

In *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), Ernest L. Boyer challenged higher education to enlarge the paradigm of academic research to appreciate the forms of scholarship required for teaching of high quality, including not only original research but also work that is synthetic, integrative, and instructionally directed in nature. During that same time, colleges and universities have increasingly recognized that excellence in teaching is critical to their institutional success, even as new standards of accountability have required them to develop better methods of assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of faculty teaching and student learning.

To what extent have these concerns been reflected in the policies and procedures by which colleges and universities evaluate faculty and make decisions about tenure and promotion? Indeed, have institutions recognized scholarship undertaken in the service of teaching alongside more traditional forms of research and scholarship? This presentation will provide a perspective gleaned from administrative experience in the evaluation process both nationally and in particular at two selective liberal arts colleges. At these institutions, questions about the nature and value of teaching-related research continue to prove among the most contentious. Should research and scholarship directed towards excellence in teaching—whether in relation to pedagogy or curriculum—be regarded as "real" research and scholarship? Should professional papers given at conferences about teaching, pedagogy and curriculum be evaluated as evidence of research and scholarship, or simply as aspects of teaching? Should the publication of articles in refereed journals devoted to teaching and pedagogy, and the publication of textbooks, even those that become standards in the discipline, be properly regarded as research?

While some institutions seem to embrace Boyer's expansive view of the relation scholarship and teaching, the harsher paradigm of "teaching vs. research" more often prevails. Observation suggests that most institutions have not articulated clear positions on these questions, that there is often institutional inconsistency, and that faculty/administrative personnel committees are often deeply divided on these issues. Not infrequently, the evaluation process will accept papers and publications on pedagogy as research—but as research of a decidedly inferior quality. Metaphors of "pure" vs. "impure" research (typically drawn from the sciences, which devalue applied science) are frequent. Ironically, the harsher critics of the scholarship of teaching tend to be faculty rather than administrators—perhaps because administrators increasingly understand that their institution's future will depend more on the quality of teaching than on research as traditionally understood.