: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998). Quoted in Braxton et al., 90.
- 12 Glassick et al., 25.
- 13 Boyer, 35-36.
- 14 Braxton et al., 94.
- 15 Glassick et al., 48.
- 16 Boyer, 35.
- 17 Glassick et al., 48.
- 18 Glassick et al., 50.
- 19 Ian Barbour. *Religion and Science: historical and contemporary issues*. (New York: Harper-Collins, 1997), 77-105. . . . Ian Barbour, *When Science Meets Religion: enemies, strangers, or partners?* (New York: Harper-Collins, 2000), 7-38.

The Scholarship of Teaching

Stephen Varvis

It has been beneficial for us at Fresno Pacific University to witness the development over the last fifteen years of the idea and practice of “The Scholarship of Teaching.” In fact the intention of Ernest Boyer when he first proposed the idea in 1990 was that it would become a characteristic practice in both liberal arts institutions and comprehensive institutions dedicated to teaching.¹ It has been argued that definitions and standards of scholarship used by institutions in promotion and tenure reviews, or what we would call three-and six-year reviews, and five-year, post-continuing status reviews, ought to grow out of institutional mission statements, which for many institutions focus on teaching.² Thus, a definition of teaching as scholarship would seem to be necessary for professional development and review. In places too numerous to cite, colleges and universities have been criticized cogently over the decades for placing too much emphasis on research and neglecting teaching (and particularly undergraduate teaching) as calls for reform have been issued regularly. The proposal for a category of scholarship called the scholarship of teaching was developed to extend the commonly understood definition of scholarship beyond research on the model of the physical and life sciences, and by extension the social sciences, to the work and mission of teaching in universities and colleges. It is an act of reform for colleges and universities, directed specifically to the work that we at Fresno Pacific hold to be at the center of both our daily work and mission.

While the meaning of the phrase and its uses are not always clear, and have not been consistent over time, it remains, I would contend, one of the most useful notions to direct and guide our work as professors in an institution whose central work is teaching, and could provide a common standard for us. It is important for two central reasons: First, it highlights the work of teaching by declaring it and explaining it as an act of scholarship. It provides an appropriate prominence to the intellectual and professional insight and creativity involved in university-level teaching. Second, it raises the standards for teaching by explaining how, why and when it can be considered a form of scholarship, the necessary elements involved in the activity, and hints about how it might be practiced effectively.

Definitions

Since the phrase has not been used consistently, I would like to point to its basic variations and then affirm its original intention. In the years following Boyer’s work, the scholarship of teaching has been sometimes rephrased as “the scholarship of teaching and learning.” In this formulation the meaning shifts towards the incorporation of learning theory, research into how students learn and pedagogy or teaching methodology as central elements in the definition and practice.³ At other times it has drawn in assessment of student outcomes as central to its role. The shifting emphases have not received consensus, beyond an agreement that professors who practice the scholarship of teaching are curious about and may use theoretical models of learning and pay attention to outcomes (what is learned, understood and retained), but this is not sufficient to describe an activity as the scholarship of teaching.⁴

Building on the classification of scholarship advocated by Boyer, the characteristics identified by Glassick, Huber and Maeroff for “any scholarly activity” still seem the most applicable and useful and seem to have gained something closest to a scholarly consensus.⁵ An activity may be considered scholarly when it meets the following criteria.

It must:

- have clear goals
- be based on adequate preparation
- use appropriate methods for the discipline
- achieve significant results
- have an effective presentation for public or peer evaluation
- result in some kind of reflective critique

To summarize, the scholarship of teaching ought to be characterized by these qualities, as will the scholarship of discovery, of integration and of application. Effective teachers will care about and be interested in how students learn and what they learn, integrating both into their scholarly teaching.

Specific disciplines have also picked up the agenda, some developing practices out of it, and some have moved away from it.⁶ Characteristically those disciplines considered more “scientific” than others tend to revert to definitions that reflect the scholarship of discovery, and those considered more akin to the arts or humanities, and which are interpretive in practice, retain the broader definition as proposed originally by Boyer. An alternative general definition was proposed by Diamond and Adams in 1995.⁷ It proposed that an activity, in this case teaching, might be considered scholarly or professional when:

- the activity requires a high level of discipline-related expertise
- the activity breaks new ground, is innovative
- the activity can be replicated or elaborated
- its results can be documented
- its results can be peer-reviewed
- the activity has significance or impact

In my reading this definition moves toward a scholarship of teaching understood on the basis of research. Especially the second, third and sixth elements of the definition borrow rhetorically from the terminology of scientific experiment: “new ground,” “replication” and “impact.” The definition proposed by Glassick, Huber and Maeroff allows for and even requires disciplinary expertise, peer review, scholarly methodology and results that will be important for college and university level teaching, without requiring and pseudo-scientific methodology in the humanities and arts.

The Necessity of Disciplinary Discussion

As part of the effort to develop this notion within the academy, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching initiated in 1998 the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). Colleges and universities from around the country were invited to join the project of defining scholarly teaching for themselves and implementing it throughout their institutions. We indicated our intention to join the effort, discussed the definition a number of times, but the effort was stalled by competing agenda. The definition they proposed was as follows:⁸

The scholarship of teaching is problem posing about an issue of teaching or learning, study of the problem through methods appropriate to disciplinary epistemologies, application of results to practice, communication of results, self-reflection, and peer review.

Note that the elements of the definition follow the characteristics of Glassick, Huber and Maeroff's definition. Problem posing correlates with clear goals, study with adequate preparation, disciplinary epistemologies with appropriate methodologies, application with effective presentation and self reflection and peer review with reflective critique. The Carnegie group's statement added an emphasis that was perhaps too weak or even lacking in the earlier discussion—the importance of disciplinary methodologies and peer review.

This definition pointed to the significant insight that the scholarship of teaching is related to the distinct ways in which we pursue our academic disciplines, and that these are to be respected in the discussion. Donald Schon argued that the scholarship of teaching requires a new epistemology not dominated by the scientific research paradigm. He described it as action research or knowing-in-action. This he linked to Deweyan "inquiry," and Polanyi's "tacit knowledge" that comes from deep experience in any form of human practice.⁹ This may not be a new epistemology so much as a recognition of the different ways in which we know and learn, and from which we develop and pursue deeper understanding beyond the paradigm of the natural and social scientific research (which may exclude this form of reflection on tacit understanding and experience). Because our scholarly disciplines have their own unique practices and methods, the scholarship of teaching must link itself to these and build upon our personal, collective and professional experience.

And so as Boyer's, Glassick's and the Carnegie group's definitions propose, the scholarship of teaching must be developed as an activity unique to the practices of academic disciplines. Each of the disciplines will share some common patterns—goals or problem posing, appropriate methodology, presentation or communication of results, and some form of public and/or peer review. As Hutchings and Schulman explained, "the scholarship of teaching is the mechanism through which the profession of teaching advances" in much the same way that research (or "the scholarship of discovery") is the way in which general and specialized knowledge advances.¹⁰

An Illustration

The scholarship of teaching might be explained by relating it to how we pursued our research in our disciplines in our own individual education. We learned the methodologies of the field, we posed problems, sought data and evidence, interpreted that evidence, communicated it in various ways, submitted it to review (mentor and peer) and then rethought and revised as seemed appropriate. In the same way, we might pursue our teaching. As an illustration, I have had to ask how does one teach an ancient and foreign thought form? I use my own discipline and experience as an example, since it is the only one I can speak to directly. Perhaps each of us can consider an example of their own from with our own disciplinary ways of learning and teaching. One must first learn the field, and its interpretive methodologies. Then one must consider the audience one is communicating to—what do they bring and need to bring to the effort? We must seek to bridge the gap between what we have learned and what needs to be gained by others. One must gather experience, look to what others have done, make some attempts in the classroom and reflect on their outcomes. Then these must be critically reflected upon by us, and by our peers in our disciplines, in a public forum of some kind.

A few years ago I made such an attempt to teach Confucian philosophy and ethics to undergraduates. I had done some prior study, but needed more. And so I pursued some independent reading as well as consulted with a Confucian philosopher to test my understanding of the field. I listened to other experts on various strategies at professional conferences and began to experiment. Eventually I developed a

particular classroom approach, adopted from Confucius's own method, to demonstrate simultaneously what Confucian learning was, how it proceeded and its basic conceptual content. According to Confucius, one only develops morally and understands ethics when one submits to traditional ways of behavior (manners and ritual). Through action one gains the ability to understand virtue, or benevolence, and can begin to act as a mature person. We developed mannered behavior in and for the class, performed it, analyzed the experience and then turned to the Confucian text to explore the meaning. I developed this over time, requested feedback from students, listened to their responses, modified what I attempted in the classroom and finally presented it to colleagues in philosophy and history from around the country at a conference of the Association for Core Texts and Courses, where the agenda is specifically the interpretation and teaching of texts and topics in liberal arts core series. It was eventually published through the peer-review process.¹¹

A number of us subsequently published essays on teaching in cores series, particularly a topic we specialize in here, the integration of biblical studies and religion with history and philosophy.¹² Each time we have worked within the discipline, reflected on interpretive methods, experimented in the classroom, drawn up proposals and benefited from collegial critique. It has been a remarkable experience for me to observe my colleagues deep in discussion of religious texts and how they might be taught with scholar-teachers from prestigious institutions around the country, struggling with the same issues that engage us, and learning from our experience and proposals.

The sequence of events and procedures here described has all of the elements identified by Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, and includes the emphases added the Carnegie Group. I might add that the experience of working through the process described provides opportunity to experience all of the fears, doubts and anxieties that one experiences developing a work of the scholarship of discovery or basic research, from the fear that the idea or project is not original enough, that the methodology will not be adequate, the knowledge that the egos present in scholarly forums can quickly rise to combat and that one's work might suffer rejection. (This might be an alternative way of judging scholarship in itself.)

Our Practice at Fresno Pacific University

A number of us at Fresno Pacific have contributed to the scholarship of teaching through academic and professional forums. I will list only a few of the examples I know of, gained largely during my tenure as dean of the undergraduate college, where I enjoyed witnessing the ongoing creativity of my faculty colleagues. I wish I could mention more of the activities of the faculty in the other current schools as well, but I do not have the first-hand knowledge, though I know through many conversations that the scholarship of teaching is practiced throughout the faculty of the university. Some of the examples might be considered part of the scholarship of application or integration as well as teaching. I include them here because of the fluid boundaries of the work we do.

Our faculty has contributed in the following ways:

- written and published texts for teaching
- reviewed texts in their discipline for publishers or for academic journals
- served on editorial boards for teaching resources, collections, publications

- written books for non-college audiences, such as adult teaching materials for churches, based on the writer's professional, scholarly and classroom experience
- presented and/or published essays on teaching particular disciplines and texts or topics, which have been peer reviewed through the process of presentation and discussion at scholarly conferences
- demonstrated teaching practices at professional forums that are particularly appropriate to individual disciplines and discussed and reviewed the implications of these for scholarly teaching
- written reviews, editorials, commentaries for non-scholarly, professional publications extending teaching beyond the classroom, and subject to editorial and public review
- presented the results of assessment efforts as they relate to teaching methods and practices and their effectiveness within particular disciplines
- presented interpretations of texts, topics or problems directed towards shaping how we teach in particular disciplines

We should note as well that many of us have worked on these kinds of projects without the benefit of a formal definition of the scholarship of teaching from which to work. We have gravitated toward this, I gather from my discussions with many, through dedication to our teaching, to our disciplines and through professional practice. One of the best tests of a proposal, it seems to me, is whether it meets the standards of our best informal practices and professional experience. Here, with the scholarship of teaching, we can recognize a proposal that meets both.

Further Implementation Possibilities

Scholarly teaching is not something we do simply in the classroom or alone in our offices. It is a public and professional practice and discipline. It requires employing our disciplinary understanding, communicating it effectively to professional peers and defending and modifying it through dialog and critique. It involves hearing the responses of students as we engage them and train them to think through our disciplinary lenses. It grows through the reflective critique we bring to it through presentation and writing and through the critical and collaborative work of others as we engage in the enterprise together.

It probably should not go without saying that the scholarship of teaching is not merely teaching: working on our classes, meeting with students for discussion, engaging in extracurricular activities, leading discussion groups on campus (though this may shade into it), reading to keep up with course content, etc. Nor is it testing an idea with a colleague down the hall. All of these may be necessary for effective teaching. But they do not meet the criteria for teaching as scholarship. They are good practices for the effective teacher. But they are not part of the scholarly development of the field of teaching in and through our disciplines.

The formal recognition of the scholarship of teaching in our policies and procedures would have distinct advantages to us as a faculty. First, it is something we can do both practically and within the context of our current work. Our teaching loads keep us busy. Practicing and developing our teaching as scholarship allows us to develop what we are doing in preparation for and in the classroom in a more thorough and tested way. It develops our teaching as a scholarly practice, encouraging effectiveness and keeping us current with developments in our professional fields. It allows and requires that what we do be professionally tested and credible. It puts us out among professional colleagues for our ongoing

development as teaching professors, and for our contribution to our disciplines and the practice of teaching them. It raises a central part of our mission, the practice of teaching, to the level of scholarship.

Furthermore, engaging in the scholarship of teaching is practically and financially workable. In 1995 Astin and Chang analyzed the costs of those schools that emphasized both teaching and pure research in an article subtitled "Can You Have Your Cake and Eat It Too?" They concluded that this dual emphasis added from \$5,000 to \$12,500 to the annual per-student tuition costs of an institution.¹³ This was a year in which the national average tuition cost at an independent college or university was about \$12,500. Roughly speaking, the investment required from 50 percent to 100 percent more in resources per student for the professor who would be engaged in both teaching and research effectively. These costs are largely due to the time needed away from teaching to develop the specialized project. No doubt many of us practice both forms of scholarship, and enjoy them. Research does not have to be in fields outside of which one teaches, and even may be integrated into our teaching, as Rod Janzen and Alan Thompson make clear. But the practicalities are that until a concentrated effort is made and achieved to make available the time and financial resources with which we can pursue both, we will pursue our research intensively when special funds, sabbaticals and other resources or release time can be arranged.

We can, however, pursue the scholarship of teaching as we continue to work as teachers, and as part of our central mission as an institution. Because of our mission, because of the kind of institution we are, we can and should become a leading faculty in the scholarship of teaching consulted by peers across North America. The scholarship of teaching was proposed for us, and to counter the neglect of teaching in the dominant forms of our institutions of higher learning today. We can practice our art, our science, our disciplines of teaching and learning at the highest levels of professional competence and creativity. The practical question is simply this: How can we encode this in our handbooks, our policies and the ongoing practice of our work together as a faculty and administration?¹⁴

Notes

My thanks to Greg Camp, Ron Pratt, Richard Rawls, and Isolina Sands, who presented to the Faculty Session their experiences in the scholarship of teaching in August 2003 as part of the presentation that forms the core of this article. My thanks also to the numerous colleagues who sent me articles and examples of their work in this form of scholarship, and discussed their experience with me.

¹ John H. Braxton, William Luckey and Patricia Helland, *Institutionalizing a Broader View of Scholarship through Boyer's Four Domains*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 29, no.2 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003), 67. For the beginning of the discussion see Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990)). See also Marvin Lazerson, Ursula Wagener, and Nichole Shumanis, "What Makes a Revolution? Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 1980-2000," *Change*, May/June, 2000, 12-19.

² Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 103.

³ See for a summary Pat Hutchings and Lee Shulman, "The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments," *Change*, Sept./Oct. 1999, 11-15. See also Mary Taylor Huber, "Designing Careers Around the Scholarship of Teaching," *Change*, July/Aug., 2001, 21-29.

⁴ Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 63.

- ⁵Charles E. Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997), 22-36.
- ⁶See Robert M. Diamond and Bronwyn E. Adam, *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional and Creative Work of Faculty* (Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education, 1995), 30 and Diamond and Adam, *The Disciplines Speak II* (Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education, 2000), 21 for a comparison of the approaches in history and psychology.
- ⁷Diamond and Adam, *Disciplines*, 14.
- ⁸See the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, www.carnegiefoundation.org/CASTL/
- ⁹Donald A. Schon, "The New Scholarship Requires a New Epistemology," *Change*, Nov./Dec. 1995, 30-31.
- ¹⁰Hutchings and Schulman, 14.
- ¹¹Stephen Varvis, "Confucius in Dialogue with the West and Today's Students," *Uniting the Liberal Arts: Core and Context*, ed. B. Cowan, and J.S. Lee, Selected Papers from the Fifth Annual Conference of The Association of Core Texts and Courses (Lanham: University of America Press, 2002), 117-124.
- ¹²See Greg Camp, "City Centered: Isaiah and the City," Richard Rawls, "Genesis within the Context of the Ancient Near East," and Stephen Varvis, "Ibn Battuta's Culture Shock," all in *The Wider World of Core Texts and Courses*. Ed. A. Brunello, M. Chiariello, J. S. Lee. "Selected Papers from The Association of Core Texts and Courses' Seventh Annual Conference, April 5-8, 2001, University of Notre Dame." (Association of Core Texts and Courses, 2004) 25-30, 19-24, and 31-38 respectively.
- ¹³Alexander W. Astin and Mitchell J. Chang, "Colleges that Emphasize Research and Teaching: Can You Have Your Cake and Eat it Too?" *Change*, Sept./Oct. 1995, 47.
- ¹⁴A broad summary of the activity around the scholarship of teaching and its reception and impact in the academy at large has recently been published in *Change*, September/October, 2005, by Eileen T. Bender, "CASTLs in the Air: The SOTL 'Movement' in Mid-Flight." This article brings the larger discussion up to the immediate present, including both some of the continuing forces retarding the effort and its influence.

Conclusion

The four essays (and one response) included in this monograph provide different perspectives on Boyer's four scholarship types. While noting important idiosyncrasies each article also suggests continuous overlap between forms of scholarly activities. Boundaries are arbitrarily drawn and to some extent artificial. Yet there are also singular characteristics that provide differentiation between different types of scholarship.

One new endeavor at Fresno Pacific University is the Scholars Speak forum, whereby faculty members write short op-ed pieces that speak to local, regional and national issues from the foundational perspective of scholarly areas of expertise. . . . Each week a new article is sent to 70 regional newspapers and is also published on the Fresno Pacific University website. These articles often mix discovery, application, integration and teaching.

At Fresno Pacific faculty and administrators continue to grapple with ways that different scholarship types and interpretations have an impact on faculty evaluation processes. We are hopeful these essays will motivate ongoing conversations of what it means to be a scholar.

Contributors

Patricia Anderson served as Provost and Academic Vice President at Fresno Pacific University from 2002-2006

D. Merrill Ewert is President of Fresno Pacific University

Rod Janzen is Distinguished Scholar and Faculty in History at Fresno Pacific University

Michael Kunz is Faculty in Science at Fresno Pacific University

David Alan Thompson is Faculty in Science at Fresno Pacific University

Stephen Varvis is a Director in the Advancement Office and Faculty in History and English at Fresno Pacific University

Appendix

THE FRESNO PACIFIC IDEA

The Fresno Pacific Idea reflects the university's interpretation of what it means to be a community of learners committed to a distinctive vision of Christian higher education. The Idea serves as a center for reflection and action and as a guide for forming a vision of the future. Rooted in the past and continuously re-shaped by the present, the Idea provides a foundation for the university's understanding of itself and of the mission to which it is called.

In pursuing this mission, the university affirms the significance of knowledge which is a foundation for wisdom and virtue. As a Christian liberal arts community, Fresno Pacific University is an integral part of the mission of the church. From this Christian and liberal arts center, the university seeks to engage members of its community in a collaborative search for knowledge and experience which lead toward a perceptive and creative relationship with God, humanity and the natural world. On this foundation, the university seeks to build and to extend the Kingdom of God by enabling persons to serve church and society.

The Fresno Pacific Idea articulates the university's primary identity, its vision of community and its relation to the larger world. The parts of the Idea are not mutually exclusive, but complementary. Together, they form an organic whole.

Fresno Pacific is a Christian University

Fresno Pacific University seeks to be a collegium centered upon Christ and His church. It is committed to the ideals of God's Kingdom and to the perspective of the liberal arts in which integration of faith, learning and action is a primary goal.

With others in the Anabaptist-Mennonite and believers' church tradition, the university encourages voluntary acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God, of the triumph of God's Kingdom, of the presence of God's Spirit in the life of the church and of the Lordship of Christ in all of life.

As an extension of the educational mission of the Mennonite Brethren Church, the university affirms the authority of the Bible over all matters of faith and life; the church as a community of redeemed people; a life of discipleship leading to holiness, witness and service; the call to serve Jesus by ministering to human need and alleviating suffering; the practice of reconciliation and love in settings of violence, oppression and injustice; and the development of spiritual maturity through disciplines such as prayer, study and meditation.

All authentic knowledge and experience are unified under God. All aspects of reality are understood to be parts of a larger whole. There is no contradiction then between the truth of revelation, of scholarly investigation and of action. The university encourages members of the Fresno Pacific University community toward a reflective and critical perspective on the nature of humanity and its relation to the world. Thus, the liberal arts enlarge the foundation for life-long learning and for advanced study in a discipline or profession. The university affirms that wisdom grows out of commitment to Christian faith and the integrative perspective of the liberal arts. Both are essential to developing a holistic view of God, self and the world.

Since education is understood to be a life-long process, university programs include a variety of academic and professional baccalaureate, graduate and non-degree programs. Each program builds on the integrative foundation of the liberal arts, encouraging thoughtful reflection on those beliefs and values that contribute to personal and societal wholeness. The intersection of Christian belief, the liberal arts and an ethic of service provides an educational perspective that leads to an examined understanding of God, self and the world that unites theory with practice.

Fresno Pacific University is a Community of Learners

Fresno Pacific University recognizes the importance of the interpersonal dimension of the learning process. The university believes that community grows out of common commitments and that learning is the result of interaction between persons, ideas and experiences. Thus, the university seeks to provide settings in which individuals can achieve such interaction within a community committed to learning and service. It believes that as individuals become more responsible with and accountable to one another, they are better able to understand themselves and to make thoughtful commitments to God, the church and the world.

The university seeks to accept each member of the community as unique, with purpose and value. Ethnic and religious identity is affirmed as a basis for respectful pluralism. While acknowledging individual differences, the university also holds to the believers' church expression of community as a body that transcends individualism and those cultural, national and ethnic boundaries which separate and alienate.

Believing that the Gospel transcends the limitations of all cultures and ideologies and that inclusiveness enriches community, Fresno Pacific University welcomes those of different cultural, national, ethnic and religious backgrounds to participate in its educational experience. The university invites those from other church traditions, both as faculty and students, to enter into dialogue and faithful practice with those in the Anabaptist-Mennonite and believers' church tradition in following Christ and in sharing the university's mission. In keeping with its voluntaristic church tradition, the university affirms the community formed as individuals relate to God and does not discriminate against students who cannot freely and honestly make such a commitment. The university encourages persons to serve across cultures and throughout the world as compassionate disciples of Christ and as constructive members of society.

The university believes that knowledge and understanding are formed in community; that learning takes place through dialogue and discourse between people who have different experiences and perspectives and that such wisdom begins with humility. These understandings join teachers and students as partners in a mutual search for truth and wholeness.

The university's belief in community expresses itself in patterns of leadership and governance that are servant oriented and participatory and which lead toward consensual decision making.

The university seeks to carry out its educational mission through faculty, students, staff and board members who participate in church and society, share a mutual respect for educational goals and community standards and are committed to enhancing the quality of the educational experience for all its members.

Fresno Pacific University is Prophetic

Fresno Pacific University believes that to be prophetic is to serve the church and society by engaging in dialogue with and critique of contemporary culture and practice. The university encourages informed reflection on personal, institutional and societal values which contribute to developing a vision for wholeness, justice and reconciliation. It offers leadership to the church and the world by enabling persons to extend perceptive, creative and skillful responses to current issues; to illuminate darkness with light and dispel ignorance with wisdom and understanding. It seeks to bring an integrative, Christian ethic and perspective to present day thought and experience and to a common search for the better way.

Fresno Pacific University understands learning to be a journey; a journey of exploration, reflection and transformation; a journey toward deepened meaning and faith growing out of creative encounter with Christ and the world. The university believes that such learning may be nurtured through many different modalities and in many different settings and that it should be encouraged to continue throughout life. Thus, the university values imaginative, experimental and innovative ways of engaging students and faculty in the process of learning even as it seeks to remain faithful to its core values and identity.

Fresno Pacific University is a deliberate and continuing attempt to realize the vision expressed in the Fresno Pacific Idea. The Idea gives the university reason for existence, courage for growth and stimulus for adventure.