

Twenty Years On: Ernest Boyer, Scholarship and the Scholarship of Teaching¹

Peter A.L. Hill

I wish to invite you to join with me in reflecting on Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*. This book has profoundly affected contemporary thought about the role and nature of universities, as it also gave rise to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. 2010 marks the twentieth anniversary of its publication. Hence it is apposite, given the passage of time and subsequent developments in higher education, that we reconsider the model of scholarship which Boyer propounded in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, and its implications today for the intellectual life and social engagement of the academy.

1. E.L. Boyer

The noted American educator, Ernest Leroy Boyer, was born on 13 September 1928, in Dayton, Ohio. His father, Clarence, managed a wholesale book business, while his grandfather, William, had served as head of the Dayton Mission of the Church.

Boyer's connection with higher education began when he attended Messiah College, a liberal arts institution connected with the Brethren in Christ church. There he met Kathryn Tyson, his future wife with whom he would have four children. Messiah was to benefit in subsequent years from Boyer's contributions as chairman and as a member of the board of trustees, but after two years there as an undergraduate he transferred and graduated from Greenville College. He went on to graduate studies at the Ohio State University, and earned his masters and doctoral degrees in speech pathology and audiology, in 1955 and 1957 respectively, from the University of Southern California. He was a post-doctoral member in medical audiology at the University of Iowa Hospital. After brief teaching and administrative posts at three Californian universities, Boyer made the choice to devote his career to educational administration.

His first major posting came in 1965, when he was appointed as the executive dean of the State University of New York (SUNY). He became chancellor of the institution five years later.

In his seven-year term, he founded the Empire State College at Saratoga Springs and four other locations as non-campus SUNY schools in which adults could study for degrees without attending classes. He also set up an experimental three-year Bachelor of Arts program; established a new rank, Distinguished Teaching Professor, to reward faculty members of educational distinction as well as research, and established one of the first student-exchange programs with the Soviet Union.²

He also initiated equal opportunity centers for the minority students. Boyer's time at SUNY was characterized by establishing a dialogue between the campuses and a focus on cooperation and community

In 1977, Boyer left SUNY to become, at the invitation of President Jimmy Carter, the U.S. Commissioner of Education. He had previously served on commissions to advise Presidents Nixon and Ford. As Commissioner, Boyer

¹This paper was first delivered as a Lecture at the American University of Beirut, Hamra, Lebanon, in
² Wikipedia n.d.

vowed to give priority to basic education, skills, and educational reform. During his tenure, Boyer created a service-learning program enabling students to get hands-on experience in their communities. He also became increasingly aware of the troubles of Native American education systems, and set up programs and conducted studies on the improvement of the Native American school system. In addition to helping the nation's less-privileged students, Dr. Boyer also managed to increase federal funds for education by 40 percent over three years.³

In late 1979, Boyer became president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In this position he gave attention to education at every level, including the earliest years of a child's education. He expanded the Carnegie Foundation to include public education, and was particularly concerned about the American high school and its relationship with higher education. A major accomplishment was to create a dialogue between teachers and administrators about teaching methods and programs. In addition, his lasting legacy includes several reports he authored that helped to change the face of education. He served the Foundation from 1979 to his death from cancer on 8 December 1995. During his career he received a number of U.S. and international awards. He received also a 140 honorary doctorates—believed to be a world record.⁴

Boyer authored or co-authored nine major studies, and numerous speeches and papers. Of particular note are *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (1983); *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* (1987); *Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation* (1991), in which he analyses early childhood education, and which led to educational television programs such as 'Sesame Street', and the Ready to Learn Act of 1994; as well as *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, the work with which we are particularly concerned in this presentation.

In addition to his infectious optimism about the capacity of education to help people reach their potential, Boyer's approach to educational issues was informed particularly by two ideas, namely service and connectedness.

That Boyer placed a premium on practical action and service that benefited others can be attributed to his upbringing and personal convictions as a member of the Brethren in Christ denomination. In particular, he was greatly influenced by the example of his grandfather;

Grandpa Boyer, he wrote, "spent . . . forty years running a city mission, working for the poor, meeting the needs of those who had been pathetically neglected, teaching them." He exemplified Christian living and, Boyer added, "he taught me, as I observed his life, that to be truly human one must serve."⁵

Describing Boyer as a 'practical pietist', Jacobsen notes that his view of service was expansive, embracing all manner of people regardless of their creeds, cultures or convictions.

...the tragedies that bothered Boyer most were instances of potential denied rather than of mere pain endured. In speech after speech [he] would quote the poet Vachel Lindsay:

It is the world's one crime its babes grow dull,
Not that they starve, but starve so dreamlessly,
Not that they sow, but that they seldom reap,
Not that they serve, but have no gods to serve,
Not that they die, but that they die like sheep.

Boyer would continue saying: "The tragedy is not death. The tragedy is to die with commitments undefined, convictions undeclared, and service unfulfilled."⁶

In *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Boyer's profound conviction about service finds expression in his support for the recognition and reward of the service activities of academics, within and beyond institutional confines. He noted that "many academics are...drawn to the profession

³ Good

⁴ Coye 2007, p. 21.

⁵ Jacobsen 2000, p.

⁶ Jacobsen 2000, p. 9.

precisely because of their love for teaching or for service—even for making the world a better place...”⁷

Further, he maintained that it was “crucially important to the health of our communities, the nation, and the academy for scholars to *use* the knowledge in their fields to benefit society and that universities and their graduates must connect with the concerns and challenges faced by the wider community.”⁸ Indeed, the failure of the academy to adequately engage with contemporary society is a major concern in *Scholarship Reconsidered*. As he saw it, the challenge facing the colleges and universities of America, as elsewhere, was whether they could, “with all the richness of their resources, be of greater service to the nation and the world?”⁹

The other feature informing Boyer’s approach is the idea of connectedness. Boyer’s Carnegie colleague, Dale Coye, notes that Boyer’s 1987 report, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, was especially concerned with the disconnects in American higher education:

There he traced the cause of many of higher education's problems to the fragmented nature of the college experience...Boyer found there were often inadequate connections between what high school students were taught and what colleges expected, between the academic and social lives of students, between the campus and the outside world...Amid the atomized world of electives, distribution requirements, and departments, there were few unifying experiences and little sense that the whole could be greater than the sum of the parts.¹⁰

The 1987 report foreshadowed Boyer’s holistic approach in his 1990 report, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, on the one hand, by developing a multifaceted view of scholarship and, on the other, by seeking to better integrate scholarship with society. Connectedness would underpin his discussion of issues such as: an equality of recognition afforded to academic research, teaching and service; the scholarship of integration; and the connection of academic knowledge with the needs of the community.

2. *Scholarship Reconsidered*

Scholarship Reconsidered is based on the findings of a 1989 Carnegie Foundation survey that garnered over five thousand responses from academics in the USA,¹¹ and in Boyer’s hands this report became a manifesto to reinvigorate American higher education by providing “a more creative view of the professoriate.”¹² Its central theme, as stated by Boyer, is the issue of “what it means to be a scholar.” “The time has come,” he declared,

...to step back and reflect on the variety of functions academics are expected to perform. It's time to ask how priorities of the professoriate relate to the faculty reward system, as well as to the missions of America's higher learning institutions. Such an inquiry into the work of faculty is essential if students are to be well served, if the creativity of all faculty is to be fully tapped, and if the goals of every college and university are to be appropriately defined.¹³

Scholarship Reconsidered commences by noting that historically, American higher education had seen its mission in terms of social service, discharged variously: in the colonial period by “preparing new generations for civic and religious leadership;”¹⁴ then in the mid-nineteenth century by developing practical nation-building skills, stimulated by the Land Grant College Act of 1862; and then at the start of the twentieth century, by distinguishing

⁷ SR, p. xii.

⁸ Coye 1997, p. 22 (original emphasis).

⁹ SR, p. 3.

¹⁰ Coye 1997, pp. 21–22.

¹¹ SR, p. 127.

¹² SR, p. xii.

¹³ SR, p. 2.

¹⁴ SR, p. 3.

service as a core mission of the university with the goal “not only to *serve* society, but *reshape* it.”¹⁵

At the same time, in the wake of the Enlightenment, the natural sciences gradually gained prominence in the academy, and engendered a growing emphasis on research and new patterns of graduate education. This emphasis received enormous impetus in the 1940s, when U.S. universities were enlisted in the national defense. With the establishment of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, “Academics flocked to Washington to staff the new agencies and federal research grants began to flow.”¹⁶ This circumstance, plus the optimism of the post-war generation in the ability of ‘science’ to secure continued progress and prosperity, gave to academic research a hitherto unimagined prestige and boundless funding. Subsequently, over the second half of the twentieth century, the view came to dominate that “to be a scholar is to be a researcher—and publication is the primary yardstick by which scholarly productivity is measured.”¹⁷

The upshot of this for the modern academy, was that as research gained in prominence academic reward and recognition became increasingly linked to research performance and outputs. At the same time teaching loads were steadily increasing. In the American context, this was engendered first by the GI Bill, and then by the social aspirations of the Baby Boomer generation, as also by the burgeoning of new technologies and fields of knowledge. By the 1980s and 90s, the so-called massification of higher education, saw student numbers in many parts of the world increase exponentially—a trend which continues to the present. These factors conspired to exacerbate the imbalance between teaching and research. Boyer found strong evidence not only that teaching was perceived by faculty to be undervalued, but also “that many professors feel ambivalent about their roles. This conflict of academic functions,” he observed, “demoralizes the professoriate, erodes the vitality of the institution, and cannot help but have a negative impact on students.”¹⁸

Moreover, due in part to the factors just mentioned, the academy had largely disengaged with society. There were research agenda and partnerships of sorts with industry and government, but generally universities had ceased being leaders in social change, or in exercising the levels of service that had once prevailed.¹⁹ At the same time, the social, economic and environmental concerns had not abated, but instead in many instances had become truly global. The academy, then, needed to discover an internal imperative to reengage with society. “There is”, Boyer stated, “a deepening conviction that the role of higher education, as well as the priorities of the professoriate, must be redefined to reflect new realities.”²⁰

¹⁵ SR, p. 6 (original emphasis). Boyer supports this observation by citing number of statements from the speeches of college and university leaders of the period. For instance, in 1908, “Harvard president Charles Eliot could claim: ‘At bottom most of the American institutions of higher education are filled with the modern democratic spirit of serviceableness. Teachers and students alike are profoundly moved by the desire to serve the democratic community. . . All the colleges boast of the serviceable men they have trained, and regard the serviceable patriot as their ideal product. This is a thoroughly democratic conception of their function’ (SR, p. 5).

¹⁶ SR, p. 10.

¹⁷ SR, p. 2.

¹⁸ SR, p. 3.

¹⁹ Reflecting on Russell Jacoby’s *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe*, Boyer remarked that “the influence of American academics has declined precisely because being an intellectual has come to mean being in the university and holding a faculty appointment (preferably a tenured one), writing in a certain style understood only by one’s peers, and conforming to an academic rewards system that encourages disengagement and even penalizes professors.” Boyer 1996b, p. 22.

²⁰ SR, p. 3.

Boyer's remedy was to offer the academy an expanded understanding of scholarship; one that would holistically combine and reinforce research, teaching and service in the life of the academy. The key to his approach, as Nicholls observes, was the thesis that "academics are first, foremost, and perhaps exclusively, scholars," and consequently to see "scholarship as subsuming all the traditional roles of an academic."²¹ Accordingly, Boyer proposed four domains of scholarship: namely discovery, integration, application and teaching. These domains "divide intellectual functions that are tied inseparably to each other", while together "they dynamically interact, forming an independent whole."²²

3. The Four Scholarships

Before examining Boyer's four scholarships, two observations are in order. First, Boyer broke new ground by treating teaching as a type of scholarship. Whatever may be thought of the validity of his categorization, it marked an enormous shift in perspective from the then commonplace view, namely that teaching is a preliminary stage to 'real' scholarship, meaning 'research', as it was a shift away from the redundant concept (though one still sometimes voiced), that teaching is a self-contained vocation somehow splendidly isolated from the general concerns of scholarship.²³ With the identification of teaching as scholarship, Boyer effectively paved the way for teaching to receive due institutional reward and recognition and, equally as important, gave rise to the Scholarship of Teaching, or Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), as an integral developmental and critical activity within universities worldwide.

Second, as Elton observes, the idea "that scholarship should underpin all the activities of universities" owes as much if not more to Humboldt than to Boyer.²⁴ However, in Humboldt's thought, *Wissenschaft* denoted a fundamental dichotomy between the university and the school, namely that the university "treats scholarship always 'in terms of not yet completely solved problems, whether in research or teaching, while school is concerned essentially with agreed and accepted knowledge.'"²⁵ The point to be noted, is that on the Humboldtian view, academic scholarship *critically* advances and extends knowledge through 'problematization'. Boyer falls short of saying this in so many words. Thus, for instance, wherever critical approaches are mentioned explicitly in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, criticism is a function assumed rather than analyzed.²⁶ But if *Scholarship Reconsidered* tends in its

²¹ Nicholls 2004, p. 31.

²² SR, p. 25.

²³ With respect to the latter point, speaking of the colonial era colleges, Boyer cites Theodore Benditt's observation that, "professors were hired not for their scholarly ability or achievement but for their religious commitment [i.e. their vocational commitment – P.H.]. Scholarly achievement was not a high priority, either for professors or students" (SR, p. 4). Compare also James Korn (1999), who argues that teaching ought to be viewed as a distinct task within the academy, one that is grounded in own right as a professional rather than scholarly activity. In making his case, however, Korn falls into the error of limiting scholarship essentially to research. This, in turn, leads him to conclude that activities such as observation, study, reflection and the stimulation of intellectual curiosity are not scholarly *per se*. These things, says Korn (1999, p.363), "We do...as teachers, not as scholars, and in saying that, my intention is to distinguish and honor the activities of teaching." However, while it is the case that teachers at all educational levels will engage variously in observation, study, reflection and the stimulation of intellectual curiosity, what Korn overlooks is that in the academy these activities are invested with critical qualities in the pursuit of higher intellectual attainments. It is the employment of this critical faculty in hand with the discovery, integration and application of knowledge, which places academic teaching and learning within the matrix of scholarship.

²⁴ Elton 2009, p. 250.

²⁵ Elton 2009, p. 248. While Boyer, I think, would have agreed with the idea behind the distinction that Humboldt expressed, nonetheless, as previously noted, Boyer was more concerned to emphasize the connectedness between all levels of education.

²⁶ See SR, pp. 19–18, 24, 69, 72 & 77.

treatment of scholarship to more descriptive than analytical, there is no doubt that it resonated deeply with the academy of the late twentieth century by furnishing a “vocabulary for discussion of the intellectual life of academe.”²⁷

While I am tempted at this point to launch into a discussion of the nature of scholarship, and the intellectual, disciplinary, social and cultural difficulties and implications of attempting to define the notion of scholarship,²⁸ we must allow Boyer’s approach to hold center-stage. So now let us consider briefly in turn the four domains of scholarship that he propounded.

(1) Discovery

The scholarship of discovery, “comes closest to what is meant when academics speak of ‘research’”. It speaks of “the commitment to knowledge for its own sake, to freedom of inquiry and to following, in a disciplined fashion, an investigation wherever it may lead.” Generally, discovery “contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university.”²⁹ On this analysis, discovery is predicated upon the intrinsic value of all knowledge. It is disciplined in its methods of inquiry. It is communal, inasmuch as it contributes to, and draws upon, the expertise and experience of a learned community. Motivated by the intrinsic worth of acquiring knowledge for its own sake, discovery is highly engaged: “Not just the outcomes, but the process, and especially the passion, give meaning to the effort.”³⁰

(2) Integration

The scholarship of integration gives “meaning to isolated facts”. Discovery necessitates a further step in scholarship, namely that of making connections by putting facts “into perspective”, in ways that illuminate and reveal their significance.³¹ This activity can be described variously as contextualization, organization, or synthesis. Through integration knowledge grows by making new connections and these connections in turn open doors to hitherto unconsidered fields of inquiry. Integration includes interpretation, which Boyer describes as the analytical task of “fitting one’s own research—or the research of others—into larger intellectual patterns” Whereas discovery asks, “What is to be known, what is yet to be found?”, integration asks, “What do the findings *mean*?”³² And Boyer adds, questions such as these “have a legitimacy of their own and if carefully pursued can lead the scholar from information to knowledge and even, perhaps, to wisdom.”³³

²⁷ Glassick 2000, p. 877.

²⁸ On which see Andresen (2000) and Hill (2008).

²⁹ SR, p. 17.

³⁰ SR, p. 17. It is interesting that Boyer preferred the term ‘discovery’ to that of ‘research,’ as it is clear in his discussion and the examples adduced that he could use the two terms as synonyms. For instance, at one point he writes, “We strongly affirm the importance of research—what we have called the scholarship of discovery” (SR, p. 75). Most likely the chief reason that he preferred ‘discovery’, was that he thought ‘research’ to be a term devalued by the reductionist equation of ‘research’ with ‘scholarship’. Moreover, he probably thought the term ‘research’ too restrictive to appropriately denote the extent of creative scholarly work (see SR, p. 15). Hence, as he states, “to define the work of the professoriate narrowly—chiefly in terms of the research model—is to deny many powerful realities” (SR, p. 75). Admittedly, the term ‘research’, properly considered, denotes a ‘research’, namely repeated searching that discovers, creates or pursues something new (cf. Neumann 1993, p. 101). But Boyer had in mind also the integrated nature of his model, in which discovery occurs not only in research narrowly construed in its investigative aspect, but also through the integration, application and teaching of knowledge.

³¹ SR, p. 18.

³² SR, p. 19 (original emphasis).

³³ SR, p. 20.

Here Boyer argued the necessity for multi-disciplinary perspectives and cross-disciplinary investigations. He believed that “Such work is, in fact, increasingly important,” as on the one hand, “traditional disciplinary categories prove confining, forcing new topologies of knowledge,” while on the other, “specialization, without broader perspective, risks pedantry.”³⁴

Underlying Boyer’s scholarship of integration, we can discern his conviction that “connectedness was a fundamental fact of life;” a condition that “applied to reality in general and to human existence in particular.”³⁵ Jacobsen relates that Boyer’s favorite comment on connectedness was that “The connectedness of things is what the educator contemplates to the limit of his [or her] capacity.”³⁶ Therefore, it comes as no surprise that in articulating the scholarship of integration he explains it not simply as a way to expand and appropriate knowledge, but as an avenue to *wisdom*.

(3) Application

The *scholarship of application* is concerned with making academic scholarship relevant to the wider social context than the knowledge of the academy requires to be applied responsibly to consequential problems. This scholarship naturally embraces areas such as the applied sciences and vocational training, but extends to embrace the entire intellectual enterprise of the academy. Accordingly, Boyer connects the scholarship of application to academic service, but with the qualification that service activities are considered scholarship when “tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity.”³⁷

Boyer remarked that “the term itself may be misleading if it suggests that knowledge is first ‘discovered’ and then ‘applied.’ The process we have in mind is far more dynamic.”³⁸ What he had in mind is the intersection between the interests of scholarship and those of society, and an application of knowledge stimulated by both. Indeed, Boyer envisaged the academy not only responding to social problems, but also allowing those problems to define an agenda for engaged scholarship.³⁹

If the scholarship of integration reflects Boyer’s concern with connectedness, then the scholarship of application manifestly draws on his fundamental belief in the virtues of service. Yet notwithstanding that “New intellectual understandings can arise out of the very act of application”, or that that a scholarship which “both applies and contributes to human knowledge is particularly needed in a world in which huge, almost intractable problems call for the skills and insights only the academy can provide,”⁴⁰ it must be recognized that the application which Boyer advocates is not without potential risk to the intellectual program and independence of the academy.⁴¹

(4) Teaching

Notwithstanding the profound impact of Boyer’s classification of a *scholarship of teaching*, it remains that in *Scholarship Reconsidered* he sketched only a faint outline of what the concept

³⁴ SR, p. 19.

³⁵ Jacobsen 2000, p. 12.

³⁶ Jacobsen 2000, p. 13.

³⁷ SR, p. 22.

³⁸ SR, p. 23.

³⁹ See SR p. 21.

⁴⁰ SR, p. 23.

⁴¹ I have in mind, whether society will happily accept the academy’s advice & challenges to social order; will the academic agenda become overburdened with the immediate, the faddish, ‘industry responsiveness’?

means and its implications.⁴² He believes teaching can be defined as scholarship because “teaching both educates and entices future scholars” (p. 23), and because teachers bring the depth of their disciplinary knowledge (p. 20) to the task of transforming and extending knowledge, in ways that encourage “students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning...” (p. 24). Each of these statements is problematic. Teaching may educate and entice future scholars, but only a minority of students go on to be scholars, and teaching is actually concerned with the totality of knowledge acquisition and student learning in its most expansive sense. In any case, the intellectual appeal that may attract someone to become a scholar is not the same thing as scholarship itself. Allowing that each discipline has its own slant on the meaning of scholarship and distinctive approaches to teaching and learning, it hardly follows that disciplinary scholarship creates a discrete scholarship of teaching. Again, encouraging students to be critical, creative thinkers and lifelong learners are fundamental goals of the academy, but do not, in and of themselves, establish teaching as a scholarship. In short, the language is inadequate, leading some to doubt whether Scholarship of Teaching proponents even understand scholarship (Andresen), as also to the subsequent fragmentation of the concept.

However, a closer examination of *Scholarship Reconsidered* will assist to better unpack what Boyer meant by classifying teaching as scholarship. As one goes through the work it is apparent Boyer believed that academic teaching required adopting and developing scholarly methods and approaches to achieve its goals. Thus he speaks of the requirement that teachers engage in critical reflection, are adequately prepared, and gather and analyze evidence of student learning. He rejects transference theories of teaching, and advocates the collaborative dynamic of teacher and student both as learners; this being the significance of his oft cited quotation from Aristotle: “Teaching is the highest form of understanding” (p. 23). Further, he discusses approaches to the engagement of students as active learners, and he recognizes the inculcation of critical approaches and attitudes as a function of learning in higher education. Taken together, these concepts may provide the basis for constructing a scholarship of teaching, or at least for the admission that teaching is a scholarly activity.

Further, it must be remembered that in Boyer’s view teaching—i.e. the act of teaching—comprises a scholarship that is integrated with the scholarships of discovery, integration and application. Hence when Boyer says that “inspired teaching keeps the flame of scholarship alive,” we may understand him to mean that the knowledge and passion which the teacher brings to facilitating the learning of a subject is an initial step towards the discovery of knowledge. Teaching and learning not only promotes and enables, but is a part of the scholarship of discovery. Accordingly, teaching is an incredible privilege, for teachers deal in the wonder of knowledge and its discovery. But with the wonder come real intellectual challenges, as authentic teaching acts to take students from the state of not knowing to actively learning and to going on learning. This development requires a pedagogical content knowledge, a scholarship, which has the capacity “to represent a subject in ways that transcend the split between intellectual substance and teaching process” (Nicholls: 32).

Teaching connects with the scholarship of integration by facilitating the transformation and extension of knowledge, through preparing students to become critical thinkers who are able to connect and synthesize knowledge in its multifarious forms. Teaching brings to the integration of knowledge a distinctive *synoptic character* through its ability to draw strands together. Moreover, the scholarship of teaching is equipped to develop cross-disciplinary approaches and new paradigms of multi-disciplinarity. This was an urgent *desideratum* Boyer believed, because “even as the categories of human knowledge have become more and more discreet, the need for interdisciplinary insight” and broader perspectives, “has increased.” In

⁴² 2%!

this respect he was particularly influenced by an earlier champion of academic teaching, Cardinal John Newman, who in his seminal work, *The Idea of a University*, “argued that professional study should be located in a university precisely because such a setting would, in fact, work against narrowness of vision. It is in the university, Newman said, where students can take ‘a survey of all knowledge,’ and acquire ‘a special illumination and largeness of mind.’

Teaching facilitates the scholarship of application. As Boyer notes, “future scholars should be asked to think about the usefulness of knowledge, to reflect on the social consequences of their work, and in so doing gain understanding of how their own study relates to the world beyond the campus.” To this we may add that the Scholarship of Teaching has established that adults learn better by doing: and applied approaches such as problem-based, practice-based and service learning strategies are now familiar features of the teaching and learning framework in numerous universities. Such approaches not only enable students to better synthesize knowledge for themselves, but better prepare them for the practical demands of the workplace, and in the case of service learning create an ethical basis for learning.⁴³

Had Boyer lived longer he may have better synthesized his thought on the Scholarship of Teaching. As it was, a great service was done by his Carnegie colleagues who in the 1997 follow-up work, *Scholarship Assessed*, supplied a *lacuna* in Boyer’s discussion, by identifying a set of standards by which scholarship in general and the scholarship of teaching in particular might be validated. The standards identified are: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. The Scholarship of Teaching evolved, and today there are competing interpretations: does the term properly refer to research about teaching, to bringing scholarly perspectives (disciplinary and pedagogic) to teaching, or as Boyer originally propounded, the act of teaching itself?

Whatever the debates, there is no question that Boyer set in train a movement that has enhanced the status, reward and recognition of teaching, that has reinvigorated thinking about the role of the modern university, that has provided an evidentiary base for university teaching and learning, and most importantly that has developed methods and approaches which have markedly improved the student experience and learning outcomes. Boyer would, I think, be gratified, especially by the knowledge that through his devotion to the ideals of scholarship, connectedness, and the service of others, the academy now ought to have a much better grasp of its humane mission.

⁴³ Cf. Coye 1997, p. 22.so

Questions for Audience – arising from SOTL

1. Academic development (developing university teachers in T&L)

“If teaching is as important as research, and research into teaching is as important as research in the disciplines, then we should demand a preparation for SoTL equivalent but not necessarily equal to the kind of preparation required for disciplinary research.” (Elton 2009: 250).

“The traditional view, although not always expressed so blatantly, was that one improved in teaching through imitation of role models – one taught, as one had been taught by academics that taught, as they had been taught, by . . . , an apostolic succession, going back to the middle ages.” (Elton 2009: 256 -257)

Strategies: Induction (means scaffolding with clear T&L framework, assessment policies, Graduate Qualities) – ongoing developmental activities (PBL approaches very fruitful), institutional support (time, people, money, culture of SOTL), awards, grants, grad certs.

2. Teaching- Research nexus

“Arguably the most regrettable feature of the dichotomy between research and teaching is that it has led to a skewed value system of by now long standing, with research being considered significantly more prestigious than teaching. In contrast, SoTL aims to achieve – in the service of scholarship – not only a unity between the practice of teaching and learning and research into teaching and learning, but an overall unity of teaching and research, i.e. disciplinary as well as generic teaching and learning, together with disciplinary research and research into teaching and learning: all in the service of scholarship (*Wissenschaft*). It is this originally Humboldtian approach to the work of universities which is – or should be – fundamental to SoTL” (Elton 2009: 248).

The nexus raises question of what is “research”? E.g. "An interesting example arose in the discussion of artistic areas, such as architecture and music. In these fields the issue of what is 'research' can give rise to considerable debate within and beyond the discipline. For example, although a wide range of fields in the arts and sciences may contribute to 'research' in such areas, a major feature of 'research' in such disciplines involves artistic creation.” (Neumann 1993:102)

“There are many ways in which the University of Melbourne’s research activity and research culture permeate teaching and learning. According to particular contexts, academic staff build the teaching research nexus through approaches that include:

- § drawing on personal research in designing and teaching courses;
- § placing the latest research in the field within its historical context in classroom teaching;
- § designing learning activities around contemporary research issues;
- § teaching research methods, techniques and skills explicitly within subjects;
- § building small-scale research activities into undergraduate assignments;
- § involving students in departmental research projects;

§ encouraging students to feel part of the research culture of departments;
§ infusing teaching with the values of researchers; and
§ conducting and drawing on research into student learning to make evidence-based decisions about teaching.

Each of these approaches is discussed in some detail on the following pages. In the main part, the discussion examines how research informs teaching and does not consider how teaching might inform research — which it can in many disciplines. For example, academics have been known to report that being asked to teach a subject in a new area has opened up unexpected lines of inquiry that have led to fruitful new research agendas.” (Baldwin 2005: 4).

References

- Abou, Sélim 2005, *Freedoms: Cultural Roots of the Cedar Revolution*. Beirut: Presses de l'Université Saint-Joseph.
- Andresen, L.W. 2000, 'A Useable, Trans-disciplinary Conception of Conception', *Higher Education Research & Development* 19.2, pp. 137–153.
- Bain, Ken
- Baldwin, Gabrielle 2005, *The Teaching-Research Nexus: How Research Informs and Enhances Learning and Teaching in the University of Melbourne*. Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.
- Biggs, John 2001, 'The Reflective Institution: Assuring and Enhancing the Quality of Teaching and Learning', *Higher Education* 41.3, pp. 221–238.
- Boshier, Roger 2009, 'Why is the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Such a Hard Sell?', *Higher Education Research and Development* 28.1, pp. 1–15.
- Bowden, R.G. 2007, 'Scholarship Reconsidered: Reconsidered', *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 7.2, pp. 1–21.
- Boyer, E.L. 1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Special Report, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E.L. 1996a, 'From Scholarship Reconsidered to Scholarship Assessed', *Quest* 48, pp. 129–139.
- Boyer, E.L. 1996b, 'The Scholarship of Engagement', *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 49.7, pp. 18–33. [Republished with minor changes in the *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1.1 (1996), pp. 11–20.]
- Burke, Peter 2000, *A Social History of Knowledge: from Guttenberg to Diderot*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Checkoway, Barry 2001, 'Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University', *The Journal of Higher Education* 72.2, pp. 125–147.
- Coye, Dale 1997, 'Ernest Boyer and the New American College: Connecting the “Disconnects”', *Change* 29.3, pp. 20–29.
- Davis, K. W., and Weeden, S. R. 2009, 'Teacher as Trickster on the Learner's Journey', *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 9.2, pp. 70–81.
- Devlin, Marcia 2009, 'Australia: Higher Education in 2029', *University World News* 98 (22 Oct.). Online at <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20091023103130927>
- Elton, Lewis 2009, 'Continuing Professional Education: The Role of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning', *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education* 8.3, pp. 247–258.
- Gale Group 2003, 'Ernest Boyer', in J.W. Guthrie (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd edn). [New York: Macmillan Reference](#), OCLC 55976558. Online at <http://www.answers.com/topic/ernest-boyer>.
- Gamage, D.T., and Mininberg, Elliot 2003, 'The Australian and American Higher Education: Key Issues of the First Decade of the 21st Century', *Higher Education* 45.2, pp. 183–202.
- Garder, Helen (ed.) 1957, *The Metaphysical Poets*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Glassick, C.E. 2000, 'Boyer's Expanded Definitions of Scholarship, the Standards for Assessing Scholarship, and the Elusiveness of the Scholarship of Teaching', *Academic Medicine* 75.9, pp. 877–880.

- Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., and Maeroff, G.I. 1997, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hayes, Dennis 2005, 'Intellectuals and Education: The Role of the University', in Dolan Cummings (ed.), *The Changing Role of the Public Intellectual*. London: Routledge, pp. 123–138.
- Healey, M. 2000, 'Developing the Scholarship of Teaching in Higher Education: A Discipline-based Approach', *Higher Education Research and Development* 19.2, pp. 169–189.
- Hill, P.A.L. 2008, 'Boyer's Model of Scholarship: A Syriac Case Study From Seventh-Century Egypt'. 2008 Occasional Papers on Learning and Teaching at UniSA – Paper 3. Online at
- Hofmeyer, Anne, Newton, Mandi, and Scott, Cathie 2007, 'Valuing the Scholarship of Integration and the Scholarship of Application in the Academy for Health Sciences Scholars: recommended Methods', *Health Research Policy and Systems* 5.5. Online at <http://www.health-policy-systems.com/content/5/1/5>.
- Horton, Richard 2008, 'Resuscitating Homo academicus', *The Lancet* 371, p. 3.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von 1810, 'Über die innere und äussere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten zu Berlin', in Leitzmann et al. (eds), *Wilhelm von Humboldt's Gesammelte Schriften (1903–1935)*, vol. 10. Berlin: B. Behr. Translated as 'On the Spirit and Organisational Framework of Intellectual Institutions in Berlin', *Minerva* 8 (1970), pp. 242–267.
- Jacobsen, Douglas 2000, 'Theology as Public Performance: Reflections on the Christian Convictions of Ernest L. Boyer', Presidential Scholars Address, 17 Feb. Messiah College. Online at <http://www.boyercenter.org>.
- Kassir, Samir 2006, *Being Arab*. Translated by Will Hobson. London & New York: Verso.
- Korn, J.H. 1999, 'Recognizing Teaching as Teaching', *American Psychologist* 54.5, pp. 362–363.
- Kreber, Carolin 2002, 'Teaching Excellence, Teaching Expertise, and the Scholarship of Teaching', *Innovative Higher Education* 27.1, pp. 5–23.
- Kreber, Carolin 2005, 'Charting a Critical Course on the Scholarship of Teaching Movement', *Studies in Higher Education* 30.4, pp. 389–405.
- Louth, Andrew 2003, 'The Unholy Market Kills the Divine Life of the Mind', *Times Higher Education* (30 May). Online at http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?section_code=26&storycode=177114.
- Maslin, Geoff 2007, 'China: Chinese Students to Dominate World Market', *University World News* 4 (4 Nov.). Online at <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20071101150549773>
- McLean, M. 2001, 'Rewarding Teaching Excellence. Can We Measure Teaching Excellence? Who Should Be the Judge?', *Medical Teacher* 23.1, pp. 6–11.
- Neumann, Ruth 1993, 'Research and Scholarship: Perceptions of Senior Academic Administrators', *Higher Education* 25.2, pp. 97–110.
- Nicolls, Gill 2004. 'Scholarship in Teaching as a Core Professional Value: What Does This Mean to the Academic?' *Teaching in Higher Education* 9 (1), pp. 29–42.
- Parks, Malcolm 1998, 'Where Does Scholarship Begin?' *ACJournal* 1.2. Online at: <http://www.acjournal.org/holdings/vol1/Iss2/special/parks.htm>
- Rice, R. Eugene n.d., 'Rethinking What it Means to be a Scholar'. Online at: <http://orpheum.ctl.mnscu.edu/iteach/resources/pod/Package11/>.
- Rowland, Stephen 2006, *The Enquiring University: Compliance and Contestation in Higher Education*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: The Society for Educational Research and the Open University Press.
- Schaeffer, Frank 2007, *Crazy for God. How I Grew Up as One of the Elect, Helped Found the Religious Right, and Lived to Take All (or Almost All) of It Back*. Philadelphia: Da Capo Press.
- Schneeweiss, Ronald, Ramsey, Paul G., and Jonsen, Albert R. 1997, 'Reflections on the Scholarship of Teaching', *Academic Medicine* 72.6, pp. 481–482.
- Shulman, Lee S. 1987, 'Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform', *Harvard Educational Review* 57.1, pp. 1–21.

- Starrett, Gregory 2008, 'Institutionalising Charisma: Comparative Perspectives on the Promise of Higher Education', in Christopher Davidson and Peter Mackenzie Smith (eds), *Higher Education in the Gulf States: Shaping Economies, Politics and Culture*. SOAS Middle East Issues. London: SAQI and London Middle East Institute SOAS, pp. 73–91.
- Strand, L.M. 1998, 'In Pursuit of Scholarship: "The Raw Nerve" of the Academy', *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 52, pp. 348–350.
- Ware, [Metropolitan] Kallistos 2000, *The Inner Kingdom*. The Collected Works, Vol. 1. Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Wikipedia n.d., 'Ernest L. Boyer'. Online at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ernest_L._Boyer.
- Young, Pat 2006, 'Out of Balance: Lecturers' Perceptions of Differential Status and Rewards in Relation to teaching and Research', *Teaching in Higher Education* 11.2, pp. 191–2002.