Recognition and reward: SOTL and the tenure process at a regional comprehensive university

By: Laura Cruz, Jill Ellern, George Ford, Hollye Moss, and Barbara Jo White

Abstract

This paper presents the results of one regional comprehensive institution's efforts to implement an infrastructure that provides both recognition and reward for research into the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL). The authors offer an intensive analysis of Western Carolina University's experiences with adopting the Boyer model of scholarship through the transformation of its tenure and promotion documents. The changes wrought at WCU suggest a path that may be particularly instructive to similar institutions that may be contemplating the use of a more expansive definition of scholarship into their institutional culture.

Recognition and Reward: SOTL and the Tenure Process at a Regional Comprehensive University

Laura Cruz
Western Carolina University

Jill Ellern
Western Carolina University

George Ford
Western Carolina University

Hollye Moss
Western Carolina University

Barbara Jo White
Western Carolina University[1]

Abstract

This paper presents the results of one regional comprehensive institution's efforts to implement an infrastructure that provides both recognition and reward for research into the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL). The authors offer an intensive analysis of Western Carolina University's experiences with adopting the Boyer model of scholarship through the transformation of its tenure and promotion documents. The changes wrought at WCU suggest a path that may be particularly instructive to similar institutions that may be contemplating the use of a more expansive definition of scholarship into their institutional culture.

---

[1] Authors' names appear in alphabetical order and do not suggest a hierarchy of contribution. All authors contributed equally.

I.   Introduction

The term "SoTL paradox" is used to describe the imbalance between growing recognition of the value of SoTL work and the relative weight SoTL research carries in formal reward systems (e.g. tenure and promotion) (Walker et al, 2008). In conventional academic culture, SoTL researchers note, the scholarship of discovery is valued over other types and article after article laments this lesser valuation of SoTL as a major obstacle towards the ultimate goal of equal status (Boshier, 2009; Diamond, 2005; Huber, 2004; McKinney, 2006; Shapiro, 2006). While researchers have been adept in describing the obstacle, solutions to the paradox have been harder to find. Part of the reason for this frustration is that the search has focused on universal solutions that would be applied to institutions at all levels, from Research I to Community College. Increasingly, scholars are recognizing that solutions to the paradox may need to be tailored to the diverse goals of different institutions or institutional levels. In his 2006 book, *Teaching at the People's University*, Bruce Henderson suggests that state or regional comprehensive universities[2] (often abbreviated as SCUs) because of their emphasis on teaching, are naturally suited to become leaders in SoTL research and, in fact, already play a disproportionate role in the publication of that research (Henderson and Buchanan, 2006). This article focuses on the efforts of one such regional comprehensive institution to implement an infrastructure that provides both recognition and reward for SOTL work.

---

2 Henderson explains the term state (or regional) comprehensive university by breaking down the terms. State, as in an institutions where "the bulk of the funding…come from state government"; comprehensive as in "contrast to single purpose or limited purpose" institutions; and university as in "most SCUs have for some time offered master's degrees and some also offer doctorates in a limited number of fields." In the Carnegie classification systems, SCU's have been variously classified as Masters I or II level, public comprehensive universities or public master's institutions. Henderson, *Teaching*, 3.

II. The Case Study: Western Carolina University

On the surface, the case of WCU is not remarkable, as it was neither the first nor the last to adopt Boyer standards[3], including SoTL, into its reward structure, though it is the first within its own UNC system to do so. Other universities have reported on their experiences with adopting the Boyer model at the institutional level, though because Boyer's classification is relatively new, many of these articles rely heavily on reported or anecdotal information rather than systematic evaluation.[4] This paper offers an intensive analysis of WCU's experiences with adopting Boyer through the transformation of its tenure and promotion documents. The changes wrought at WCU suggest a path that may be particularly instructive to other SCUs that may be contemplating the use of a more expansive definition of scholarship into their institutional culture.

Like many other regional institutions, Western Carolina University jumped at the opportunity to work with SoTL at an early stage. As an active participant in the Carnegie Academy's leadership groups and clusters, the University sought to encourage a broad range of faculty to engage in SoTL research (Bender, 2005). The Coulter Faculty Center provided support for these efforts through methods likely familiar to most SoTL practitioners (Shulman, 2002), including the instigation of SoTL faculty learning communities, organization of SoTL workshops and events, nomination of SoTL Faculty Fellows (essentially peer mentors), and the founding of a SoTL journal, *MountainRise*. The Faculty Center was particularly fortunate to receive a large endowment specifically targeted towards SoTL research, the proceeds of which

---

3 For those not familiar with the Boyer model, see the seminal text, E.L. Boyer, *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997. Boyer identifies four types of scholarship: discovery, integration, engagement and teaching. Learning was later added to the fourth category leading to the acronym SOTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning), used frequently in this piece.
4 For reports from individual campuses, see especially Barbara Cambridge, *Campus Progress: Supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* (Washington, DC: AAHE, 2004) and KerryAnn O'Meara and R. Eugene Rice, *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005).

were used to fund an active SoTL grants program and to honor an annual SoTL scholar. In addition, the center pioneered other SoTL-related activities, including an annual two-day intensive SoTL Retreat and SoTL Socials (informal gatherings held at the University Club). Despite this variety of opportunities and expenditure of resources, actual participation in SoTL tapered off to a relatively low level and many faculty remained unfamiliar even with the SoTL acronym.

As institutions, universities and colleges are historically among the most resistant to change (Evans and Henrichsen, 2008) and this may especially be the case when dealing with an issue as sensitive as faculty reward systems. For this reason and others, many of the most familiar models of institutional change used in the business world are not always a good fit to higher education. Researchers have also evoked sociological models, especially Wexler's community of practice, in making sense of SoTL's road to recognition, but these seem to provide more insight into the situation than solutions for it (Cambridge, 2004). The integration of multiple forms of scholarship, including SoTL, at WCU followed a distinctive path towards fruition that included two major stages: recognition and then valuation. Similar to the five stages of institutional change in higher education outlined by Conrad (2007), the recognition stage at WCU took the form of facilitating the interests of different, even divergent, stakeholder groups on campus.

Margaret Mead once famously quipped, "Never doubt that a small dedicated group of people can change the world, indeed it is the only thing that ever has." This certainly seemed to apply to this case study. In the case of the Boyer model, there were several parties on campus with diverse reasons for advocating the adoption of a model that recognized multiple forms of scholarship. The librarians, for example, had already embraced the Boyer classifications because it facilitated the recognition of the diversity of their scholarly activities. Further, as an SCU, the institution also carries considerable responsibilities for regional engagement and that charge had been strengthened by recent mandates of the UNC system, of which WCU is one of

seventeen member campuses. This charge led to a considerable number of faculty and staff

initiatives designed to work with community partners and to produce scholarship of

engagement. Finally, the activities of the Coulter Faculty Center (noted above) led to the

creation of a small but very dedicated band of SoTL practitioners. Together, these groups

formed the core of initial advocacy for change on the campus.

This advocacy alone, though, was insufficient to overcome the considerable inertia that

often characterizes academic cultures. At WCU, the initial spark that eventually led to the

incorporation of SoTL into the reward system was an administrative initiative to update the aged

Faculty Handbook, particularly those sections that covered tenure, promotion, and

reappointment. Although many sections of the handbook had been added or amended, over

fifteen years had passed since the last comprehensive revision. The document suffered from

problems of organization, accessibility, and transparency. In addition, the process was not

uniform, as departments across the university were using many different methods and

standards to evaluate faculty. The Academic Affairs division, led by the Provost's office, decided

to instigate a thorough revision of the tenure and promotion sections of the handbook under the

auspices of the Faculty Senate.

The need to adapt rewards systems to changing university culture was one impetus

towards this revision, but another was legal. Encarta (2007) defines tenure as "the position of

having a formal secure appointment until retirement, especially at an institution of higher

learning after working there on a temporary or provisional basis." As a relatively new concept in

American higher education (Ceci, Williams & Mueller-Johnson; 2007), tenure protects faculty

members in the classroom regardless of their political and social beliefs which may leak into

their instruction. Tenure is generally awarded to professors after a probationary period of six to

eight years after submission of a detailed, lengthy dossier outlining their teaching, scholarship

and community service accomplishments and other contributions to their university. Legal

remedies may be an alternative for professors who are not conferred tenure.

Mullaney et al. (1994, pp. 176) define due process as "a system of procedures designed to produce the best possible judgments in those personnel problems of higher education which may yield a serious adverse decision about a teacher. By its fairness, it seeks to protect not only the career of the individual, but also the reputation of the institution." The proceedings leading to tenure decisions may involve peer or departmental review, external or university review, and administrative review. Each of these procedures is a due process system in itself. A specific university's appeal process to a negative tenure decision is another example of due process. Given an established, fair due process program for awarding tenure, legal action is the next step for a professor to consider if tenure is not granted. Literature on litigation is varied but generally addresses legal options for tenured faculty who have been fired unfairly due to perceived unfair classroom academic interventions by administrators (Ceci et al., 2007) or legitimate reasons for dismissal of faculty (Mullaney et al., 1994). These detailed discussions exceed the scope of this paper, but the threat of legal litigation is a balancing force in most university tenure processes. To mitigate potential legal problems, clarity and consistency in the processes for tenure and promotion are essential. The proposed faculty handbook revision addressed this issue and university legal council was an active participant in the revision process.

The initial committee included representatives from legal council, Academic Affairs, and the Faculty Senate. As is the case with many long-term academic committees, its membership would fluctuate over time but the core representation remained stable. Before getting down to the nuts and bolts tasks of composing new language and individual sections, the committee discussed the creation of a guiding philosophy that would give the new document greater coherence and wider applicability. The members of the committee agreed that any major changes would increase the time it took to reach a consensus among the faculty, departments and colleges and so committee members wanted to pick their battles wisely. In the end, the committee chose to follow a standard of "minimum university standard for collegial review". This principle was designed to provide departments with the flexibility to build upon the Faculty

Handbook's basic description of teaching, scholarship and service. The principle proved

effective, as the handbook was completed, revised, and approved by all levels of the university

within two years.

With the minimum standard in place, each discipline/program/department was free to

incorporate particular expectations and values. In many ways thanks to the advocacy of groups

outlined in the above overview, part of the minimum standards outlined in the new handbook

included the Boyer model of scholarship. The new handbook very briefly described each of the

four types of scholarship (see Appendix A for descriptions) and left it to each department to

evaluate the relative importance of each type of scholarship within its own disciplinary

parameters. With the university-level minimum standard officially in place, the onus moved to

the departmental level to create new tenure and promotion documents that would incorporate

these standards. With the adoption of the new handbook, WCU's recognition of multiple forms

of scholarship, including SoTL, was official, but the task remained to resolve the paradox or gap

between recognition and valuation.

Throughout most of the revision process thus far, faculty and administrators had worked

together to achieve desired results. With the department-level revisions, however, negotiations

became more contentious and multiple compromises had to be made in order to maintain a

balance between flexibility and coherence in the tenure review process. First, communication

was essential. Because the handbook was deliberately brief in its descriptions of the Boyer

model, a campus wide effort to educate faculty on the concepts became necessary. Both the

Provost's Office and the Faculty Center provided workshops, forums, and individual department

consultations to increase familiarity. Secondly, because the balance being negotiated took place

at the institutional level, academic affairs coordinated the process of updating thirty-three sets of

departmental documents, using the drafts to encourage minimal levels of standardization and

addressing new issues as they arose. In the end, Academic Affairs revised the standards to

include the following provisions: departments had to provide recognition in some way, shape, or form to all four forms of scholarship.

They also had to be as clear as possible about their standards for peer-review, the latter an issue that came increasingly to the fore as the process unfolded. From the initial departmental documents, Academic Affairs constructed a template (see appendix A) that would apply to all faculty at the institution and provided the parameters from which departments would construct their own tenure and promotion standards. Then and now, the Provost's office approves all department-level documents by comparing them to the standards set out in the template. For the first time last year, the revised departmental documents on standards for tenure and promotion became effective across campus. What follows is a study of the diversity by which the departments of this SCU placed value on multiple forms of scholarship, particularly SoTL. The researchers in this study analyzed departmental tenure review documents (on this campus, commonly abbreviated CRDs for Collegial Review Documents) in order to determine how different entities, such as departments and schools, within the institution valued research in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

III. The Study: Sample of Tenure and Promotion Documents

To be included in the set of documents analyzed, two conditions had to be met. First, a CRD had to follow the template provided by the provost (see Appendix A) and be in effect for Fall, 2008 or Fall, 2009. The template was provided to thirty-three departments and schools organized within six colleges. By Fall, 2008, eighteen (54.55%) had CRDs following the new template. By Spring, 2009, another five departments and schools within colleges had CRDs following the template. Second, in order to be included in the analysis, documents needed to contain statements regarding departmental policy regarding scholarship of teaching and learning and other forms of research. Thus, documents were excluded if they contained statements in the scholarship sections allowing individual faculty members to determine

emphasis on various forms of scholarship in consultation with their department heads. One department allowed for individual faculty members to determine the value of different forms of scholarship and was excluded from analysis. Thus, twenty-two documents were included in the final analysis, each between eight and thirty pages in length (average 20.3 pages). A group of five researchers independently coded each of these to maintain objectivity and consistency.

IV. Characteristics of Tenure and Promotion Documents

A. Load Balance

Considerable discussion took place on whether or not departmental documents should mandate the relative balance between teaching, service, and scholarship as part of the faculty load. As proponents have pointed out, in order for SoTL to succeed faculty members will have to balance their SoTL research with their other commitments (Huber, 2004). The Academic Affairs division chose to leave the decision up to individual departments. In the end, only four departments chose to include the suggested percentages in their documents. For example, in one case a department specified that faculty should balance their work loads to spend approximately 50% of their time on teaching, 30% on scholarship (regardless of type) and 20% on service. In a department with many members who engage in applied research, the department suggested two separate tracks for faculty to follow, one for educator/scholars and another for educator/practitioners. Others chose not to provide such uniform standards. As one document notes:

> "[T]he department needs to balance teaching, scholarship, and service, but individual faculty members don't all need to achieve exactly the same balance. Certainly we will differ with regard to specialty area within our discipline, but we will also vary in terms of the types of scholarship we emphasize."[5]

---

5 All quotes are from the documents themselves unless otherwise noted. The documents are available for public viewing at http://www.wcu.edu/10870.asp

In between these two poles, departments varied in their specifications, but teaching remained the highest percentage or most emphasized activity in all cases, as is perhaps befitting a SCU with a high teaching load (4/4) and explicit institutional identity as a teaching and learning institution.

B. Scholarly Outlets

The majority of documents (twenty of twenty-two documents) contained explicit statements regarding the differential value of various scholarship research outlets, regardless of type of scholarship (discovery, integration, engagement, or SoTL). For example, these departments placed higher value on publications in well-regarded refereed journals in the discipline than on publications in lesser known journals and/or non-refereed journals or magazines. Similarly, in some cases departments valued international conference presentations over national presentations which were, in turn, more highly valued than regional or campus presentations. Often, departments employed a point, module or category system, or more rarely a system of benchmarks, to differentiate scholarship outlets and formats. Under these systems, candidates would need to earn a set number of points per year or per review period in order to successfully advance to higher statuses (see Appendix B for a sample point system). In contrast (or at times in conjunction with), other departments specified standards of quality that did not specify outlets. A handful of departments used the criteria developed by Glassick, et al in *Scholarship Assessed* (1997), including "clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique." Several departments went their own way, setting criteria such as "degree of difficulty, potential impact, and value to the mission of the department and/or the university" or, in a different department, "clear goals which lead to improved instruction, adequate review of the literature and research on teaching and learning with a clear understanding of current research in the field, effective dissemination

of results and findings"-- each set of criteria serving as arbiters of the value of SoTL for tenure

and promotion purposes.

C. Peer Review

One of the biggest challenges to implementing the Boyer model was determining proper

forms of peer review. Not all types of scholarship recognized under this model are traditional

publications in the form of books and articles, so departments became more explicit about what

types of peer valuation would be appropriate. Several departments allowed for various forms of

alternative peer review, usually when the traditional double-blind standard did not apply. In

several cases, departments specified that candidates for tenure or promotion could call together

review committees to determine whether a particular scholarly activity was properly reviewed for

quality. For example, one department included the following disclaimer:

"We recognize that infrequently a candidate may present other activities that do not fit

well with these categories yet are still legitimately scholarship. It will be up to the

candidate to defend the activities as scholarship based on their extraordinary nature, or

justifying why an activity should be moved to a higher classification."

In other cases, departments allowed candidates to designate outside reviewers to adjudicate

quality standards. Most of these cases concerned the scholarship of engagement specifically,

but the principles could also apply to SoTL.

D. SoTL vs. Scholarly Teaching

One issue often cited as an obstacle towards the institutional-level acceptance of SoTL

is problems with its definition (McKinney, 2006). SoTL practitioners have often tried to hammer

home the difference between scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning

(Kreber, 2001). At this campus, the template provided only a brief definition, "systematic study

of teaching and learning process." The distinction between SoTL and scholarly teaching was

not always clear to faculty developing the new tenure/promotion standards and several

departments had to revise their documents to exclude scholarly teaching in the category of

scholarship. Others addressed the definitional issue in interesting ways. One department chose

to provide a definition of each in order to explicate the differences to its faculty, even providing

case studies and examples for review. Taking a different tack, another department chose to

differentiate between published articles and creative activities, both of which counted as

scholarship for tenure purposes (not surprisingly, this was a creative discipline). For this

department, the scholarship of teaching and learning included "creation and publication of

original aids to teaching whether in traditional print media or on the web" as well as "master

classes that reach an off-campus audience." Other departments allowed for unpublished

outcomes, ranging from grant development to classroom experimentation. With the two-tier

adoption system, departments could define SoTL in a way that they were most familiar and

comfortable with, and the university allowed for differences in interpretation.

E. SoTL Valuation

As for SoTL specifically, the departmental documents manifested significant differences

along two major axes: academic career stage and SoTL valuation.

Academic Career Stage (Pre-Tenure vs. Post-Tenure): 9 out of 22 (41%) documents

posted the same scholarship requirements for tenure as for promotion to associate professor,

but departments occasionally differentiated their expectations for post-tenure review and/or

promotion and tenure requirements. In one department, for example, senior faculty are

expected to engage in a greater degree of scholarship of discovery as their careers progress. In

a few cases, there was recognition of the differing roles SoTL can play over the course of an

academic career (Weston and McAlpine, 2001).

SoTL Valuation (Equal vs. Unequal): Academic Affairs required that all departments

recognize all four forms of scholarship, but allowed for them to be weighted, or valued, as the

department saw fit. In this analysis, documents with explicit statements that all four forms of scholarship would be equally valued, we labeled 'equal'. In addition, in the absence of explicit document statements indicating inequality, documents were also considered equal. The two axes were then measured against each other to fall into one of four quadrants (see Figure 1 next page).

For the purposes of obtaining tenure, SoTL was considered equal to the other three forms of scholarship during the pre-tenure period by more than a two-to-one margin. Of the twenty-two departments, fifteen departments (68.2%) considered SoTL equal to other forms of scholarship while the remaining seven departments (31.8%) explicitly considered SoTL unequal to other forms of scholarship. Each of these seven departments required the predominance of the scholarship of discovery in order to receive tenure.

On the other hand, considering post-tenure expectations, more departments considered SoTL equal to the other three forms of scholarship. Of the twenty-two departments, twenty departments (91.9%) considered SoTL equal to other forms of scholarship while the remaining two departments (9.1%) considered SoTL explicitly unequal to other forms of scholarship.

Given the two variables, SoTL valuation and pre/post tenure status, the departments fell into the following four quadrants/categories:

Cruz et al.   *Recognition and Reward*   14

Figure 1: Pre-Tenure and Post-Tenure Valuation of SoTL

Boyer Valuation Pre-Tenure (Short Term)	Equal	Health and Human Sciences Nursing	**Arts and Sciences** Communication English **Business** Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, & Economics Business Administration, Law & Sport Management Global Strategy & Management Professional Sales, Marketing & Hospitality and Tourism **Education and Allied Professions** Educational Leadership & Foundations Health, Performance ER Human Services **Fine and Performing Arts** School of Music **Health and Human Sciences** Criminology and Crim Justice **Engineering & Construction Management** Construction Management Engineering & Techology **Library** Library
	Unequal	**Arts and Sciences** History	**Arts and Sciences** Geosciences and Natural Resources Philosophy and Religion Political Science **Education and Allied Professions** Elementary and Middle Grades Education Psychology **Health and Human Sciences** Communication Sciences and Disorders
		Unequal	Equal
		Boyer Valuation--Post Tenure (Long-Term)	

1. Conventional Consistent: Unequal Pre-Tenure – Unequal Post-Tenure

Departments here value scholarship of teaching and learning differently than other forms both during pre-tenure and during post-tenure and one department fell in this quadrant. These departments explicitly valued the scholarship of discovery, a convention generally regarded as the norm across US colleges and universities as necessary for tenure and for successful post-tenure review. The document of this department says flatly, "the department encourages faculty to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning but regards this work as supplemental to the scholarship of discovery and insufficient by itself for tenure and promotion consideration."

2. Conventional Inconsistent: Unequal Pre-Tenure – Equal Post-Tenure

Seven departments fall into this quadrant, in which SoTL is only on equal par with other forms of scholarship during the post-tenure period. As is typical of many colleges and universities, the scholarship of discovery is valued more highly, and even required, for a successful tenure bid. As one department states, "the scholarship of application, integration, and of teaching and learning are valued, but the scholarship of discovery must be represented in the granting of tenure." Another states that three out of four units must be in the scholarship of discovery for tenure, but leaves scholarship for post-tenure review unspecified.

3. Non-conventional Inconsistent: Equal Pre-Tenure – Unequal Post-Tenure

One department fell into this quadrant which describes situations in which the scholarship of teaching and learning is valued equally, but only before tenure. In the case with this department, SoTL is valued unequally during the post-tenure process because the department requires SoTL publications.

4. Non-conventional Consistent: Equal Pre-Tenure – Equal Post-Tenure

Thirteen departments are located in the quadrant describing those that value the scholarship of teaching and learning equally during both the pre-tenure stage as well as the post-tenure stage. As one document states clearly, "candidates will be allowed to pursue their scholarly interests in any Boyer function they choose and are not required to complete projects

in multiple functions." Others want to see a bit more breadth, specifying that faculty pursue "at least two of the four Boyer Scholarship Model categories."

VI. Discussion and Future Research

The lessons learned from this evaluation of the process by which SoTL became formally recognized and valued at a regional comprehensive university are manifold. SoTL activists have long recognized the need to improve recognition of SoTL as a part of a larger shift to a learning-centered paradigm in higher education (Shapiro, 2006; Diamond, 1995). As a regional comprehensive university, WCU's primary mission emphasizes regional engagement as well as effectiveness and innovation in teaching and learning, both of which are scholarly activities recognized by the Boyer model. The alignment of the faculty reward system with this mission took the collective efforts of administrators, faculty, and faculty organizations in order to induce fundamental change (Brascamp, 1994). As SCU's struggle to find their own identities relative to other types of institutions (Henderson, 2007), this kind of alignment may prove particularly fruitful.

That being said, a major objection to adopting SoTL remains. There are, as the economists say, 'penalties to the pioneer'. In this case, by being an early adopter of the Boyer model, WCU has guided its faculty to tracks that may or may not be recognized at other institutions or by other organizations. This is particularly true of the Research I institutions that tend to dominate academia and the production of future faculty. For faculty who may desire to change institutions later in their careers or to rise to leadership positions within their respective disciplines, the early adoption of Boyer standards may prove to be detrimental, at least in the short run. In other words, while it may be valued here on this campus, the world of academia naturally extends beyond its own hallowed halls. Future research into the mobility (or immobility) of SoTL practitioners might prove instructive.

Recognition of SoTL at the institutional level has been significantly hampered by the varying

standards held by the increasing number of disciplines housed under the university umbrella. It

should be heartening to SoTL advocates how many departments on this campus embraced the

equal status of SoTL when offered the opportunity. WCU's success stemmed from the adoption

of a two-stage process in which minimal university standards provided broad parameters and

individual departments/programs filled in specifics according to perceived disciplinary standards.

This balance between standardization and flexibility characterized not only the process, but the

documents themselves. While the documents were certainly not identical, there were sections

that very nearly were, even beyond the requirements in the template. For example, several

documents shared verbiage regarding scholarship requirements for various stages of a faculty

member's academic career (Annual Faculty Evaluation, Tenure, Reappointment and Post

Tenure Review) and/or standards for outlet differentiation. The wording for a standard point

system (see Appendix B), for example, was essentially identical in five of the documents under

review. These similar sections, though, belie the diversity of responses achieved through the

revision process. Discussions took place primarily at the department level and the documents

reflect the differing personalities, disciplines, and generations of the people that created them.

Faculty have cherished and jealously guarded their academic freedom, as the tenure process

attests, and this two-step process allowed for greater faculty input and the casting off of one-

size-fits-all models that would not do justice to the abundance of opinions and perceptions that

make up a thriving academic environment.

Though many consider WCU's efforts thus far a mark of success, dangers remain. To

say that practice always follows policy would be grossly naïve. Undoubtedly, some of the

department documents reflect only a lip service commitment to multiple forms of scholarship. If

SoTL is to be fully and genuinely recognized and valued, it will require fundamental changes in

academic culture and faculty perceptions (McKinney, 2006). This is a larger and less concrete

task than what has been described in this paper. With the adoption of these standards,

however, WCU has moved considerably along the continuum of SoTL development (Bender, 2005). It remains to be seen how much effect these policy changes will have in the future and it will be interesting to investigate what, if any, changes in scholarly production and attitudes will ensue.

This study is in some ways similar to a case study, a document-based analysis, and an institutional level survey, yet it lacks certain elements of each one.[6] The researchers intend this work to be preparatory to a further research agenda that includes deeper work in each of these categories. Future research will include a compendium of case studies from different institutions, a comparative analysis of a wider set of documents across institutions, and/or qualitative studies of the people and processes behind the documents.[7] As this study has suggested, collaboration that is not limited to any one individual, discipline, or institution can lead to further resolution of the SOTL paradox.

---

6 Thank you to an anonymous reviewer for his comments that led to the inclusion of this final paragraph.
7 Readers at institutions that have adopted or are considering adopting the Boyer model are encouraged to contact the authors for possible collaboration on future research.

References

American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United

Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group. (2000). *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation:*

Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators.

Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Arreola, R. (2000) *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System* (2nd edition). Bolton,

MA: Anker.

Bender, Eileen. (2005). CASTLs in the Air: The SOTL Movement in Mid-Flight. *Change: The*

Magazine of Higher Learning, 37(5), 40.

Boshier, Roger. (2009). Why is the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Such a Hard Sell?

Higher Education Research and Development, 28(1), 1-15.

Boyer, E. L. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Brascamp, L.A. and Ory, J.C. (1994). *Assessing Faculty Work. Enhancing Individual and*

Institutional Performance. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Cambridge, Barbara. (2004). *Campus Progress: Supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and*

Learning. Washington, DC: AAHE.

Ceci, S. J., Williams, W. M., & Mueller-Johnson, K. (2006). Is tenure justified?: An experimental

study of faculty beliefs about tenure, promotion, and academic freedom. *Behavioral and*

Brain Sciences, 29(6), 553-569.

Conrad, Clifton F. (2007). A Grounded Theory of Academic Change. *Sociology of Education*,

51(2), 101-112.

Diamond, R.M. (1999). *Aligning Faculty Rewards with Institutional Mission: Statements,*

Policies, and Guidelines. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Diamond, R.M. (2005). Scholarship Reconsidered: Barriers to Change. In Kerry Ann O'Meara

and R. Eugene Rice (Eds.), *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms
of Scholarship* (pp. 56-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997) *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the
Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Henderson, Bruce. (2007). *Teaching at the People's University: An Introduction to the State
Comprehensive University*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Henderson, Bruce and Buchanan, Heidi. (2007). The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: A
Special Niche for Faculty at Regional Comprehensive Universities. *Research in Higher
Education*, 48(5), 523-543.

Huber, Mary Taylor. (2004). *Balancing Acts: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in
Academic Careers*. Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Huber, Mary Taylor. (2002). Faculty Evaluation and the Development of Academic Careers.
New Directions for Institutional Research, 114, 73-83.

Kreber, Caroline, ed. (2001). *Scholarship Revisited: Perspectives on the Scholarship of
Teaching*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 86. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

McKinney, Kathleen. (2006). Attitudinal and Structural Challenges Contributing to Challenges in
the Work of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *New Directions for Institutional
Research*, 129, 37-50.

Mullaney, J., & Timberlake, E. (1994). "University tenure and the legal system: procedures,
conflicts, and resolutions." Journal of Social Work Education, 30(2), 172-184.

Shapiro. Howard. (2006). Promotion and Tenure and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 38(2), 39-43.

Shulman, Lee, "Visions of the Possible: Models for Campus Support for the Scholarship of
Teaching and Learning," Originally published 1999, accessed Summer 2009
(http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/publications).

Tenure. (2007). In *Microsoft Encarta College Dictionary*. New York : St. Martin's Press.

Walker, J.D., Paul Boepher, and Brad Cohen. (2008). The Scholarship of Teaching and

      Learning Paradox: Results without Rewards. *College Teaching,* 56(3), 183- 189.

Weston, Cynthia and McAlpine, Lynn. (2001). Making Explicit the Development Toward the

      Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 86,

      89-97.

Youn, Ted I. K. and Price, Tanya M. (2009). Learning from the Experience of Others: The

      Evolution of Faculty Tenure and Promotion Rules in Comprehensive Institutions. *Journal*

      of Higher Education, 80(2), 204-237.

Appendix A

Department of [*Template*]
Collegial Review Document
2008-2009

Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation:
Annual Faculty Evaluation; Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment; Post-Tenure
Review

I.   **Overview** – The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the department in which the faculty member is appointed. The document is guided at the highest level by *The Code* of the UNC system and by the Faculty Handbook of Western Carolina University. Included also are policies issued by General Administration, by the Office of the Provost, and in some cases by the college. While this document is intended to be comprehensive and precise with regard to department-level criteria and procedures, the faculty member should have familiarity with *The Code* and with the WCU Faculty Handbook (section 4.0). Further, in preparing a dossier for one of the review processes described here, the faculty member should also have available the appropriate Guidelines for the Preparation of the Dossier.

II.   **Domains of Evaluation**
        A. Teaching
                1. **Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 7 dimensions:**
                        a) **Content expertise** – Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters. Content expertise includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.
                        b) **Instructional delivery skills** – Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.
                        c) **Instructional design skills** – Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.
                        d) **Course management skills** – Effective teachers give timely feedback to students, make efficient use of class time, and handle classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations (e.g., academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.) appropriately.
                        e) **Evaluation of students** – Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.
                        f) **Faculty/student relationships** – Effective teachers display a positive attitude toward students, show concern for students by being approachable and available, present an appropriate level of intellectual challenge, sufficient support for student learning, and respect diversity.

g) **Facilitation of student learning** – Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work.

2. **Methods of evaluation** (and approximate weighting)

   a) **Evaluation of teaching materials** (40%). In all evaluation processes reviewers should be presented with a substantive and representative set of teaching materials, including syllabi, tests and examinations, assignments and projects, class activities, etc. [Describe specific departmental expectations with regard to presentation of teaching materials. More detail may be provided in the appropriate appendix]

   b) **Direct peer observation** (20%). [Describe departmental policies and procedures for peer observation of teaching, including methods related to part-time and fixed-term faculty. More detail may be provided in the appropriate appendix]

   c) **Self-evaluation** (20%). Self-evaluation of teaching, using the 7 dimensions of effective teaching, is a component of all evaluation processes. [Describe departmental practices for self-evaluation. More detail may be provided in the appropriate appendix.]

   d) **Student perceptions** (20%). **All sections of all courses taught by untenured faculty will include SAIs. These will include a form of the university-wide SAI instrument.** [Include additional departmental policies and procedures related to SAI, particularly as they related to tenured faculty. More detail may be provided in the appropriate appendix.]

3. **General comments** –

   [*Include any departmental expectations regarding Professional Development in teaching.*]

B. **Scholarship**

   1. **WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the 4 types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.**

      [*Department should provide 2-3 representative examples of each type of scholarship that would be deemed acceptable.*]

      a) **Scholarship of discovery** – Original research that advances knowledge.
         1) Published outcomes
            i. [*example*]
            ii. [*example*]
            iii. [*example*]
         2) Unpublished outcomes
            i. [*example*]
            ii. [*example*]
            iii. [*example*]

      b) **Scholarship of integration** – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.
         1) Published outcomes

      i. [*example*]
      ii. [*example*]
      iii. [*example*]
    2) Unpublished outcomes
      i. [*example*]
      ii. [*example*]
      iii. [*example*]

  c) **Scholarship of application** – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.
    1) Published outcomes
      i. [*example*]
      ii. [*example*]
      iii. [*example*]
    2) Unpublished outcomes
      i. [*example*]
      ii. [*example*]
      iii. [*example*]

  d) **Scholarship of teaching and learning** – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.
    1) Published outcomes
      i. [*example*]
      ii. [*example*]
      iii. [*example*]
    2) Unpublished outcomes
      i. [*example*]
      ii. [*example*]
      iii. [*example*]

2. Methods of evaluation – Representative samples of scholarly works will be examined, with consideration to issues such as peer review, acceptance rate of outlet, visibility, citation index data, impact on field.

3. General comments – [*Describe departmental philosophy on the Boyer types, with relative weighting. Consider how grant proposals and awards are counted in this section. Include any departmental expectations regarding Professional Development in scholarship.*]

C. Service/Engagement

 1. Types of service/engagement:

  a) **Advising –** being informed about curriculum and related processes, availability to advisees, assistance with academic and career planning (includes thesis/dissertation advising as well as advising student professional organizations)

  b) **Community engagement**

  c) **Institutional service** (e.g., committees, recruiting students, mentoring new faculty, serving as advisor to student organizations, etc.)

  d) **Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership** (includes service in professional organizations, work on accreditation documents, etc.)

 2. Methods of evaluation -

 3. General comments –

  [*Include any departmental expectations regarding Professional Development in service/engagement.*]

III.   Criteria – The criteria specific to each form of review and each type of promotion are described in detail below.

   A. Annual Faculty Evaluation:
   1. **Teaching** -
   2. **Scholarship** -
   3. **Service/Engagement** -

   B. Reappointment:
   1. **Teaching** -
   2. **Scholarship** -
   3. **Service/Engagement** -

   C. Tenure
   1. **Teaching** -
   2. **Scholarship** -
   3. **Service/Engagement** -

   D. Promotion to Associate Professor
   1. **Teaching** -
   2. **Scholarship** -
   3. **Service/Engagement** -

   E. Promotion to Full Professor
   1. **Teaching** -
   2. **Scholarship** -
   3. **Service/Engagement** -

   F. Post-Tenure Review
   1. **Teaching** -
   2. **Scholarship** -
   3. **Service/Engagement** –

Appendices

A.   Composition of Collegial Review Committees
B.   Specific procedures and dossier guidelines for AFE for part-time teaching faculty:
C.   Specific procedures and dossier guidelines for AFE for full-time faculty
D.   Specific procedures for Reappointment
E.   Specific procedures for Tenure
F.   Specific procedures for Promotion
G.   Specific procedures and dossier guidelines for Post-tenure review

Appendix A. Composition of Collegial Review Committees

    I.   **Departmental**
         a. AFE – [*Describe composition and function of departmental AFE committee or equivalent.*]
         b. TPR - The departmental TPR Advisory Committee shall be chaired by the department head (non-voting) and shall be composed of up to six tenured faculty members elected annually by the department's full-time faculty. In the event that we have six or fewer tenured faculty, the committee shall be composed of the department head and tenured faculty, providing that the resultant committee shall consist of at least three members, exclusive of the department head. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Provost, in consultation with the department and dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.
         c. PTR - The departmental PTR Advisory Committee shall be chaired by the department head (non-voting) and shall be composed of up to six tenured faculty members, excluding any faculty members scheduled for Post-Tenure Review during the current academic year, elected annually by the department's full-time faculty. In the event that we have six or fewer tenured faculty, the committee shall be composed of the department head and tenured faculty, providing that the resultant committee shall consist of at least three members, exclusive of the department head. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Provost, in consultation with the department and dean, selects tenured faculty from similar departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

    II.   **College** – The College of Education and Allied Professions TPR Advisory Committee shall be chaired by the dean (non-voting) and shall be composed of 10 tenured, full-time faculty members of the college, half elected (one per department) and half appointed by the dean. Each shall serve a 3-year staggered term, with no limit on succession.

    III.   **University** - The university TPR Advisory Committee shall consist of the Provost as chair (non-voting); the Dean of the Graduate School, one tenured faculty member elected from each college by the faculty of that college, one tenured member elected by the faculty of the university library, and tenured faculty members appointed by the Provost equal to the number of elected faculty members on the committee. Each shall serve a 3-year staggered term with no limit on succession.

Appendix B: Sample Point/Unit System

Category A - two units:
o   First authorship of an article in journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline (e.g. *IEEE Transactions*)
o   Authorship of the first edition of a textbook or a scholarly treatise
o   Editorship of an edited book
o   Granted patent with strategic or application value
o   A successful external grant proposal that transformationally supports departmental goals

Category B - one unit:
o   First authorship of an article in a scholarly journal within the discipline or second authorship in a journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline (e.g. IEEE Transactions)
o   First or second authorship in conference proceedings (e.g. ASEE, IJME, IEEE)
o   An invited address at a conference
o   An invited journal paper
o   An engagement activity having met all criteria required by the Kimmel School Engagement Committee to be approved as "scholarship"
o   A chapter in an edited book
o   A patent application
o   A successful external grant proposal incrementally supporting departmental goals

Category C - one-half unit:
o   A scholarly book review
o   Presentation at a professional conference (no proceedings)
o   Other than first or second authorship in conference proceedings (e.g. ASEE, IJME, IEEE)
o   A successful internal research grant proposal supporting departmental goals
o   Poster at a professional conference
o   NCUR sponsorship
o   Submission of an unsuccessful but significant external grant proposal as a Principal Investigator (PI) supporting departmental goals