

***Scholarship in Doctoral Education:
A Conceptual Framework for Self-Study
In Graduate Departments of Psychology***

Paul D. Nelson
Education Directorate
American Psychological Association¹

September 2006

Contents

Purpose of the document

Source of inspiration for the document

Topic I: Is there a core body of knowledge, skills, and related competencies expected of all psychologists, or at least those awarded the PhD degree?

Commentary

Self-study questions

Topic II: The nature of scholarship

Commentary

Self-study questions

Topic III: The scholarship of engagement

Commentary

Self-study questions

Topic IV: The scholarship of teaching and learning

Commentary

Self-study questions

Topic V: Ethical and cultural contexts of scholarship

Commentary

Self-study questions

Concluding comments

Selected readings

¹The purpose and background of this document is explained in the introductory sections. It is not to be interpreted as a formal set of guidelines, policy, or opinions approved by the American Psychological Association.

Purpose of the document

Over the past two decades, during a period in which the quality of education at all levels from pre-K-12 has been a matter of public debate and political initiative, so too has higher postsecondary education come increasingly under public scrutiny, most notably but not exclusively at the undergraduate level. Prompted to a considerable extent by demands for more transparent accountability of public institutions, especially in the face of increasing costs, leaders of higher education in this country have given correspondingly greater attention to ways in which our nation's colleges and universities serve more effectively the public good (Kezar *et al*, 2005), consistent with the history of higher education in our society.

Beyond the issues of public accountability in regard to undergraduate education, however, is the recent attention given to doctoral education itself, specifically that leading to the PhD degree. Following the classic work of Bowen and Rudenstine (1992) a decade ago, additional attention has been given to the experiences of graduate students (Golde & Dore, 2001), attrition from doctoral programs (Lovitts, 2001), how education process variables interact with student demographic characteristics (Nettles & Millett, 2006), strategies for preparing the next generation of faculty (Wulff, Austin, & Assoc., 2004), and envisioning the future of doctoral education in the context of evolving disciplines (Golde & Walker, 2006).

In these contexts, whether prompted by a public call for social responsibility, by the changing nature of academic disciplines and the preparation of their stewards, or by

the regional accrediting bodies, postsecondary education institutions in the United States have become engaged increasingly in the process self-study, more clearly articulating their mission and goals, and developing strategies for the assessment and public reporting of measurable outcomes against those goals.

It is largely through the process of institutional self-study that higher education institutions engage their administration, faculty, and students in periodic review of their education assessment practices in the context of their distinctive institutional history and mission, goals, resources, and education structures. In the course of participating in such reviews, faculty often are called upon to engage in much the same self-study process at the departmental level, thus reflecting on their departmental goals, their curriculum and other pedagogy structures designed to achieve those goals, the adequacy of facilities and other resources needed to support faculty and students in working towards the goals, and the outcomes of their efforts represented by various scholarly and other professional indicators of student, faculty, and departmental achievement. Department self-study is most useful, of course, when conducted in the context of its institution's history, mission, and goals.

Self-study typically begins and ends with questions, not unlike the nature of scholarly inquiry itself. The conceptual framework presented in this paper was developed with such a context in mind for the purpose of facilitating discussion and analysis of departmental practices and qualities among faculty and students in psychology graduate departments that grant the doctoral degree. Although primary consideration in this

document is given to graduate departments in research universities granting the PhD degree, the questions raised may be useful to other graduate departments (*i.e.*, those in comprehensive universities or professional schools of psychology) in the contexts of their institutional missions and graduate degree programs as well.²

While recognizing and respecting the diversity among research universities, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) affords a common frame-of-reference in defining the purpose of the PhD degree as awarded by all academic disciplines in the United States. It is as follows:

The PhD degree is a research degree designed to prepare a student to become a scholar, that is, to discover, integrate, and apply knowledge, as well as communicate and disseminate it. (CGS Policy Document on The Doctor of Philosophy Degree, 1990, p. 1).

It is from this definition that the present conceptual framework for psychology graduate department self-study takes its lead in focusing on *scholarship as the defining characteristic of the PhD degree*. The construct of *scholarship*, therefore, is the central theme of the questions raised in this conceptual framework for graduate

departments of psychology, especially those whose programs lead to the granting of the PhD degree.

Source of inspiration for the document

The idea for this self-study framework was

derived from the graduate education workshops held at the 2001 and 2003 Education Leadership Conferences, sponsored by the American Psychological Association's Education Directorate and Board of Educational Affairs.³

Prior to each workshop, participants were given a reading list of selected articles related to the topics they were to address. In the 2001 ELC, graduate education

³ The Education Leadership Conference (ELC) participants each year are nominated by more than 50 organizations or groups concerned with education, training, and credentialing of psychologists, various interest groups of psychologists in research, practice, and public policy, and membership organizations of psychologists at national and state levels. Participants at each conference were assigned to workshops primarily on the basis of their self-designated interest. Whereas in the 2001 ELC there was one workgroup on graduate education, in the 2003 ELC there were 5 workgroups focused on different questions about graduate education. Those who participated in the workshops on graduate education in each year are noted as follows.

2001 ELC: Karen Maitland-Schilling (Chair), Judith Albino, Sharon Berry, Alan Boneau, Richard Bootzin, James Council, Jessica Daniel, Diane Gill, Judy Hall, Rosemary Hays-Thomas, Mary Jansen, Laura Koppes, Rodney Lowman, and Wilbert McKeachie.

2003 ELC: (Workgroup A: Nature of Scholarship) Victor A. Benassi, Cheryl A. Boyce, A. Toy Caldwell-Colbert, Emanuel Donchin, Jay L. Lebow, Mary Lee Nelson, and Michael C. Roberets; (Workgroup B: Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) Ludy T. Benjamin, Jr., Michael Cofrin, Joan D. Duer, Suzanne Bennett Johnson, William G. Johnson, Jeffery S. Mio, James L. Pate, and Rosemary Phelps; (Workgroup C: Scholarship of Application/Civic Engagement) Deborah A. Boehm-Davis, Gwyneth M. Boodoo, Jean Lau Chin, Elaine Clark, Steven J. Danish, David A. Gansler, Laura K. Palmer, Nathan W. Perry, Jr., Roger L. Peterson, and Kurt Salzinger; (Workgroup D: Scholarship and Cultural Diversity) Sharon L. Bowman, Madonna G. Constantine, Beverly Greene, Harvette Grey, Justin (Doug) McDonald, David Scott Miller, Marie L. Miville, and Karen Maitland Schilling; (Workgroup E: Scholarship and Ethics) Lee D. Cooper, W. Brad Johnson, Gerald P. Koocher, Martita A. Lopez, Michael Madsen, Gilbert H. Newman, Aaron B. Stills, and Gary Stoner.

² The majority (75%) of doctoral degrees awarded in psychology today are PhD degrees, most of the other doctorates in psychology being the PsyD degree awarded primarily (but not exclusively) by professional schools of psychology for which the National Council of Schools and Programs in Professional Psychology (NCSPP) serves as an institutional membership organization. It is important to note that in the context of this document the NCSPP through annual meetings, conferences, and meta-self-study initiatives affords a common frame-of-reference for PsyD programs and professional schools of psychology related to their mission, goals, and curriculum objectives (Peterson, D., 1997; Peterson, R., 2004). Most of those programs and schools endorse a scholar-practitioner model of education and training, thus also reflecting scholarship in the context of an applied professional degree program.

workshop participants were given the following question to resolve:

Is there a core body of knowledge, skills, and related competencies that should be expected of all psychologists, or at least those awarded the PhD degree?

In the 2003 ELC, prompted in part by the outcome of the 2001 workshop deliberations, the graduate education workshop participants were divided into five work groups (following a plenary overview session) related to the following topics: (1) the nature of scholarship; (2) the scholarship of teaching and learning; (3) the scholarship of application and civic engagement; (4) scholarship and cultural diversity; and (5) scholarship and ethics. Each work group was tasked in relation to its assigned topic:

To develop questions that doctoral degree granting psychology departments might use in the course of departmental self-study to examine their departmental and program goals, their education philosophy and culture, and their practices related to advancing scholarship and preparing future scholars in psychology.

The graduate education workshop participants in these two conferences were different groups of scholars in psychology. Although the conceptual framework offered in this document is based on their deliberations and the conclusions they reached in response to questions posed of them, it should not be assumed (unless

stated otherwise) that this document necessarily reflects individually or collectively their endorsement. Neither should this document be interpreted as a set of guidelines or other policy approved by the American Psychological Association.

Rather, this document has been developed by the author based on outcomes of the ELC graduate education workshop deliberations for the purpose of affording a possible frame-of-reference for engaging faculty and graduate students in some aspects of graduate department self-study, the ultimate responsibility for which resides with the graduate faculty and their academic administration. Selected readings included at the end of this document are offered as background for the issues and questions posed for possible use in department self-study.

Each section that follows provides a brief commentary on the topics addressed by the two ELC workshop participants, followed by questions that your department may find useful for purposes of your own departmental or program self-study.

Topic I:

Is there a core body of knowledge, skills, and related competencies expected of all psychologists, or at least those awarded the PhD degree?

Commentary

Although diverse in opinion about many issues related to the topic question, there was general consensus among the 2001

ELC graduate education workshop participants about the summary of their deliberations that follows.

Psychological science and practice today have as a foundation many bodies or domains of knowledge. The discipline is too broad and complex to have as its foundation a single body of knowledge. What all students must learn is that there are multiple determinants of behavior. In their graduate education, students are afforded different types of opportunities to learn about subsets of these determinants through their research, studies, and practiced applications of knowledge and skill. This education also is intended to prepare students to learn how to learn as psychologists in new domains of knowledge through their careers.

Although there remain differences of opinion about whether there should be a core curriculum for all doctoral students in psychology, as there may have been 50 years ago, the reality of graduate education in doctoral programs today is that there is not such a curriculum for all students (Benjamin, 2001).

Differentiation of new areas of inquiry within the traditional boundaries of psychology and expansion of the same through exciting new interdisciplinary collaborations represent promising developments for the field; but these very dynamics also present significant challenges to older notions about common mastery of core areas by all doctoral students. Even in the accreditation of doctoral programs in professional psychology, there is not a specified curriculum but rather a set of core competencies expected of program graduates.

This observation notwithstanding, there is general agreement, as there has been for 50 years, that doctoral education in psychology should emphasize breadth of education and training as well as depth of focus in one's research. There is comparable consensus, however, that how this principle is implemented in graduate departments should not be prescribed.

Some programs of graduate study preparing students primarily for scientific careers may have a more highly specialized research focus, very often employing a "mentor model" in which a few graduate students work closely with one another and a faculty mentor. Although students in these programs may have formal coursework in psychology and other disciplines related to their research, the general manner in which their graduate education is structured varies from program to program, even at times from student to student in the same program. Breadth of preparation in these programs often includes interdisciplinary as well as disciplinary study, tailored to and pursued in individualized programs targeted to specific foci of specialization. Rather than being predetermined as curriculum requirements, scholarly exploration of these subjects is often prompted by the discovery process of critical inquiry among graduate students themselves or is prompted by the rhetorical question posed by research mentors. Thus, it is through their research agenda and mentoring that these doctoral students are challenged to explore the multiple determinants of behavior in their area of focus, pursue diverse learning methods, and develop attitudes and ethical principles of scientific inquiry and explanation.

In contrast, other doctoral programs in psychology, especially those preparing students for professional practice or careers in applied psychology, are designed to ensure that students learn at graduate levels of instruction about biological, cognitive, affective, social, and individual difference bases of behavior that serve as scientific foundations for practice. These programs also tend to familiarize their students with the history of thought in the discipline, research methods, statistics, qualitative analysis, and ethics through formal courses or seminars, and require study of the functional areas of practice (*e.g.*, assessment, intervention, consultation) through didactic and supervised field experience. Research is a requirement of these programs as well, being a central focus for some while in others being integrated with practice. Typically, students in these programs study with many different faculty over the course of their graduate education and training, thus having multiple role models.

Despite the diversity of bodies of knowledge foundational to psychology as a scientific discipline and profession, and despite the diversity of pedagogy models among doctoral programs in psychology, it is expected that those receiving the doctoral degree in psychology will demonstrate the following *core competencies*:

- ⇒ a substantive understanding of multiple determinants of behavior in individuals, groups, organizations, and communities;
- ⇒ a “culture of evidence” perspective about behavior based on scientific inquiry and reasoning, replicable methods of

observation and measurement, and interpretation of qualitative and quantitative evidence;

- ⇒ an understanding of ethical principles applicable to practice, research, and teaching as well as a value orientation of respect for human diversity; and,
- ⇒ an understanding of what it means to learn as a psychologist and a commitment to lifelong learning.

In addition, doctoral programs in psychology may conceptualize *additional competencies expected of their graduates in one or more of the following domains of scholarly activities*, as noted in the CGS guidance on the purpose of the PhD degree:

- *discovery of knowledge*
- *integration of knowledge*
- *application of knowledge*
- *communication of knowledge*

Possible questions for department self-study

1. Given the premise and conclusions reached by the workshop participants, on which of their ideas, if any, is there general agreement among your faculty? Among your advanced doctoral students? On which ones, if any, is there variance of thought among your faculty and advanced students? How is that variance accommodated in the department’s goals and culture?

2. To what extent and by what means does your department facilitate the development among its doctoral students of the four core competencies noted above, and how is each one assessed in formative and summative ways? In what ways might the department do a better job in addressing these competencies?

3. What additional competencies are expected of your department's doctoral students, perhaps differentially among students depending on their graduate program goals, by the time they receive their degree? How are these additional competencies related to the four domains of scholarship noted above, as set forth by the Council of Graduate Schools? How is their development facilitated and assessed? How are they modeled by your faculty?

4. In the context of these reflections, what do your faculty consider to be the strengths of their department? What do your graduate students consider to be the strengths of the department? How similar or different are these perceptions, and to what might differences in perception (if they exist) be attributed?

5. Considering the strengths perceived by faculty and students in the context of your departmental goals, in what areas of development might your department seek to improve its quality, from both faculty and graduate student perspectives? What steps might be taken by the department to realize this improvement?

6. What information does the department gather from graduate students who leave prematurely or otherwise fail to complete their degree requirements, and how is that information used by the department in its

self-study process? What information does the department gather from its graduates and how is that information used by the department in its self-study process?

Topic II:

The nature of scholarship

Commentary

The Council of Graduate Schools (1990) defines the PhD degree as a research degree designed to prepare a student to become a scholar, that is, to discover, integrate, and apply knowledge, as well as communicate and disseminate it. While this characterization of a scholar is broad, the term “scholar” or “scholarship” has been stereotypically equated most often over the past half century with the conduct and publication of research (Rice, 1991). Certainly in the culture and mission context of major research universities, the discovery, integration, and publication of knowledge as an outcome of original research has been the most common criterion of scholarship used in the evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion. An economic as well as prestige factor related to this is the ability of faculty to bring major external grant support for research to the university. As scholars who develop in this tradition mature, they are more likely to interpret or integrate their work or that of others into broader schematic or theoretical constructions of knowledge; but in most instances, for other than a few questions that their dissertation committee may pose of them, most of those who graduate from PhD programs are quite narrowly focused within their niche of disciplinary research.

This seems to be as characteristic for psychology (Benjamin, 2001) as it is in other fields of science (COSEPUP, 1995)

It was partly in response to such a narrowing of perspective about scholarship, but also in response to increasing demands during the 1980s for greater public accountability of higher education institutions to society, that a number of higher education scholars initiated efforts to broaden our understanding of scholarship, especially as related to faculty work. Thus, coincidental in time with promulgation of the CGS policy statement on the PhD degree, Ernest Boyer, then president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in his landmark publication *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Boyer (1990, p.16) stated:

Boyer spoke of the *scholarship of discovery*, the *scholarship of integration*, the *scholarship of application*, and the *scholarship of teaching*.

“Surely, scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar 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.” From this conceptualization, This broadened view of the forms of scholarship, Schon (1995) argued, requires a new epistemology, one grounded in inquiry and reflection-in-action, in a sense, action research as pioneered by Kurt Lewin and his colleagues. In his account of Lewin’s life and work, Marrow (1969, p. 230) described Lewin as “a scientist who integrates his role as a scientist with his responsibilities as a citizen of a democratic society that must keep bettering its works and ways. The patterns of action research were developed primarily as ways of realizing this ideal ...”

Among the same circuit of scholars at the time were Russell Edgerton and his colleagues at the American Association of Higher Education who initiated a national forum through which to study and discuss faculty roles and rewards in different types of higher education institutions, a natural link to understanding how different forms of scholarship are more or less valued in various settings. Related to this initiative also was the work of Robert Diamond and his colleagues at Syracuse University who, in recognition of the significant role that disciplines play in defining what is important in the way of scholarship, initiated a multi-year effort to examine the perspectives of different science and humanities disciplines on the nature of scholarship. Psychology was among those disciplines.

In an effort supported by a task force appointed by the Society for the Teaching of Psychology, Halpern *et al* (1998) summarized, as a point paper to stimulate discussion in the field, an overview of what scholarship means among academic psychologists, being sensitive to institutional differences from those of community and four-year colleges to those of major research universities. Halpern and Reich (1999) summarized and responded to an invited set of replies to the task force report from psychologists in different types of institutional settings conveying different perspectives on the nature of scholarship and how it is valued in various academic settings (Girgus, 1999; Korn, 1999; Myers & Waller, 1999; and Peterson & Trierweiler, 1999). It is clear from the

commentary that different forms of scholarship are valued differently in different academic settings. Another point to note is that faculty may engage in or value different forms of scholarship at different stages of their careers.

Endorsing the broader concept of scholarship advanced by Boyer and others, Halpern and her task force colleagues (1998, p. 1294) referred to scholarship as “the creation, organization, dissemination, and application of knowledge.” “The value of scholarship,” they added, “depends on its quality and whether it fills a present or future need ...” While noting that some faculty work may be expected and important, *e.g.*, student advising, it is not likely to be considered as scholarship unless it meets the following criteria set forth by Diamond and Adams (1995, p.14) based on their assessment of what most disciplines would consider the requisites of scholarship: (1) requires discipline-specific expertise; (2) is innovative; (3) can be replicated or elaborated; (4) can be documented; (5) can be peer reviewed; and (6) has significance or impact.

Yet another perspective on the nature of scholarship was offered by former Council of Graduate Schools president, Jules LaPidus (1997) in his suggestion that research is “what you do” and scholarship is “the way you think about it.” The relationship of research to scholarship, Lapidus argued, is analogous to the relationship between information and knowledge. Placing this notion of scholarship in the context of graduate education, especially for the PhD degree, he further states (1997, p.4): “It is this broader view, this placing of one’s research not just in the context of the discipline, but in a larger framework of intellectual work, that

distinguishes good graduate education from advanced training programs.” Similarly, Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff (1997) referred to one of the standards by which scholarship may be assessed as “reflective critique,” depicting scholars as those who not only make public their work, but in so doing personally reflect on that work, seek critique of the work by others, *e.g.*, scholarly peers, and learn from this process so that their work might be improved. These aspects of scholarship are analogous to what Schon (1983) referred to as the “reflective practitioner” in writing about how professionals think in action and, similarly, to what Shulman (2004) cited as “reflective thinking and practice” in the profession of teaching, culminating in the “wisdom of practice.”

Integrating these various perspectives, we might conclude that scholarship can be conceptualized as reflective intellectual activity that considers one’s professional work activities not only in the context of one’s disciplinary knowledge, but also in a larger framework of intellectual work and its significance for society, including its cultural context. More than merely being reflective, however, scholarship in its best form is creative, can be documented, subjected to peer review, and is otherwise made public.

Possible questions for department self-study

1. How do your department faculty and doctoral students conceptualize the construct of “scholarship?” How is this conceptualization represented in your department mission and goals? What criteria and methods are used in your department for assessing continued development of scholarship among faculty?

What criteria and methods are used for assessing the development of scholarship among your doctoral students?

2. If your department were to be allotted a total of 100 points for allocation to each of the four conditions listed below, how would those points be distributed among the following activities of a scholar: (a) generation of knowledge; (b) synthesis of knowledge; (c) communication of knowledge; and (d) application of knowledge? In other words, indicate the relative weight given by your department to the preceding four activities of a scholar in the context of each of the following:

- o For emphasis in department goals
- o For evaluation of faculty achievement
- o For evaluation of graduate student development
- o For department climate and culture

[Suggestion: You might have subgroups of faculty and students do this task followed by discussion of similarities and differences in the resulting profiles. How coherent are the four resulting profiles from this analysis? If there are major differences in the four profiles, to what might they be attributable? If greater coherence between the profiles is desired, what might be done to facilitate that outcome?]

3. In as much as the generation and synthesis of knowledge can be assumed to be of considerable priority to graduate faculty, especially in research universities, what is your department's philosophy about the best ways to prepare graduate students

to do the same? How clearly and in what ways is this philosophy modeled or otherwise communicated to graduate students before and after they are admitted to the department?

4. In academic and non-academic contexts, collaborative, multidisciplinary problem-solving research is valued increasingly. How do your doctoral students learn to engage in such research efforts? How do you assess their ability to conceptualize the importance of their research in the context of their discipline, in the broader context of intellectual work across disciplines, and in the context of its potential significance for society?

5. In addition to the importance of scholarly reflection about one's research in broader than local level contexts, the work of a scholar whose focus is on the generation and synthesis of knowledge typically requires practical knowledge and skills of a professional nature, *e.g.*, grant writing, grant and laboratory management, supervision of research assistants, mentoring graduate students or postdoctoral fellows, IRB procedures and rationale. How and to what extent are the knowledge and skills essential to these activities developed in your graduate students? And, if you have them, in your postdoctoral fellows?

6. To what extent and in what ways do your department faculty discuss with and mentor graduate students in regard to their career choices and relevant issues regarding those choices? If this is done, to what extent are graduate students informed about academic and non-academic careers, and within each of these two broad categories about the diversity of institutional settings and types of professional work done?

To what extent are alumni of the department or other professionals invited back to discuss these types of issues with your students?

Topic III:

The scholarship of engagement

Commentary

Subsequent to the publication of his landmark work on the reconsideration of scholarship, Boyer (1996) and others who were influenced by his thinking (*e.g.*, Huber & Hutchings, 2005; O'Meara & Rice, 2004; Rice, 2003; Shulman, 2000) expanded the “scholarship of application” and the “scholarship of teaching,” respectively, to become the *scholarship of engagement* and the *scholarship of teaching and learning*. As noted in the preceding section, the “scholarship of discovery” and the “scholarship of integration” were not as foreign to the prevailing thought about the nature of scholarship as these two forms, at least within the context of the major research universities where significant proportions of PhD degrees are granted. Consequently, of Boyer’s four suggested forms of scholarship, more attention has been given during the past decade to the “scholarship of engagement” and the “scholarship of teaching and learning” than to the “scholarship of discovery” and the “scholarship of integration.” This section and the one that follows, consequently, focus on these two forms of scholarship.

The relationship of academic institutions and the community at large, albeit increasingly less defined by geographic boundaries, is central to the history of higher education in this country. While that

role has changed over the years, a compelling challenge to strengthen that relationship has been posed for higher education institutions in recent years, especially for the research university and its extensive research programs (Bok, 1990; Kennedy, 1997; Kezar *et al*, 2005; Ramaley, 2005).

In response to this challenge, coupled with leadership from the American Association of Higher Education, its affiliate organization Campus Compact, and more recently the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, numerous initiatives have been advanced during the past decade under such rubrics as service-learning and civic engagement. Resulting from these initiatives are a number of good practices or models that work among community-engaged colleges and universities, with faculty and students across disciplinary boundaries engaged collaboratively with community leaders and agencies in research and other problem-solving services for benefit of the public (Ehrlich, 2000; Zlotkowski, 1998).

In his 1990 treatise *Scholarship Reconsidered* Ernest Boyer referred to the “scholarship of application” as one among four aspects of scholarship. A few years later, Boyer (1996) wrote on the “scholarship of engagement” in an effort to stimulate thinking about the relationship between work of the academy and its disciplines with social, civic, and ethical problems of society. Altman (1996) captured this notion in his *American Psychologist* essay referring to the construct “socially responsive knowledge.” While some areas of research in which psychologists are engaged may appear to be more readily linked than others with the

development of socially responsive knowledge, psychology as a discipline has a rich history of community-based and engaged research. Building on that history and Altman's writing, Nelson (2004) invites attention to possible implications of such for graduate education in psychology.

The scholarship of engagement, however, goes beyond the traditional application of academic-based research to problems in the community, or even community-based research by the academic community. It may include these as elements; but introduces another epistemology to the development of knowledge through discovery and integration.

Rice (2005) advances the notion that whereas the scholarship of application or community-based research was based on an academic expert model of knowledge, in the scholarship of engagement knowledge is developed through a transactional, collaborative model of discovery and integration between those of the academy and of the non-academic community. The latter model leads to what Rice refers to as "local knowledge" rooted in the local community context, to be differentiated from "cosmopolitan knowledge" generated by the expert model. Such distinctions have been drawn in regard to the educating professional psychologists as "local clinical scientists" (Peterson, 1997; Stricker & Trierweiler, 1995; and Trierweiler & Stricker, 1998). Advocating likewise for greater collaboration between the academic community and the public, Walshok (1995) advances the case that, in our knowledge-based economy, the types and sources of knowledge are increasingly diverse, seemingly without boundaries of

institutions, settings, or traditions. She also distinguishes information from knowledge, much as Boorstin (1980) did at the time during which he served as Librarian of Congress.

The majority of graduate students in psychology today are enrolled in programs that focus on the application of psychology. Whether or not they are, however, there are those who would argue that all graduate students need to learn to reflect on and communicate with others about how their area of research not only advances knowledge within the discipline but also about how it is of potential benefit to society. Whether engaged in research or practice, or both, they also need to be well grounded as scholars in the philosophy of thought and knowledge.

Possible questions for department self-study

1. Some faculty think of the application of knowledge as the antithesis of scholarship. How do your faculty and graduate students think about this issue? In reflecting on the mission and goals of your department, in the context of your institution's mission and goals, in what ways are elements of the scholarship of application and civic engagement represented? If they are not identifiable, how important is it that they be included?
2. What forms of pedagogy are employed in your department for the purpose of preparing your graduate students to become engaged in the community or otherwise applied scholars? For example, is service learning a pedagogy of choice among any of your faculty who teach undergraduate or

graduate courses? If so, to what extent are graduate students involved with those faculty and in what ways is their reflective practice related to their preparation as scholars in our discipline?

3. In what types of activities are your faculty engaged related to the application of psychology outside the academy or in collaboration with others of the external community in civic engagement initiatives? Do faculty involved in such ways regard this as scholarly work? If so, how do they document their scholarship and model or otherwise share it with their graduate students? How are these activities valued by other faculty in the department? By your graduate students?

4. What are your departmental and institutional policies related to applied work or other forms of engagement external to the academic community? Are there barriers created by these policies in regard to the scholarship of application or civic engagement? What about policies and practices related to recognition of faculty, including those related to tenure and promotion? Are they consistent with the values of a scholarship of application and engagement?

5. To what extent does your department seek a balance among faculty strengths in terms of those whose scholarly activities focus principally on advancing knowledge in the discipline and those whose scholarship is more aligned with activities of application and engagement in the community external to the academy? If so, how respectful of each other are the faculty of these different orientations and how is such culture of respect communicated to your graduate students? Is there comparable recognition of achievements in each area of emphasis?

6. Among the competencies expected of engaged scholars is the capability of working collaboratively with others, of other disciplines within the academy and of other vocations outside the academy. This involves, among other things, being an effective listener and an ability to conceptualize problems and possible approaches to their solution from different epistemological perspectives. To what extent and in what ways are your doctoral students prepared to work this way?

Topic IV:

The scholarship of teaching and learning

Commentary

In the context of increasing demand from legislators and others for greater public accountability of higher education institutions, and their accrediting bodies, the 1980s and 1990s in higher education were characterized by the zeitgeist of what many referred to as “the assessment movement.” The focus on education outcomes increasingly led to an emphasis on the assessment of student learning, defined by Ewell (2001, p. 6) as “the particular levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities that a student has attained at the end (or as a result) of his or her engagement in a particular set of [educational] experiences.” During this same period of time, there was an increased public awareness, at least in academic circles, of the work of cognitive and behavioral scientists on “how people learn” (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999; Halpern & Hakel, 2003). Beyond general principles and theoretical constructs of learning, however, a number of scholars,

Lee Shulman among them, spoke of the contextual nature of learning and teaching, and the need for local inquiry and public sharing about how and under what conditions learning takes place in the classroom or elsewhere.

Whereas the American Association of Higher Education, and its periodical *Change Magazine*, had become a major national forum for conferences, workshops, and scholarly publications on assessment in higher education, the demise of that organization was a natural occasion for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to assume national leadership in promoting what Boyer and others had come to label as the “scholarship of teaching and learning.” This form of scholarship integrated what we had learned about assessment into a richer scholarly construct, most notably led by Lee Shulman and his colleagues when he assumed the Carnegie Foundation presidency in 1997. Teaching and the profession of teaching have been central to Shulman’s life work as a scholar, highlights of which are summarized in collections of essays on teaching and learning (Shulman, 2004a) and teaching as community property (Shulman, 2004b).

Being creative in one’s teaching, making one’s teaching public as community property, documenting and submitting one’s teaching to peer review, assessing the effects of one’s teaching, and reflecting on and learning from these activities to improve one’s work and build upon related work of others are among Shulman’s themes of emphasis. These themes are virtually identical to the qualities characteristic of scholarship, noted earlier (Diamond & Adams, 1995; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Halpern *et al*,

1998). Huber (2004) calls upon a number of scholars to indicate how this form of scholarship has been integrated into their academic careers.

More than scholarly teaching (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999), the scholarship of teaching and learning is described by Shulman’s colleagues Mary Huber and Pat Hutchings (2005) as having four essential features: (1) questioning; (2) gathering and exploring evidence; (3) trying out and refining new insights; and (4) going public. As Huber & Hutchings (2005, p ix) put it: “The scholarship of teaching and learning invites faculty from all disciplines and fields to identify and explore those questions in their own teaching --- and, especially, in their students’ learning --- and to do so in ways that are shared with colleagues who can build on new insights. In this way, such work has the potential to transform higher education by making the private work of the classroom visible, talked about, studied, built upon, and valued --- conditions for ongoing improvement in any enterprise.” When such a goal is achieved, it leads to a community of learners across disciplines --- a teaching commons in which colleagues can informally exchange ideas about their teaching in scholarly fashion, much as they might do in other areas of their research interests.

To advance this initiative, the Carnegie Foundation established a Carnegie Academy for the Scholars of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), under the leadership of Pat Hutchings, inviting faculty from all disciplines to devote a sabbatical year in community with one another to reflect and act upon their teaching. Information about that program can be found at:

Carnegie
Foundation for
the Advancement
of Teaching

the Carnegie Foundation website

<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/>.

Psychology has been privileged to have numerous Carnegie Scholars since the inception of the program, faculty who represent all types of higher education institutions from community and 4-year colleges to comprehensive and research universities. One among those is Daniel Bernstein, currently professor of psychology and director of the Center for Teaching Excellence at the University of Kansas, who with two other Carnegie Scholars shared his perspectives about the scholarship of teaching and learning in a recent article in *Change Magazine* (Bernstein, Marx, & Bender, 2005).

Most of the attention given in recent years by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and others to the “scholarship of teaching and learning” has been focused on the development of faculty who are already members of the professoriate. Much less attention has been given to this construct in the development of graduate students who aspire to academic careers. Even the national initiative of the past decade on “Preparing Future Faculty” (Gaff *et al.*, 2000; Gaff *et al.*, 2003; Morreale & Nelson, 2003; and Pruitt-Logan, Gaff, & Jentoft, 2002), while embracing a broader perspective of scholarship in faculty work, was not necessarily implemented by campuses and departments in a manner that would result consistently in graduate students developing an understanding of what is meant by the “scholarship of teaching and learning,” why it is important, and how it can be developed or modeled.

In psychology, Burgess & Buskist (2006) describe what is certainly one example of such a development. Yet another is the longstanding emphasis of the University of New Hampshire Graduate Department of Psychology on preparing graduate students for the professoriate with a major focus on their becoming scholars of teaching as well as scholars of particular disciplinary areas of psychology (Benassi & Fernald, 1993; Fernald, 1995). Other psychologists in recent years likewise have attested to some of the more practical outcomes of a well-designed, intentional effort to prepare graduate students for future faculty work. One such outcome is their learning to develop a teaching philosophy and portfolio, itself a scholarly documentation of reflective practice and observable consequences of teaching. In addition to its reflective value for the author of such documentation, it can be shared for peer review and through such process build upon other documented knowledge about teaching and learning (Bernstein, 2002; Korn, 2002; and Perlman & McCann, 2002), and as such becomes community property (Shulman, 1993; 2004).

Possible questions for department self-study

1. What does the “scholarship of teaching and learning” mean to your faculty and doctoral students? Is it a construct that is discussed at your institution and, if so, to what extent is it discussed in the context of undergraduate education, graduate education, or both? How much importance is given to this construct at your institution, graduate school, and department? How is it implemented by your faculty in the assessment of student learning at undergraduate and graduate levels?

2. How does your department view teaching in the context of: (a) the annual evaluation of faculty; (b) faculty tenure/promotion; (c) other faculty recognition; and (d) graduate student development? Are there institutional or departmental goals that enhance or hinder the value of this aspect of faculty work?
3. What assistance is available for faculty (both tenured and non-tenured) who need or seek help in their teaching? To what extent are new junior faculty mentored in regard to their teaching and other faculty responsibilities? To what extent are faculty and graduate students kept abreast of research on teaching and learning?
4. To what extent and by whom are graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in your department encouraged to develop competence in teaching as part of their professional development as scholars? What training and mentoring opportunities outside or within the department are there for them to develop as teachers? How and by whom are students evaluated in their teaching?
5. To what extent does your department assist graduate students in developing a philosophy of teaching? A teaching portfolio? How important to the department are the teaching philosophies of individual faculty members and how are they shared among faculty and graduate students? To what extent does the department use a teaching portfolio model or other peer review models of teaching in the assessment of faculty scholarship?
6. To what extent is research on teaching and learning acceptable as scholarly work by faculty of your department? By your

graduate students? How is research and publication on teaching viewed in terms of annual evaluations of faculty? In terms of faculty tenure/promotion? Is there a difference of perspective on these issues between your department faculty and the academic administration at your university? If so, what is its nature and how might that difference be addressed?

Topic V:

Ethical and Cultural Contexts of Scholarship

Commentary

It can be argued that the ultimate purpose of scholarship, in any of its forms, is to benefit human society through the pursuit of truth and understanding of the world in which we live, through the education of its future leaders, and through other services to the local, national, or global community. The history of higher education in our society, as a foundation for advancing scholarship, has been aligned in various ways at different times with this goal of public service. In recent years, however, concern about a deterioration and need for restoration of such a value orientation has been expressed by many scholars of higher education (Bok, 1990; Ehrlich, 2000; Kezar *et al*, 2005), their focus being on such constructs as moral and civic responsibility. As president of Harvard University, Bok (1990, p.62) put it this way, in reference to recent trends: “These trends underscore the need for universities to provide a sound moral education in the broadest sense of the term --- that is, to help students adopt higher ethical standards and a stronger sense of communal and civic responsibility.” While this broad sense of

moral and civic responsibility has received considerable attention in undergraduate colleges, it is equally applicable as a goal for graduate and professional education.

In their Carnegie Foundation report *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, Glassic, Huber, & Maeroff (1997) speak to the vital importance of ethics among scholars. In addition to disciplinary and pedagogical competence, these authors note three other qualities essential to a scholar: integrity, perseverance, and courage. The APA *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* (American Psychological Association, 2002) cites 5 principles expected of all psychologists: beneficence and nonmaleficence, fidelity and responsibility, integrity, justice, and respect for people's rights and dignity. That document also cites ethical standards in 10 areas, all of which have implications for scholars of the discipline. Ethics is a significant aspect of education for professional practice in psychology (de las Fuentes, Willmuth, & Yarrow, 2005); but its importance is equally profound in preparing graduate students to become academic scholars through the conduct of research (Committee on Assessing Integrity in Research Environments, 2002), teaching and mentoring (Kitchener, 1992), the scholarship of teaching and learning (Hutchings, 2002), the design of graduate programs (Cherwitz, Rodrigues, & Sievers, 2003), distinguishing between personal and professional roles (Pipes, Holstein & Aguirre, 2005), and, or a related nature, in the exercise of judgment with regard to issues of academic freedom (Minnich, 2006). Exemplifying the idea that ethical behavior and morality is itself the object of scholarly inquiry, Bebeau, Rest, and Narvaez (1999) advance a model for

research on moral education, the elements of which they describe as moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral motivation, and moral character.

The civic, moral, ethical context of scholarship, of course, is part of a broader societal context, that of culture. One of the five ethical principles endorsed by the American Psychological Association (2002) is that pertaining to "people's rights and dignity" in regard to individual, cultural, and role differences.

For the discipline of psychology, issues of individual and cultural diversity are of such substantive significance to the understanding of human thought and behavior that they have become central to our thinking about teaching, research, practice, and public policy (American Psychological Association 2003).

Accordingly, the construct of "cultural competence" is one to which scholars have given attention in several contexts (Sue et al, 1999; Sue, 2001; Sue & Sue, 2003; Thompson-Robinson, Hopson, & SenGupta, 2004). From another perspective, however, Fowers and Richardson (1996) pose the question "why is multiculturalism good?" In doing so, they raise some challenging issues for psychology's embracement of multiculturalism and offer philosophical hermeneutic principles by which these issues might be more meaningfully addressed. More recently, Fowers and Davidov (2006) discuss the value of multicultural competence in the context of virtue ethics. Given the increasingly global context of commerce, including that of education and the professions, these types of issues have led the question of whether

there is a universal set of ethical principles based on the value of individual or cultural diversity? Answers to the latter and related questions are being sought by Gautier and his colleagues (2004) in their research to identify a common set of ethical principles for psychologists across geographic, national, and cultural boundaries.

Even within the same broader societal context, academic institutions themselves have distinctive cultures, some values of which are shared across most higher education institutions, while other values are shared as sub-cultures among different groups of institutions, and still other values are almost idiosyncratic to particular institutions. Indeed, as Peterson (2004) points out, even an academic sub-category of programs preparing students for the profession of psychology can be characterized as representing diverse epistemological cultures. Some awareness, at least, of these various cultural contexts is important for graduate students preparing for academic careers. One of the major goals of the “Preparing Future Faculty” initiative noted earlier was just that, to acquaint graduate students with diverse academic cultural contexts of faculty work in different types of institutions, at different levels of education, and in different categories of academic program.

The cultural context has other significance for scholarship in our society, the population of which is increasingly diverse in individual and cultural background or orientation. Student populations increasingly reflect that diversity. Trends of undergraduate major and graduate student enrollment in psychology certainly attest to this (Maton *et al*, 2006), despite the challenges that remain for increasing the number of psychologists of color (Vasquez & Jones, 2006; Vasquez *et al*, 2006). These

students bring to the academic context diverse epistemologies about their education, what they value, how they learn, what they aspire to do and be, and how they relate to faculty and the institutions in which they study.

As Schon (1995) and others have noted, culture shapes the prevailing epistemologies about the importance or value attributed to different types of knowledge, different sources of knowledge, including the methods or processes by which knowledge is developed, and the ways in which knowledge is shared through application, teaching, or other forms of communication. The implications of this for the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching are significant. This fact is illustrated by Guzman (2003) and Mertens (2005) in their writings on program evaluation and social research. It is illustrated as well in a series of essays on cross-cultural differences in the human cognitive processes of categorization addressed through mathematical modeling, laboratory experiment, and field research (Ahn *et al*, 2005).

Possible questions for department self-study

1. Of what relevance are issues of individual and cultural diversity to the ways in which you define the quality of your department faculty? How is this value orientation reflected in each of the following departmental responsibilities: faculty recruitment; junior faculty mentoring; faculty workload and service committee distribution; faculty tenure and promotion considerations?

2. Of what relevance are issues of individual and cultural diversity to the ways in which you define the quality of your doctoral students? How is this value orientation reflected in the following departmental responsibilities: public information; recruitment and admissions of students; mentoring and advising students; assistantship and other financial assistance programs; completion rates and time to degree among students; postdoctoral fellowships and employment guidance?

3. In what ways might you describe your department's climate as "reflecting the values and experiences of culturally diverse students and faculty?" What specific examples or evidence might you cite to support such an assertion? What barriers, if any, impede the department's goal of having a culturally diverse group of faculty and students? How might those barriers be addressed?

4. In what ways are issues of individual and cultural diversity addressed in the curriculum of your doctoral students, including the relevance of these issues to theory, research, and practice? To what extent are your doctoral students the epistemological significance of individual and cultural diversity in reflecting about those issues as scholars? To what extent is an understanding of such issues a competency expected of your doctoral students, and how is it assessed?

5. To what is ethical practice a competency expected of all doctoral students in your department, and how are the ethical qualities of a scholar encouraged, taught, and assessed? For students in applied programs, to what extent does the department request information from practicum and internship sites about its

students' ethical reasoning and conduct? If not, why not? If so, how is this information used to facilitate the student's professional development?

6. How do your faculty model self-reflection about ethical issues? How deliberate or intentional are faculty in sharing with other faculty their concerns about ethical issues? How does the department assure a safe growth-promoting ethical climate for students? In what ways do faculty model ethical principles in their collaborative work with students?

7. How does the department encourage and assist students to disclose errors and vulnerabilities without feeling excessively threatened? How are ethics violations by faculty and students managed in your department? How explicit are departmental rules and policies regarding ethical infractions? How clearly is academic dishonesty defined?

8. How does the department identify what student information is confidential versus open for faculty discussion under the heading of student evaluation or advancement in the program? How and when is this made clear to all faculty and students?

Concluding Comments

This document was inspired by more than a decade of national initiatives and thoughtful writing about the meaning of scholarship in higher education, its nature, its manifestations and value to society, and its significance in preparing the future stewards of learned disciplines and professions ... today's graduate students. It was enriched further by the deliberations of many colleagues in our scientific discipline

and profession of psychology who, as educators, scientists, practitioners, and public policy advocates of psychology participated in two national education leadership conferences sponsored by the American Psychological Association Education Directorate and Board of Educational Affairs.

As such, this document is not to be interpreted as policy, or as a set of standards or guidelines, officially endorsed by the APA or any of its governance. Nor should it even be assumed that the commentaries and questions have been endorsed by the education leadership conference participants acknowledged in the document, unless otherwise specified. Rather, the intent of the document is that of a reflective commentary on the nature of doctoral education in psychology, with particular focus on the nature of scholarship and its manifestations in that context. In addition to commentary on different aspects of scholarship and its relationship to the development of the next generation of psychologists, examples of questions are provided for possible use by graduate departments of psychology in the self-study processes in which they engage naturally within their higher education institutions.

The author expresses genuine appreciation to all who participated in developments that made this effort possible, and assumes full responsibility for any errors of fact or interpretation. It is hoped that some elements of this document may be helpful to at least some of our graduate departments of psychology.

Selected Readings

Ahn, W-k., Goldstone, R.L., Love, B.C., Markman, A.B., & Wolff, P. (Eds.)(2005). *Categorization inside and outside the laboratory: Essays in honor of Douglas L. Medin*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Altman, I. (1996). Higher education and psychology in the millennium. *American Psychologist*, 51 (4), 371-378.

American Psychological Association (2003). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychological Association (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 58 (5), 377-402.

Bebeau, M.J., Rest, J.R., & Narvaez, D. (1999). Beyond the promise: A perspective on research in moral education. *Educational Researcher*, 28 (4), 18-26.

Benassi, V.A. & Fernald, P.S. (1993). Preparing tomorrow's psychologists for careers in academe. *Teaching of Psychology*, 20 (3), 149-155.

Benjamin, L.T. Jr. (2001). American psychology's struggles with its curriculum. *American Psychologist*, 56, 9, 735-742.

Bernstein, D.J. (2002). Representing the intellectual work in teaching through peer-reviewed course portfolios. In S.F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer*, pp.

215-230. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bernstein, D., Marx, M.S., & Bender, H. (2005). Disciplining the minds of students. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, March/April, 36-43.

Bok, D. (1990). *Universities and the future of America*. Durham, NC: Duke University press.

Boorstin, D.J. (1980). *Gresham's Law: Knowledge or information?* Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Bowen, W.G. & Rudenstine, N.L. (1992). *In pursuit of the PhD*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E.L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1 (1), Special Issue.

Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (Eds.)(1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Cherwitz, R., Rodriguez, S., & Silvers, J. (2003, July). Ethical commitments, professional visions, and intellectual choices: Students call for changes in graduate education. *Council of Graduate Schools Communicator*, 36 (6), 8-9.

Committee on Assessing Integrity in Research Environments, Institute of Medicine and National Research Council (2002). *Integrity in scientific research:*

Crating an environment that promotes responsible conduct. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (COSEPUP), National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine (1995). *Reshaping the graduate education of scientists and engineers*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Council of Graduate Schools (1990). *CGS policy document on the doctor of philosophy degree*. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Graduate Schools (1994). *CGS policy document on master's education: A guide for faculty and administrators*. Washington, DC: Author.

de las Fuentes, C., Willmuth, M.E., & Yarrow, C. (2005). Competency training in ethics education and practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 36 (4), 362-366.

Ehrlich, T. (Ed.) (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Fernald, P.S. Preparing psychology graduate students for the professoriate. *American Psychologist*, 50 (6), 421-427.

Fowers, B.J. & Richardson, F.C. (1996). Why is multiculturalism good? *American Psychologist*, 51 (6), 609-621.

Fowers, B.J. & Davidov, B.J. (2006). The virtue of multiculturalism: Personal transformation, character, and openness to the other. *American Psychologist*, 61 (6), 581-594.

Gaff, J.G., Pruitt-Logan, A.S., Weibl, R.A., and PFF Participants (2000). *Building the faculty we need*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities and Council of Graduate Schools.

Gaff, G., Pruitt-Logan, A.S., Sims, L.B., & Denecke, D.D. (2003). *Preparing future faculty in the humanities and social sciences*. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools and Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Gautier, J., Pettifor, J.L., & Sinclair, C. (2004). The feasibility of the Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists. In M.J. Stevens & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Psychology: International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS) Global Resource [CD-ROM]*. Hove, East Essex, UK: Psychology Press.

Girgus, J.S. (1999). Refereeing on different playing fields: Diversity in higher education. *American Psychologist*, *54* (5), 356-357.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Golde, C.M. & Dore, T.M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trusts.

Golde, C.M. & Walker, G.E. (Eds.)(2006). *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guzman, B.L. (2003). Examining the role of cultural competency in program evaluation: Visions for new millennium evaluators. In S.I. Donaldson & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Evaluating social programs and problems: Visions for the new millennium* (pp. 167-182). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Halpern, D. F., Smothergill, D.W., Allen, M. Baker, S., Baum, C., Best, D., Ferrari, J., Geisinger, K.F., Gilden, E.R., Mester, M., Keith-Spiegel, P., Kierniesky, N.C., McGovern, T.V., McKeachie, W.J., Prokasy, W.F., Szuchma, L.T., Vasta, R., & Weaver, K.A. (1998). Scholarship in psychology: A paradigm for the twenty-first century. *American Psychologist*, *53* (12), 1292-1297.

Halpern, D. & Reich, J. (1999). Scholarship in psychology: Conversations about change and constancy. *American Psychologist*, *54* (5), 347-349.

Halpern, D. & Hakel, M. (2003). Applying the science of learning to the university and beyond. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, Jul/Aug, 36-41.

Huber, M.T. (2004). *Balancing acts: The scholarship of teaching and learning in academic careers*. Washington, DC: The American Association of Higher Education and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Huber, M.T. & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, P. & Shulman, L.S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations,

new developments. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, Sept/Oct, 10-15.

Hutchings, P. (2003). Ethical issues in the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, Sept/Oct, 27-33.

Kezar, A.J., Chambers, T.C., Burkhardt, J.C., and Associates (2005). *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kennedy, D. (1997). *Academic duty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kitchener, K.S. (1992). Psychologist as teacher and mentor: Affirming ethical values throughout the curriculum. *American Psychologist*, 33 (3), 190-195.

Korn, J.H. (1999). Recognizing teaching as teaching. *American Psychologist*, 54 (5), 362-363.

Korn, J.H. (2002). Beyond tenure: The teaching portfolio for reflection and change. In S.F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer*, pp. 203-214. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

LaPidus, J.B. (1997, November). Doctoral education preparing for the future. *Council of Graduate Schools Communicator*, 30 (10), Special Issue.

Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield.

Marrow, A.J. (1969). *The practical theorist: The life and work of Kurt Lewin*. New York: Basic Books, Publishers.

Maton, K.I., Kohout, J.L., Wicherski, M., Leary, G.E., & Vinokurov, A. (2006). Minority students of color and the psychology graduate pipeline. *American Psychologist*, 61 (2), 117-131.

Mertens, D.M. (2005). Research and evaluation in education and psychology: *Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Minnich, E. (2006). Between impartiality and bias: On the importance of judgment. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, May/June, 17-23.

Morreale, S. & Nelson, P. (2003, July). Preparing future faculty: Disciplines and graduate deans look back, learn, and look to the future. *Council of Graduate Schools Communicator*, 36 (6), 7 & 10.

Murray, H., Gillese, E., Lennon, M., Mercer, P., & Robinson, M. (1996, December). Ethical principles for college and university teaching. *AAHE Bulletin*, 49 (4), 3-6.

Myers, D.G. & Waller, J.E. (1999). Reflections on scholarship from the liberal arts academy. *American Psychologist*, 54 (5), 358-361.

Nelson, P.D. (2004). Civic engagement and scholarship: Implications for graduate education in psychology.
http://www.apa.org/ed/slce/engage_nelson.pdf

- Nettles, M.T. & Millett, C.M. (2006). *Three magic letters: Getting to the Ph.D.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Nyquist, J. (2002). The PhD: A tapestry of change for the 21st century. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, Nov/Dec, 12-20.
- O'Meara, K. & Rice, R.E. (Eds.)(2004). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perlman, B. & McCann, L.I. (2002). Peer review for meaningful teaching enhancement. In S.F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer*, pp. 189-202. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Publishers.
- Peterson, D. (1997). *Educating professional psychologists: History and guiding conceptions*. American Psychological Association: Washington, DC.
- Peterson, R.L. & Trierweiler, S.J. (1999). Scholarship in psychology: The advantages of an expanded vision. *American Psychologist*, 54 (5), 350-355.
- Peterson, R. L. (2004). Evaluation and the cultures of professional psychology education programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 35, 4, 420-426.
- Pipes, R.B., Holstein, J.E., & Aguirre, M.G. (2005). Examining the personal-professional distinction: Ethics codes and the difficulty of drawing a boundary. *American Psychologist*, 60 (4), 325-334.
- Pruitt-Logan, A.S., Gaff, J.G., & Jentoft, J.E. (2002). *Preparing future faculty in the sciences and mathematics*. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools and Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Ramaley, J.A. (2005). Scholarship for the public good: Lining in Pasteur's Quadrant. In A.J. Kezar, T.C. Chambers, J.C. Burkhardt, and Associates (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 166-181).
- Rice, R.E. (1991). The new American scholar: Scholarship and purposes of the university. *Metropolitan Universities*, 1, 7-18.
- Rice, R.E. (2003). Rethinking scholarship and engagement: The struggle for new meanings. *Campus Compact Reader*, Fall 2003, 1-9.
- Rice, R.E. (2005). "Scholarship reconsidered:" History and context. In K.A. O'Meara & R.E. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered*, pp 17-31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shavelson, R. & Huang, L. (2003). Responding responsibly to the frenzy to assess learning in higher education. *Change*, 35 (1), 11-19.
- Schon, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D.A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, Nov/Dec, 27-34.

Shulman, L.S. (2004a). *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shulman, L.S. (2004b). *Teaching as community property: Essays on higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stricker, G. & Treirweiler, S.T. (1995). The local clinical scientist: A bridge between science and practice. *American Psychologist*, 50, 995-1002.

Sue, D.W. (2001). Multidimensional facets of cultural competence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 29 (6), 790-821.

Sue, D.W., Bingham, R.P., Porche-Burke, R., & Vasquez, M. (1999). The diversification of psychology: A multicultural revolution. *American Psychologist*, 54 (12), 1061-1069.

Sue, D.W. & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th edition). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Thompson-Robinson, M., Hopson, R., & SenGupta, S. (Eds.)(2004). *In search of cultural competence in evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, No. 102*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Trierweiler, S.T. & Stricker, G. (1998). *The scientific practice of professional psychology*. New York: Plenum.

Vasquez, M.J.T. & Jones, J.M. (2006). Increasing the number of psychologists of color: Public policy issues for affirmative diversity. *American Psychologist*, 62 (2), 132-142.

Vasquez, M.J.T., Lott, B., Garcia-Vazquez, E., Grant, S.K., Iwamasa, G.Y., Molina, L.E., Ragsdale, B.L., & Vestal-Dowdy, E. (2006). Personal reflections: Barriers and strategies in increasing diversity in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61 (2), 157-172.

Walshok, M.L. (1995). *Knowledge without boundaries*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wulff, D.H., Austin, A.E., & Associates (2004). *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.