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The Committee’s charge was as follows:
1. develop an expanded definition of scholarship that includes the scholarship of teaching;
2. suggest measures for scholarly productivity and excellence beyond those recognized for the traditional scholarship of discovery;
3. propose a faculty reward system that recognizes faculty diversity; and
4. determine what is needed to gain greater acceptance of this broader definition.

During this decade, AACP has studied Ernest L. Boyer’s Scholarship Revisited: Priorities of the Professoriate(1). Boyer’s categories of scholarship include: (i) the scholarship of discovery; (ii) the scholarship of integration; (iii) the scholarship of application; and (iv) the scholarship of teaching. Specifically, Boyer asserts that in his broader definition of scholarship, the scholarship of teaching entails assuring that “the work of the professor becomes consequential because it is understood by others. As a scholarly endeavor, teaching both educates and entices future scholars. The scholarship of teaching demands that the teacher be informed and fully conversant with the knowledge of his or her field. As a scholarly and intellectual activity, teaching is rigorous and time-consuming, and requires serious, continuous study.” (from AJPE 1993; 57, 386)(2).

The membership has adopted policy based upon Boyer’s broader definition of scholarship:
- “AACP encourages colleges and schools of pharmacy to accept a broader definition of scholarship for pharmaceutical education as described in Paper IV of the Commission to Implement Change in Pharmaceutical Education.” (Boyer’s expanded definition is explicitly described in Commission Paper IV). (1) (Source: Research and Graduate Affairs Committee, 1993)(3).
- “AACP encourages activities by colleges to clearly identify the guidelines by which the scholarship of teaching and service activities of all college faculty will be evaluated.” (Source: Academic Affairs Committee, 1992)(4).
- “AACP supports and encourages activities by colleges and schools of pharmacy that enhance the recognition and reward for demonstrated excellence and accomplishment in teaching and for demonstrated excellence and accomplishment in professional service.” (Source: Academic Affairs Committee, 1992)(4).

The Committee believes its charge, to develop an expanded definition of scholarship, has been met through the membership’s acceptance of the 1993 Research and Graduate Affairs Committee policy. To address the remaining charges, the committee felt it necessary to determine the present status of scholarship assessment, recognition, and reward in the schools and colleges of pharmacy.

DETERMINING OPINIONS OF THE FACULTY

From the Deans’ Perspective. A brief survey was submitted via E-mail to the deans of 20 randomly selected institutions (10 independent and 10 state-supported). An explanation of the AACP policy statements on scholarship and teaching was elaborated. Boyer’s four categories of scholarship were defined (including the scholarship of teaching), and two questions were asked: (i) “Do you agree with AACP’s position that teaching is a variety of scholarship?” and (ii) “Can you provide examples of mechanisms your institution employs to nurture and reward excellence in teaching?”

From the Faculty’s Perspective. A survey was submitted via E-mail to five AACP-member faculty (three in basic pharmaceutical science and two in pharmacy practice) in each of 21 institutions (total of 105 faculty in nine independent and 12 state-supported schools and colleges, including 14 institutions that were part of the dean’s group) (Tables I and II). An explanation of the AACP policy statements on scholarship and teaching was presented. Boyer’s four categories of scholarship were defined (including the scholarship of teaching), and seven questions were asked. Questions 1-5 were Likert-scale items (see Table III). Questions 1 and 2 asked if there is personal and institutional acceptance of the broader definition of scholarship to include the scholarship of teaching. Questions 3-5 asked to what extent schools and colleges are operationalizing support for the scholarship of teaching. Questions 6 and 7 were open-ended, asking how teaching is recognized and rewarded in the institution, and about differences between the way scholarly activities of basic pharmaceutical science and clinical faculty are defined, recognized, nurtured, and rewarded.

DATA COLLECTION AND SURVEY RESULTS

From the Deans’ Perspective. Of the 20 surveys E-mailed, responses were received from 17 deans representing 16 institutions (nine independent and seven state-supported). The results of the survey demonstrated unanimous agreement that the scholarship of teaching is, in fact, considered to be a form of scholarship. There are, however, some differences of opinion as to whether demonstrated excellence in the scholarship of teaching, alone or in combination with the scholarship of integration and the scholar-
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Table I. Institution data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools/Colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Usable responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-supported</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ship of application, is sufficient to merit justification for tenure. It would appear that most schools of pharmacy have made institutional commitments to the primacy of the scholarship of discovery in the “scholarship category” (of the three-category system of teaching, scholarship, and service) in retention, promotion, and tenure considerations, especially beyond the rank of assistant professor. Having so stated, this vary rough, preliminary survey seems to indicate that it is also clear that the character of the deanship in 1996 is one of steadfast support for teaching excellence.

From the Faculty’s Perspective. Tables I and II provide response rate information. Table III presents results for the Likert-scale items. Faculty support the scholarship of teaching as a form of scholarship. There is much less agreement that their institutions accept the expanded definition of scholarship to include the scholarship of teaching, though independent school/college faculty appear to feel that they have greater support. Responses to the remaining questions appear equivocal. Independent institution faculty are in closer agreement with their colleagues in public institutions, though it seems faculty in private institutions believe that teaching is slightly more emphasized. Great care must be exercised in analyzing these data, as the number of responders is quite small.

Responses to Question 6 listed the many ways that excellence and accomplishment in teaching are recognized and rewarded. These are highlighted in a later section of this report (see section entitled “Some Mechanisms for the Nurturing and/or Rewarding Teaching Excellence”).

From the responses to Question 7, it is hard to interpret faculty reported differences between the way scholarly activities of basic pharmaceutical science and clinical faculty are defined, recognized, nurtured, and rewarded. The wording of the question may have caused confusion, as some responded about differences between basic pharmaceutical scientists in the tenure track and “clinical” faculty in nontenure track positions. Some faculty did report that there are no differences in criteria for any tenure track faculty at their institution. There seems to be a general feeling, however, that there are differences. There has been some attempt to expand the definition of scholarly activities to include greater small group teaching (e.g., recitations) and clerkship precepting. However, faculty perceive that grants and publications are more easily quantified, recognized, and rewarded.

GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

Perceptions of the Deans. Most deans do not feel that there is an issue here. Most believe that the era of basing decisions regarding retention, promotion, and tenure as well as the decisions for merit salary evaluations on just the scholarship of discovery is well behind us. Deans feel that teaching excellence is valued and is being rewarded.

Perceptions of the Faculty. From some of the comments offered by faculty, there is confusion regarding “teaching,” “scholarship,” and the “scholarship of teaching” as described by Boyer. A group of faculty view teaching more as student contact in the classroom and clinic and not as much as a scholarly endeavor that entails continuous evaluation for process and outcome for purpose of improvement. These people view “scholarship” as traditional “research.”

Almost all faculty accept that there is such a thing as the scholarship of teaching. They appear to believe that it is being given some “presence” in their institutions, but that “presence” runs the gamut from lip-service to fairly strong recognition and reward. It is not surprising that the deans rate recognition and reward for teaching greater than do faculty. However, signs everywhere indicate that the prominence and importance of scholarly teaching is on the rise. Within AACP, there are numerous examples: annual teachers’ seminars, the Commission to Implement Change in Pharmaceutical Education, policy statements, teaching innovations competition, the Center for the Advancement of Pharmaceutical Education (CAPE), themes of recent interim meetings, etc. Almost all institutions have teaching awards, some with a monetary component. The national press in higher learning and the efforts of American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) are focusing much more on innovative teaching. Also, an ever-increasing number of institutions have implemented “Teaching and Learning Centers” to assist faculty in their innovative and everyday teaching.

SUMMARY

The process for retention, promotion, and tenure as well as the process for merit salary evaluations is spelled-out at most, if not all, institutions. Traditionally defined “teaching, scholarship, and service” are the widely recognized components that are used as yardsticks in these processes. It appears to many faculty that the scholarship of teaching is significantly “under-valued” or not understood at many institutions. It is also a suspicion that administrators and university-wide P&T committees do not regard the scholarship of teaching as a bonafide form of scholarship, or that they are not well informed on the subject. Hence, the scholarship of teaching is frequently overlooked, frequently under-appreciated, and consequently unrewarded. There may be a need to

---

Table II. Faculty data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveyed</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>State-Supported</th>
<th>Pharm. Science</th>
<th>Pharm. Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responders</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent response</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*32 received: 3 unusable (i.e., E-mail response not readable or responder not identifiable).
reassess the definition of scholarship—to broaden it to include the scholarship of teaching a la Boyer at many of our institutions. Therefore, because little real change occurs without support from leadership, deans and department chairs need to positively advocate dialogue on the scholarship of teaching.

The committee does not feel there is need for additional AACP policy regarding the importance and place of the scholarship of teaching within the entire realm of scholarly work. The Academy has ample policy that is at least “creeping” into schools and colleges of pharmacy and is already operational in some. The committee does offer some suggestions for the immediate future.

**SOME MECHANISMS FOR NURTURING AND/OR REWARDING TEACHING EXCELLENCE**

- Teaching included in annual evaluation and in merit salary considerations
- Student-selected “Teacher of the Year”
- Faculty-selected “Teacher of the Year”
- “Teacher of the Year” provided AACP Annual Meeting travel and registration
- “Master Teacher” designation with monetary award
- Outstanding Teaching Award given, based on dossier evaluation under a point system
- Special monetary award to best TA in each class
- Teaching awards are publicly announced, associated with tangible reward
- Conscious effort to mentor junior faculty through master teachers
- “Outstanding Teachers” selected for each class
- College of Pharmacy nominates excellent teachers for university-wide awards
- A formalized “Teaching and Learning Center” to nurture and stimulate teaching improvement, teaching excellence, and teaching portfolio development
- Instruction provided to transition faculty from traditional, passive lectures and labs to “learner-centered teaching approaches”
- Committee evaluation of teaching portfolio
- Faculty encouraged to present and publish in realm of teaching innovation
- Authors, co-author, editors, co-editors considered demonstration of teaching excellence
- Grants associated with scholarship of teaching weighed as heavily as R01 grants in faculty evaluations
- The P&T letter of recommendation from the department chair must discuss teaching abilities
- Teaching formally evaluated for each instructor of each course each time it is offered; instructor is informed how he/she compares to institutional means
- Designated budget for teaching improvement and innovation

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. It is recommended that the nature of the faculty concern, and the perceptions of the deans, as well as the nature and ramifications of Boyer’s definitions of scholarship be considered as topics of discussion for AACP member school/college faculty meetings and faculty retreats. Additionally, these deliberations should entail discussions of AACP policies as they pertain to the specific mission of the institution.

2. It is further recommended that an AACP Joint Committee be charged with recommending a comprehensive process or processes for a model multi-faceted system of teaching effectiveness documentation and assessment. Comprehensive, individual teaching portfolios should be considered, and their impact on the teaching itself needs to be assessed.

3. It is further recommended that the COD and COF continue to add to/amend this list of mechanisms for the nurturing of teachers and for stimulating and rewarding teaching excellence. The final document should be distributed to all member schools of pharmacy.
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