

***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

¹ The 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. The author gratefully acknowledges editorial suggestions offered in the preparation of this document by Cynthia Belar, Martin Heesacker, and Clare Porac.

Table of 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

Scholarship in doctoral education: A conceptual framework for self-study in graduate departments of psychology

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), 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 it 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.

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.

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 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

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. Roberts; (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.

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 followed by questions that your department may find useful for purposes of your own departmental or program self-study. As a process suggestion, departments might consider having groups of faculty and students discuss the questions separately or in different mixed groups at first, and then share with one another their perspectives and responses.

We begin with an issue that has been the focus of debate in psychology for some time (Kimble, 1996; Koch, 1993; Matarazzo, 1987; Sternberg, 2005), namely whether psychology is a unitary scientific discipline, and the implications of such a question for graduate education, especially for doctoral programs.

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 Council of Graduate Schools 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 the department? What do your graduate students consider to be the strengths of the department? How similar or different are the faculty and student perceptions, and to what might such differences (if they exist) be attributed?
5. 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?

In the next section, the nature of scholarship is explored from different perspectives, all of which have implications for graduate education at the doctoral level.

Topic II: The nature of scholarship

Commentary

Although the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) guidance on the PhD degree is broad in terms of what it means to be a scholar, Rice (1991) submits that the term “scholar” or “scholarship” typically has been equated with the conduct and publication of research. Certainly in major research universities, the discovery, integration, and publication of original research have been common criteria for evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion. An economic, prestige, and quality factor related to this is the ability of faculty to garner major external grant support for their research. As grant funded scholars mature, they are likely to interpret or integrate their work into broader scientific contexts; but most PhD graduates are quite narrowly focused within their niches of sub-disciplinary research. This seems to be as characteristic of psychology (Benjamin, 2001) as it is of other scientific fields (COSEPUP, 1995).

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

Among the cohort of scholars at the time Boyer’s leadership of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was Russell Edgerton, president of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE). In advancing Boyer’s ideas about the facets of scholarship, Edgerton with Ernest Lynton, Eugene Rice and other colleagues initiated a national forum sponsored by the AAHE through which faculty from all types of higher education institutions could discuss issues related to faculty roles and rewards. The rationale for this emphasis was that the way in which faculty roles and rewards are configured in particular academic settings is a major determinant of how scholarly activity is defined and reinforced. Also related to the structures of faculty roles and rewards are the cultures of different academic disciplines and their departments. Thus, another leader among the scholars of higher education in the 1990s was Robert Diamond of Syracuse University who, in recognition of the significant role that disciplines play in defining what scholarship is important, initiated a multi-year examination of disciplinary perspectives about the nature of scholarship.

Psychology was among the disciplines engaged in this process. From their work on a task force appointed by the Society for the Teaching of Psychology, Halpern *et al* (1998) summarized for discussion in the field what scholarship means among academic psychologists. Halpern and Reich (1999) subsequently responded to an invited set of replies to the task force report from psychologists in different types of institutional settings (Girgus, 1999; Korn, 1999; Myers & Waller, 1999; and Peterson & Trierweiler, 1999). The commentary revealed that different forms of scholarship are valued differently in different academic settings, and that faculty may engage in or value different forms of scholarship at different stages of their careers.

Examining the concept of scholarship advanced by Boyer within the context of psychology as a discipline, Halpern and her 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 types of 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 Adam (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 at about the same time 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 between research and scholarship, Lapidus argued, is analogous to the relationship between information and knowledge. Placing this notion of scholarship in the context of graduate education he stated (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, and 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 their work public, but in so doing personally reflect on that work, seek critique of the work by others, e.g., scholarly peers, and learn from these critiques. Such aspects of scholarship are represented in Schon’s (1983) reference to the “reflective practitioner” in writing about how professionals think in action. They are reflected also in what Shulman (2004) cited as “reflective thinking and practice” in the teaching profession, resulting in the “wisdom of practice.”

Integrating these various perspectives, one might conclude that scholarship can be conceptualized as reflective intellectual activity that considers one’s professional work activities (*i.e.*, research, writing, teaching, and service) in the context of one’s disciplinary knowledge and in the broader framework of its significance for society. More than merely being reflective, however, scholarship in its best form is creative, is documented, is subjected to peer review, and is otherwise made public.

Possible questions for department self-study

1. How do your department faculty and doctoral students interpret the meaning 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. In as much as the generation and synthesis of knowledge is a major priority to graduate faculty in research universities, what are your department’s shared beliefs about the best ways to prepare graduate students to become effective scholars in these activities? How clearly and in what ways are these shared beliefs modeled or otherwise communicated to graduate students before and after they are admitted to the department?

3. In academic and non-academic contexts, collaborative, multidisciplinary problem-solving research is increasingly valued. Do your doctoral students learn to engage in such research efforts? If so, how? How do you assess their ability to conceptualize 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?
4. In addition to the importance of scholarly reflection about one's research in broader contexts, the work of a scholar whose focus is the generation and synthesis of knowledge also requires practical knowledge and skills of a professional nature, *e.g.*, grant writing, grant and laboratory management, supervision of research assistants, mentoring graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and sponsor procedures. How and to what extent are the knowledge and skills essential to these activities developed in your graduate students? How and to what extent are they developed in your department's postdoctoral fellows?
5. To what extent and in what ways do your department faculty discuss career choices and relevant issues regarding those choices with their doctoral students? 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?

Subsequent to his landmark publication on reconsidering the nature of scholarship, Boyer (1996) and others (*e.g.*, Huber & Hutchings, 2005; O'Meara & Rice, 2004; Rice, 2003; Shulman, 2000) expanded the "scholarship of application" to the *scholarship of engagement*. Similarly, they expanded the "scholarship of teaching" to the *scholarship of teaching and learning*. In as much as these two forms of scholarship historically had been given less attention than the scholarship of discovery and integration, they are the focus of the next two sections in this guide to self-study.

Topic III: The scholarship of engagement

Commentary

The term "engagement" in this context refers to transactions between academic institutions and the community of which they are a part. Historically, this relationship has been central to the evolution of higher education in the United States. While the nature of that relationship has changed over the years, a compelling challenge to renew and strengthen it has been posed for higher education institutions in recent years (Bok, 1990; Kennedy, 1997; Kezar *et al*, 2005; Lynton, 1995; Lynton & Elman, 1987; Ramaley, 2005). In response to this challenge, numerous initiatives have been advanced under such rubrics as service-learning and civic engagement. Examples of good practices or models

that work among community-engaged colleges and universities have resulted, 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).

The scholarship of engagement goes beyond the traditional application of academic-based research to problems in the community, or even community-based research by the academic community. Rice (2005) advanced 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 those 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.

Boyer’s thinking about the scholarship of engagement was that it represented a way for the academy and its learned disciplines to be engaged with non-academic institutions of the community in addressing social, civic, and ethical problems of society. Altman (1996) captured this notion in his *American Psychologist* essay referring to the construct “socially responsive knowledge.” Whereas 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 civically-engaged research. Building on this history and Altman’s writing, Nelson (2004) invites attention to its possible implications for graduate education in psychology.

Such distinctions have been drawn in regard to preparing professional psychologists to work with individual clients 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) argued 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 distinguished information from knowledge, much as Boorstin (1980) did at the time during which he served as Librarian of Congress.

This conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement, contrasted to the earlier scholarship of application, represents a new epistemology, one that Schon (1995) argued is grounded in inquiry and reflection-in-action. This perspective captures the essence of action research, pioneered by Kurt Lewin and his colleagues many years earlier. 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 ...”

The majority of graduate students in psychology today are enrolled in programs that focus on the application of psychology. Among these students, for those who have a focus on community-based professional services, including action research, the concept of civic engagement is especially relevant. As such, its implications for scholarship are worthy of attention during doctoral and postdoctoral work. On the other hand, given the history of psychology's development as a science, so much of which has occurred in the context of community and societal needs, the scholarship of engagement is meaningful also to doctoral students who may not at the time of their graduate education even have in mind the application or relevance of their research for the public good.

Possible questions for department self-study

1. Some faculty think of the application of knowledge or other forms of engagement in the community 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 members 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 members of the external community in civic engagement initiatives? Do faculty members involved in such initiatives 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 members 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. Among the competencies expected of engaged scholars is the capability of working collaboratively with others, with other disciplines within the academy and with other vocations outside the academy. This involves, among other things, being an effective listener and having an ability to conceptualize problems and possible approaches to their solution from different perspectives. To what extent and in what ways are your doctoral students prepared to work this way?

The transactional engagement of the academy with its surrounding community, however that community is defined, is a form of public accountability by the higher education community. In the context of increasing demand from legislators and others for greater public accountability of higher education institutions, there has likewise been an emphasis on the assessment of education outcomes for the public good. This emphasis provides a context for the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Topic IV: The scholarship of teaching and learning

Commentary

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.” Much of the recent emphasis on the assessment of student learning also has been informed, at least in academic circles, of the work of cognitive and behavioral scientists on “how people learn” (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999; Halpern & Hakel, 2003), and the implications of that for teaching and faculty development (Katz & Henry, 1993). Beyond general principles and theoretical constructs of learning, however, there is always a context within which teaching and learning occurs. Huber and Hutchings (2005) build upon this contextual aspect of teaching and learning in their discussion of the teaching commons, a conceptual space within which scholars can exchange ideas about teaching and learning. Some of this can be done on a broader, universal level; but it is also relevant for local inquiry and public sharing about how and under what conditions learning takes place in the classroom or elsewhere within particular academic contexts. This is much the same distinction as made by Rice (2005) between local and cosmopolitan knowledge related to the scholarship of engagement.

The concept of a teaching commons and the scholarship of teaching and learning has been enriched by the lifelong work of Lee Shulman, a scholar of teaching as a profession and president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. His essays on teaching and learning (Shulman, 2004a) and teaching as community property (Shulman, 2004b) are classic examples of his reflection on such matters. 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, build upon related work of others, and reflecting on and learning from these activities to improve one's work 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 and 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 scholarly 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 on 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 and Buskist (2006) have described 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 portfolio author, it can be shared for peer review and through such a process can build upon other documented knowledge about teaching and learning (Bernstein, 2002; Korn, 2002; and Perlman & McCann, 2002), and thereby becomes community property (Shulman, 1993 and 2004).

Possible questions for department self-study

1. What does the “scholarship of teaching and learning” mean to your faculty members and doctoral students? How much importance is given to this construct by your university, its graduate school, and your graduate department? How is it implemented by your faculty members in the assessment of student learning at undergraduate and graduate levels?
2. Is there an example of a teaching commons at your university where faculty members and graduate students can exchange ideas on teaching and learning? To what extent are new junior faculty mentored in regard to their teaching and related faculty responsibilities? To what extent do your faculty members and graduate students keep abreast of research and scholarly reflection on teaching and learning?
3. 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?
4. 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?

5. 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?

Professional work as a scholar, whether carried out within or outside an academic setting, is bounded by ethical and cultural contexts. In this sense, it is no different from any other work of a profession. In their professional education, therefore, it is important that those who are preparing to become scholars of the disciplines become familiar with these contexts. The next section is focused on these contexts.

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 public service 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 several 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, Derek 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) have spoken to the vital importance of ethics among scholars. In addition to disciplinary and pedagogical competence, these authors noted 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 five 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 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) pointed 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 often have different world views and expectations about their role as students, 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 and thus the importance or value attributed to different types and sources of knowledge, including the methods or processes by which knowledge is developed. 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 admission of students; mentoring and advising students; assistantships and other financial assistance programs; degree completion rates and time to degree; postdoctoral fellowships and employment guidance?
3. In what ways does your department’s climate reflect the values and experiences of culturally diverse students and faculty? What specific examples

and other evidence support such an assertion? What barriers, if any, impede the department's goal of having a culturally diverse group of faculty members 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? In what ways are your doctoral students expected to become competent in their understanding of the epistemological significance of individual and cultural diversity? How is this competence assessed?

5. To what extent 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 being prepared for professional practice, for which out-placement practicum and internship training may be required, to what extent does the department request information from practicum and internship sites about its students' ethical reasoning and conduct?

6. How do your faculty members model self-reflection about ethical issues? How deliberate 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 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 document is intended to be 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 their relationship to the development of the next generation of psychologists, questions are provided for possible use by graduate departments of psychology in their naturally occurring self-study processes.

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, 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, 377-402.

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

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

Benjamin, L.T. Jr. (2001). American psychology's struggles with its curriculum. *American Psychologist*, 56, 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, Spring, 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, 8-9.

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

Diamond, R.M. & Adam, B.E. (Eds.) (1995). *The disciplines speak: Rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

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, 421-427.

Fowers, B.J. & Richardson, F.C. (1996). Why is multiculturalism good? *American Psychologist*, 5, 609-621.

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

Gaff, J.G., Pruitt-Logan, A.S., Weibl, R.A., & 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, 356-357.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: 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, 1292-1297.
- Halpern, D. & Reich, J. (1999). Scholarship in psychology: Conversations about change and constancy. *American Psychologist*, 54, 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.
- Katz, J. & Henry, M. (1993). *Turning professors into teachers: A new approach to faculty development and student learning*. Pheonix, AZ: Orynx Press.
- 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.
- Kimble, G.A. (1996). *Psychology: The hope of a science*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

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

Koch, S. (1993). "Psychology" or "the psychological studies"? *American Psychologist*, 48, 902-904.

Korn, J.H. (1999). Recognizing teaching as teaching. *American Psychologist*, 54, 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). Doctoral education preparing for the future. *Council of Graduate Schools Communicator*, 30, November, Special Issue.

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

Lynton, E.A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Lynton, E.A. & Elman, S. (1987). *New priorities for the university: Meeting society's needs for applied knowledge and competent individuals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Matarazzo, J.D. (1987). There is only one psychology, no specialties, but many applications. *American Psychologist*, 42, 893-903.

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, 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, 7 & 10.

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

Myers, D.G. & Waller, J.E. (1999). Reflections on scholarship from the liberal arts academy. *American Psychologist*, 54, 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, 350-355.

Peterson, R. L. (2004). Evaluation and the cultures of professional psychology education programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 35, 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, 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. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 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, 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, 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.
- Sternberg, R.J. (Ed.) (2005). *Unifying the field of psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- 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, 790-821.
- Sue, D.W., Bingham, R.P., Porche-Burke, R., & Vasquez, M. (1999). The diversification of psychology: A multicultural revolution. *American Psychologist*, 54, 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,* 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,* 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.