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1 Need.
Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (Boyer, 1990) is an enduring and seminal work in higher education. Its sales numbers (more than 35,000 copies since Jossey-Bass took over its publication in 1997) attest to the persistence of Boyer’s views in the academy. Since its initial release in 1990, Scholarship Reconsidered has been cited over 6,675 times, according to Google Scholar (Ream & Braxton, 2014). Rarely does such a work achieve these heights in both sales and citations.

The year 2015 marks the 25th anniversary of this landmark study. Such an anniversary provides an opportunity to explore, reflect, and critique Boyer’s views and their impact on the academy. Since its release, there has not been a revised edition of Scholarship Reconsidered, and no eBook even exists. A 25th anniversary is a unique time to invest in this work in ways that will ensure its usefulness for future generations of higher education practitioners, policy makers, scholars, and graduate students.

When first published, Scholarship Reconsidered was a timely report. The nation was still trying to make sense of the tumult of the 1980s and the conversations launched surrounding faculty reward systems. Boyer, ever the educational populist, desired that the issue of scholarship be a national discussion that reached beyond the ivory tower. Additionally, the Carnegie Foundation’s (1990) Campus Life report revealed that the current utilization of time by faculty members was a significant hindrance to the type of campus community Boyer envisioned. He lamented the “publish or perish” reality faculty faced and challenged the nation to reconsider the definition of scholarship. Original research was only introduced to American higher education in 1906 (Boyer, 1990) and quickly became the sole focus of the professoriate at the expense of teaching and service. Boyer pointed his audience back to the scholars who predated modern universities, reminding them scholarship once was measured by the ability to think, communicate, and learn.

Reports such as Campus Life and Scholarship Reconsidered revealed the dissonance between what faculty valued and the reward structure measuring their efforts. The majority of faculty truly desired to teach and spend time interacting with students. The dominant structure of the modern university, however, rewarded faculty who successfully removed themselves from the classroom (often to be replaced by graduate assistants) so that they could spend more time conducting research. The faculty reward system in the 1980s was weighted towards published research, not teaching. This system arguably remains dominant today. Though research was exalted, its quality was difficult to measure and thus neglected. Evidence of this reality was found in the fact that over a third of the faculty respondents reported their institutions simply counted publications regardless of their quality (Glassick, 2000). Even at research institutions, 42% agreed systemic quality control in university scholarship was lacking.
Boyer’s speeches and writings on scholarship argued that the nation embraced a narrow view of scholarship. How can scholarship simply be evidenced by publications? By looking back to history as well as forward into the future, Boyer proposed a broader vision: “The work of the scholar also means stepping back from one’s investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one’s knowledge effectively to students” (Boyer, 1990, p. 16).

A communal act for the sake of student learning was not the traditional milieu of American scholarship. Such thinking, however, was consistent for Boyer. A survey of his previous writings and speeches reveals a convergence of his key philosophical tenets of education: connectedness; service; language; and teaching. Boyer insisted on viewing education in an integrated, holistic manner. If these attributes are the building blocks of a quality education, they must have an impact on scholarship within college education. In essence, scholarship must have a connection to a community. Scholarship for scholarship’s sake is not an option. It must serve the common good and thus must effectively use language to foster learning. Such attributes reflect the essence of Boyer’s call for an education of coherence.

Boyer’s most popular work, Scholarship Reconsidered, was written to achieve such coherence for the common good. He wanted to shift the paradigm of scholarship to value qualities universities had lost: community; service; and teaching. If education can pursue both excellence and access, scholarship should as well. It became Boyer’s most influential work, in part, because it was also his most controversial. Bucher and Patton (2004) provide a helpful response through which to explore Boyer’s view of scholarship:

To understand Scholarship Reconsidered . . . is to see it as moving the notion of service into the center of the academic enterprise. [Boyer] proposed the scholarships of application, discovery, integration, and teaching partly as a critique of more elitist notions of university research. (p. 3)

Ernest Boyer’s voice offered a unique perspective, and his four domains were a clear departure from the majority view. Despite the considerable nature of the sales and citations of Scholarship Reconsidered, those domains remain distant from the present condition of scholarship in the academy. Published research is still the dominant lens through which scholarship is understood. However, the professoriate is continuing to undergo sweeping changes that provide new opportunities for Boyer’s views to be applied in the academy.

**Why do people need help on the topic at this time?**

The faculty landscape in higher education has shifted dramatically since the release of Scholarship Reconsidered almost 25 years ago. The rise of the non-tenure track class of professors is well documented and, to many, troublesome. For example, The Atlantic Monthly reported a 300 percent rise in adjunct faculty since 1975 (compared to a meager 26 percent rise for tenured/tenure track faculty during the same period) (Wiessmann, 2013).

Most conversations regarding this new faculty majority are typically framed in economic terms as they are simply less expensive in a number of ways to employ. While important, such a
perspective only sheds light on part of the problem. The new faculty majority represents not only a fiscal crisis, but one of ideology and utility. Adjunct, contingent, and other maligned groups of faculty are organizing to be recognized by their institutions. However, what is not being discussed is the long-term impact of this new faculty majority on the academy at the macro level.

The faculty role, as explored in a recent Association for the Study of Higher Education conference paper by Sean Gehrke and Adrianna Kezar (2013), was referenced as unbundling. The traditional duties of a faculty member are being distributed among many individuals, most of which are now part-time. This fragmentation is pursued, argue Gehrke and Kezar, with little attention to institutional impact. The strategic vision of the future gives way to the fiscal tyranny of the urgent. Other challenges, however, linger.

Beyond institutional impact, consider the toll on almost any discipline. Central to the cultivation of a discipline-specific guild is the generative production of research in which scholars convene, critique, share, and contribute to their field. If the new norm for scholars is the cobbled together of part time-teaching positions, where is the time to research, write, and present (not to mention teach effectively)? Even if faculty members have such time afforded to them, a critical incentive in tenure is removed, along with some of the motivation to publish in the first place. No doubt scholars will continue to conduct research simply for the joy of cultivating the life of the mind, yet there are many hindrances to such work.

If the historic rule of promotion and tenure is waning, what role can scholarship play in a fragmented, unbundled academy? In Scholarship Reconsidered, Boyer offers a still much-needed approach. To begin, Boyer attacked the academy’s sole focus on original research and called for a broadened view of scholarship, audaciously refocusing its gaze from the tenure file and to a broader community.

Through the scholarly domains of discovery (original research and publication), integration (scholarship conducted across the disciplines), application (scholarship as service), and teaching (the pursuit of innovative pedagogy), Boyer wrote Scholarship Reconsidered as a coup d’état to the publish-or-perish status quo that dominated the academy. This particular Carnegie report, published almost 25 years ago, lobbied that publication was pursued at the expense of teaching and service, and that publication also robbed faculty of the time needed to contribute to a vibrant learning community.

While Boyer’s broadened view has remained a significant part of the national conversation on scholarship in the academy, it has done so in spirit more than practice. Scholarship Reconsidered arguably generated more discussion than concrete action. Instead of disregarding his views as being out-of-step with the emerging structure of the American faculty, perhaps scholars should consider Boyer ahead of his time. Perhaps Boyer’s views are more relevant to this particular iteration of the professoriate with its radically shifting priorities than it was to the professoriate of his day. All said, the time has come to consider the possibility of employing his domains to the present condition.

While still important, the focal point of Boyer’s scholarship was not the publication of refereed journal articles. In contrast, Boyer’s emphasis was on forming an integrated community of
learning on, and even beyond, the campus. In other words, Boyer viewed scholarship as a highly communal act. In doing so, he believed scholarship for the common good (whether conducted through teaching, service, or collaborate endeavors) would restore the credibility of higher education to the public.

The faculty landscape undoubtedly shifted in significant ways since the release of Scholarship Reconsidered and is likely to continue to do so. While faculty trudging along the tenure track may not have the luxury of complaining about the pressures of publishing in comparison to many of their colleagues, adjuncts now lack sufficient time to devote to traditional scholarship. The subtitle of Scholarship Reconsidered is thus timely and poignant: “Priorities of the Professoriate.”

What then are the priorities of the new majority of college faculty? Media reports mentioned above reveal the first priority is survival. The compass of a scholar is, however, his or her research agenda. The vibrancy of one’s discipline depends on the collective pursuit of its scholars to advance their field. Perhaps an even better question for the academy to ask is: “What should the priority of the professoriate be given the current condition?”

Boyer’s model is pertinent and instructive. His four domains of discovery, integration, application, and teaching were a call for scholarship to be diverse and flexible enough to serve the common good and advance higher education in the ways it needs to in order to thrive. Boyer’s views serve as a helpful correction to the unbundled fragmentation of the present.

How is the topic of increasing rather than passing or declining importance?

In addition to Scholarship Reconsidered’s consistently strong sales and citation numbers, promotion and tenure in the academy remain in flux, and will continue to evolve for many years to come. The role of scholarship will undoubtedly be at the core of the debate over this changing professoriate.

Purpose.
What is the work designed to accomplish?

This 25th anniversary edition will introduce Boyer’s ideas concerning scholarship to a new generation of higher education practitioners, policy makers, scholars, and graduate students. It will also briefly assess, through a critical introduction, the impact of Boyer’s views and the implications of those views for the future. This introduction will also provide a call to action regarding new directions in higher education.

How does it meet the need you have identified?

In the spirit of Jossey-Bass and Scholarship Reconsidered, this 25th anniversary edition intends to frame the content of Scholarship Reconsidered for a new audience in an unashamedly practical manner. The content will be accessible and applicable to practitioners, policy makers, scholars, and graduate students. In doing so, this edition will also carry with it a critical dimension. For example, this edition will ask, “What has been the true impact of Scholarship Reconsidered on higher education?; What relevance does it have for the future?;” and “How can it be applied to a shifting professoriate?”

Contribution.
What new information is offered?

This 25th anniversary edition will include a brief, critical introduction exploring the impact of Boyer’s views. It will also provide a call to action, applying Boyer’s views toward new directions in higher education, particularly among the changing nature of faculty work (as previously mentioned).

In what ways would the work add to current knowledge and practice?

Scholarship Reconsidered is widely cited, and sales of the book continue to remain high. However, as mentioned above, Boyer is often cited, yet perhaps underutilized in practice. The critical introduction that precedes the original text will propel Scholarship Reconsidered into future practice by asking the emerging generation of practitioners and scholars to consider the possibility of its ongoing influence. Or, as we previously proposed, is Scholarship Reconsidered more relevant now than it was to members of its original audience given the changing nature of the professoriate?

Intended Audiences.
The primary audience for this work is two-fold. First, this book is intended for higher education administrators and faculty members engaged in the promotion and tenure processes on their respective campuses. Quite often, individuals serving on promotion and tenure committees are asked to consult Boyer’s work when they are facing a critical juncture in the history of their institutions. We can even think of a large number of campuses where chief academic officers have purchased copies of Scholarship Reconsidered for members of these committees and asked them to review Boyer’s work as they decipher future challenges and opportunities. Part of our
desire for this new edition is to continue to make this work accessible and useful to individuals serving in these capacities.

This work is also intended to serve as a resource for policy makers whose work intersects with higher education. Repeated calls for accountability are now most formally manifested in the looming possibility of the United States Department of Education issuing a report card for colleges and universities. Regardless of whether some form of a report card comes to fruition, there is no denying that state and federal involvement in higher education will only grow in the foreseeable future. As a result, making resources such as Scholarship Reconsidered available to policy makers is one way of making sure those decisions are made in as thoughtful a manner as possible.

The secondary audience for this book includes scholars and graduate students of higher education. In particular, Scholarship Reconsidered has found its way into any number of classes related to the professoriate. This 25th anniversary edition is designed to not only help these ideas maintain their presence in these courses but even expand it. The critical introduction is designed to give faculty members and graduate students an overview of the current state of Boyer’s ideas and conditions in which those ideas may prove even more influential in the future given the changing nature of the professoriate.

Uses.
What would the work help the audiences to do, understand, improve, carry out, and so on?

This work will help the audience analyze the impact of a prominent work in the higher education literature. It will also provide a vision for future application of Boyer’s views for a changing professoriate and equip scholars to effectively assess the impact of Boyer’s views on scholarship. Finally, this project will bring Boyer’s landmark views to a digital audience through the publication of an eBook.

Knowledge Base.
What is the research or experience base for the information in the project? Briefly describe any special studies or previous work relevant to this project.

Scholarship Reconsidered quickly became a Carnegie Foundation bestseller and, according to Glassick (2000), “clearly had struck a nerve in higher education” (p. 877). The response was mixed and passionate. Regardless of whether scholars loved or loathed his four domains, Boyer provided a much desired vocabulary for a national debate on the issue of scholarship. In Glassick’s estimation, “Scholarship Reconsidered lacked specificity, [but] its concepts . . . were immediately recognized as important new proposals in a field that was ripe for revision” (Glassick, 2000, p. 878).

The majority of responses to Boyer’s view of scholarship were positive. Many praised Scholarship Reconsidered for expanding the thinking of the academy to a broader definition of scholarship (Bruns, et al., 2003). Others also praised Boyer for not just challenging the definition of scholarship, but also fostering comprehensive reform of higher education. One group of scholars wrote:
A broadened view of scholarship that is congruent with progressive missions invites changes in the academic culture that touch faculty roles, reward systems, disciplinary boundaries, and changing purposes. Learning becomes the measure of success rather than teaching—a challenging but worthy endeavor. (Fiddler, McGury, Marienau, Rogers, & Scheideman, 1996, p. 138).

Estes (1996) may have summed it up best when he wrote, “Boyer’s approach to scholarship is scholarly . . . Boyer was a scholar of scholarship” (p. 128). The very nature of that scholarship, however, invited not only praise, but critique. Others liked portions of Boyer’s view, accepting some while critiquing others. Paulsen and Feldman (1995) mostly praised Boyer’s efforts, but they suggested replacing the scholarship of integration with their own scholarship of academic citizenship.

Some scholars were also largely critical of Boyer’s view, with McNeil (1996) being one of the strongest critics. He admitted Boyer’s intention to broaden scholarship was noble, conceding that the report raised the collective consciousness surrounding scholarship in higher education. However, he strongly critiqued Boyer’s scholarship of teaching by offering, “Boyer’s intention is to broaden our concept of scholarship within the university. But he has succeeded only in clouding the issue. Part of the cloudiness results from his failure to draw a relationship between teaching and learning” (McNeil, 1996, p. 143).

Davis and Chandler (1998) did not challenge his views on teaching, but believed that “his analysis fails largely because he ignores the socioeconomic context of universities and the purposes universities have historically served” (p. 23-24). They argued against Boyer’s assumption that the reward system is a necessary part of scholarship, for they viewed the entire reward system as a manipulative tool of administrative control.

Johnston (1998) praised Boyer’s four areas of scholarship but felt they were insufficient apart from a global learning system perspective. In her estimation, “The university is more than the sum of what it does, however, it is what it uniquely is, defined as that which is duplicated by no other institution in society” (Johnston, 1998, p. 270).

Rubin (2000) was also not impressed, claiming that Boyer’s view of scholarship only succeeded in leading to a “scholarship of confusion” (p. 263). His primary concern was that Boyer was dangerously inclusive. In essence, should everything an academic does be defined as scholarship? If so, does this not diminish the quality of scholarship? Rubin believed Boyer’s approach “fosters the potential for superficial work, isolation and division, and the lack of common or shared values” (Rubin, 2000, p. 263).

Clearly, Boyer’s view of scholarship was controversial in higher education. Glassick (2000) summarized the tension well by explaining that an expanded definition of scholarship was generally well received but two main questions provided stumbling blocks. First, what is the meaning of the scholarship of teaching? Second, how should the quality of scholarship be assessed?
Lee Shulman (1999), Boyer’s successor as President of the Carnegie Foundation, attempted to clarify the scholarship of teaching. Boyer’s one condition, that teaching be a creative act to be considered scholarship, was too vague for most. Shulman (1999) concluded that to be scholarship, teaching must meet three criteria: it must be made public; it must be available for peer review and critique; and it must be reproducible and built on by other scholars.

Schulman’s efforts were helpful but still left many with questions. As a response, the Carnegie Foundation established the Carnegie Teaching Academy Campus Program in 1999, “which promotes campus conversations designed to help institutions draft definitions of the scholarship of teaching and learning” (Glassick, 2000, p. 880). Shulman was instrumental in developing the academy and believed it fostered generative, collaborative relationships in which faculty can build upon innovative teaching methods. The academy introduced peer reviews of teaching and thus adapted the well-established practice of assessment for the classroom. With 130 institutions enrolled, the academy was a proactive attempt to prove to American higher education that teaching could be a scholarly act, subjected to peer review and critique, reproducible, and a contribution to the field.

**Title Possibilities.**

*Along with your current working title, please suggest several alternative titles.*

- Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate – A 25th Anniversary Edition
- Scholarship Reconsidered: A 25th Anniversary Edition
- 25th Anniversary Edition of Scholarship Reconsidered
- 25 Years of Scholarship Reconsidered
- 25 Years of Scholarship Reconsidered: Assessing Impact, New Directions for the Future

**Length.**

The current edition is 147 pages including appendices, notes, and an index. The critical introduction will include a preface of approximately six to nine manuscript pages. This section will be followed by five brief, thematic essays and then a summative conclusion. Each one of those contributions will be ten to twelve pages. The total length for the introduction to the 25th anniversary edition of Scholarship Reconsidered will be 66 to 81 manuscript pages in length. However, given the font size of the current edition, a new typeset would likely create a more efficient printing and could keep the total length at approximately the same number of pages as the current edition.

**Outline of Contents and Chapter-by-Chapter Descriptions.**

*Provide a few sentences about the purpose and contents of each chapter, giving specific details and examples as well as general statements. Also explain the logic of the work’s organization.*

I. Critical Introduction: 25 Years of Scholarship Reconsidered

Preface: This section will include introductory remarks from representatives of the Ernest L. Boyer Center, Jossey-Bass, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Each one of these individuals will reflect upon not only what this manuscript has meant to their
respective organizations but also what they are doing to make those ideas relevant to the next generation.

Essay 1: The Origins of Scholarship Reconsidered (Drew Moser, Taylor University & Todd C. Ream, Taylor University). For individuals unfamiliar with the history of Scholarship Reconsidered, this contribution seeks to provide an overview of the details that brought the original report into existence. It will move to a discussion of how it was received in the broadest sense of the word (as mentioned above, points of both affirmation and criticism) and then conclude with remarks concerning the relevance of those debates, and thus Scholarship Reconsidered, even today.

Essay 2: The Influence of Scholarship Reconsidered on Different Institutional Types and Academic Disciplines. (John M. Braxton, Vanderbilt University). By drawing upon the Carnegie Foundation’s classification structure for institutions of higher education, this chapter offers an empirically-based overview of the impact Scholarship Reconsidered has had on different types of colleges and universities. In Scholarship Reconsidered, Boyer posited that the domain of scholarship emphasized by a given college or university should align with its institutional mission. Accordingly, he identified domains of scholarship that different types of two and four year colleges and universities should stress. This essay will focus on research findings to assess whether faculty engage in the domains of scholarship prescribed by Boyer. These findings include both four-year colleges and universities and community colleges. In addition to a consideration of institutional types, this essay will also concentrate on how faculty engagement in the four domains of scholarship vary across different academic disciplines.

Essay 3: The Influence of Scholarship Reconsidered on Graduate Education and Professional Education (Ann E. Austin, Michigan State University & Melissa McDaniels, Michigan State University). Making sense of the efforts made by graduate and professional school faculty has long proven to be a challenge for universities. Their students are often older, attending school for more specific reasons than undergraduates, and are engaged in more narrow and also often more practical areas of study. The forms of scholarship produced by faculty often mirror these differences too. As a result, how is the scholarship generated by a professor charged with teaching practice court in a law school, homiletics in a divinity school, or pedagogy in a graduate school of education evaluated by a university-wide tenure and promotion committees? Too often, members of those committees have deemed such efforts as being too practical in nature. Boyer's four domains of scholarship proposed a way forward for faculty serving in graduate and professional education capacities. This contribution explores that way forward, its impact to date, and what prospects may exist for its future.

Essay 4: The Influence of Scholarship Reconsidered on Faculty Development (Andrea L. Beach, Western Michigan University). One can arguably make a cursory judgment of the quality of an institution based upon a review of the quality of its professional development programs. Institutions seeking to make sure the faculty they introduce to their students and to the scholarly community are as well-prepared as possible make professional development programs a priority. Such programs are thoughtful, well-resourced, and serve clear and specific ends. This contribution explores the ways different types of institutions and faculty members within
different groups of disciplines were challenged to think about professional development as a result of *Scholarship Reconsidered*.

Essay 5: The Influence of *Scholarship Reconsidered* on Promotion and Tenure (KerryAnn O’Meara, University of Maryland). The health of a faculty development program can in many ways be measured by how members of a particular college or university community are prepared to participate in both the summative and formative components of the evaluation process. Good faculty development programs do not ensure success. What they do offer are clear paths of opportunities and resources for members of their community who are then given every opportunity to succeed. This contribution assesses how *Scholarship Reconsidered* impacted evaluation processes against which faculty members are measured. In particular, this contribution explores the ways different types of institutions and faculty members within different groups of disciplines are challenged to think about promotion and tenure as a result of *Scholarship Reconsidered*.

Summative Reflections: New Directions for *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Drew Moser, Todd C. Ream, John M. Braxton). This concluding essay ties the previous critiques of *Scholarship Reconsidered*’s impact together. It then provides a call to action that presents new directions for Boyer’s views that ensure *Scholarship Reconsidered*’s significance for the next 25 years.

II. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*.

This section will include the original text of *Scholarship Reconsidered*. The only change will include a revised index that also considers the material in the critical introduction.

**Format.**
We envision this project resulting in a paperback and an eBook.

**Related and Competing Works.**
Because this is a 25th anniversary edition of a now classic work, there are no competitors. It stands on its own merits as a category unto itself. The only related work is the current edition.

**Potential Text Adoption.**
In addition to sales to individual practitioners, policy makers, and scholars of higher education, this work would be utilized in masters and doctoral level programs in higher education, specifically in courses on the professoriate, academic leadership, contemporary issues, and faculty development.

**Timetable.**
1) Initial drafts of the essays comprising the critical introduction are to be submitted to the volume editors by November 30, 2014. Our current plan is to gather as a group just prior to the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) in Washington, DC for a half-day meeting to review each one of our respective contributions.
2) The editors will then review the drafts, work with the contributors on any needed revisions, and have the critical introduction ready to be submitted for peer review by January 1, 2015.
3) Peer reviewers will then have until February 28, 2015, to review the manuscript and note any possible changes.
4) The editors will work with the contributors to make any needed changes over the course of March 2015.
5) The full manuscript will be submitted to Jossey-Bass by April 1, 2015.
6) Release of the 25th anniversary edition of Scholarship Reconsidered would take place in time for the November 2015 ASHE conference in Denver, CO.

Other Publishers.
Has the manuscript been sent to other publishers for consideration?

Given the unique nature of this project, this manuscript has not been sent to other publishers.
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The editors (curriculum vita also attached) for this 25th anniversary edition include:

Drew Moser (PhD, Indiana State University) is an Associate Dean of Students and Assistant Professor at Taylor University;

Todd C. Ream (PhD, Pennsylvania State University) is Professor of Higher Education at Taylor University and Research Fellow with Baylor University’s Institute for Studies of Religion; and

John M. Braxton (EdD, Pennsylvania State University) is Professor of Higher Education at Vanderbilt University.


References


