

Council of Faculties Chairman's Section

Redefining Scholarship: It Is a Faculty Responsibility

Lee Evans

School of Pharmacy, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 5005 Rockhill Road, Kansas City MO 64108

Over the last few months I have been involved in recruitment of faculty. Numerous prospective faculty have expressed uncertainty about tenure track positions, a theme heard all too frequently over the last few years. Candidates echoing these concerns have been well qualified, many had completed research and published findings during post graduate work. Based upon my experiences, they should have had no problem jumping through the promotion and tenure hoop. Yet, they were looking for non tenure positions. Almost without exception, when questioned about their preference, I was told they did not want to live the life of their mentors who had made unbelievable personal sacrifices in order to meet the expectations of their university. The general theme expressed was that they did not think they could live up to the same expectations. All of these prospective practice faculty were from "good" schools of pharmacy with post doctoral residency and fellowship(s). I look at these individuals as potential leaders for pharmacy education as we make the transition to the entry level PharmD degree. Is there going to be a crisis involving human resources for this transition? Are we asking the right things of our faculty? Do faculty have a problem with quality of life issues?

I can't help connecting my recent recruitment experiences and rhetorical questions with discussions on the issues of scholarship in pharmacy education with which I was involved several years ago during an AACP annual meeting. At that meeting I presented, "Redefining Scholarship in Pharmacy Education: A Chairman's Perspective," which was a response to Boyer's work. While it was targeted to practice faculty, the implications are broad. The comments were intended to encourage faculty to rethink the definition of scholarship. With this in mind and after some urging from a colleague who encouraged me to publish my comments, I decided to offer excerpts from the presentation. I consider the following comments as a book report tinged with my personal observations.

Perhaps if we as faculty can be proactive about redefining scholarship, the future of pharmacy education will not be determined as a result of crisis intervention. The following is taken from the 1992 presentation.

Personal History and Blind Acceptance of Scholarship

I have been an educator for 21 years. In all that time I don't remember open discussions contemplating definitions of scholarship, other than research and publication. Perchance, like others, I blindly accepted the decree that to be a scholar, I needed to do research and publish and I set out to accomplish the goal. I entered the professoriate at a time of great change in my discipline and I had a personal drive to help mold that change, to be a part of it. My universities and schools encouraged me to embrace the concept of providing leadership to the pharmacy community and teaching students how to practice to better meet the needs of patients and the health care arena. I wasn't worried about promotion and tenure, after all, I was doing what I loved and what I had been directed to do. As my first promotion time approached, there was some apprehension by the school's committee and the dean advised me to request promotion without tenure. Since I was the first practice faculty member to go through the process, there was a perceived risk of rejection. Reality reared its ugly head and from that time on I lived with the awareness that I was going to be rewarded for work that wasn't my primary focus and that my supervisors had not mandated. The university said that I was to be involved in teaching, research and service and that in order to be rewarded for my work, I was to excel in at least two of these areas. The implicit message was that one of the areas must be research and there must be associated publications. Professionally, my needs were to teach students, provide care to patients and attempt to advance a profession in need of change. Part of the implicit message was that these other functions were necessary but they

didn't count as heavily as research and publication. Over the years this implicit message has grown louder and today it seems, for prospective new faculty, the message has become an accepted expectation. Research demands a strong focus.

Functioning as a chairman for the last five years, a more complex sense of duplicity has developed for me. I now, either implicitly or explicitly, collude with my University, my School and my fellow faculty to encourage faculty, at least at some level, to engage in the same "schizophrenogenic" existence where you are told one thing and are held accountable for something else. The message may be somewhat different than the one I received 19 years ago but, the conflicts of encouraging a faculty member to focus so narrowly on one aspect of scholarship is not different. There are faculty who are deeply interested in teaching, who are gifted and approach this responsibility in a scholarly manner, but are driven to succeed by developing a traditional research focus. Perhaps I am being too cynical, but this narrow focus, at this juncture in the reprofessionalization of pharmacy practice and educational reform, may render academia unable and unwilling to assist the pharmacy community to its fullest potential.

What is the Issue?

Maybe my observations are just that, my life experiences screened through my filters. Maybe no one else has had similar experiences or feelings! But, the Carnegie Foundation report, "Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate," legitimizes my experience as evidenced by their 1989 faculty survey which confirms that many professors feel ambivalent about their roles. Findings further support that this conflict in academic function demoralizes the professoriate, erodes the vitality of the institution, and cannot help but have a negative impact on students. Boyer's work established that some of the faculty conflict arouse from inappropriate evaluation and recognition of scholarship. This raises the question of how the various dimensions of faculty work can be more appropriately evaluated and rewarded. Do we in pharmacy education share the problems described by Boyer? Has our preoccupation with a narrowly defined definition of scholarship affected our students? Has this preoccupation diminished our ability to help change pharmacy practice and have an impact on health care education? I believe that we should be concerned about these questions and realize that there is a good chance the answer is yes!

History of Scholarship in American Colleges and Universities

Perhaps to better prepare us for change it would be useful to understand how we arrived where we are. How did the current interpretations of scholarship evolve? American universities assumed these responsibilities (or if you will, this baggage) slowly over the last 350 years. According to Boyer there have been three distinct but overlapping phases in the development of scholarship in American higher education. Three hundred and fifty years ago the first college was founded on this continent. The university's role consisted of building character and preparing new generations for civic and religious leadership. *Teaching* was a religious dedication. As society dictated, the student was the central focus of the faculty. This lasted well into the nineteenth century. The country's expansion and industrialization correlated with the beginning of the second phase. Education became more practical. In 1862 the Morrill Act, perhaps better know as the Land Grant College Act, enhanced education in liberal arts and training in skills which helped the emerging agricultural and mechanical revolutions. At this juncture, *Service* was added as one of education's missions. Academics were confident they had the expertise and an obligation to contribute to building a nation. They set out to spread knowledge that would improve agriculture and manufacturing through applied research. A moral goal of academe developed during this period. The goal was not only to serve society, but to reshape it. Emphasis on liberal education and values continued while faculty applied knowledge to practical problems. *Basic research* was the third dimension of scholarly activity with an early

history in the country. Most of this activity occurred outside the university. However, by the mid 1800s the scientific effort gained legitimacy. Clearly, by the late nineteenth century, the advancement of knowledge through research became a university mission. Until the 1940s the emphasis on research and graduate education remained the exception rather than the rule in the American university. During the forties a number of significant societal events (The Great Depression and World Wars) caused a dramatic change in academic life. Universities and the nation joined in common cause to address societal problems through research and other direct involvement. The collaboration was so successful following the resolution of the country's crisis, society significantly funded the scientific effort of universities. An army of new PhDs were educated with discipline based allegiances. The term "scholar" became synonymous with being an academic professional. There had been an academic revolution that paralleled the scientific revolution. At the same time, our higher education system moved away from educating only the elite to educating the masses. Higher education became a right.

By 1958 it was obvious this new reality of the University had created a "Catch 22" for the professoriate. Faculty hired to teach were primarily evaluated as researchers. This phenomena was documented as early as 1969 by the Carnegie Foundation's National Survey of Faculty. In that year, twenty-one percent agreed it was difficult to achieve tenure without publishing. By 1989, that number had doubled. The professoriate shifted priorities to accommodate how they were evaluated and rewarded; they delivered papers and sought extramural research funding. The Berkeley's and MIT's became yardsticks by which other universities were measured and the vision which other universities mimicked, regardless of the appropriateness of doing so. In a few short decades, priorities of American higher education were significantly realigned. Graduate and research experience emphasis occurred at the expense of the undergraduate experience. *Teaching, service, and research* are the evolutionary vestiges and fabric of the American university. I believe society has a covenant with the university to provide teaching, service and new knowledge. Society expects the professoriate to perform well in all three areas, especially in the areas that directly and dramatically affect it, education and service. Society is now reacting to violation of this covenant and is indicating that the university's research focus at the expense of teaching and service is unacceptable. For pharmacy education there is data to support this notion; PD certificates, certificates of equivalence, grand fathering, attacks on Schools for not redeveloping community practice, mandated minimum credit hour requirements for faculty; I am sure you can easily add to this list.

Addressing the Issues

How then do we address these issues? Boyer states a new vision of scholarship is needed today. We need to clarify campus missions and relate academic work more directly to the realities of contemporary life. We need to ask how we can support diversity in our colleges, universities, and even in departments. We need to ask how we can effectively use and continuously renew the talents of the professoriate. We must consciously proceed in redefining missions and creatively reconsider the meaning of scholarship if the nation's higher learning institutions are to meet today's urgent academic and social mandates.

There probably are numerous definitions of scholarship. Webster defines scholar as one with advanced study in a special field or a learned person. Scholarship is also defined as learning or a fund of knowledge and learning. So how is it the American university equates scholarship with the triple threat, or perhaps the more narrow definition of research and publication?

The term scholarship, introduced by Daniel Coit Gilman at the turn of the century, referred to a variety of creative work carried on in a variety of places. Its integrity was measured by the ability to think, communicate, and learn. Today's scholars are academics who conduct research, publish, and then perhaps convey their knowledge to students or apply what they have learned.

It is thought that the ability to teach and apply knowledge grows out of scholarship, however, scholars are not considered as part of it. Boyer argues, knowledge is not necessarily developed in a linear manner. Certainly theory leads to practice and *visa versa*. Teaching, at its best, shapes both research and practice. Considering these possibilities, it may be useful to consider scholarship to be more fluid, less rigid, more flexible than the triple threat.

Data exists with the reoccurring themes of this organization's meetings as well as in academic publications and surveys of the professoriate, that perhaps the University is ready to enter a new phase, a new part of the life cycle of American higher education. One in which the work of faculty can be defined in a way which realistically reflects the full range of academic and civic mandates. Boyer suggests "scholarship means engaging in original research. It also means stepping back from one's investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one's knowledge effectively to students."

Pharmacy Application of Boyer's Scholarship Definitions

Boyer recommended that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate yet overlapping functions: the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching.

Scholarship of Discovery: We should all be comfortable with this concept. It parallels current concepts of *research*. I agree with Boyer in that research is central to work in higher education and if anything, the scholarship of discovery should be strengthened in our redefinition. However, faculty, who are not involved in the work of scholarship of discovery due to differing interests, training, environment, resources or perhaps for other reasons, shouldn't be penalized. I don't suggest this should change. In the ideal, work in this area should increase. Some in our ranks do not pursue scholarship of discovery due to different interests, training, environment, resources and for perhaps other legitimate reasons. I do not see them limited in terms of their capacity to do scholarly work.

Scholarship of Integration: The Scholarship of Integration is closely related to discovery. The scholar is involved in giving meaning to isolated facts and making connections across disciplines. Discovery asks, "What is to be known, what is yet to be found?" Integration asks, "What do the findings mean, is it possible to interpret what's been discovered to provide a comprehensive understanding?" These questions call for critical analysis and interpretation and lead the scholar from information to knowledge.

Scholarship of Application: This area engages the scholar in the direct application of knowledge. Application asks, "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?", "How can knowledge be helpful to individuals as well as institutions?", "Can social problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?" Originally, the purpose of professional schools was to connect theory and practice. Boyer indicates that professional schools have fostered a more academic and less practical view of what their students need to know. This area does not parallel the current *service*. Serving on the P&T Committee may not be "application", however, it is citizenship. Scholarship here should not be equated with doing good. Boyer states, "Scholarship of Application activities should be tied to one's special field of knowledge and relate to professional activity." It must be rigorous and there must be accountability. It should be dynamic, new understandings must come out of the very act of application. Theory and practice vitally interact to renew one another. Examples here might include: treatment of a patient, working on health care policy consultation and developing an alternative practice paradigm for pharmacy practice. Documentation should be based on evaluation by those receiving services.

Scholarship of Teaching: A professor's work only becomes consequential when it is understood by others. Teaching is the highest form of understanding. It can be well regarded only if professors are widely read and intellectually engaged. Great teachers stimulate active learning, encourage students to be critical, creative

thinkers, and life long learners. Faculty must also be learners; the professor can be pushed in new directions by students. Inspired teaching keeps the flame of scholarship alive. Today's professor has a great challenge—to cultivate future scholars for our society, for without them our society will not improve, nor will it solve its problems. The professoriate must be recognized and rewarded for teaching, good teaching, accountable teaching. Teaching should be vigorously assessed by evidence from self assessment, peer assessment, and student assessment. Faculty should be responsible for evaluating teaching performance.

Boyer's four categories divide intellectual functions that are tied inseparably to each other. This vision of scholarship, one that recognizes the great diversity of talent within the professoriate, may also prove especially useful to faculty as they reflect on the meaning and direction of their professional lives.

Observations About Our Current State of Affairs From a Chairman

As I reflect upon the meaning of scholarship, I see barriers existing in pharmacy education today which require our attention. Overcoming these barriers offer us opportunities to enrich the professoriate and perhaps the pharmacy profession.

I see a reward system based on the number of publications and grant proposals funded or submitted each year. Perhaps we need to consider that creativity doesn't work like this. An examination of records of meaningful creativity in our discipline bears this out. Faculty do have periods of quiescence on the research/publication front. Staying abreast of the literature and advancements in practice is staying alive and expert. I believe this to be scholarly. I am not suggesting we can afford to have idol faculty. I am suggesting recognition of other forms of scholarship and the need to develop methods of measuring such scholarly activities.

I see faculty accepting research and publication as the definition of scholarship. Young faculty, emerging from post graduate programs, with a narrow perception of scholarship, have expectations of developing a clinical or bench research program and publishing. Some view teaching and service as necessary evils until they finish the tenure hurdle. They heed the warning by their mentors to watch the service work, teach as little as possible, and stay focused. However, for many there is a theme of ambivalence—duplicity of purpose—which is similar to my personal experience. These new faculty continue to be drawn to academe, some with the knowledge they will have to work extra hard to do what is expected in addition to what they want to do. But they still come; perhaps because they really love discovery or integration. I sense, though, they are also drawn to academe because of the opportunity to teach and help change our world and make it a better place. We must examine our own definitions of scholarship. If scholarship is redefined, something like Boyer has proposed, faculty would have the opportunity to pursue with purpose many avenues of interest. How should we prepare pharmacy professoriate to insure future faculty who understand the breadth of scholarship and who can establish a quality of life and accomplishment which will allow them to make the academe home?

I see chairpersons defining the kind of research that is acceptable. Such a narrow focus does not support diversity of scholarship.

I see pharmacy education losing faculty, figuratively and literally, who were at one time excited and committed to a life's work making this world a better place. People have jumped all hurdles, made tenure and even Professor and then stopped. They can go no further; something inside will not allow it. Creativity, energy, and commitment cease. Furthermore, they become angry, distrustful and hard to reach out to. Maybe they say it was the money and maybe it was. Would they still part with academe if it were a kinder, gentler place to be; maybe a place where all scholarship efforts are excepted and rewarded. Perhaps school's could be positioned to help change pharmacy practice environments in a more meaningful way. Maybe we wouldn't have members of society devaluing the role of pharmacists. Maybe we would have more practitioners who are capable of assuming enhanced teaching roles for students. I

don't have a crystal ball to answer my "what ifs". Instead I like to think things would be different and I also think that they could be different in the future.

I see faculty being directed to publish in the "correct" journals. To publish in unrefereed "ice cream" journals, (those which are widely circulated to practitioners and who we have an obligation to help) will not earn them tenure.

I see faculty members being told they are not living up to their potential because grants and publications are not coming in. At the same time, that individual is a valuable faculty member and a good teacher. I find it unacceptable for promotion and tenure to depend largely on research and publications when other dimensions of scholarship are required. It is unfair to use evaluation procedures that restrict faculty, distort institutional priorities, and neglect the need of students, especially when a significant number of faculty are dissatisfied with the current system. Can we not consider a broader range of writing, especially in the area of integration. Health issue publications for the public should be legitimate endeavors, as should preparation of quality software, audiovisuals for educational purposes, even for non specialists, designing new courses, curricular innovations, cross disciplinary classes, and seminars (especially those fostering integration).

I see pain in our faculty, especially those who are not the stereotypical researcher. They don't fit the narrow mold of the scholarship definition. They tend not to be rewarded as well and their career patterns seem to become frozen. Boyer reports from the Carnegie Foundation's faculty survey that 53% of those under 40 reported "that my job is a source of considerable personal strain." Seeking broader definitions of scholarship may humanize the meaning of being a member of the professoriate. Burnout/stagnation can be countered by recognition in its fullest sense, broadening the reward system, and creating flexible and varied career paths. We must acknowledge that a seasonal rhythm exists in academic life just as in personal life. It does not remain the same, there are stable periods and transitional periods when our expectations must change.

I see students mistrustful of faculty. It saddens me that students see faculty, especially the practice faculty, as adversaries. It seems we are viewed as being in ivory towers and we can't be trusted. How can faculty be the spiritual/professional mentors that are trusted? Trust takes time and perceived interest in students. Will a change in the way we view scholarship help?

I see the pharmacy curricula as being fragmented with a lack of coherence. We say we are educating a practitioner, yet the majority of the curriculum continues not to relate to practice, nor encourage acceptance of pharmaceutical care responsibilities. Does this relate to scholarship of teaching and integration? I would suggest that it does. If we truly have the responsibility to help change pharmacy practice, our students continue to be one source of change. Unless students are prepared to assume responsibilities inherent in the pharmaceutical care philosophy, there will be little change.

I see the public, the legislatures and governing boards of universities demanding teaching workload accountability. What's really being called into question is the reward system and the key issue is this: what activities of the professoriate are most highly prized? Our consumers are making a forceful statement about their needs and, in response, I see a great white-wash on the part of some universities instead of addressing how the professoriate could meet society's needs. What is really a shame is that the public will eventually recognize that there has been no meaningful change in support for teaching and service and will again attempt to increase accountability of the professoriate. On the bright side, there are universities attempting to make teaching more important and have made the reward structure compatible with the effort. There seems to be abundant evidence that pharmacy education is working on the scholarship of education. It remains to be seen whether anyone gets tenure on the basis of their scholarly educational work.

Concluding Comments

Pharmacy education has acquired, over the years, the same visions of scholarship as our other university colleagues. We show signs of narrow focus for our existence. We may be on the path to disenfranchising ourselves from students and teaching. We can not turn our heads on the scholarship of education and application. At no time in our history has a greater need existed for connecting the work of the pharmacy professoriate to health care and professional practice issues beyond our campuses. And yet the rich diversity and potential we hold can not be fully realized if we define our purpose so narrowly and if the faculty reward system does not acknowledge diversity and is inappropriately restrictive. Clearly while research is crucial, a renewed commitment to education and service is essential for the health of pharmacy education.