

SCHOLARSHIP ASSESSED AND RECONSIDERED: A CASE STUDY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIES

Mikhail L. Makarov, Tver State University, Russia

This study was made possible through invaluable support of Carnegie Corporation of New York, International Research and Exchange Board, Clemson University, Kennesaw State University, and all the people who work hard to bring excellence to modern scholarship across the borders

INTRODUCTION

This paper adopts a case study research method using two case studies (Kennesaw State University, Georgia, and Clemson University, South Carolina), as well as the existing research data previously published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and proposes a framework to guide the strategies for enhancement of university scholarship and learning communities (UNIT OF ANALYSIS).

As we move from an industrial to a knowledge economy, new skills and competencies will be demanded of the workforce. The U.S. Department of Labor's 1991 Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) report suggested the following: the ability to

- a) direct one's own learning (personal and professional growth through lifelong learning);
- b) work in teams;
- c) work well with people from other cultures;
- d) deal with complex issues and problems that require different kinds of expertise.¹

A study by Dr. Gardiner in fairly similar terms identified the proficiencies required as the ability to work in teams, excellent presentation and critical thinking skills, and the capacity to use a variety of technology and software.² Although these requirements became a part of the official discourse on education a decade ago, their relevance in the modern context remains unquestioned.

The specific function of the universities to equip students with the abovementioned skills cannot be taken apart from their crucial role of knowledge generators (especially in a knowledge economy environment). This issue should not fall into the framework of the traditional *teaching vs. research* debate. Furthermore, this issue brings up a vast social context, which sets cultural constraints on the very definition of *teaching, research, professional development, quality, educational resources*, etc. That context in the greater part is determined by the history of the relations between universities and the state.

¹ U.S. Department of Labor (1991). The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. Washington D.C. <www.academicinnovations.com/report.html>

² Lion F. Gardiner, *Redesigning Higher Education: Producing Dramatic Gains in Student Learning* Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1994.

CULTURAL CONTEXT: GOVERNMENT VS. UNIVERSITY

The *relations between universities and the government* of the country within which they are located are surrounded by traditions. From their beginnings, universities justified their existence by focusing on their unceasing search for knowledge. Neither the state nor the church in the West were to interfere in the scholars' work. Students, on the other hand, were permitted and even encouraged to question their professors: hence the terms *lecture*, the scholar-professor's explanation of a text or an idea, followed by the students' disputation, their exchange of thoughts with the professor. That exchange in many ways still constitutes the core of the dynamics at universities and learning communities.

The modern university (as a cultural pattern) is often said to have been created by Wilhelm von Humboldt at the University of Berlin early in the 19th century. Here, scientific research became the core of the *university*. Further, von Humboldt emphasized again the principle of academic freedom that was to permeate the university. This construct referred to the freedom of professors to conduct scientific research and experiments, as well as the freedom of students to ask questions, even to challenge their professors' lectures and explanations, and read widely to expand their knowledge. Von Humboldt's reforms occurred after Prussia's humbling defeat by Napoleon's armies. Von Humboldt was in a position to reassert the traditions of universities namely, their being a *community of scholars*, the *unity of research and teaching*, and the *unity of those who teach and those who learn*,³ all three without either interference or guidance by the state. That authoritarian and even more – totalitarian states feel threatened by academic freedom at universities has been amply demonstrated in Nazi Germany by the removal and persecution of professors whose research and teaching critiqued national socialist ideology or in the Stalinist Soviet Union and mainland China where dissident students and professors were repressed, and even in the McCarthyist U.S. in the times of cold war.

State power vs. the power of the university today figures in a number of other areas in addition to that of academic freedom. The society (including the learning communities, the state, and the public at large) is also concerned with the varied purposes of universities, access to universities, the financing of universities, governance within universities and control by outside bodies, and *quality control*. These issues are under frequent discussion both in Europe and in the United States. In Europe, the financing of universities becomes linked with a review of their purposes and quality assessment. A British bureaucrat writes, "Higher education includes such purposes as: the acquisition of a body of knowledge on which to base professional judgments; the preparation for a lifetime of learning; the building of a value system against which to make personal, social, and moral judgments; the development of an understanding of one's culture; and the construction of confidence to contribute to it."⁴ To this, one may add European governments' and industrialists' concern to replenish or expand the pool of professionals and skilled technical workers. That some students to be admitted to the university register

³ Ulrich K. Preuss, *Demokratie in der Hochschule*, Kursbuch, September 1989.

⁴ Sylvia Wicks, *Peer Review and Quality Control in Higher Education*, British Journal of Educational Studies, XXXX: 1, February 1992.

for a program where positions need to be filled but later work in an occupational area more to their liking raises the question of access and selection. Should admission be restricted on any basis beyond a student's academic proficiency? Should the academic output of university departments match economic demands? Further, should professors' research first and foremost meet the state's or industry's requests? How free from state control or intrusion are professors in selecting the focus of their research?

These questions lead to a consideration of the *administration of universities*. In many American as well as European institutions of higher learning, the democratization process has resulted in faculty and also students and staff engaging in endless committee work, sorting out the pathways of power to make decisions and implement policy, and in the process expanding the university's own administrative structure. No longer does the senior professor (*the ordinarius*) rule supreme in his or her domain or specialty, but various clusters of faculty or committees compete for power, space, and resources.

As a solution, Preuss speaks of the *sachliches Ethos* (functional ethos) of scholarship (i.e., the criterion to guide relations among a faculty). What he refers to is their moral obligation to apply the principles of rationality, display commitment to the search for knowledge, engage in an open, scholarly discourse, and find a balance between a focus on freely choosing their research topics and serving the needs of the state, the public, the community, or other scholars in their field.⁵ The functional ethos of scholarship and research forms the basis that unites the interests of all who work at a university. It is very interesting to apply this criterion to the case study of different universities.

HISTORY

The history of the two universities (Kennesaw and Clemson) presents an interesting and vivid example of the learning community transformation within the local functional ethos of scholarship.

The history of **Kennesaw State University** makes an impressive transition from a 2-year junior college with an under 1000 enrollment (1963) to a senior community college (1978) and a decade later – to Kennesaw State College. It started graduate programs in 1985 and was attained a university status in 1996. Today Kennesaw State University is classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Master's University I. It offers a wide range of baccalaureate programs (offered by School of the Arts; Bagwell College of Education; Coles College of Business; College of Health and Human Services; College of Humanities and Social Sciences; College of Science and Mathematics) with a commitment to graduate education through the master's degrees awarded across 9 disciplines.

Today Kennesaw State is a fairly new and fast-growing university. Enrollment numbers go up almost every year (10030 in 1990; 17485 in 2003). Most traditions stem from the community college past of Kennesaw State. KSU serves a diverse student body in the northern suburbs of Atlanta and extending into northwest Georgia. It includes young

⁵ Ulrich K. Preuss. Op. cit.

adults who enroll as freshmen or undergraduate transfers and an equally large number of older adults who return or transfer to the university at different stages in their lives for undergraduate or graduate study (60% of KSU students are of non-traditional age). Students reside off campus and commute to classes. A majority pursue their academic goals (mostly professionally oriented degrees) on a part-time basis because of job, family and civic responsibilities. Evening and weekend programs accommodate experienced professionals seeking academic advancement. A number of programs, services and activities are offered outside the classroom to enrich campus life and enhance student success and personal development. Kennesaw State University can hardly be recognized as a model university following the cultural pattern described above. Both historically and administratively, it lays much greater emphasis on teaching and community relations. No wonder that last fall, in a report called “Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place,” the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) ranked Kennesaw State University third in the nation in its commitment to community engagement. It may be considered as one of the major factors that has helped KSU to raise funds for the campus development and to maintain a fairly good salary for its faculty (about average among Comprehensive Master’s Universities and Colleges), yet a bit behind Clemson. This comparison may be relevant for the scholarship study.

Table I. Average Faculty Salary by Rank 2002-2003

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor
Kennesaw State University	74,800	59,400	47,600	39,900
Clemson University	85,956	64,342	56,143	45,278

Clemson University was founded in 1889, a legacy of Thomas Green Clemson, who willed his Fort Hill plantation home, its surrounding farmlands and forest, and other property to the state of South Carolina to establish a technical and scientific institution for South Carolina. Clemson opened its doors to 446 students as a military college in 1893. It means that it has been a profound *science institution* from the very beginning

Today, Clemson is classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Doctoral/Research University-Extensive, a category comprising less than 4 percent of all universities in America. About 17,000 students (with a special emphasis on serving South Carolina students) select from undergraduate and graduate degree (63 master’s and 40 doctoral) programs in more than 70 fields of study offered by five colleges: Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences; Architecture, Arts and Humanities; Business and Behavioral Science; Engineering and Science; and Health, Education and Human Development. Research and quality education have always been high priorities for Clemson University. Enrollment numbers of circa 17000 have been steady for the past 15 years (16303 in 1990; 17016 in 2003). Clemson can boast of an excellent campus, and a long tradition for the campus community layout. As the state's land-grant university, Clemson reaches out to communities and businesses all over South Carolina. The Public Service Activities

division includes the county-based Cooperative Extension Service, five off-campus Research and Education Centers, etc.

Clemson is the most competitive school for South Carolina's brightest students. At 1205, the average SAT score for Clemson freshmen is the highest among public institutions in the state (cf.: 1029 total average SAT score for Kennesaw State University freshmen). Clemson enrolled more than a third of the state's Palmetto Fellows, the state's highest academic scholarship, more than any other public or private institution. Clemson's reputation as a *national university* is ever growing – due to its academia and research, in the first place. In 2001, it was named TIME Magazine's Public College of the Year for its innovative communications-across-the-curriculum program. In its 2004 annual college guide edition, U.S. News and World Report ranked Clemson 35th among top national public universities. Kiplinger's ranks Clemson 20th among top public universities, based on quality and accessibility.

Clemson's stature as a *research institution* also is growing. Its Center for Advanced Engineering Fibers and Films was designated a national engineering research center by the National Science Foundation, one of only 20 in the nation. Clemson's record in generating income from patents and licenses and its faculty expertise in textiles, fibers and film engineering led to the donation of more than \$50 million worth of patents and intellectual properties from Eastman Chemical Co. and the Hoechst Co.

To sum it up, Clemson is a good example of a traditional research university as Vilhelm von Humboldt meant it to be. The major mission goal is to become a recognized top 20 public university in the USA.

For both schools *quality control* remains a problem for several reasons. First, today's measures of quality give fuzzy results at best in the case of academia. For some fields, whether in the humanities or the sciences, any attempts to assess degrees of quality are virtually impossible. Aesthetic judgments permeate the humanities, and in the sciences a circuitous path may eventually lead a researcher to a significant discovery or invention. When it comes to assessing the comprehensive achievement of university students, a large number of variables interfere, such as individual differences in motivation, intelligence, clarity of career plans, communicative skills, and time to study, along with the teaching effectiveness of professors, availability of laboratory space and materials, and library resources, among others. The last two are closely related to the financial support offered by governments and/or private funding sources, and, in turn, the revenue derived by governments from their tax system or efficiency of the private foundations. And *cost vs. quality* dilemma has become an administrative 'nexus' for most universities nationwide (if not worldwide).

BETTER FOR LESS: THE POSTMODERN CHALLENGE

The postmodern condition of the two universities in question (Kennesaw and Clemson) makes a good example of the crisis management, since like many other colleges and universities, they face their most significant crisis in over 40 years. The analysis of this

crisis has coalesced over the last years with a focus on the double-edged sword of costs: the expenses of institutions are too high for their revenues and the costs of what they offer are growing beyond students' (and their families') capability or willingness to pay. If there are any doubts, a quick look at the facts and figures: there were job cuts and/or load increase; mid-year budgetary cuts; limited or no salary increases; and, finally, tuition costs went up (significantly at Clemson, a little less at Kennesaw – a new university simply could not afford a greater increase, though it did some for non-residents):

Table II. Full-Time Undergraduate Tuition and Fees 1985-2003

Year	CLEMSON		KENNESAW	
	Resident (\$)	Non-Resident (\$)	Resident (\$)	Non-Resident (\$)
1990-1991	2,470	6,600	N/A	N/A
1991-1992	2,630	7,028	N/A	N/A
1992-1993	2,762	7,380	N/A	N/A
1993-1994	2,954	7,896	N/A	N/A
1994-1995	3,036	8,116	N/A	N/A
1995-1996	3,112	8,316	N/A	N/A
1996-1997	3,112	8,316	1,056	3,642
1997-1998	3,252	8,676	1,120	4,094
1998-1999	3,344	9,100	1,730	6,950
1999-2000	3,470	9,456	1,808	7,236
2000-2001	3,590	9,784	1,876	7,504
2001-2002	5,090	11,284	2,428	8,224
2002-2003	5,834	12,932	2,516	8,546
2003-2004	6,934	14,532	2,778	9,414

All these factors combined put enormous pressures for university management change. It is believed that three major forces will alter most universities over the next 5-7 years:

- the high costs associated with undergraduate education in the public and private sectors will give rise to overwhelming pressures to cut back expenses rather than increase tuition;
- there will be an ever-growing demand from many sectors of society and government that student learning outcomes and overall educational quality are better evaluated and documented;
- the new information technologies will provide the capability to alter traditional ways of how students learn and how faculty teach.

New technologies finally begin to pay back, mostly because nowadays they are employed for and by the new generation of students who have grown up with laptop computers and Nintendo games. Two examples from Clemson University: first, a laptop is *required* for each and every student since fall 2004, and a special laptop program is set in motion to facilitate this transition; second, a new and somewhat unexpected kind of academic support unit – the Communication Studio – is open for all students (various majors) who want to master their communication techniques from basic speech presentation to a hi-tech multimedia project (it is so popular, that you will need an appointment to get there). Tremendous opportunities for absolutely new types of learning environments, teaching interaction, data management and communication networks evolve, circumstances that both augment and replace classroom settings. The question is whether present day faculty members who grew up in a very different technological culture can adapt to these new opportunities. Given the potential financial savings and the power of these new tools for student learning and scholarship, there will be a great deal of pressure to adopt them. In certain aspects these new electronic technologies may replace many learning activities faculty are now performing. No doubt, new technologies have already become a *valid constituent of quality education and professional development*.

The cost of education has become a public worry. I was told that people in the U.S. are beginning to draw parallels between the economics of higher education and of the health care system: costs that rise relentlessly; the unwillingness of providers to deal directly with the core delivery system; governance structures that rest decision-making power about costs in the hands of professionals whose personal interests are compromised by reducing costs; belief stereotypes that increases in quality always require increases in expenditures; and a decentralized system that is heavily underwritten by federal dollars, but that allows federal policy-makers little direct capability to reduce costs. Frustration that they produce find new expression in recent federal and state *accountability* initiatives – SPREs, report cards, faculty workload legislation – all assessing quality and questioning the public value delivered by higher education.

Beyond legislation, the litany of pressures on the cost side is very real:

- institutional expenses increase relentlessly and are not being offset by non-tuition income (true for both Kennesaw State University and Clemson University – there is a steady and visible decrease of tuition/fee constituent in the overall budget pie chart);
- increases in tuition and fees outstrip the capability and/or willingness of prospective students, or the public generally, to pay; tuition costs increasingly seem not to be credible for the educational value received (with the rare exceptions – Clemson being one of them, at least partially); every cut-back made decreases the perceived value of what is offered;
- federal and state fiscal priorities will likely lead to a flattening of support over the next decade rather than increases, since higher education is becoming the fourth or fifth funding priority behind K-12, health care, welfare, and prisons;
- in the public sector, public demands for access will likely mean forcing more and more students into existing institutions, with little more (if any) offered in the way of financial support;

- financial aid costs seriously impede the ability to fund basic needs – as tuitions rise, more students need financial aid, but less federal and state financial aid is available; so colleges increase tuition even higher, to fund the needs of aid-dependent students.

The message should be clear: there will be *less money*, and new ways must be found to *reduce institutional expenses*, and then to *reduce student costs*. Educational accessibility remains a recognized value for the American society. Both KSU and Clemson struggle to meet this requirement.

Quality assurance is another value, which governs most of the educational market. Nobody opts for a worse kind of education. Whether from state governments, parents, accrediting associations, or students themselves, people want to know they are getting a good return on their own and society' s educational investment. Higher education can no longer avoid demonstrating to professional and political audiences, as well as the general public, that appropriate levels and forms of student learning result from the education.

For decades, universities have tried to define academic *quality* in terms of *resources*: faculty scholarship and degrees, the depth and breadth of curricular offerings, and the presence of topflight laboratory, library, and like facilities. More recently, many institutions – and many parents and students – have come to define undergraduate quality in terms of faculty reputational rankings, campus beauty, and the range of recreational and support services offered. There is a striking new marketing situation.

Traditional interpretations of quality have led to the proliferation of programs based on the interests of faculty members, and to the significant increase in expenses for student support services over the last 15 years. Those definitions of quality are just beginning to be questioned on a grand scale. The faculty are so accustomed to a definition of quality based on resources that they find it extremely difficult to deal with the results of their work, namely student learning.

While the preparation of faculty members and character of institutional facilities are important resources for student learning, it is far from clear that there is a straight-line relationship between them and the fact of student learning. Indeed, the contribution of faculty teaching to student learning is for the most part unexamined. Rarely do most faculties think hard together about how students learn, about the implications of research on student learning styles and multiple intelligences, or about developmental issues based on the age, gender, race, nationality, or life experiences of the students being taught. Faculty members are not trained to thinking about learning processes and outcomes. Just as difficult to change is the important, implicit assumption held by most faculty that a university is inherently a selective environment. If students don't perform well, it's their problem (or fault), irrespective of how they were taught, the environment in which they were asked to learn, or differences in their learning styles.

Focusing on student learning turns our thinking about the future of the universities upside-down: from faculty productivity to student productivity, from faculty disciplinary interests to what students need to learn, from faculty teaching styles to student learning

styles, from classroom teaching to student learning. These are the kinds of shifts that more and more parties are coming to see as necessary; the pressure to refocus on student learning has only begun (which can be seen at Clemson and a bit less – at Kennesaw). Returning to the basic point: the costs of education, the demand for enhanced learning outcomes, and rapid advances in technology bring pressures for radical change in the administrative and educational practices of American higher education. The need is twofold: to reduce student costs and increase student learning – “better for less”.

CONFLICTING VALUES AND CULTURES: TQM VERSUS EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

One of the widespread reactions to the education market crisis described above – and a very natural one – was the proliferation of the *Total Quality Management* (TQM) system borrowed from the industrial economy sector. Behind that was a shift in reasoning paradigm: facing the crisis, which was by many in academia perceived as a market phenomenon, TQM champions sought for the well-structured rigid solution in the market economy field and finally found something which had long been in many ways opposite to the humanistic paradigm of the classical education. That meant the change of the whole set of values.

TQM is one of the ways in which higher education can seek new designs. For many practitioners, especially administrators and non-academic service providers within higher education, TQM offers a completely new pattern for their work, with a new focus, new principles, and new processes. For others, especially those involved in the academic life of colleges and universities, TQM provides a reshaping and re-emphasis of existing learning and teaching models and methods. Higher education began to experiment with Total Quality Management in the late 1980's. But TQM has its roots way back in the 1930's through the efforts of Juran, Crosby, and Deming. For those writers TQM was an approach to solving problems and acting on opportunities, which focused on:

- continual improvement;
- process orientation;
- customer satisfaction;
- feedback systems using hard data;
- team problem solving;
- participant empowerment.

One of the most helpful conceptual and/or operational definitions of TQM for the higher education area was provided by Jann Freed in the 1997 ASHE-ERIC report⁶:

Taken together, the quality principles are a personal philosophy and an organizational culture that uses scientific measurement of outcomes, systematic management techniques, and collaboration to achieve an institution's mission. Essentially, the quality principles change the culture of higher education institutions.

⁶ Jann Freed et al., *A Culture for Academic Excellence: Implementing the Quality Principles in Higher Education*, ASHE-ERIC, 1997.

The success of TQM's approach in fulfilling the two demands of leadership, namely *Goal Achievement* and *Stakeholder Satisfaction*, is founded upon seven characteristics of TQM within higher education:

- face validity;
- excellence emphasis;
- stakeholder focus;
- sound educational change;
- comprehensive and systematic;
- value/culture congruity;
- leadership congruity.

In the terms of TQM the need for change within higher education was caused by the number of factors some of which I have already mentioned and some of which were most commonly revealed by the students and administrators of both Clemson University and Kennesaw State University in a series of informal interviews. It is interesting to notice that practically the same major risk factors were specified in reports generated in mid 1990's by such organizations as the Task Force on College Quality of the national Governors Association, the Wingspread Group, and the American Association for Higher Education:

- high prices;
- excessive student loan debt;
- poor teaching;
- out-of-date and incoherent programs;
- low graduation rates;
- unresponsive faculty;
- bureaucratic administrations;
- misplaced focus on needs of administrators, staff, and faculty rather than those of other stakeholders, especially students and their families.

These criticisms are made more acute when combined with a variety of internal and external forces impacting American higher education, Clemson and Kennesaw in particular. These forces which have also been cited in the national reports and informal interviews (as a piece of soft data) include: increasing competition, increasing government intervention, diminishing public confidence, changing cost/benefit structures and expectations, increases in consumerism, changing student demographics, competing faculty demands, and rapid changes in technology, etc.

Here we have come to the point where we took off. And I think, there is a simple explanation to that. In the broadest sense, there is hostility to large public institutions, including perceptions that public employees are less deserving of recognition (financial or otherwise) than their private sector counterparts and that large organizations (public and private) are self-serving and somehow disconnected from the public interest. There is a strongly held belief, evidently, that public organizations, including universities, should be more business-like, more entrepreneurial, and more pragmatic. In some measure, faculty and administrators may have contributed to the problem by paying too little attention to their political constituencies, Clemson University President James F. Barker

being a lucky exception.⁷ Academic work inside – and way more outside of the classroom is not well understood. The promotion of private sector virtue, as measured by efficiency, is aided by institutional and system boards. The major issues appear to be productivity and workload, rather than program quality or success. The focus turns out to be on efficiency measures, often with little regard for effectiveness.

Despite the efficiencies, improved quality in “production” process, and other benefits resulting from the adoption of TQM in university administration, there can be serious costs. And they are clearly seen at Kennesaw State University (less at Clemson) in those parts of university management where those techniques were implemented. The managerial culture is a product of the natural process of institutionalization and professionalization and it brings with it changes in basic values, including intended and unintended changes in institutional reward systems, reallocations of resources, and shifts in institutional priorities. Example: during the 2004 Annual University Awards Ceremony at Kennesaw State University the greater number of awards (67%) was granted to administrators, not the faculty.

The TQM desire to ‘reinvent’ universities ends in the ongoing value conflict between managerial and academic cultures. Paradoxically, it has more succeeded in ‘reinventing’ *quality*... of a different quality. However, letting economic values become the foundation of university administration poses a serious threat to academic interests and humanistic values the whole learning community should stand for.

Luckily, there is a different approach to the quality assessment issue, a different ideology, which suggests non-traditional ways of evaluation of the professoriate and ‘reinventing’ scholarship rather than ‘reinventing’ universities. To a greater extent that approach is employed by Clemson University and to some extent – by Kennesaw State University.

EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The evaluation of teaching in higher education is an area of strong interest for different stakeholders, and a subject that goes beyond the world of researches, given its social, political, and legal implications. In recent years, pressures for accountability, changes in enrollment trends, and financial retrenchment have forced Clemson and Kennesaw State universities to pay more attention to formal procedures for evaluating and improving the quality of their teaching. When cost of tuition rises and stories of large undergraduate

⁷ A 1970 Clemson graduate, the former dean of the University's College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities, he was named president in October 1999, having outlined for the Board of Trustees a vision of making Clemson one of the top-20 public universities in the country. From that vision came the development of set of 10-year goals adopted in 2001 – goals that are already showing results, including a 70-plus percent increase in research support over two years, earning Clemson a ranking as one of the nation's top 100 research universities and reaching Barker's goal of \$100 million dollars in research support in just three years; a successful capital campaign that raised \$295 million; the enrollment of Clemson's brightest class ever, with an average SAT exceeding 1200; recognition in 2000 as TIME Magazine's Public College of the Year for its innovative Communication-Across-the-Curriculum program, etc.

classes taught by doctoral students (Clemson) or ever-changing adjunct faculty members (Kennesaw) have angered parents, pressures on universities to improve teaching have produced urges of new initiatives for teaching improvement. Research universities have not escaped this trend if only because faculty evaluation is considered an essential element of institutional quality. The growing concerns about the quality of teaching in research institutions have led to current discussions about post-tenure reviews, etc.

A national assessment movement was born out of a response to the criticism and was supported by state policymakers, by professional higher education organizations, by federal funds to encourage exemplary or innovative institutional programs, and by individual and institutional leadership (cf.: Association of American Colleges, National Governors' Association, etc.). Although institutionally based accountability through locally designed assessment processes produced rich and diverse models, the framework did not allow for comparisons and the institutional response was uneven. The challenge to the quality of American higher education emerged despite the century-long tradition of voluntary self-regulation in the six regional accreditation associations (including SACS/COC in our case) that were once regarded as "trusted gatekeepers of quality". Accreditation, a process intended to ensure high standards and a focus on improvement of the instructional programs, involves institutional self-study (done at Kennesaw State University, for example, by the Center for Institutional Effectiveness and the Office for Institutional Research) and affirming or challenging the results of that self-study, accreditation places great emphasis on institutional integrity – the university delivering what it promises within a stable and appropriate framework, defined in a traditional structure.

An outcome of an intensive focus on quality, productivity, and competition was the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program (MBNQP), which was established in 1987 by the United States Congress as an incentive and reward for quality development in the corporate world. A signal attribute of the MBNQP is the articulation of concrete and explicit criteria by which an organization can evaluate its own quality improvement programs. Those criteria, however, were framed from a corporate context. In 1995, the MBNQP piloted a set of educational criteria to explore the feasibility of a translation of the quality principles and processes from business and industry to health care and educational institutions and, in 1999, an application process and criteria for performance excellence for educational institutions were set. The Baldrige Criteria define the focus on learning. Learning-centered education includes high expectations, alternative instructional strategies to address learner differences, active learning and development of problem-solving skills, marketplace and citizenship requirements translated into curriculum, and the notion of *teaching effectiveness* as the promotion of learning achievement (see MBNQP, 1999).

Teaching effectiveness relies heavily on *professional development* of the faculty – even more in the quality-centered transition of the two universities in question. Essentially, continuing professional development encompasses three types of activities: (1) self-directed learning experiences, (2) formal professional development programs, and (3) organizational development strategies. In the professional career, professional

development most often takes the self-directed route. Self-directed learning experiences are activities the faculty members plan, implement and evaluate primarily on their own. Learning that takes place as a result of preparing class materials, teaching classes, designing new courses, revising curriculum, supervising dissertations, conducting research, and being involved in service functions (as a member of various committees, boards, panels, etc.). Those activities are well-defined and fairly recurrent at Clemson University and considerably less – at Kennesaw State University. Formal professional development programs both at Clemson and Kennesaw are put in action. These are evidenced by the multitude of brochures and advertisements we receive for professional meetings, workshops, and conferences. Most programs are focused on teaching, including implementation of technology, scholarship, and research. Organizational development is a third area of continuing professional development. It can be defined as a systematically planned change effort for the purpose of developing and implementing action strategies for organizational improvement. Although the other forms of professional development described may also address organizational issues and needs, the explicit purpose of organizational development is to effect organizational change rather than individual change. This type of professional development is implemented by administrators (namely, Offices for Strategic Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, Institutional Research, etc. at Clemson and KSU). Many factors affect faculty members’ professional development – among them we can specify four domains: *Interpersonal Relationships*, *Institutional Structures*, *Personal Considerations*, and *Intellectual Characteristics*. A number of interviews conducted at Clemson University and Kennesaw State University provided ample soft data, which is summed up in the following tables.

Table III. Interpersonal Relationships in Faculty Development

Enabling Factors	Impeding factors
Personal support systems at the work site	Lack of personal support at the work site
Positive working relationships with department chair and other university administrators	Passive or active opposition by department chair, other administrators, and faculty leaders
Mentoring or modeling by respected colleagues which is freely given	Little, if any colleague support and work-related interaction
Department or division faculty who team in teaching, research, and service	Most faculty work individually and rarely collaborate on any projects
Faculty respect each other as colleagues, despite differences in personal philosophies and ways of working	Faculty interactions characterized by infighting, lack of professional respect, and “one-up-manship”
Recognition provided for your work by colleagues at local, state, national, and international levels	Work recognized only at the campus, or perhaps the local level
Encouragement of and support by family and friends for your faculty role and professional development activities	Spoken or unspoken disapproval by family and friends for your faculty role and professional development efforts.

Table IV. Institutional Structures in Faculty Development

Enabling Factors	Impeding factors
Provision of necessary resources (e.g., funding, personnel, time, technology) for professional development	Lack of resources or access to resources for professional development
Variety of opportunities for professional development both on and off campus	Poorly coordinated or sporadic opportunities for professional development available on campus or within a reasonable distance
Recognition through official policy statement of different forms of professional development	Policy statements which recognize only formal professional development programs
Time allotted for professional development within the framework of your work life as a faculty member	Insufficient time provided for professional development, given high time and energy demands of your faculty role
Climate of the department, division, and/or college which fosters collaboration and collegiality	Climate of competition, fostering a “dog-eat-dog” atmosphere, between individuals and groups within the department, division, etc.
Written and unwritten procedures and operating norms of the unit which encourage professional development and career success for all faculty and allow for different definitions of success	Written and unwritten procedures and operating norms encouraging professional development in the form of formal programs and career success only for a select few top performers (primarily in the area of research)

Table V. Personal Considerations and Commitments in Faculty Development

Enabling Factors	Impeding factors
Support and encouragement of family members and friends	Lack of support from, or active discouragement by family members and friends
Resources (time, funds, people) to meet demands of the many everyday roles we play in our lives, including those of parent, friend, etc.	Lack of adequate resources to manage the various roles taken on as adults
Major life transitions and crises (e.g., divorce, illness, death of loved one, job changes) are few and far between	Major life transitions and crises which are frequent and overwhelming, making it difficult to adequately perform your role as a faculty member or engage in professional development activities
Continued good health enabling us to carry out roles as faculty members and engage in professional development activities	Significant or frequent personal health issues which interfere with both the faculty role and professional development
Cultural and/or religious values confirming faculty role and commitment to professional development	Cultural and/or religious values in conflict with the professional role as a faculty member

Table VI. Intellectual and Personal Characteristics in Faculty Development

Enabling Factors	Impeding factors
Strong personal beliefs and values which demand excellence in our work	Lack of commitment to excellence; “getting by” with the minimum is sufficient
Strong personal beliefs and values about the value of continuing professional development; sense of obligation to be active teachers, scholars, and learners throughout the career	Lack of interest in and commitment to continuing professional development; lack of commitment to continue as active teachers, scholars, and learners after receiving tenure
Self-confidence in our roles as faculty members	Little confidence that we are, or can be, successful faculty members
Commitment to a line of inquiry that helps center our work (recognizing that this focus may evolve over time)	Lines of inquiry have no central core, leading to scholarly records which are both unfocused and inconsistent over time
Enjoyment of challenges and change	Reluctance and/or active resistance to change
Ability to see the “big picture” issues related to our universities and our fields, in general	Focus of concern solely on your own work, or issues relevant to your department
Ability to thrive with intrinsic rewards	Need for extrinsic rewards as a primary source of motivation
Continued enthusiasm for the role of faculty member and for continued professional growth	Feelings of exhaustion or burnout as a faculty member

Let’s compare two administrative units, which are to provide professional development and quality enhancement at Clemson University and Kennesaw State University:

Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (Clemson University), founded August 1998. Five major missions are declared:

- To keep Clemson on the cutting edge of teaching excellence and innovation.
- To foster communication, understanding, and a sense of community between teachers and learners by helping instructors to view their teaching through their students’ perspective and to involve their students more actively in their learning.
- To help faculty and TAs select and implement the most effective teaching methods from an ever-broadening repertoire of techniques and technologies.
- To help ensure that teaching and learning are assessed by valid and reliable means that encourage and reward improvement.
- To sustain a vision of teaching as an intellectual activity essential to the overall professional goals of Clemson faculty members and the mission of the University.

The office has the total budget of \$186,797.00 (48,175.00 or 21% less than that of the previous year). The office is run by Linda B. Nilson (full-time position) – former director of Teaching Development Program at University of California, Riverside (1989-1993) and director of the Center for Teaching at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN (1993-1998).

The series of 91 workshops delivered in 2002-03 were attended by 1050 faculty members. The topics varied from technology issues (using laptops, for example) to curriculum development and educational ethics. Services also include consulting to academic and administrative units, as well as private consulting, consulting to grants, faculty funding for teaching-related research and travel, a library, a comprehensive web-site, class interviews, classroom observations, classroom videotape reviews, etc. Special attention is paid to new faculty.

The Kennesaw State University **Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning** (CETL) provides leadership for University-wide programs designed to enhance teaching and student academic success. CETL cultivates an institutional culture that encourages, values, and rewards excellence in teaching and learning through programs and services coordinated by the CETL Director, Bill Hill (full-time since 2001), and five CETL Faculty Fellows (part-time – 50% reduced load) in the following areas: Diversity in the Curriculum, E-Learning, Scholarly Discourse Across Disciplines, the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, and Student Retention & Success. The budget is about \$50,000 plus salaries for the full-time and part-time members (overall it is a little less than that at Clemson, but fairly comparable).

New Faculty Success Program

This yearlong program is designed to establish a foundation for the future success of new faculty at KSU. The program starts with a two-day on-campus retreat designed to provide an opportunity to network with their new colleagues, connect with experienced faculty (seasoned faculty participate in panels during the retreat and the CETL Faculty Fellows also attend), get an overview of the university's mission and culture, and obtain some "fast-start" information they will need early in their first semester at KSU. During the year, new faculty participate in two follow-up workshops that allow them to explore topics in greater depth (e.g., student success, enhancing diversity, promotion & tenure, etc.). The program's goals are to help new faculty: develop an understanding of KSU, including a sense of its past and future; provide an overview of available resources at KSU that can help them achieve professional goals; provide opportunities to make connections with faculty and staff across campus; and assist them in developing a sense of how and in what ways they might contribute at KSU.

CETL Workshop Series on Topical Issues in Teaching

This series offers practical advice on selected issues confronted by teachers and students. Each workshop is designed to provide an overview of the issue, best practices in addressing the issue, resources, and an opportunity for participants to engage in conversation on the issue. Workshop topics, dates, and times are listed on the CETL Campus Workshop & Events Web site. Past topics include: Developing Your Teaching Philosophy and Style; How to Make Visually Interesting and Professional PowerPoint Presentations; The Design and Delivery of Team-taught Interdisciplinary Courses; Analogy Construction as a Heuristics Tool in the Undergraduate Curriculum; Making the Most of the First Day of Class; Incorporating Diversity into the Classroom; An Introduction to the Reflective Practice of Teaching; The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: What It Is and How to Get Started; Classroom Embedded Assessment;

Approaches and Tools; Minority Student Success; and The Ethics of Teaching: Professional Dilemmas and Responsibilities. CETL also sponsors a series of drop-in workshops that deliver advice and help on developing WebCT-based courses.

CETL Book Club

It is an interesting program, which combines scholarship with social life. Each month, a faculty member hosts a discussion focused on a book addressing a current topic or issue in teaching and learning. Participants can look forward to stimulating conversation, collegiality with faculty from across campus, and refreshments as well as that ever-elusive respite from phones, appointments, meetings, and memos. Email invitations and flyers announce book titles and help to sign up for the CETL Book Club discussion groups. Participants for each book discussion are limited to 15 and each will be supplied with a free copy of the book of the month. Upcoming Book Club meetings are also listed on the CETL Campus Workshop & Events Web site.

Social Events

During the year, CETL sponsor a series of Social Hours at the CETL House to facilitate building faculty communities and encouraging discussions about best practices for enhancing teaching and student learning. One series of events will be designed for new faculty and provide the opportunity to meet colleagues from various support units at KSU (e.g., Information Technology and the Library, Business Services, Student Success & Enrollment Services). Upcoming Social Events are listed on the CETL Campus Workshop & Events Web site.

Late Adopters Program

This development program is supported by the Office of the CIO, Dr. Randy Hinds, and focuses on faculty "late adopters" of classroom technology. CETL collaborates with the CIO's Office to offer the Late Adopter Program. The two-semester program's primary goal is to enable faculty "late adopters" to investigate, create, and use alternative instructional strategies through the use of classroom technology. Participants who complete the program will gain knowledge of how to use state-of-the-art instructional technology, and skills to allow them to collaborate with their colleagues in leveraging instructional technology in their courses. Successful completion of the program and a project results in the award of a stipend.

CETL Travel Grants

CETL sponsors travel grants for faculty to attend conferences related to teaching and student learning. Each grant is limited to a maximum of \$250. Grants are competitive, with preference given to grant applications in the following priority order: faculty who are making a presentation on a teaching or student learning topic, faculty receiving an award for excellence in an activity directly related to teaching and student learning, and faculty attending a conference on teaching and learning.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Resource Team Grants

Annually, CETL offers twelve (12) stipend grants for participants in its Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Resource Team (STLRT) initiative. Based upon a successful

program at Portland State University, STLRT is designed to help facilitate and recognize faculty endeavors to do research on teaching and learning. Although participants work autonomously on their project throughout the year, they also attend several team meetings to advance their own research through discussion, problem solving, and the sharing of ideas. Through a community of scholars, this interdisciplinary approach to research can both facilitate research and help keep projects on track through collegial support and encouragement. Benefits of the program include: team support, resource and technical support, a writing retreat offered to STLRT participants to assist with project completion, and travel support for presentations at professional meetings.

Scholarship Incentive grants are awarded to faculty members (as teams or individuals) conducting research in the fields of scholarship of teaching and learning at Kennesaw State University. Accepted projects are awarded a total of \$600, a \$300 stipend upon completion of their participation in the STLRT meetings and \$300 as a travel grant for presentation of their research at a conference.

Reel-n-Rap Series

The Center for University Learning and the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning presents a new program series. In Reel-n-Rap sessions you view a short film and then following the film join in discussion with your KSU colleagues. Reel-n-Rap sessions are held in at the CETL/CIE House and refreshments are provided, too. Fall Semester 2003 films were “Leadership and the New Science”, “The Angry Eye”, “Emotional Intelligence”, and “The Attitude Virus”. Upcoming films are listed on the CETL Campus Workshop & Events Web site.

Talking about the factors stimulating quality enhancement it would be interesting to take a look at the KSU awards.

KSU Foundation Distinguished Professor Award

Newly established in 2004, the KSU Foundation Distinguished Professor Award is conferred annually on a single faculty member who exhibits excellence in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service and has received national or international recognition for his or her contributions. This award is distinguished from those that recognize excellence in a single area (i.e., teaching, scholarship, or professional service). The KSU Foundation will give the KSU Foundation Distinguished Professor recipient a \$5,000 cash award and an additional \$5,000, which is administered through the KSU Foundation, to use for professional travel, supplies, research, etc. The recipient holds the title for the academic year following his or her selection.

KSU Distinguished Teaching Award

The principal campus award for excellence in teaching is the Distinguished Teaching Award, which was established in 1982. Criteria for the award include:

- Consistent excellent teaching performance.
- Impact on students (including classroom teaching, mentoring, advising, supervising in and out of the classroom).
- Implementation of innovative approaches to teaching (including creativity, ability to teach in ways that students learn, honoring individuality and diversity).

- Contributions to improved instruction and curriculum (including special projects, innovative teaching methods, curriculum development).

The University Distinguished Teaching Award recipient and three finalists are selected each year by the Faculty Development and Awards Committee from among the faculty recipients of the college/school, graduate studies, and learning support programs distinguished teaching awards. The winner receives a \$4,000 cash award from the KSU Foundation. The KSU Distinguished Teacher also receives access to an expense account of \$4,000, which is administered through CETL, to support travel, instructional materials, research supplies, or computer hardware and software.

KSU Distinguished Scholarship Award

The principal campus award for excellence in scholarship and creative activity is the Distinguished Scholarship Award, which was established in 1997. Scholarship is the term used to encompass a diverse and multidimensional array of research and creative activities through which faculty make significant contributions to the advancement of knowledge, understanding, problem solving, aesthetics, and pedagogy. Criteria for the award include:

- Significance of the research to the researcher's academic specialty, university and/or region.
- Relative level of research productivity maintained by the researcher.
- Use or impact of the findings or outcome, including but not limited to, publications, presentations, exhibits, and/or benefits derived by the community, region, and/or the university.

The University Distinguished Scholarship Award recipient and three finalists are selected each year by the Faculty Development and Awards Committee from among the faculty recipients of the college/school and graduate studies distinguished scholarship awards. The winner receives a \$3,000 cash award from the KSU Foundation. The KSU Distinguished Scholar also receives access to an expense account of \$3,000, which is administered through CETL, to support travel, instructional materials, research supplies, or computer hardware and software.

KSU Distinguished Service Award

The principal campus award for excellence in service is the Distinguished Service Award, which was established in 1997. Multiple service awards had been made to faculty for many years prior to 1997, however. Service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity. Criteria for the award include:

- The degree to which the service impacts KSU, the outside community, or an individual's profession in notable and substantive ways.
- Sustained leadership in service activities OR leadership in one or more outstanding activities.

The University Distinguished Service Award recipient and three finalists are selected each year by the Faculty Development and Awards Committee from among the faculty recipients of the college/school, learning support program and graduate studies distinguished service awards. The winner receives a \$3,000 cash award from the KSU Foundation. The KSU Distinguished Service recipient also receives access to an expense

account of \$3,000, which is administered through CETL, to support travel, instructional materials, research supplies, or computer hardware and software.

KSU Foundation Prize

Established in 2003 by the KSU Foundation Board of Trustees as part of its effort to encourage, support and recognize scholarly activities among tenure-track faculty, the Foundation Prize recognizes high quality publications by a faculty member in each college/school of the University. 2003 Foundation Prize honorees received the “Flame of Excellence”, which is a personally hand crafted from boron glass rods by Klaus Widmann of the Frabel studio, to “honor those who bravely go before and light the way for others”. Honorees also receive a \$3,000 cash award from the KSU Foundation and an additional \$3,000, which is administered through the KSU Foundation, to use for professional travel, supplies, research, etc.

Philip C. Preston Community Leadership Award

In order to honor the late Phil Preston's years of distinguished community leadership and service, members of Leadership KSU created the Philip C. Preston Community Leadership Award in 1990. Unlike the KSU Distinguished Service Award, service activities recognized by this award are not necessarily directly tied to one's special field of knowledge or professional activity. Nominations are solicited from faculty and staff and a committee of faculty and staff selects a winner who exemplifies distinguished and long-term service to the local community.

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP REASSESSMENT

In 1998, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching launched an initiative known as CASTL: the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Through its higher education program, CASTL aims to advance the development of a scholarship of teaching and learning that will

1. foster significant, long-lasting learning for all students;
2. enhance the practice and profession of teaching; and
3. bring to faculty's work as teachers the recognition and reward afforded to other forms of scholarly work.

CASTL is only a piece of the larger picture, but work such as this opens useful windows on what is happening in the “scholarship of teaching”: what it is, its contributions and conundrums, and, especially, how notions about it have evolved since its initial appearance in work by Ernest Boyer and Eugene Rice at the beginning of this decade.

For KSU and Clemson, it's now safe to say that the scholarship of teaching has been a catalyst for thought and action. True, some faculty find the term off-putting or confusing. At a recent event for both campuses, some participants reported that there was a readiness among their colleagues for many of the *ideas* behind the scholarship of teaching but that the term itself was divisive. In general, however, the scholarship of teaching and the vision it embodies have generated significant interest and activity in the last few years. There are faculty who are eager to engage in sustained inquiry into their teaching practice

and their students' learning and who are well positioned to do so in ways that contribute to practice beyond their own classrooms. It adds to the growing list of campuses (more 120, ranging from Augustana College to Xavier University of Louisiana, from Brown University to Birmingham-Southern, from Middlesex Community College to the University of Minnesota) that have made a public commitment to the scholarship of teaching through CASTL's Campus Program. Coordinated by Carnegie's partner, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), the Campus Program invites campuses to undertake a public process of stock-taking and planning for ways they can support knowledge-building about teaching and learning. Many of these campus conversations evolve into what could be called campus "teaching academies", as is seen in Kennesaw and Clemson, support systems, and learning centers across the disciplines. Scholarly and professional societies, too, are part of the action, working as partners with Carnegie and AAHE to advance the development of the scholarship of teaching. Again, this is the case with KSU and Clemson University. These developments are backed by a growing number of publications through the Carnegie Academy.

What Boyer did *not* do was to draw a sharp line between excellent teaching and the scholarship of teaching. Is excellent teaching different from the scholarship of teaching? If it is, why should anyone care about it? Is there a useful distinction to be made between the scholarship of teaching and "scholarly teaching"? Where does student learning fit in? These, in fact, are the very questions that KSU and Clemson campuses are responding to as part of their process of stock-taking. They're important questions – to be taken up not in the name of creating yet another set of terms but as a way of being clear about our ends and the strategies necessary to reach them.

A scholarship of teaching is *not* synonymous with excellent teaching. It requires a kind of "going meta", in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning – the conditions under which it occurs, what it looks like, how to deepen it, and so forth – and do so with an eye not only to improving their own classroom but to advancing practice beyond it. This conception of the scholarship of teaching is not something we presume all faculty (even the most excellent and scholarly teachers among them) will or should do, though it would be good to see that more of them have the opportunity to do so if they wish. But the scholarship of teaching is a condition—as yet a mostly absent condition for excellent teaching. It is the mechanism through which the profession of teaching itself advances, through which teaching can be something other than a seat-of-the-pants operation, with each of us out there making it up as we go. As such, the scholarship of teaching has the potential to serve all teachers—and students.

This vision will not be easily reached. And it will not be achieved except over the long haul. It is important to stress that faculty in most fields are not, after all, in the habit of framing questions about their teaching and students' learning and designing the systematic inquiry that will open up those questions. In scholarship and research, having a problem is at the heart of the investigative process; it is the compound of the generative questions around which all creative and productive activity revolves. But in one's teaching, a "problem" is something you don't want to have, and if you have one, you probably want to fix it. Changing the status of the problem in teaching from terminal

remediation to ongoing investigation is precisely what the movement for a scholarship of teaching is all about.

But here we face the reality of a culture that is only beginning to be receptive to such work. Doing it is a risk, both in terms of tenure and promotion and in terms of wider impact on the field, since there are as yet few channels for other faculty to come upon and engage with this work in ways that will make a lasting difference. **Tenure** is one of the most important issues here. It has been a long tradition – since W. von Humboldt – to assess scholarship in terms of disciplinary research. Now we can see attempts to define *different tenure tracks*: College of Business at Kennesaw State University introduced three tracks (teaching, scholarly, and combined); Duke has put in practice two (teaching and research); but the fact is that teaching track faculty members cannot be tenured, although they are offered long-term contracts. All this leaves the aftertaste of giving the teaching constituent a second-rate status. At least many faculty members from KSU and Clemson complained that teaching is generally undervalued. At the same time tenured faculty teaching skills in some cases leave much to be desired, – accompanied with motivation breakdowns after receiving tenure they pose a serious threat to quality teaching. This has brought the issue of post-tenure reviews to the focus of administrative practices.

Another institutional problem that arises here is the uneven and drastically different procedure for traditional scholarship or research assessment and teaching assessment. The trick is that **research value** of a faculty member is *peer-evaluated*, while his or her **teaching expertise** is *student-evaluated*. Unless this gap is bridged, there will be little, if any at all, chance of rounding up a balanced model for the modern university faculty.

CONCLUSIONS

The strategies taken by the Kennesaw State University and Clemson University are different and yet in many ways similar:

1. quality education is considered a priority among academic values;
2. various institutional strategies for professional development are implemented; personal development is motivated through career success, grants, awards, etc.;
3. scholarship for excellence in teaching and learning plays an important role through corresponding administrative units and strategies (multi-track system at KSU, for example, reduced teaching load, etc.);
4. Kennesaw State University, going through the college-university transition, is seeking more and better research, since teaching has been the strongest tradition with its faculty for a long time;
5. Clemson University aims at the most advanced yet balanced research-teaching synthesis through the development of student-centered research (including masters' and doctoral programs).

RECOMMENDED READINGS:

Bender, Eileen and Donald Gray. *The Scholarship of Teaching, Research & Creative Activity*, 1999.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Brookfield, Stephen D. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Cambridge, Barbara. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Questions and Answers from the Field, *AAHE Bulletin* 52 (3): 7-10; 1999.

Cerbin, William. Inventing a New Genre: The Course Portfolio at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. In: P. Hutchings, *Making Teaching Community Property*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education; 1996, pp. 52-56.

Cross, K. Patricia. Teachers as Scholars. *AAHE Bulletin* 43 (4): 3-5; 1990.

Cross, K. Patricia, and Mimi Harris Steadman. *Classroom Research: Implementing the Scholarship of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Cutler, William W., III. The History Course Portfolio. *Perspectives* 35 (8): 17-20; 1997.

Diamond, Robert M. and Bronwyn E. Adams, eds. *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1995.

Diamond, Robert M. and Bronwyn E. Adams, eds. *The Disciplines Speak II: More Statements on Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.

Edgerton, Russell. A National Market for Excellence in Teaching. *Change* 26 (5): 4-5, 1994.

Edgerton, Russell, Pat Hutchings, and Kathleen Quinlan. *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1991.

Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Halpern, Diane, et al. Scholarship in Psychology. *American Psychologist*, December 1998: 1292-1297.

Huber, Mary and Morreale, Sherwin, eds. *Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Exploring Common Ground*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2002.

Hutchings, Pat, ed. *The Course Portfolio: How Faculty Can Examine Their Teaching to Advance Practice and Improve Student Learning*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1998.

Hutchings, Pat, ed. *The Ethics of Inquiry: Issues in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2002.

Hutchings, Pat. *Using Cases to Improve College Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1993.

Hutchings, Pat. *Making Teaching Community Property: A Menu for Peer Collaboration and Peer Review*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. 1996.

Hutchings, Pat and Lee S. Shulman. The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments. *Change* 31 (5):11-15; 1999.

Kreber, Carolin, ed. *Scholarship Revisited: Perspectives on the Scholarship of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.

Palmer, Parker. Good Talk About Good Teaching: Improving Teaching Through Conversation. *Change* 25 (6): 8–13; 1993.

Rice, R. Eugene. Making a Place for the New American Scholar. *New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century Project*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1996.

Shulman, Lee S. Disciplines of Inquiry in Education. In R. Jaeger, ed. *Complementary Methods for Research in Education* (2nd edition), pp.3-30. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, 1997.

Weimer, Maryellen. The Disciplinary Journals on Pedagogy. *Change* 25 (6): 44-51; 1993.